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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Past researches have focused exclusively on gender and race at work within academia. However, I examine how ethnicity and cultural differences intersect with gender and race to produce an experience of ‘otherness’ or ‘exotic other’ for female professors who migrate to the United States. Therefore, this study expands on the existing scholarship to look at how the different statuses of gender, race and/or ethnicity, and immigration meet to shape the academic experience of female faculty and determine their opportunities, responsibilities, authority, legitimacy and advancement at work.

I will be analyzing the experiences of immigrant female professors in university and the academic world at large. For the purpose of my analysis, I am drawing from ‘outsider-within’ (Collins 1986) to understand how gender, race, ethnicity and cultural differences come together in an interlocking system of oppression (Collins 1991) for immigrants, thereby creating a binary division between ‘us’ and ‘they’ (Said 1978). Basically, the purpose of my study is to see how workplaces, especially academia engage in ‘doing difference’ (West and Fenstermaker 1995) on the lines of gender, race, ethnicity and cultural differences. In my work I also enhance the theory of tokenism beyond gender and race by encompassing ethnicity and cultural differences to look at how workplaces increase the visibility and exclusion of immigrants, as well as create assimilation problems amidst the dominant group.

In short, my paper looks at the experiences of immigrant female professors as gendered “cultural tokens” that lead to their alienation or exoticization by colleagues and students, and in the university at large and thus, how they experience the process of ‘othering’. Therefore, my paper is oriented towards making sense of how power operates in an interlocking system of oppression governed by the ideologies of male hegemony, white supremacy and anti-immigrant sentiments, thereby affecting the academic career of the immigrant female faculty. Hence, my study focuses on three levels: macro, meso and micro. The macro perspective looks into how gender, race, ethnicity and immigration status organize the
workplace in academia (structural), the meso views the cultures and rules that operate in academia, and
lastly, the micro standpoint looks into how people do ‘gender’ and ‘race’ or ‘ethnic other’ everyday.

I undertook a qualitative project to analyze and understand the process of exoticization for
immigrant female professors and I conducted in-depth face-to-face interviews with my participants in a
large public university in Midwest. My study is based on a diversified sample comprising of immigrant
female faculty from all racial and ethnic background including both non-whites and whites, so that a
comprehensive and coherent analysis could be made between them, as well as for each one of them.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

Tokenism in workplaces

Tokenism suggests the inclusion of minority population in a setting dominated by a majority group, such as hiring of women and non-whites in organizations dominated by men and whites respectively. The term ‘token’ has been defined by Kanter (1977) as a person of the minority population constituting of the 15% of the total population in the workplace. Basically, Kanter (1977) applied the term ‘token’ to minority female employees in organizations that play the organizationally devalued and feminine roles (e.g. secretarial and clerical jobs). As a result of being a minority group, the tokens are scrutinized and analyzed by super-ordinates and colleagues, have banal and stereotypical images about them, and their uniqueness is compromised. In short, the three main problems that surround the ‘tokens’ are: heightened visibility, assimilation and exclusion. These problems in turn relate to power issues and block the opportunities and career mobility of the ‘tokens’.

As a result of tokenism, the minority population becomes the ‘outsider-within’ (Collins 1986) in organizations, that is, gender and race simultaneously constitute insiders and outsiders in organizations especially run by white men. So, in spite of having a formal membership in the organizations women and people of color do not enjoy the same benefits or privileges as the white men do, thereby manifesting structured inequality that may lead to varying social and psychological lesions on the part of the minorities. In other words, such a structural arrangement reflects the hierarchical control and culture of the insider-group.

Gender and race in academia

Past studies show that academic institutions are gendered and bureaucratic structures organized around the principle of hegemonic masculinity, thereby hampering the professional enhancement of
female faculty by creating a ‘leaky pipeline’ (Bird 2011; Cheng 1996; Todd et al. 2008) in the form of less and less females in higher positions of authority or professorship. Hegemonic masculinity is a gendered practice that gives men a dominant position in society and women a subordinate social location (Connell 1995). The practice of hegemonic masculinity can be seen in university when for instance, male faculty are found to occupy most of the decision-making positions who evaluate and implement policies both at the departmental and institutional level, as well as evaluate candidates in faculty recruitment, promotion and tenure processes based on the assumption that they have the expertise and competency (Fox and Long 1995; Long et al. 1993; Martin 1994). Since, female professors do not constitute significant leadership positions it results in the ‘ghettoziation’ of females into lower academic ranks and positions that encompasses more of the non-tenure track positions such as that of lecturers, adjunct faculty etc. (Kulis and Miller-Loeski 1992) or assistant professorship.

Female faculty are discriminated in many other ways. For example, in case of the number of publications, they are related to increased pay for male professors but not for female professors (Ward 2001), and in most cases males received more frequent promotion than women (Long et al. 1993; Toren and Moore 1998). Also, despite equal qualification males are preferred over females in hiring (especially, in science and engineering) as the former are considered to be more effective and competent than the latter, and the same assumptions are held when teaching, research and service are evaluated (Steinpreis et al. 1999). Female faculty also suffer wage penalty even when they are employed in higher proportions based on established criteria and credentials, that is, their earnings are less in average compared to their male colleagues in the same academic fields (Bellas 1994).

There also exists a perception of women as intellectually, biologically, morally and emotionally inferior to men (Palma 2005; Sommers 2008; Summers 2005). Such a perception of women leads to their marginalization and elimination as faculty in the sciences especially, in case of those who are to be tenured (Bailyn 1999) in the form of discriminative practices (e.g. male faculty favored over female faculty, differences in salary, office space, awards, resources etc.) in the process of getting tenure (Dusky
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1996; Schneider 1998), as well as generation of a glass ceiling for female faculty to achieve the rank of a full professor (Geisler et al. 2007).

There is also an existence of gendered racism in academia despite the prevalence of affirmative action. Female faculty of color are often tokens in academia in terms of their underrepresentation at American colleges and universities and holding of lowest ranks like those of instructor, adjunct faculty, lecturer and assistant professor. They are low in number, rarely tenured and have less academic standing compared to white colleagues (Allen et al. 2000; Kim et al. 2011; Schneider 1997). In case of Black female professors as noted in 1996, only 6.43% occupied full time faculty positions in the ranks of assistant, associate and full professors and only 1% taught full-time in a 4 year majority institutions across the country (Gregory 2001), and mostly located in traditional black colleges and universities. Similarly, only 2% of assistant professors in the U.S. and 0.4% of all full professors were Asian women (Kennelly, Misra and Karides 1999). Latina/o female faculty comprises 4% of the tenure-track positions and 3% in the ranks of full professors (Nunez and Murakami-Ramalho 2012). Other than underrepresentation and constituting low academic ranks, female faculty of color are also victims of “cultural taxation” (Padilla 1994), that is, they serve several diversity committees, mentor abundant students, act as departmental specialists for particular gender and racial/ethnic group, do race related research etc. Such care work and “emotion labor” (Hochschild 1983) in turn often acted as a barrier in getting tenure (Gregory 2001; Medina and Luna 2000) because tenure or promotion demands research productivity that gets hindered by committee and service work.

Female faculty of color experienced gendered racism amongst colleagues as well. For instance, colleagues did not collaborate with black female faculty in research, often lacked mentoring by senior faculty as well as research funding or access to research resources. White female faculty stood on the same podium as black female faculty only when they had to discuss what benefits they do not share, thereby exhibiting ‘sister solidarity’ (Patton, 2004). On the other hand, Latina/o female faculty underwent the pressure of proving themselves to colleagues of their abilities where the former were viewed as a consequence of affirmative action (Medina and Luna 2000). Asian female faculty hear pompous and
patronizing comments from male colleagues, feel as if their voice was not heard, addressed as ‘Mrs’ rather than ‘Dr.’, their competence being questioned and assumptions are being held about their role because of their gender and race. These in turn produce anger, depression and anxiety (psychological), and headaches, nausea and chest pain (physical) (Kim et al. 2011).

There is a strong connection between students’ gender and professors’ gender (Bachen et al. 1999). In other words, professors’ assessments are to an extent guided by sex-role expectations and evaluations. This is manifested when male students generally and female students especially gave high ratings to female professors compared to male professors based on the traits of being compassionate, communicative, interactive, professional, exigent, planned and structured. In case the female professor is perceived not to be emotionally unavailable, she is criticized as ‘high on herself’ or as someone with ‘something to prove’, especially by male students. On the other hand, there were no such expectations out of male professors who are stranded by the established gender schema of lacking nurturing and expressive qualities. Female faculty of color experience both sex-role expectations, as well as denial of authority especially with white male students as in the case of black female professors (Pittman 2010). The students challenged their authority (e.g. open office doors without knocking, address professor by their first name etc.), teaching competency (e.g. criticizing her effectiveness as a teacher) and scholarship expertise (e.g. overtly and directly questioning their knowledge of mainstream scholarship, did not recognize scholarly expertise on issues of race and gender as ‘real’ scholarship), offering subtle and not so subtle threats to their persons and careers (e.g. low course evaluation ratings, confronting about grade, throwing papers at professor etc.). Also, Aversive racism was noticed when Latina professors were evaluated by students in comparison to Anglo professors, however, with no impact of the professor’s gender (Smith and Anderson 2005).

Immigration and ‘otherness’

Existing scholarship reveals that immigration plays a huge role in academic employment and experience amongst colleagues and students for female faculty of color. Immigration brings along with it the notion of “racialized tokens” amidst a majority of White colleagues producing anti-immigrant
sentiments for immigrant colored (Latina) faculty (Flores 2011). According to Rong and Preissle (1997), immigrant minorities share three main problems related to unfamiliarity with the (English) language and culture of the host country; arousal of hostile sentiments, suspicion and feeling of alienation from the native born; and their race or ethnicity emphasizing their cultural difference (e.g. religion, customs etc.) and bringing in racial discrimination. Immigration is also central to the meaning of racism along with xenophobia and underemployment (Rong and Preissle 1997). Also, the difficulty in grasping the English language leads to the branding of first generation Asian and Hispanic immigrants to the U.S. as the ‘language minority’.

There are several ways in which immigrants (non-native English speakers) who speak world English or African English are discriminated (Lin et al. 2004). For instance, they are being treated as ‘illegitimate’ and excluded from communication related to important decisions, pressurized to do extra work beyond assigned duties, treated as a teaching assistant deprived of decision-making power, blamed for students’ complaints about programs they are not primarily responsible of, expected to do student-teacher supervision rather than teaching a graduate course, and given the lowest salary at the same rank as their White colleagues. Their cultural and linguistic heritage is devalued and criticized as ‘sulky’. Despite having equal number of scholarship and publications compared to White male faculty, immigrant female faculty of color are excluded from tenure and their work being criticized as ‘trashy work’. Despite having extensive training in research methodology, female faculty of color constituted as a local class person who supervised the students’ practicum and coordinated school placement (equivalent to a PR job). They also kept silent about any discussion related to discourses of danger, security and vulnerability about diversity fearing that it might hamper the comfort levels of students from dominant groups, thereby making them more vulnerable. They could not even protest against the issues of marginalization fearing that they will be perceived as emotionally unstable, lacking reason and incapable of enjoying themselves or engaging in productive argumentation.
Exoticization of the ‘ethnic other’

Ethnic groups constitute of those people who are associated with each other on the basis of a national identity, and a common culture and heritage but living outside its national borders. These ethnic groups are tied to each other through a common racial, national, religious, linguistic and cultural heritage. Therefore, ethnicity is a political tool of exclusion, as well as a basis of meaning and unity and cohesion, and the relationship between culture, power and social identity (Kaner 2007). Ethnicity constructs social identity on the basis of a binary division between a cultural ‘self’ and various ‘others’ (Kaner 2007). This means creation of social identity constructs a boundary reflecting a ‘group comradeship’ and thus ethnicity “matters particularly in contexts of inequality between groups widely considered to constitute ‘the cultural majority’ and those living as minorities respectively” (Kaner 2007). The dominant group applies the idea of ‘stranger’ ‘who comes today and stays tomorrow’ (Simmel 1972) to respond to the ethnic immigrants as the ‘other’ who embodies difference amidst them (Bauman 1990). Therefore, as understood, ethnic identity leads to exoticization. Therefore, exoticization indicates the process of ‘othering’ in which ‘others’ are considered as exotic, mystifying, primeval, bizarre, and quite unlike from ‘self’ (Fukuda 2006). The concept has been enhanced on Said’s (1978) twofold categorization between ‘superior self’ and ‘inferior others’.

Workplaces indicate that the intersection of gender, ethnicity, and culture have a deep impact on women of color (Toren 1999) and thereby, lead to their exoticization. Past studies indicate that issues of gender and ethnic identity are very important in understanding the work lives especially of Latina women professionals in the United States (Gloria and Hird 1999). For instance, they feel marginalized compared to any social ethnic group manifested in the form of low earning (Browne 1999; Mora and Davila 1998; Sanchez and Brock 1996) leading to their anxiety and loneliness (Canabal and Quiles 1995; Franks and Faux 1990; Kranau et al. 1982; Long and Martinez 1994; Romero, Castro and Cervantes 1988). This is also true when the Latina women and women in general are absent in leadership positions reflecting the idea that women only support organizations whereas, men rule (Kelly et al. 1991). The process of ‘othering’ is also visible in the U.S. academia where for instance, Chicano literature and
Chicano women are hardly recognized because “as academics and third world women [they] are constantly in a border space, straddling the elitism of the academy and the communities where [they] are raised.” (Sandoval 1999). Therefore, as stated Chicana women face the daily resistance and challenge of connecting their community and academy thereby reflecting problems associated with assimilation.

In my study I seek to address the following questions. Firstly, what is the interactional experience of immigrant female professors amongst colleagues and students or in the university and the academic world at large? Secondly, what are the specific treatment and responsibilities faced in terms of gender, race and ethnicity? Thirdly, how does immigration specifically affect the academic experience of the ethnic minority female faculty? Fourthly, how does the process of creating ‘ethnic others’ operate in the academic world, and how does this lead to their exoticization at work in terms of ethnic identity and cultural differences? Lastly, how does the theory of tokenism affect the legitimacy, opportunities and advancement of the immigrant female faculty?
CHAPTER 3

DATA AND METHODS

In my study, I conducted in-depth face-to-face interviews to look at how gender, race, ethnicity and immigration intersect to define the female faculty’s academic experience in university. I drew my sample from a mid-western public university (see table 1 for demographic details) based on convenient sampling and using snowball sampling in getting access to three respondents. I chose a public research university because along with teaching heavy importance is being placed on research as well. This in turn helped me to determine the roles of the female faculty in both teaching and research including how they are being viewed and treated in their service in comparison to their white male colleagues in particular and other male colleagues in general.

I began by getting a list of all professors from the diversity office that included details about the female faculty’s racial and ethnic background, and immigration status. Later on, I emailed each professor informing about the purpose of my study, thereby acquiring their informed consent for participation in my research. I also met them personally during their office hours to explain the study. After getting consent I conducted my interviews with 17 female faculty members from March 2012 to February 2013.

Of the seventeen female professors I interviewed, eleven identified themselves as Asian, four as White, one as Latina and one as African. In terms of their ranks, one is a lecturer, eight are assistant professors, five are associate professors and three are full professors. One professor is from the school of business, two from engineering, seven from sciences (agricultural science, natural science and stem program), two from social science, one from fine arts, and four from media and communication. Their ages range from 31 to 61. However, two of my respondents did not report their age. While one identified herself as a lesbian the rest identified themselves as heterosexual, and one did not report her sexual orientation or marital status. Of these fifteen heterosexual professors eleven are married with children, one is a single unmarried mother, one is divorced, one is partnered and has children, and one is single.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Department/College</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Income (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shalini</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Asian/Indian</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>80,000-89,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shweta</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Asian/Indian</td>
<td>Mass Communication</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>60,000-69,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leela</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Asian/Indian</td>
<td>Mass Communication</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>50,000-59,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Asian/Korean</td>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>50,000-59,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Asian/Chinese</td>
<td>Mass Communication</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Asian/Indian</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anila</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Asian/Indian</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>90,000-99,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jia</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Asian/Chinese</td>
<td>STEM Program</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>90,000-99,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Asian/Chinese</td>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Above 100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnese</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>White/Italian</td>
<td>Agricultural Science</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>70,000-79,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>White/English</td>
<td>Natural Science</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Above 100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranjeeta</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Asian/Indian</td>
<td>Natural Science</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Asian/Chinese</td>
<td>Natural Science</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>80,000-89,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alecia</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>White/Greek</td>
<td>Agricultural Science</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>90,000-99,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deena</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>White/Israeli</td>
<td>Mass Communication</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Above 100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Latina/Mexican</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>60,000-69,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>African/Jamaican</td>
<td>Natural Science</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>60,000-69,999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Two respondents did not report their age and three did not report their annual income.
Except for three respondents who are second generation immigrants, all others are first generation immigrants to the United States. Eight hold the American citizenship, one is a green card holder, and the rest are neither. Except for two professors who had their doctoral degree from Europe and Asia respectively, the rest did their PhD in the United States.

My respondents reported dedicating around ten hours to teaching (including preparation), 40-50 hours in research, and 10-15 hours in service work (including administration and committee work responsibilities) per week. The professors’ minimum salary was within the range of USD 50,000-59,999 and the maximum was above USD 100,000. On an average, the professors earned within the range of USD 70,000-79,999. However, three professors did not report their salary.

All the interviews were conducted in the professors’ offices. On average, the interviews lasted an hour. In case of my three respondents, follow up sessions were held to complete the interview. The interview questions revolved around how the female professors navigate academia in terms of gender, race, ethnicity and distinct cultural background. I told them to describe their overall experiences in the university, as well as amongst colleagues and students so far, and how their gender, race and/or ethnicity, culture and language affect their work experience in terms of teaching, research and service. The interviews were transcribed followed by coding. Initially, I began with open-coding looking at the emerging themes related to how the professors made sense of their experience in academia. Some of the themes included experiences of exoticization by colleagues and students, and in the university at large determining their authority, legitimacy, opportunities, and responsibilities at work. As concrete themes emerged, I moved on to focused coding looking at how these professors varied in terms of their sensitivity and understanding of their gendered, racial and/or ethnic, and distinct cultural experience.
CHAPTER 4
FINDINGS

Four concrete themes emerge in my study that explicate how gender, race and/or ethnicity intersect to shape the academic experience of the immigrant female professors: (1) They experience denial of power and authority at work, and disrespect in their interactions with colleagues and students, and at the same time segregation; (2) They are not recognized and devalued in terms of their stature and accomplishments, and understood as secondary to male faculty (3) Language acts as a barrier for them; and (4) Cultural aspects like religion, food, costume etc. lead to their alienation. These themes in turn draw a picture explaining the process of exoticization of the immigrant female faculty as gendered ‘cultural’ tokens.

‘It is an invisible discourse’: Segregation and denial of authority

Majority of my respondents reported incidents of negative experiences that led to their exclusion amongst colleagues and students. They described the academic institution as a space that led to the denial of their authority and feeling that they are a minority in terms of gender, race, and ethnic identity, feeling disrespected and lacking status and power, and isolation. Leela, an (Asian) associate professor at the college of mass communication and a first generation immigrant from India says “it is an invisible discourse and the language of race and gender is used just for people’s own benefit…they are these real issues of power.” Therefore, as stated power is located in the various statuses of gender and race.

Majority of my non-white respondents suggested that male hegemony and white supremacy interact in the process of ‘othering’ the ethnic minority female faculty in academia, and thereby in the process of exoticization amongst colleagues. Along with the experience of alienation that ethnic minority female faculty undergo in academia amongst colleagues, one of my respondents points out that there exists a hierarchy of status among ethnic groups belonging to the same racial standing. Overall, the ethnic minority female faculty are tokens in the university who receive varying levels of support leading to their
alienation (Medina and Luna 2000), as well as their opinions. For example, Amy, an (Latina) assistant professor in the college of liberal arts and a second generation immigrant from Mexico said,

I’m clearly a minority and it’s gone to the point now where there’s a white male colleague in faculty meetings, who pretty much any time I open my mouth, he rolls his eyes, because he’s probably expecting me to say something about race, or make some kind of criticisms. I also think it’s getting dismissed because I am a woman of color making these suggestions, pointing out these concerns and so it’s easier to dismissing coming from me than if I were a white man making those same kinds of suggestions…I feel like if I was even Hispanic from a different country, like Argentina or whatever, somewhere else, that I might be actually given like more respect because Mexicans in the United States don’t have a lot of status.

Women felt white colleagues excluded them from face-to-face discussions using racial and ethnic identity as a tool for isolation, especially when there were disagreements. For instance, Leela said,

A few years ago we had a Chair who was Indian. [The Chair] had certain issues in terms of how he worked. So, he could be pushy, he could be arrogant. But, I feel instead of disagreeing with him [upfront], saying ‘we don’t like your management style’ my colleagues chose instead to focus on the two of us. First of all, they could not separate the two and I think they felt that there was something like I was getting some particular advantage out of the situation.

Leela points out that ethnic and racial identity can be used unduly by white colleagues in situations especially when they feel threatened by people of color and thereby, isolate them. This is because as Shweta, an (Asian) associate professor in mass communication and a first generation immigrant from India pointed out, “men and [white] women feel threatened, feeling like they know better or are more knowledgeable or experienced, whatever it might be.” Often this process of isolating racial and ethnic minorities took place in a very subtle manner. Respondents reported that on surface, there was
no display of animosity for people of color but, there existed a ‘Pandora’s box’ of rumor or gossip undercover. Leela said,

Social circles are very segregated you know according to class and race, then it feeds into these social circles of gossip and rumor and stuff. I feel that it is a closed community here where there is a lot of rumor, gossip and kind of personal politics that plays a heavy part and that is a kind of disillusioning, disappointing that people will not disagree with you openly and publicly but, will kind of talk about you behind your back. So, there is a certain culture of friendliness on the surface which is deceptive.

However, exclusion also took place amongst white immigrant female faculty in many ways by their male colleagues. For instance, Agnese, a White assistant professor in the agricultural sciences and a first generation immigrant from Italy said, “they [male colleagues] go out for coffee or they have dinner parties at their houses and they don’t invite me.” Therefore, colleagues “do difference” on the lines of gender, race and/or ethnicity (West and Fenstermaker 1995) by creating a division between ‘us’ and they’ (Said 1978) in faint ways like gossiping and spreading rumors at the back of the ethnic minority female faculty, as well as excluding them in occasions of socialization.

Majority of my respondents reported that they are put on committees more than their male colleagues. For instance, Agnese, said, “I think at the university level I am at the point where I do more than my male colleagues. Some of that is because I am a woman. So, you need to have women on certain committees and there is less women…so, [I] am put on more committees.” Other than representing diversity in committee work in terms of gender, female faculty also act as representatives in terms of their racial identity. For example, Leela said, “I get to be put on committees like this token person. There is this system by which every committee has to have a person who’s not white.” Being internationals the immigrant faculty reported that they are expected to deal with international students as well and the faculty finds it hard to refuse. For instance, Shweta said, “there have been times someone [approached] me because of just not knowing anybody, stereotyping, thinking of [me] being able to understand every international student’s problem. Sometimes you get request to do such service.” This shows that other
than general committee work, immigrant female faculty tend to act as representatives that deal with minority (international) students’ committees as well resulting in the confinement into particular jobs (Hernandez and Morales 1999) and therefore, being considered as different or exotic. It also shows that female faculty in general and immigrant female faculty in particular are pushed and preferred to do the department’s service and care work, thereby becoming the ‘mother’ or ‘caretaker’ in the academic world by playing the organizationally undervalued roles (Kanter 1977; Pierce 1995) that male and white colleagues are not expected to do.

In addition to the committee work, the ethnic minority female faculty are approached to undertake some particular service work because of their gender, race, ethnicity as well as sexuality. For instance, Amy said,

I’m on three dissertation committees outside the department. There isn’t a lot of Hispanic faculty and I think I am the only one who looks at race. The Hispanic Center approached me because I am Hispanic. [K]appa Delta Kai approached me because I’m Hispanic. LGBTQ Resource Center, I think I got hooked up with them because I’m gay. I’m [also] on the Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies curriculum committee.

This shows that female faculty from other countries are segregated not only on the basis of gender and race but, are also exoticized in academia as ‘ethnosexuals’ (Nagel 2003) who engage in service work that deal with gender, race, as well as sexuality matters. Other than committee and service work, non-white immigrant faculty are also expected to teach classes related to gender and race and/or ethnicity, and at the same time, minority students expect the ethnic minority female faculty to mentor them. Again, according to Amy,

I’m expected to teach gender and race classes and I think it’s because I’m a woman of color. [According to colleagues] it’s like, ‘well since none of us know anything about race and at least you are a racial ethnic minority, so you should know more than the average white person’ type of thing, which is kind of bull shit! [Also] a lot of times students are looking for mentors or just looking for making a connection with professors.
A lot of students of color look for a professor of color. There are a lot of students who come to me.

Female faculty of color who are also ethnic minorities are not only expected to delve into gender and race related work and therefore, suffer from “cultural taxation” (Padilla 1994), but are also expected to engage into emotional labor and care work (Hochschild 1983) of mentoring minority students as well that white faculty stay away from. Therefore, ‘cultural taxation’ and emotional labor work lead to the consideration of immigrant female faculty as exotic and different.

Apart from issues of gender, race and/or ethnicity and culture, motherhood acted as an obstacle in the process of getting accepted for female faculty amongst students as well as colleagues, especially for single mothers who are also ethnic minority. For instance, Alecia, a White assistant professor in the agricultural sciences and a first generation immigrant from Greece said,

I had a student. She was a potential student. She made a lot of [rude] comments about everything. She made comments about my nationality. She said many times, “yes, of course, you’re a single mother.” She made comments like these. I can tell you that it was a shock for me. [Also] when [male colleagues] first found out that I was pregnant and they knew I was single, they had a kind of a different attitude. They were gossiping! It is a big challenge for them because they have other models in their mind. You cannot be unmarried with a child in academia.

This goes into showing that motherhood demeans a status of female faculty making her unlikeable, especially in case of a single mother creating a sense of ‘otherness’ and leading to her marginalization (Cuddy et al. 2004; Schlehofer 2011). It also suggests an unsaid expectation out of female professors which is gendered in nature echoing that being unmarried and having children in academia is a stigma. Again, gendered expectations of female chastity are coupled with national identity to produce a distinct experience of powerlessness for ethnic minority female faculty, and in the process lead to their exoticization.
Despite the negative experiences of exclusion that the immigrant female faculty in my study underwent in their interaction amongst colleagues mainly, one-fourth of my respondents had job satisfaction in terms of objective administration, friendly and cohesive department, collaborative faculty and students, and the freedom to work in their own way. For example, Shalini an (Asian) assistant professor in the college of engineering and a first generation immigrant from India said,

I have had a very positive experience both from an administration point of view and from the teaching aspect and the work itself. So, I enjoy doing research, teaching, and interacting with students. The administration, the department Chair, they are all extremely supportive. Anything you can need you can walk into his office and ask him and if it is within his reach to help you he will do it. Even for my colleagues, I have been able to ask them for advice.

Such positive experiences of cohesiveness and collaboration happened mainly in departments that were international in nature having faculty and students mostly from outside the United States. For example, Jia, an (Asian) associate professor in the STEM program and a first generation immigrant from China said, “[My colleagues and me] we did publish papers. By working together we write papers over the summer and we got accepted. And we also have students getting involved in writing and in some experiments. And, in [my department] a lot of faculty member is international. We have three Americans out of thirteen [faculty]. So, there are foreigners and in this [collaboration] area it is common international wise.” This explains that if departments have colleagues who are mainly foreigners, there is more of collaboration amongst immigrant faculty and therefore, more job satisfaction.

According to some immigrant female professors out of the one-fourth who reported job satisfaction, said that the university environment was very flexible allowing them to work independently, in terms of both teaching and research. For instance, according to Chang, an (Asian) assistant professor in mass communication and a first generation immigrant from China said, “I think it is very high, job satisfaction. I think the environment, the teaching environment, research environment is very flexible and we have a lot of freedom to decide what kind of research we are going to do.” Apart from a flexible
teaching and research environment, some of my respondents felt that the academic environment has been objective as well in terms of rewarding female professors of color. For instance, Anila, an (Asian) associate professor in the social sciences and a first generation immigrant from India said, “I got the outstanding teacher of the year and I got in 2007 the co-curriculum award. I have got 7 teaching awards.”

Positive interactions with colleagues were not restricted to within the department or the institution only. Collegiality and a sense of community were visible outside the territory of school as well. For example, Juan, a (Asian) full professor in natural sciences and a first generation immigrant from China said, “…another thing is the community. In the sense for instance, I get along with my colleagues, we are like working, like professionally engage and also personally after work and you felt a kind of a connection to your friends so they become my friend and we can maybe do some activities outside of the department, that’s a very important thing. And all my friends are White Americans. We have a Book club. So, we read books together.” This explains even though ethnic minority female faculty are segregated in most occasions, at times they were able to develop a sense of belonging to the racially dominant white community in the U.S.

Half of my respondents including the white immigrant faculty reported that their authority was denied inside classroom, and that they felt challenged by students. According to majority of my respondents who reported boorish behavior on part of the students, especially white male students said that they did gender most of the time and thereby, denied female faculty’s authority in class. For example, Amy said, “in class I’ve had a traditional white male student [in his forties] constantly referred to me as ‘Kiddo’ and [addressed] me as ‘look babe’! I repeatedly asked him not to do that and at one point I interrupted him, but [he] was constant! It was ridiculous!” So, it is difficult for female faculty in general and female faculty of color and ethnic minorities in particular to establish control in class, especially amongst white male students (Pittman 2010).

Gender, race and/or ethnic identity also intersect to produce exploitative experiences for female faculty in their interactions with students outside classroom. Along with gender and ethnic identity, culture plays a big role in the abusive treatment of the ethnic minority female faculty by students in the
U.S. and thereby leads to their exoticization (Toren 1999). In short, female faculty of an ethnic minority status lacked power and authority amongst students as well. For instance, Amanda, a Black assistant professor in the natural sciences, and a second generation immigrant from Jamaica said,

I do have students who don’t have manners. They would barge in without knocking; some of them would try to call you by your first name. They come at will whereas; they probably wouldn’t do that to [most] professors. So, I think the rudest thing for me is acknowledging a professor by their first name....So, I think it is an American [cultural] thing.

Other than the negative experiences of establishing authority amongst students, there also existed positive experiences. Few of my respondents said that the students are energetic and cooperative and they collaborate together on research work. For instance, Jia said, “I really like to work with the young students. They are energetic, they have new ideas and I like to talk to them. Sometimes their ideas can inspire my research. I published a paper with my student. We go to the conference. So, that’s a very nice experience.”

In short, this section explains that gender, race and ethnicity intersect to shape the immigrant faculty’s experiences of isolation by colleagues and students, thereby leading to their denial of authority and disrespect. This in turn reflects the power dynamics located in the varied social statuses.

‘We just need to be loved’: Non-recognition and Devaluation

Many of my respondents reported that academia was not welcoming, especially male colleagues and the academic world at large did not acknowledge or recognize their identity and accomplishments. They reported of having been perceived of less importance and secondary or inferior to white native male professors in terms of status and achievements. For instance, Kate, a (White) full professor in the natural sciences and a first generation immigrant from England said, “[male colleagues] would just devalue my work. They would say my [research papers] were not published in the best journals, they would say that they were multi-authored instead of single authored which was like antiquated notion of what research is. Good research is very often multi-authored these days.” In another instance she also said, “I was
nominated by my students for the outstanding educator of the year award. Actually that was a really nice honor. My senior [male] faculty thought that it was just something what women get.” This shows that apart from considering work done by female professors as inferior, there is also this idea that female professors are best suited for teaching than research. The idea is that males do better research than their female counterparts and that the former’s research is of a superior quality than the latter. This makes academia in the U.S. very hierarchical that unevenly esteems and rewards success (Park 1996) amongst male and female professors.

None of my respondents reported any discrimination or negative experiences related to the process of tenure, that is, everybody got tenure in a smooth way. For instance, Shweta, said, “No problem. I went up for tenure when I was supposed to with the unanimous vote of the department and went [straight] up to the college level.” However, a few respondents reported once tenured they experienced barriers to getting promoted to the rank of a full professor. This can be understood when Deena, a (White) full professor in mass communication and a first generation immigrant from Israel said,

I was up for a promotion and there was a complicated issue with a male faculty member. We needed eight letters and they all had to agree unanimously and you would get this promotion but, in my case there was this one minority letter against me and I did not get the promotion. Everybody knew that this was really bad and later the Head came to me and said “Don’t worry about your promotion, you know we all love you” and he did not realize what a big gender thing it was to say that….We don’t need status, we don’t need respect, we don’t need a higher salary, we just need to be loved!!! I know that he really meant nice things when he told me that but, it was so gendered, the thought that women can wait longer to be promoted. It’s okay as long as we are loved.”

The above description shows that not only female faculty lack status and respect in comparison to male professors but, the very idea of being just ‘loved’ signifies that their work is not being taken seriously in academia, and that they can wait longer to get their work recognition and get promoted. Therefore, as a result of being devalued and considered inferior to men culturally, female professors’
work also gets devalued (Bellas 1994) and thereby, hinder their promotion. This in turn results in the generation of a glass ceiling for the female professors to achieve the rank of a full professor (Geisler et al. 2007) and thereby, their exclusion from promotion.

Apart from within the department, there were occasions in the academic world as a whole in which immigrant female professors were not respected as well. They were denied of their status, identity as well as attainments. Along with getting denied of due respect amongst colleagues and students, they are also victims of gendered oppression in the university culture at large and sufferers of patronizing and pompous comments (Kim et al. 2011) that is not restricted to female faculty of color alone. For example, as nicely described by Deena again,

…some subtle differences, like you will be in a panel of specialists in a symposium or to be interviewed for television and there will be men and women and the men will be introduced like ‘professor’ this or ‘Dr.’ this and ‘chief’ of this and ‘director’ of that and I will be addressed by my personal name. And that happens so often that there is this sense not that someone is trying purposefully to hurt me but it’s just stripping women of their achievements and accomplishments and titles and status by just calling them by their first names.

There were many other ways in which my respondents were denied of their status and stripped of their identity by male colleagues and the administrative body in the university. Even though my respondents reported that they were paid no less than their male counterparts in their positions and in some cases were also paid more, they described that they were considered unworthy of the money that they got as per their academic stature. Also, many of my respondents reported that their male colleagues were better in terms of negotiating the salary compared to them. For example, Deena said, “the issue of negotiation of salary is a thorny issue. [It] is annoying even for me in my stature, in my position, knowing my worth in the market. The [dean] will say “this is what we are offering you.”’The idea is it’s not nice for women to argue about money. The concept is “you should be grateful to what you are offered. That’s a very gendered issue.” Therefore, the immigrant female faculty in my study pointed out that women
should be happy and satiated with whatever they are offered in academia. Male colleagues too were not happy if their female counterparts earned more than them. For instance, as described by Agnese, “I get a higher salary than my male colleagues. And that really pisses them off. After 8 years of experience at a research center I did lots of proposals and bring in lots of money. I was competitive. That’s why they pay me the money because I bring in the money. The dean was meeting all the faculty. And one of my colleagues said [in a sarcastic tone], “I am glad that I am meeting with him for you because you have made me look bad.” They are little bit upset that a woman is so successful.”

Therefore, this section shows that the immigrant female faculty in my study were stripped of their worth in several ways by colleagues and in the wider academic world that led to their exoticization and alienation in many ways.

‘I am not performing in English’: ‘Otherness’ due to language

Past studies have suggested that immigrants such as Asian Americans and Hispanic Americans are the ‘language minority’ in the United States (Rong and Preissle 1997). However, my study suggests that it’s not only the Asians or the Hispanics who should be considered as the minority group in terms of language but, also the white immigrants including people from the English speaking countries as well. This is because the white female faculty in my study reported of having mainly faced the issue with their accent that led to communication problems amongst students. On the other hand, the female faculty of color faced issues with both fluency and accent. The exceptions were those professors who were second generation immigrants in the United States.

My respondents reported that language posed as a barrier to assimilation in terms of communication with colleagues and students in the university thereby, shaping their academic experience. Therefore, fluency and accent are the major issues when it comes to speaking English in academia. To understand that non-native English speakers are unable to communicate, Liu, an (Asian) assistant professor in the fine arts and first generation immigrant from Korea said, “[students] would have a hard time in understanding me and sometimes they misunderstood and did something different from what I told them to do. [And colleagues] would just ask me again and again, and clarify.”
Language acts as a barrier to communication and a tool for exoticization for immigrants and because of the foreignness of the (English) language, the non-native speakers become incomprehensible that affects their communication amongst colleagues and students, and influence their evaluations amongst students especially. Exclusion due to language got reflected when Chen, an (Asian) assistant professor in the school of business and a first generation immigrant from China said,

Because my native tongue is not English I have to work harder you know on my English and how to deliver my lecture to the Americans. You know you have to work extremely harder compared to a native speaker. So, I have students complaining about my language. They said [in evaluations] you know something like “I don’t understand her English” and things like that.

However, the non-white English speakers are not alone in the league when language presents itself as a barrier. The white immigrant female professors also reported to having the same issue with language including those from the non-English speaking countries, as well as English speaking countries. For example, Deena who comes from a non-English speaking country said,

One simple challenge is the issue of language. Even though I am fluent in English I do not feel that I am fluent in English. My writing, speaking and thinking in English is not at par with my native language so, I always feel that I am not performing in English to the best of my abilities and whenever I am in a meeting and I speak in English, I always feel that if that meeting was in [***] then I would be a lot more clearer and a lot more eloquent, a lot more persuasive. So, I always feel like I am not performing on a Hundred level but I am performing less because of the language issue. So, to me that’s a huge obstacle because I don’t feel that I am getting the most out of myself when I am doing anything in English.

Language, precisely the English accent also acted as a tool for exclusion for professors who are from English speaking countries. For example, Kate who has been residing in the United States for the past 42 years said, “well you know first I had tough time understanding people, trouble understanding the
humor. That was difficult for me to get it at first. So, when I started teaching at [***], I had an English accent and after a while one student came up to me and said that [he] couldn’t understand what I was saying. And that struck me as rather bizarre because I thought I didn’t have a very strong cockney accent or like that.” This is turn shows that other than fluency in English language, having an English accent in an American academic system exoticized the immigrant faculty as ‘cultural tokens’ in university.

Other than being considered as unfathomable, the issue of English language also led to several consequences. For instance, language made it difficult for the immigrant female faculty to establish authority and control in class especially amongst male students. For example, Agnese said, “you know students can drop out of classes the first week. In my experience all the students that have dropped out of my classes are men rather than women. Those are the guys [who] don’t like to be taught by the lady with a funny accent. You know stuff like that.” This in turn reflects that language acts as an instrument of prejudice and denial of authority, as well as a way of doing gender and in the process, alienating the immigrant professors as an exotic other. In short, language made the immigrants ‘cultural tokens’ in university that reduced their legitimacy and power.

**Multiculturalism and ‘pigeon holes’: ‘Otherness’ due to cultural customs**

For many respondents in my study different cultural background (e.g. religion, food costume etc.) owing to their immigration status created a sense of ‘other-ness’, that is, marginalization in academia arose from different cultural customs. According to Leela, the idea of multiculturalism fosters difference between the native born and the ones who came from outside the United States, especially from the East or the Oriental countries. The idea is that multiculturalism creates pigeon holes by restricting people within their own cultural community. For example, she said, “perhaps this idea like multiculturalism, that’s something I don’t like. I don’t like being invited as the [Indian] in this multicultural event, sort of a pigeon holed in a bracket where I am expected to get some samosas [particular food] and wear a certain costume and show up. I don’t like that because multiculturalism reinforces difference and makes it purely a matter of culture.” This is turn signifies that multiculturalism is a form of cultural politics (Goldberg 1994) that excludes the ethnic other, as well as produces a signification of the ‘oriental other’ linking to
the cultural otherness (Hirose and Kei-Ho Pih 2011) and therefore, reinforcing their ethnic identity as the exotic other.

Cultural marginalization takes place in various ways. People from other cultures are made to feel foreign and thereby, compelled to achieve the status of an ‘outsider-within’ (Collins 1986). The native born reflect apprehensions and uneasiness towards the foreign born faculty and in turn exclude them. This becomes clear when Leela described the notion of xenophobia as “a sort of being spoken down to or being informed about cultural aspects.” She said,

I find it always hilarious, kind of entertaining that my colleagues take it upon themselves to inform me of certain cultural things like “you know this wine is better than so and so.” My most funniest example is this, I was introduced to this [white] faculty member and he was from [Harvard] and you know he asked me where your PhD from. I said I am from [Princeton]. He is like you know [Harvard] and [Princeton] are about the same level. I found that so really funny because I did not ask and it was not even a question which was like ‘I have to inform this foreigner so that she understands that I am in the same league that she does not think that she’s better or something’. Sometimes, people over inform me and I always find that interesting because it reveals something about them and about their anxieties and insecurities.

This in turn reflects that immigration is closely associated with the idea of not only ‘racialized tokens’ (Flores 2011) or xenophobia but, also the idea of gendered ‘cultural tokens’ expressed in interaction with white male faculty who look down upon female faculty from other cultures with the belief that the latter know less and therefore, inferior. Therefore, it signifies exoticization or a sense of ‘other-ness’ on the grounds of gender and ethnic identity.

Two of my immigrant white respondents also felt that they too undergo the feeling of being an ‘outsider-within’ in terms of religion and other cultural aspects respectively. According to Deena, the academic environment in the university is highly Christian in nature that did not respect any other religions. For instance, she said, “the culture around here is highly Christian and also highly missionary in
many ways and I definitely feel [like] an outsider that way. I am not really religious that way, practicing religion or something in that way but, I am just coming with a different history, culture, attitudes, holidays and [those] kinds of things etc. and I am definitely [a] minority here.” This idea of how the university’s atmosphere and culture foster difference and create a sense of minority becomes clear when she narrated the following:

I was in some University event, very high profile University event and it was a very festive dinner and I was dressed up and I was sitting at the dinner and they started the event by saying GRACE. It was a heavily Christian thing…and it was almost offensive to me. They did not even think, they did not even consider that this could be offensive, they still take it for granted that everybody there was a Christian and that everybody would believe in Jesus etc. but, it never even occurred to them that it will make people uncomfortable that you do this blessing to a God that I don’t believe in! So, it does not happen very often but occasionally there are those incidents which is there to remind that, you know, ‘I am a foreigner here, I am a minority’.

The idea of outsider-within is also reflected when one is represented as the cultural representative of one’s country. For example, Agnese said,

We are cultural ambassadors all the time and sometimes we don’t have that hat on and it’s you know sometimes there will be like “Oh Italy! A lot of [people] play soccer. Because I am Italian, sometimes it’s annoying because the way people think that I am like a, I don’t know how to say this, the first thing that people tell me, “Oh Milan! My friends went to Milan.” They don’t see me as a person. They see me as a cultural representative. So, like I go to a conference and it’s like “Oh I went to Italy with my family” and I will be like okay ‘another one’, whatever you know! So, I am like the token Italian. “Oh you must eat good food” you know that kind of thing. So, sometimes I feel I find it that too much for me. It’s kind of like Oh again! There they go again! “Oh I am good to go to Rome” and I am like I am not a travel agent.
The fact that immigrant female faculty are regarded as cultural ambassadors also signifies that being ‘cultural tokens’ shapes their experiences in academia of lesser importance as a professor. This means that they are exoticized and considered as the ‘ethnic other’, and demeaned of their status as a professor in academia at large. In short, they are challenged of their legitimate positions as professors and relegated to a lower position such that of a food connoisseur or a travel agent and things like that as described by my participant.

In spite of the discerning and sensitive experiences associated being the ‘outsider-within’, being a foreigner also had its positive impacts on academia, although in rare occasions. Few of my Asian respondents felt that coming from a different country and a different culture is an asset in academia that brings in new things to the table, especially helping to build a beneficial association with the students. Being a foreigner helped the female faculty of color to introduce the outside world, helping the students to know more about diversity and connect with the external world at large. For example, Anila said, “I think I bring that into the classroom which I would not have been able to if I had not been from a different part of the world. It’s like a chance to be with them and give them a flavor of the outside world or else they would not.” The students too are receptive of the new comings. For instance, Leela said, “I think there are some particular things that I bring to the classroom because of a cultural background, because of a cultural history. I have actually found students to be invariably really to be very welcoming and intrigued by the difference.”

Other than bringing in new things to the table, being a foreigner and coming from a certain culture gave the immigrant faculty a huge pride in sharing their cultural norms within academia, especially amongst colleagues. For example, Ranjeeta, an (Asian) associate professor and a first generation immigrant from India said, “on a day to day basis, I am not thinking about my gender and definitely not thinking about my ethnicity. If anything and the one thing it allows me to do is when I have international students and I see students from India, and I remember from way back when I was a student and I explain to the Americans that they are confused and need to settle down. Several Indian [students] are quiet when they first come. So, the Americans think they aren’t interested. I understand where they
are coming from. Those are the only times when my cultural background pops in. It is a cultural thing, the [students] need to be given time and they’ll come up as new people.” This shows that being an immigrant professor helps in understanding international students’ problems, especially when they are of the same ethnic origin thereby, making colleagues aware of their own cultural norms and attitudes.

Coming from a different culture and a dissimilar academic environment and being a part of the university administration helped in bridging the gap between two different academic cultures. Having a different cultural affiliation is often a plus point that includes different values and different organization systems serving to accommodate two distinct academic systems, both in terms of gender as well as culture. For example, a Deena said, “I am talking about being the other and that otherness to me is such a big value to bring anything especially to the academic environment that needs to be a place where you ask questions, where you doubt, where you are open to new ideas, where you discover, you create, your thinking and your scholarship....so, being a woman and being a non-American, to me, are assets that I am bringing to this environment. In terms of generalizing, that as a woman I am bringing in a different style of managing from the literature. My managing style is undoubtedly lot more horizontal, lot more collaborative, lot more democratic, lot more participatory and a lot more people oriented, which is not typically the more masculine style which is more regulations oriented, more hierarchy oriented, more authority oriented and more centralized or whatever.” Therefore, it can be said that being gendered ‘cultural tokens’ can often have certain advantages in academia, making the system more integrative and accommodating in terms of gender, race and/or ethnicity.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The purpose of my paper was to explore how gender, race and/or ethnicity intersect to shape the academic experience of immigrant female professors amongst colleagues and students, as well as in the university and academic world at large. Basically, I investigated how ethnic differences and differences that come with immigration determine the authority, legitimacy and experience at work, especially in academia. For the purpose of my study, I interviewed 17 immigrant female professors from diverse racial and cultural backgrounds in order to make a comprehensive and coherent analysis of their experiences. In short, my study was designed to explore the structural arrangement in the academe as a whole from the standpoint of gender, race and culture, the rules and culture in academia, and how people do ‘gender’, ‘race’ and ‘ethnic other’ in academia every day.

I find that majority of my respondents suggested that they are gendered ‘cultural tokens’ in academia who are exoticized thereby, reflecting feelings of ‘outsider-within’ and ‘otherness’ amongst colleagues and students, as well as in the university and academic world at large. The immigration perspective generates the feeling of ‘cultural tokens’ amongst the ethnic minority professors, and it emanates when both female faculty of color and white faculty from the European continent suffer from the fear of being a foreign minority and cultural ambassadors of her nation and culture. However, on a positive note, the idea of being a ‘cultural token’ brings in experiences in an affirmative way as a way of dealing with diversity within the U.S. academia.

There are four major themes that emerged in my study. The first one suggests that the ethnic minority female faculty are excluded on the lines of gender, race and/or ethnicity in their interaction with colleagues, as well as they are denied of power and authority amongst students both inside and outside classrooms. The second theme shows that immigrant respondents are considered lacking capacity in comparison to male colleagues and therefore, devalued in terms of their stature and achievements. My third theme points out that language is not only a barrier for those faculty who came from non-English speaking countries but, also for those who are from the European continent including the English
speaking countries, barring the second generation immigrants. In terms of culture, my last theme suggests that many of my respondents felt that they are being out casted in terms of religion, food etc. that generated a feeling of ‘outsider-within’ indicating that ethnicity and nationality play an important role in shaping the academic experience of immigrant professors. Overall, my findings suggest that immigration brings with it a demarcation between ‘us’ and ‘they’ in academia, and that the different statuses of gender, race and ethnicity affect the legitimacy, responsibilities, opportunities and advancement at work. Also, my findings extend beyond the conventional definition of ‘tokenism’ taking into account ethnic identity and cultural differences that lead to the alienation of immigrants at work thereby, creating ‘cultural tokens’.

What is startling in my research is that some of my findings are overlapping in nature. For instance, ethnicity and nationality intersected with gender to exoticize my respondents from all racial backgrounds (whether white or non-white) in a similar way. Another surprising aspect of my study is that language not only acts as a barrier for non-native English speakers who are non-Whites, but also for the white immigrant professors including those from the English speaking countries that can brand all of them as the ‘language minority’ in the academic world of the United States. Overall, my study shows that oppression is located in an interlocking system of domination located in gender, race and nationality (culture). On the one hand, where white female faculty face discrimination in terms of patriarchal domination and male hegemonic culture, on the other hand, female faculty of color experience discrimination from both the ideal perspectives of white supremacy and male hegemonic culture. The thing that tied all my respondents in my study is their immigration status giving them the experience of ‘otherness’ and ‘outsider-within’.

My study had a couple of limitations. Firstly, my study had three second generation professors. In that case, a comparative analysis of experiences between the first generation and the second or third generation (born and educated in the U.S.) was not possible, and something that was beyond the scope of my research. Secondly, how the dominant idea of heteronormativity affects female faculty’s experience,
somebody who is identified with a deviating sexual orientation coupled with the idea of minority (racial and/or ethnic) status was beyond the scope of my research.

Future research may want to consider the following topics. How female faculty in junior ranks experience academia in comparison to those in the senior ranks from the intersectional perspective that includes gender, race, and culture? This is because age can also have a pervasive influence of marginalization in academia that can help revealing mechanisms that track out and bring success for some but not for all. How do varied statuses like immigration and racial and/or ethnic shape legitimacy, authority and advancement of male faculty in academia? Future research may also address more of ethnic minorities of Hispanic and African standing, something that was beyond the scope of my study, thereby looking into how different ethnic identities shape the academic experience of the same racial group in similar and different ways. Lastly, prospective research may also expand the idea of ‘cultural tokens’ and see how it operates in workplaces other than academia.

In short, the strength of my study is that that it goes beyond the existing scholarship thereby, integrating gender, race and/or ethnicity from the perspective of immigration, an intersectional approach that has not been addressed till now. Therefore, my work looked into how gender, race and/or ethnicity intersect to shape the academic experiences of female faculty leading to their exoticization as an ‘ethnic other’, as well as understanding how immigration creates a sense of ‘other-ness’ or a division between ‘us’ and ‘they’ and ‘outsider within’ in academe. This means my study shows how colleagues, students and academia as a whole ‘do difference’ on the lines of gender, race and culture.
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