Southern Illinois University Carbondale
OpenSIUC

Dissertations Theses and Dissertations

9-1-2020

U.S. HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF “GOOD” AND “BAD” IMMIGRANTS: FOREIGN-BORN FACULTY’S TALES OF SEXISM, RACISM, AND XENOPHOBIA AT WORK

Debaleena Ghosh
Southern Illinois University Carbondale, debaleena.ghosh85@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: https://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/dissertations

Recommended Citation
Ghosh, Debaleena, "U.S. HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF “GOOD” AND “BAD” IMMIGRANTS: FOREIGN-BORN FACULTY’S TALES OF SEXISM, RACISM, AND XENOPHOBIA AT WORK" (2020). *Dissertations*. 1834.
https://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/dissertations/1834

This Open Access Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at OpenSIUC. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of OpenSIUC. For more information, please contact opensiuc@lib.siu.edu.

U.S. HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF “GOOD” AND “BAD” IMMIGRANTS: FOREIGN-BORN FACULTY’S TALES OF SEXISM, RACISM, AND XENOPHOBIA AT WORK

by

Debaleena Ghosh

B.A., Sociology, St. Xavier’s College, Kolkata (Calcutta), 2006
M.A., Sociology, University of Calcutta, 2008
M.A., Sociology, Southern Illinois University Carbondale, 2013

A Dissertation
Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Doctor of Philosophy Degree

Department of Sociology
in the Graduate School
Southern Illinois University Carbondale
August 2020

Copyright by Debaleena Ghosh, 2020
All Rights Reserved

DISSERTATION APPROVAL

U.S. HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF “GOOD” AND “BAD” IMMIGRANTS: FOREIGN-BORN FACULTY’S TALES OF SEXISM, RACISM, AND XENOPHOBIA AT WORK

by

Debaleena Ghosh

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in the field of Sociology

Approved by:

Dr. William F. Danaher, Chair

Dr. Rachel Bridges Whaley

Dr. Kristen Barber

Dr. J. Tobin Grant

Dr. Patrick Dilley

Graduate School
Southern Illinois University Carbondale
June 15, 2020

AN ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION OF

Debaleena Ghosh, for the Doctor of Philosophy degree in Sociology, presented on June 15, 2020, at Southern Illinois University Carbondale.

TITLE: U.S. HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF "GOOD" AND "BAD" IMMIGRANTS: FOREIGN-BORN FACULTY'S TALES OF SEXISM, RACISM, AND XENOPHOBIA AT WORK

MAJOR PROFESSOR: Dr. William F. Danaher

In this dissertation, I explore the experiences of immigrant (i.e. foreign-born) faculty in the U.S. academy, especially during a trying period of time—Donald Trump's presidency—when anti-immigrant sentiments and rhetoric have heightened in America. Specifically, I explore how in the Trump era, gender, race, ethnic (national) origin, cultural background, and foreign-born status intersect to shape immigrant faculty's experiences at the individual, interpersonal, and organizational level, including the privileges they enjoy and/or the penalties they pay based on their multiple social locations and ethnic culture—a group occasionally studied. Finally, I explore how the organizational and departmental culture of diversity enables the faculty to make sense of their overall satisfaction and/or stress at work—rarely considered. Overall, the goal of this study is to understand how different social identities, cultural background, and immigrant status intersect to shape the professional and social standing of a highly skilled group of immigrant professionals in a foreign country and especially in a high-status occupation, such as professorship. Most importantly, this study attempts to understand how structural inequalities are produced and reinforced in the academy that is supposedly a haven for social consciousness and ethical conduct.

For the purpose of my study, I conducted 66 in-depth interviews with immigrant faculty, search committee members, administrators (department chairs, interim directors of programs, college deans, and chancellors), and administrative personnel (staff members of Affirmative

Action, Equity and Compliance, and Human Resources) at a large public university in the rural Midwest. I also conducted approximately 42 hours of observations in the faculty meetings and class lectures that my immigrant participants attended and delivered respectively. I noted faculty-faculty and faculty-student interactions, including their verbal and non-verbal exchanges. I used an intersectional lens grounded in the theories on tokenism to analyze my findings.

Two overarching themes emerged in the data. The first one reveals the stereotypes (negative as well as positive), performance pressures, and professional marginalization my immigrant participants encounter at work. The second one shows that cultural contrasts result in my immigrant participants' ethnic othering or exoticization at work, as well as heighten boundaries between them and their U.S.-born colleagues and students. These, in turn, affect my participants' legitimacy, interpersonal communications, productivity, and career growth in the academy. Overall, I conclude that immigrant faculty are cultural tokens—held up against local hegemonic gendered and ethnic norms and racial stereotypes—in the U.S. academy, whose tokenization—scrutiny, performance pressures, and isolation—is shaped by their multiple social locations, cultural background, and the organizational and departmental culture of diversity. Lastly, keeping my study findings in mind, I make recommendations for diversity and inclusion in higher education in order to prevent women and racial and ethnic minorities from becoming tokens at work.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It certainly takes an army to finish a Ph.D. and I extend my sincere gratitude to those people who played a crucial role in the successful completion of my dissertation. To begin with, I thank all my participants for carving out time to take part in the study and especially those immigrant faculty who showed enormous enthusiasm and support for my project. I am also forever grateful to my outstanding advisor and dissertation chair, William (Bill) Danaher, for being the calming force during my doctoral studies and for his relentless support throughout. I have been extremely fortunate to work under his wings and cannot thank him enough for his continuous mentorship. I also thank my other committee members, Rachel Whaley, Kristen Barber, Tobin Grant, and Patrick Dilley, for their thoughtful comments and invaluable suggestions on my project. A special shout out to Kristen Barber for always encouraging me and showing faith in my work. Last but not least, I thank the Sociology Department Secretary, Judy Rose, for being a great friend and for coming to my rescue whenever needed.

Most importantly, I thank my mom and dad for all their hard work, sacrifices, and patience for the past 9 years and beyond. I also thank my other family members for their faith in me. I couldn't have done this without their constant encouragement, support, and prayers. I especially thank my twin cousins, Isita Ghosh and Samhita Ghosh Mazumder, for always guiding me and making me laugh. Additionally, I thank my buddies, Paloma Sarkar and Jahnavi Chatterjee, for always listening to my frustrations with utmost patience, for believing in me, for inspiring me, and for reminding me every day that there is light at the end of the tunnel. I also thank my other buddy, Abira Majumder, for seeing in me what I never saw in myself; 11 years ago, when I was hell bent on pursuing an MBA, she insisted that I will be better at teaching and research. Lastly, I thank everyone who believed that I can do this.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to all immigrant workers.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

ABSTRACT....................i

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS....................iii

DEDICATION....................iv

LIST OF TABLES....................vi

CHAPTERS

CHAPTER 1 – Introduction....................1

CHAPTER 2 – Theoretical Background and Literature Review....................7

CHAPTER 3 – Data and Methods....................36

CHAPTER 4 – Stereotypes, Performance Pressures, and Marginalization at Work.........67

CHAPTER 5 – Cultural Contrasts, Ethnic Othering, and Boundary Heightening..........135

CHAPTER 6 – Discussion and Conclusion....................163

REFERENCES....................176

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A – Field Instruments....................209

VITA....................239

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

Table 1: Immigrant Participant Demographics..44

Table 2: Administrator and Search Committee Member Demographics.....................................46

Table 3: Administrative Personnel Demographics..46

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In summer 2011, I was accepted in the Sociology M.A. program at Southern Illinois University Carbondale. So, I decided to quit my Visiting Lecturer job in India—which I worked extensively for 3 years—and move to the United States to pursue my graduate studies, a conduit that I believed would take me closer to the American Dream. Additionally, I was selected as a Teaching Assistant (TA) in Sociology. My duties included grading tests and paper assignments and leading my own discussion sections. Hence, I was of the conviction that I could leverage my past undergraduate teaching experience for the TA position and embark upon my journey to enlighten young minds in America.

In fall 2011, while I was conducting one of my introductory sociology discussion sections, a young native White male sophomore challenged my expertise when I returned his essay assignment with my feedback on the paper, including corrections of his grammatical mistakes. He walked to my desk and told me, “You’re wrong! I will take this paper to my English Professor.” It is needless to say that I was flabbergasted momentarily, as this situation was utterly foreign to me. Nonetheless, I managed to smile and tell him, “Please let me know what your English Professor says.” And he never resumed any conversation about the topic anytime during the semester or beyond but continued to confront me in other ways. For example, he once addressed me outside the class as “Hey, kiddo.” In fact, my struggles with establishing authority and teaching credibility did not end there, as I continued to encounter similar challenges—small and big—throughout my tenure as a graduate instructor.

Despite having my formal academic training in (British) English for 24 years (prior to shifting continents), the above-mentioned incident made me question my own proficiency in the

language and I felt isolated in the new academic setup. Later, following my curiosity in the scholarship of social inequalities, work, occupations and organizations, and immigration and culture, I was able to reflect upon the confrontation with my student and understand how such idiosyncratic events are connected to the wider meanings of race, ethnicity, and foreign-born status. Precisely speaking, existing scholarship highlights that native students in American colleges and universities tend to question the expertise and legitimacy of their immigrant instructors of color—both TA and regular faculty—since the latter speak with non-American accents (see, for example, Rubin and Smith 1990; Rubin 1992; Guo 2006; Skachkova 2007; Mfum-Mensah 2016).

However, it was still unclear to me how gender intersects with race and ethnic background to shape the immigrant experience of work. This, in fact, inspired my M.A. project, for which I interviewed 17 immigrant female faculty—4 White women and 13 women of color—employed at a large public university in the rural Midwest (see Ghosh 2013; Ghosh and Barber 2017). Except for one—a second-generation immigrant—the rest of my participants were born outside the U.S. And barring 2 faculty, the rest earned their undergraduate and/or graduate degrees (including Ph.D.) in the U.S. I asked them to describe their experiences among colleagues and students and their overall experiences in their respective department and in the university. Their age or rank, or from where they earned their Ph.Ds. had no impact on their work experiences whatsoever. However, they reported experiencing *cultural tokenism*—scrutiny, performance pressures, and isolation—as they are held up against local racial stereotypes and hegemonic gendered and ethnic norms—accent, food habits, clothing styles, and religion—at both interpersonal and institutional levels. In fact, *cultural tokenism* highlights that race intersects with gender and ethnic background so that the White women in the study do not have

to navigate all of the same challenges as their colleagues of color, where the latter struggle to assert authority in class, fight controlling images (i.e. negative and oppressive stereotypes), and cope with isolation at work. In other instances, these women are expected to act as diversity symbols or cultural ambassadors in the university. Overall, my participants reported that their U.S.-born colleagues and students question both their professional legitimacy and cultural belonging in the country.

Thus, building on my M.A. project, my Ph.D. dissertation explores: 1) How do the experiences of foreign-born female faculty vary with those of their male counterparts—both White men and men of color? 2) How does the organizational and departmental culture of diversity shape these faculty's meaning-making experiences in relation to their overall job satisfaction and/or stress at work? In order to answer these research questions, I interviewed 66 immigrant faculty (both male and female faculty of color and their White counterparts), administrators (department chairs, interim directors of programs, college deans, and chancellors), search committee members, and administrative personnel (staff members of Affirmative Action, Equity and Compliance, and Human Resources) at a large public university in the rural Midwest. I also conducted approximately 42 hours of observations in the faculty meetings and class lectures that my immigrant participants attended and delivered respectively. I noted faculty-faculty and faculty-student interactions, including their verbal and non-verbal exchanges. I used an intersectional lens grounded in the theories on tokenism to analyze my findings.

This dissertation attempts to show how gender, race, ethnic (national) origin, ethnic culture (i.e. cultural background), and foreign-born status intersect to determine the opportunities, challenges, and interactions that immigrant faculty navigate, or the power and privileges they enjoy and/or the penalties they pay in a foreign academic work setting, something

rarely explored in past studies. In fact, by drawing from the theories on tokenism and by doing an intersectional analysis, this dissertation highlights that immigrant faculty's multiple social locations and cultural background determine the extent to which they experience *cultural tokenism* and enjoy power and privileges at both interpersonal and institutional levels. In this dissertation, I also explore how these faculty make sense of their job satisfaction and/or stress at the backdrop of their departmental and organizational culture of diversity surrounding hiring, tenure and promotion, leadership roles, work distribution (e.g., teaching load and committee and service work), and the general diversity among faculty and students—rarely considered. This shows that the immigrant experience of work—the extent of scrutiny, performance pressures, and isolation or enjoying power and privileges—varies with the context in which they are situated (i.e. the department and organization they work at), including their social locations and cultural background. Overall, this dissertation contributes to the general scholarship of social inequalities, work, occupations and organizations, and immigration and culture.

In Chapter 2, I review the existing theories on tokenism as well as how cultural contrasts result in ethnocentrism and the process of othering of racial and ethnic minorities at work, including the academy. In this context, I discuss the theoretical and empirical loopholes in existing research and propose how my dissertation attempts to fill those gaps. Additionally, I discuss how my current study provides a new analytical framework to rethink the concept of tokenism—that is, *cultural tokenism*—especially in light of the experiences of a highly skilled group of immigrant professionals in a high-status job, such as professorship. I also emphasize that it is necessary to analyze the immigrant experience of work by contextualizing it in the organizational and departmental culture of diversity and from an intersectional perspective. These are essential to show that not every immigrant experiences the workplace in the same way,

that is, their privileges and penalties are determined by their cultural background and multiple social locations—gender, race, ethnic origin, and foreign-born status—and how their respective department and the organization they work at practice diversity and inclusion. Finally, I emphasize how this study will help us to think about tokenism during a trying period of time—Donald Trump's presidency—when anti-immigrant sentiments and rhetoric have heightened in America.

In Chapter 3, I discuss my data collection techniques—and the rationale behind choosing them. Following this, I describe my sample and justify why I chose the particular research setting. Next, I describe the codes of ethics that I obeyed throughout my study, followed by an explanation of the data collection process. Thereafter, I explain my data coding techniques and the steps that I took to assure the validity and reliability of my data. Finally, I describe how my positionality—as a foreign-born female graduate student of color—affected my interactions in the field and the data collection process.

In Chapter 4, I highlight and examine the stereotypes (negative as well as positive) that my immigrant participants encounter at both interpersonal and institutional levels. I also discuss the performance pressures and marginalization they are subjected at work. In Chapter 5, I discuss how cultural differences impact my immigrant participants' assimilation among their U.S.-born colleagues and students or in the academy more generally; they confront microaggressions, ethnocentrism, exoticization, and heightened boundaries at work. In both these chapters, I contextualize my participants' experiences within their departmental and organizational culture of diversity, as well as use an intersectional lens to show that some of my participants are "partial tokens" (Wingfield 2013) in comparison to others and so, do not experience tokenism in the same way.

In Chapter 6, I underscore the key findings from my study. This is followed by a discussion of the study's strengths and limitations. Next, I provide directions for future research. Finally, I make recommendations for diversity and inclusion in higher education.

CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Since this study focuses on the experiences of immigrant faculty in the U.S. higher education, they cannot be comprehensively understood without contextualizing their lives at the backdrop of the current political and social climate in the United States. This is because after the 2016 election, America has witnessed a sudden upsurge of immigration-centered debates and anti-immigrant rhetoric that not only jeopardized the daily experiences and opportunities of immigrants in the country but also thwarted the image of the United States as "a nation of immigrants" (Kennedy 1964). The strong nationalistic sentiments that stimulated as well as followed the election also reinforced certain racial and ethnic stereotypes revolving around meritocracy and competence in juxtaposition to xenophobia, including anti-Muslim sentiments (see Leonhardt and Philbrick 2018).

The new administration sees some groups as more competent than others and hence, more deserving of immigrating to the United States. For example, the merit-based immigration policy of the Trump government aims to support the entry, contribution, and assimilation of highly skilled English-speaking immigrants. These policies benefit White Europeans and Asians over Black or Hispanic immigrants. With respect to Asians, China and India send the highest numbers of students to American colleges and universities, which is about 48 percent and 26 percent respectively, and overall, Asians constitute about 69 percent of the total international scholars in the United States (Institute of International Education 2018). A large chunk of these Asian scholars ends up in faculty positions at American institutions of higher education. Likewise, an estimated 11 percent of Asians are employed in architecture and engineering occupations and roughly 12 percent in life, physical, and social science related occupations—a

majority group among all racial and ethnic minorities—and hence, concentrated in some major high-paying jobs in America, such as management, business, financial operations, architecture, engineering, healthcare, technical, natural or social science related occupations (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics 2018b). This fact continues to bolster the "model minority" stereotype associated with the racial group (Hsu 2015). With respect to White European immigrants, they comprise about 8 percent of the total international student pool, making them the second largest group after Asian international scholars, and they also end up in large numbers as faculty in U.S. colleges and universities (Institute of International Education 2018). Similarly, Whites comprise about 79 percent in managerial, professional and related occupations, and an estimated 78 percent in life, physical, and social science related occupations in the United States (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics 2018b)—a fact that tends to reinforce and legitimize their authority and 'superior' status in organizations (Acker 1990, 2006, 2012). Furthermore, English is the Lingua Franca in most Asian nations as a result of colonial history and similarly, spoken among a vast number of Europeans. Hence, it can be argued that these socio-cultural factors make both Asians and the European Whites the most coveted immigrants in the United States.

The Trump administration also labeled African countries and Haiti and El Salvador as "shithole" countries (Dawsey 2018; Kendi 2019) and so, restricted the entry of ethnic people that it presumed to be subpar compared to their European and Asian counterparts. Additionally, its immigration policies manifested a racist and xenophobic undertone; for example, the ban of immigrants from seven major Muslim nations in the Middle East and Africa (Thrush 2017; Yuhas and Sidahmed 2017)—Iraq, Iran, Syria, Yemen, Somalia, Libya, and Sudan—a group that the Trump government equated with "terrorists," but as a matter of fact, has no terrorist history in the country. Further evidence of the new administration's bigotry is reflected in its proposal of

the increased policing and building of the wall on the U.S.-Mexico border (Woodward and Costa 2016) in order to prevent the entry of Mexicans into the United States, an ethnic group whose majority population is employed in low-paying and low-status jobs (e.g., Hondagneu-Sotelo 2001; Ramirez 2011) and primarily speaks Spanish instead of English. Theoretically speaking, immigration regulations tend to affect every immigrant to a large capacity irrespective of their country or region of origin, but policies designed on racial and ethnic lines will impact various groups differently. Thus, in theory, merit-based admittance in the United States will advance the American Dream of many highly skilled immigrant professionals. But, in reality, it will intensify the already existing racial and ethnic hierarchy and make their social and professional standing questionable in the host country. Last but not least, it will likely also create newer forms of institutional discrimination.

Amidst such anti-immigrant sentiments and racial and ethnic divide, we see numerous immigrants in academic workplaces in the United States, especially in the STEM program (Institute of International Education 2017). Nevertheless, immigrant academics face heightened visibility and scrutiny at work, but their experiences are compounded by their gender and racial status (Ghosh and Barber 2017). For example, studies have shown immigrant female faculty—both Whites and people of color—are tokens in American universities, where they are held up against hegemonic cultural norms, such as accent and fluency in English, religion, clothing styles, and food habits and thus, treated differently at work compared to their U.S.-born colleagues (e.g., Manrique and Manrique 1999; Skachkova 2007; Ghosh and Barber 2017). Also, colleagues and students question their expertise and scholarship (Skachkova 2007; Ghosh and Barber 2017). However, Debaleena Ghosh and Kristen Barber (2017) note that immigrant female faculty of color face more challenges than their White counterparts, which are manifested in

gender- and race-based stereotypes, performance pressures, and authority challenges by students. Such occurrences threaten their personhood and legitimacy at work and result in their occupational stagnation. However, the discussion of immigrant male faculty's experiences in the U.S. academy remains limited in past scholarship and what exists is largely focused on non-European men but showcases fewer negative experiences compared to their female counterparts (see Manrique and Manrique 1999). For instance, Cecilia G. Manrique and Gabriel G. Manrique (1999) found that students rarely questioned immigrant male faculty's competency if they taught courses centered on Western or American society but would question their female counterparts for the same. The authors explained that this could be largely possible due to immigrant male faculty's increased presence in the STEM program—a field conventionally equated with rationality and considered more competitive than non-STEM programs—or due to their superior gender status that gave them more legitimacy and power over their female counterparts in American universities more generally—irrespective of the field/discipline. Keeping these power differentials in mind, in this chapter, I will evaluate the experiences of immigrants and ethnic minorities that address their challenges, barriers, and prospects in the workplace.

I draw from the theories on tokenism and discuss them in light of women and racial minorities' experiences in diverse professions. I will also review literature that addresses tokenism from an intersectional perspective and also prioritizes further analysis at the intersections of gender, race, ethnic origin, and foreign-born status in order to understand the privileges and penalties of immigrants in the workplace. Lastly, I will show how U.S.-born Whites use ethnic culture to exclude immigrants and ethnic minorities both at interpersonal and organizational levels by seeing them as exotic anomalies, perhaps harmless but not fully accepted. These theories will foreground immigrant faculty's experiences with stereotypes,

performance pressures, professional marginalization, cultural boundaries, and assimilation in the workplace.

Overall, I argue that employing the theories on tokenism in the context of immigration and ethnic culture and from an intersectional perspective will increase our understanding of the complex issues of power, privilege, and oppression at work, both from symbolic and institutional dimensions (see, for example, hooks 1981; Collins 1993; Williams 2006; Wingfield 2013). An intersectional analysis in fact, will reveal the multidimensional nature of oppression that takes place through an interaction between distinct sources of bigotry, such as gender and race (Crenshaw 1989)—as well as ethnic origin, cultural background, and foreign-born status. Similarly, it will show how different categories of oppression impact people differently; their privileges and/or penalties are determined by their multiple social locations (see Crenshaw 1991; Collins 1993) and ethnic culture. In other words, it will show how a social group (here, immigrant faculty) can have multiple statuses at the same time (see, for example, McCall 2005; Wingfield 2013). Additionally, I contend that it is necessary to consider the organizational and departmental culture of diversity to contextualize the process of tokenization.

In what follows, I will define and discuss tokenism at work and how the process creates and perpetuates discrimination against women and people of color. Next, I will discuss how cultural otherness exoticizes immigrants and ethnic minorities in the workplace and results in microaggressions. I will then discuss and show how tokenism, ethnocentrism, and ethnic othering operate especially in the academy. Finally, I will discuss the theoretical and empirical gaps in current scholarship and how my study addresses them.

Tokenism at Work: Gender and Race in Occupations and Organizations

Based on her groundbreaking study of "Indsco," a large corporation dominated by men,

Rosabeth M. Kanter (1977) propounded the term "tokenism" to describe the processes that held female employees to hegemonic standards—men as "ideal and "rational" workers (Acker 1990; Brumley 2014). This resulted in women's social isolation, devaluation, and role encapsulation at work. Women were relegated to stagnant positions with little power—secretaries or "office wives"—as well as subjugated to heightened visibility, performance pressures, and stereotypical images—"seducers," "mothers," or "pets" to male bosses and colleagues (Kanter 1977). As a result, the female workers felt compelled to constantly fight against these oppressive stereotypes and prove their competency and merit at work. In other words, male workers viewed their female colleagues in "contrast" to them and created boundaries to prevent their professional advancement. Men would also socially marginalize their female colleagues by communicating in a "masculine language," illustrated through swears, technical jargons or discussion about sports. These obstacles made it harder for women to assimilate in an organization characterized by an androcentric culture and resulted in their unique experience of the workplace compared to their male co-workers. Thus, whereas, tokenism gave men an automatic 'insider' status at work, it rendered women an "outsider-within" status (Collins 1986), the latter for both aspiring and joining occupations traditionally occupied by men and seen as masculine (Laws 1975). Moreover, Kanter (1977) asserted that any group that is less than 15 percent in an organization is likely to experience tokenism. While Kanter's work on women provides an example of how tokenism works, the idea can be extended to other groups, such as immigrants. In other words, Kanter provided a comprehensive theory that stated tokenism is not exclusive to women only but to any group that is a numerical rarity in the workplace.

Researchers have confirmed the effects of tokenism on women in other male-dominated occupations, such as law enforcement (Martin 1994; Krimmel and Gormley 2003), medical

practice (Floge and Merrill 1986), financial sector (Roth 2004, 2011) athletics or interscholastic sports (Kane and Stangl 1991), mining (Smith Rolston 2014), the military (Williams 1989), law (Pierce 1995; Wallace and Kay 2012), firefighting (Yoder and Aniakudo 1997), construction work (Paap 2006), the oil and gas industry (e.g., Williams, Muller, and Kilanski 2012; Williams 2018), the culinary industry (Harris and Giuffre 2015), the tech industry (Algeria 2019), and academia (Muhs et al. 2012). Additionally, many scholars criticized Kanter (1977) and argued that tokenism is not a result of women's low representation but also a byproduct of their subordinate gender status (Zimmer 1988; Yoder 1994). For example, although women continue to represent in masculine domains, such as the financial sector (Roth 2004, 2011), the oil and gas industry (Williams, Muller, and Kilanski 2012; Williams 2018), construction work (Paap 2006), or the culinary industry (Harris and Giuffre 2015), they find themselves earning less than their male colleagues, being cut-off from mentorship and networking opportunities, lacking work projects, being sexualized, or wearing the labels of "bitches" "dykes" or "psycho" if they exhibit any form of 'masculine' leadership (e.g., yell, curse, crack sexualized banters, and/or are up-front). Hence, women often succumb to such scrutiny by accepting discrimination, conducting themselves in sexual or nurturing ways, or simply opting out from the occupation (Roth 2011; Harris and Giuffre 2015). These responses mainly occur because male co-workers believe that their female counterparts do not possess the necessary skills or are on par with them to be in 'their' profession and so, devise tactics to marginalize them.

In contrast, men in female-dominated occupations are not subjected to tokenism (e.g., Heikes 1991; Williams 1995, 2015; Hultin 2003). For example, Christine L. Williams' (1992) pioneering study on male nurses found that they rode the glass escalator, such as they were concentrated in leadership and prestigious ranks—acute care, intensive care, psychiatric

nursing—and enjoyed an income advantage over their female colleagues, where the latter were mostly hourly paid Registered nurses. Men's experience with the glass escalator has also been noted in other female-dominated sectors, such as elementary schools (Williams 1995; Cognard-Black 2004) and libraries (DPEAFLCIO 2018), where they surpass women both in administrative ranks (e.g., principal) and income due to their superior gender (male) status. Such inequalities at work are a result of cultural beliefs about men as "natural" leaders and women as "naturally" nurturing (Ridgeway 2011). In fact, these beliefs push men out of women's work and place them in more powerful positions (Williams 1992; Cognard-Black 2004). In other words, status and competence beliefs about men and women (Ridgeway 2011) perceive men as 'born' leaders in both men and women's occupations and thus, bestow them with powers and privileges, as well as higher pay package (Connell 1987; Acker 1990; Williams 1992; Britton 2000; Budig 2002; Paap 2006; Harris and Giuffre 2015).

Other scholars, such as Karrie A. Snyder and Adam I. Green (2008) argue that men choose "masculine" work—highly intense, technologically driven, instrumental in nature, and better in pay compared to the nurturing and maternal qualities attributed to "feminine" work—even in female-dominated occupations. In fact, men choose certain sectors (e.g., marketing, personnel management, and administrative work) that are aligned with their male identity and allow them to maintain their masculinity and social position, redefine what is masculine and feminine work, and prevent any stigmatization for being employed in feminized occupations (Lupton 2000, 2006). However, research also needs to explore horizontal job sorting in order to understand sex segregation, upward mobility or the glass escalator effect, and gender wage gap in female-dominated occupations (Snyder and Green 2008).

Overall, studies on men's experiences in female-dominated occupations also provide a

counter argument to Kanter's (1977) theory of token experiences for the numerical minority at work. In other words, they contradict Kanter because unlike women in male-dominated professions, men in female-dominated occupations receive favorable treatment and positive attention due to their social status. This, in essence, paves the way to their career advancement. The social prestige accorded to masculinity also produces double standards at work, where men have the liberty to be assertive and authoritative with co-workers and juniors (Pierce 1995). In contrast, women face discouragement and sanctions for similar behaviors and fulfill the expectations associated with nurturance (Pierce 1995) and "emotional labor" (Hochschild 1983)—suppress or manage real emotions and serve clients with a smile.

Two decades after her landmark study, Williams (2013) argued that the "glass escalator" has become a characteristic feature of the traditional work organization—rigid, vertical, permanent employment, specialized jobs, job security—and that the "neoliberal" work organization in the 21st century—flexible, horizontal, contractual/temporary employment, project based, job insecurity—required new concepts to understand gender inequality at work (see Williams, Muller, and Kilanski 2012; Brumley 2014). For example, in the 21st century, when women's participation in male-dominated occupations is increasing, Sharla Algeria (2019) found that instead of riding the glass escalator, women climbed on a "glass step stool" by being lifted on to middle-management positions that require skills associated with effective listening and communication at work; a strategy to preserve the technical or engineering domain exclusively for men. These contemporary forms of workplace inequalities emerge from the belief that women possess better "people" skills. These gendered beliefs actually hinder their promotion into executive ranks yet allow them to escape sexism or visibility in male domains and find mutual support in the positions where they are concentrated.

Scholarship on workplace inequalities explored tokenism further but from an intersectional perspective, showing that not *all* men ride the glass escalator or enjoy on-the-job advantages (e.g., Schilt 2011; Connell 2012; Woodhams, Lupton, and Cowling 2015). For instance, Adia H. Wingfield's cutting-edge and classic studies on Black male nurses (2009) and Black male professionals (2013) found that these men struggled with gendered racism and stereotypical images, such as "angry," "criminals," and "rapists"—controlling images associated with Black men (Ferguson 2001; Collins 2004)—and thus, experienced heightened visibility and performance pressures in the workplace. They also experienced social isolation from White colleagues who exhibited a cold attitude during interactions and presumed them to be "incompetent" and products of "affirmative action hires." Overall, studies show that, unlike their White counterparts, men of color lack the privilege of riding the glass escalator or experiencing cordial treatment from colleagues.

Furthermore, intersectional research (e.g., Yoder and Aniakudo 1997; Wingfield 2007) shows that women of color, such as African American women also receive similar treatments from White colleagues as their Black male counterparts, and are subjected to "controlling images"—oppressive and negative stereotypes, such as "mammies," "jezebels" or "welfare queens"—that are culturally and historically associated with them (Collins 2000:72-84). These women of color not only find White colleagues communicating less or behaving rudely with them but are also forced to accept the racialized connotations associated with them. Likewise, Gladys García-López (2008) in her study about Chicana attorneys in the White- and male-dominated law profession, also found that White colleagues practiced gendered racism towards these Chicana/Latina lawyers, who fought against gender, racial, and ethnic stereotypes—"too weak," "subordinates," "incapable," or "foreigners" (i.e. "outsiders")—and found themselves

overburdened with low-profile work and lower earnings. White co-workers also ignored and subjected them to heightened visibility and gender-racial-ethnic boundaries. Moreover, Algeria (2019) argues that unlike their White counterparts, women of color are not even pushed or encouraged into middle-management ranks, a small "step up" that privileges only White women in male-dominated occupations. Nonetheless, women of color have to endure structural inequalities and microaggressions at work in order to escape the additional label of the "troublemaker" (Wingfield 2007; García-López 2008).

The understanding of tokenism gets more complicated when research shows that not all racial and ethnic minorities experience tokenism in the same way. For example, Meghan S. Stroshine and Steven G. Brandl (2011) in their study of police officers of color found that Latino officers were subjected less to the process of tokenization—heightened visibility and isolation—in comparison to their Black male and female colleagues. This happened despite their lesser numbers than their Black colleagues. Such instances demonstrate the presence of a racial and ethnic hierarchy that excludes some groups more so than others, but establishes the status quo associated with white masculinity—white male hegemony—in occupations. Also, Stroshine and Brandl (2011) challenged any form of racial binary—Whites versus non-Whites—that understands the tokenization process and emphasized its deeper exploration, especially from an intersectional perspective—intersections of gender, race, and ethnicity.

In sum, tokenism is predominantly a gendered and racialized phenomenon that overstates the abilities of White men and places them in prestigious positions and compels women and racial minorities to prove themselves regularly. The latter suffer exclusion at work not only due to their skewed representation but also as a result of their inferior status resulting from the structures of gender and race (Chused 1988; Zimmer 1988; Yoder 1994; Yoder and Aniakudo

1997; Turco 2010; Flores 2011; Roth 2011; Schilt 2011; Wingfield 2013; Harris and Giuffre 2015). These create additional pressures for these groups in terms of career advancement and establishing collegiality at work. Moreover, it is important to note that certain groups are "partial tokens" in the workplace, that is, they are both privileged and disadvantaged at the same time because of their social locations (hooks 1981; Wingfield 2013). For example, Wingfield (2013) found that Black male professionals earned more and had superior professional networks than their White female colleagues but were subjected to scrutiny on a regular basis. In other words, Black professional men enjoyed social prestige and the resulting advantages due to their gender status but were penalized because of their race. Similarly, Adia H. Wingfield and John H. Wingfield (2014) argue that unlike Black women in comparable situations, Black male professionals reap the benefits from their heightened visibility in White male-dominated occupations, where they are able to draw social support from other Black colleagues (the latter located in lower-status positions) as well as get opportunities to highlight their achievements. But, at the same time, these men are held up against higher standards compared to their White male peers. In other words, gender and race intersect to create unique experiences for Black men at work.

The theories on tokenism indeed provide a vehicle and a valuable framework to understand the experiences of numerical minorities in the workplace. But research also shows that it operates differently for different groups as a result of their multiple social locations. For instance, men enjoy comradeship, collegiality, and upward mobility in contrast to their female colleagues, both in male-dominated and culturally feminized professions. Such experiences are consequences of both social prestige associated with masculinity and lesser value attached to feminized professions (Reskin 1988; Reskin and Roos 1990; Reskin and Padavic 1994).

Additionally, race adds an extra layer of complexity to the token experiences of people of color, who are subjected to heightened visibility, constant scrutiny, and barriers to advancement, but benefiting men of color in more ways than their female counterparts. Yet, further research needs to be done to understand the token experiences of other groups, such as immigrants, who have a skewed representation in the workplace, but from an intersectional perspective—intersections of gender, race, ethnicity, and foreign-born status—to understand how privilege and penalty work for different groups. And I do this in my present study.

However, the literature on gender, race, immigration, and work shows that in the U.S., immigrant women and men of color particularly find themselves doing unskilled labor or in low-status and low-paying occupations that prevents their career growth (e.g., Hondagneu-Sotelo 2001; Ramirez 2011; U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics 2018a). Besides the institutional processes associated with hiring—the state's employment policies and practices—the lack of linguistic capital and other cultural barriers can make immigrants and ethnic minorities vulnerable and prevent them from making professional advancement in the host country (e.g., Man 2004; Shih 2006; Shinnar 2007)—will be discussed in detail in the next section. Similarly, high-skilled professions (e.g., science and engineering) that employ a large number of foreign-born professionals demonstrate the production and reinforcement of structural inequalities at work.

Johanna Shih (2006), for example, in her study of engineering professionals in the Silicon Valley, attested that both immigrant male and female engineers from Asia frequently changed jobs in order to dodge unfair practices at work. These practices involved gender and ethnic stereotyping, occupational segregation and glass ceiling, or the immigrant professionals' exclusion from the old (U.S.-born White) boys' network that controlled and held power in the organization. Shih's work, in fact, contradicted the image of the Silicon Valley, which is known

for being technology and innovation driven and to value meritocracy alone. Nevertheless, racism and xenophobia supersede meritocracy and immigrant professionals from Asia end up as "high-tech coolies" in science and engineering professions (Varma 2002). They are ghettoized in technical roles and hit the glass ceiling (also see, Fernandez 1998)—a contrasting reality compared to that of the immigrant White men who attain managerial positions fairly easily. Also, the popular racial and ethnic stereotypes pertaining to the group (e.g., "submissive" or "not troublemakers") allow the immigrant professionals' U.S.-born White bosses to easily evade their aspirations for managerial positions (Shih 2006). Likewise, these science and engineering professionals from Asia earn lower wages, as well as do not have comparable occupational mobility or status compared to their Caucasian White colleagues in the American labor market (Tang 1993). And in most cases, the fragile nature of H-1B work visa rules and regulations make these foreign-born ethnic professionals of color vulnerable, who are often forced to serve as contract laborers—cheap, short-term, and flexible—and endure the abusive working conditions and job insecurity (see Banerjee 2006).

However, the immigrant experience of high-status work is still understudied, especially outside of science and engineering—for example, the academy. And even though scholarly attempts have been made to study immigrant workers' work-related experiences, existing studies do not explore their experiences from the theoretical lens of tokenism and fail to show how different groups of immigrants experience the workplace based on their multiple social locations—for example, the experiences of White male immigrants versus those of White female immigrants or immigrant men and women of color—something I explore in the current study.

The Cultural Other, Exoticization, and Microaggressions at Work

Edward Said (1978) in his much talked about work titled *Orientalism* discussed the

cultural hegemony of the West and how it is believed to be superior and in "contrast" to the East, (mainly the Middle East). He used historical ethnology to argue that the cultural forms of the French, British, and Americans dominate over those of the East, a position that continues to impact even contemporary society. Since his work is not empirical, scholars often criticize it. Nevertheless, it provides a powerful paradigm to think about the exoticization of cultural attributes that are different from one's own, and in the process, understand the discord, otherness, and the dichotomy of "us" (as the ""superior self") versus "them" (as the "inferior other") that is produced by ethnocentrism (see Fukuda 2006). Thus, exoticization is the process via which dominant groups exclude and label ethnic minorities as the "other." The "other" can be equated with Georg Simmel's notion of the "stranger" "who is beyond being far and near. The stranger is an element….whose membership within the group involves both being outside and confronting it" (Levine 1971:144). In other words, a stranger is someone who fails to acquire in-group membership and encounters heightened boundaries or a social and professional distance with the natives (or the dominant group) due to (cultural) differences rooted in one's origin.

Thus, in the following paragraphs, I will discuss how dominant cultural norms result in the scrutiny of racial and ethnic minorities, followed by their exoticization and othering at work. I will discuss them in the context of immigration and show how xenophobia holds immigrant or ethnic minority workers up against the cultural norms of the host country, as well as how cultural clashes result in racial microaggressions in the workplace. According to Sue et al. (2007:273), "racial microaggressions are brief and commonplace daily verbal, behavioral, and environmental indignities, whether intentional or unintentional, that communicate hostile, derogatory, or negative racial slights and insults to the target person or group." In other words, racial microaggressions are meant to undermine or denounce a racial and ethnic minority's identity,

heritage, and culture (Sue et al. 2007; Shenoy-Packer 2015).

Language (e.g., accent and fluency in English) is a dominant cultural attribute that exoticizes immigrants (foreign-born) and challenges their credibility in the American workplace, as well as affects their upward mobility and wage, concentration in "occupational linguistic niches," access to job-related information, and membership (that is, full acceptance) in the country (e.g., Chiswick and Miller 1995, 2002; Bleakley and Chin 2004; Shinnar 2007; Warriner 2007; Bergman, Watrous-Rodriguez, and Chalkey 2008; Muow and Chavez 2012; Valdivia and Flores 2012; Akomolafe 2013; Shenoy-Packer 2015). This is particularly true for the Latinx or Hispanic immigrants at work (e.g., McManus, Gould, and Welch 1983; Trejo 1997) and more generally for immigrants in the United States (e.g., Warriner 2007; Nawyn et al. 2012). For instance, in his study of Mexicans in the United States, Stephen J. Trejo (1997) analyzed Current Population Survey Data and found that deficiency in English language was one of the major factors that affected their earnings. The lack of cultural (linguistic) capital also affected the group's advancement on the job (see, for example, Mexican immigrant workers experiences in the food industry in Shinnar 2007). Similarly, Mindy E. Bergman, Kristen M. Watrous-Rodriguez, and Katherine M. Chalkley (2008) in their study of Spanish-speaking Hispanic workers in Texas found that speaking in Spanish or with an accented English resulted in their marginalization and harassment at work. For example, due to the workers' Hispanic origin and/or accented English, American supervisors or colleagues automatically assumed that they cannot speak English and are illiterate, unintelligent, incompetent, and unreliable. The management also did not extend any support for Spanish communication in the workplace. Moreover, a social distance was maintained between the U.S.-born and Hispanic workers due to language differences. In other words, ethnocentrism and controlling images prevented the ethnic

workers' membership into the dominant group, as well as their access to lucrative jobs. Also, the U.S.-born workers challenged the Hispanic workers' credibility, resulting in the latter's outsider status in the workplace.

Thus, immigrants in the United States experience "linguistic isolation" (Siegal, Martin, and Bruno 2000; Nawyn et al. 2012; Ghosh and Barber 2017). In other words, language acts as a social capital in America and a lack of linguistic capital immediately transfers immigrants into a lower status and limits their social integration. In fact, a power differential is constituted via the dominant or formal language of those in authority (Bourdieu 1991)—here, the host country and its citizens—which, in turn, affect the economic opportunities of the immigrants (Nawyn et al. 2012) and their sense of belonging (or cultural citizenship) in the receiving country (Warriner 2007). For example, Nawyn et al. (2012) noted in their study of Burundian and Burmese refugees in Michigan, "linguistic isolation" caused the immigrants to lose respect among the dominant community as well as prevented their access to social networks and information—the latter affected the immigrants' economic opportunities. The authors also noted that the lack of linguistic skills produced a tremendous amount of anxiety among the immigrants on a day-to-day basis, coupled with the dominant group blaming and mistreating them for their failures in the country. These findings also resonate with Doris D. Warriner's (2007) study of African refugees and immigrants in the United States who struggled to belong in the country, as they were not fluent in unaccented or "Standard American English" (Lippi-Green 1997).

Additionally, religion often results in cultural discrimination, greater scrutiny, lower prospects of getting jobs, high employee turnover rates and slow career growth, unwelcoming attitudes from dominant ethnic groups and social exclusion, as well as stress and tensions among ethnic minorities at work (e.g., Brierton 1988; Cromwell 1997; Kulwicki, Khalifa, and Moore

2008; Ghumman and Ryan 2013; Laird, Abu-Ras, and Senzai 2013; Pasha-Zaidi, Masson, and Pennington 2014; Padela et al. 2016). For example, Lance D. Laird, Wahiba Abu-Ras, and Farid Senzai (2013) in their study of migrant Muslim physicians in the United States, found that this highly educated and skilled group of professionals struggled to find and retain jobs due to discriminatory practices from their co-workers, patients, and supervisors. Precisely, they struggled to establish a sense of "belonging" because of their religious background and "cultural outsider" status in the workplace. Hence, they had to work twice as hard as their U.S.-born colleagues and portray themselves as "the representatives of 'good Islam'" in order to be accepted. Similarly, another study found that Arab American nurses were questioned about their identity, attacked with negative comments about their food habits and accent, called names, refused care, and often treated suspiciously by their colleagues and patients (see Kulwicki, Khalifa, and Moore 2008).

Existing scholarship also notes cases of exclusion based on ethnic attire, often in the form of ridicule and negative comments or unfair treatment at work (e.g., Kulwicki, Khalifa, and Moore 2008; Ghumman and Ryan 2013). This is highly prevalent in the case of Muslim workers wearing hijabs or caps in the workplace (Bun 2006; Greenhouse 2010; Pasha-Zaidi, Masson, and Pennington 2014). For instance, Sonia Ghumman and Ann M. Ryan (2013) as well as Nausheen Pasha-Zaidi, Tiffany Masson, and M. Nan Pennington (2014) in their respective study found that in the U.S., Muslim women who wore the hijab or the headscarf had lower chances of employability over women who did not put on such ethnic clothing, as American employers viewed them negatively. Similar employment-based discrimination was also meted out to the Sikh community in America, where Sikh men are required by their religion to don a turban and beard, but experienced racial slurs and violence at work or on-the-job discrimination (Pew

Research Center 2009; The Sikh Coalition 2016).

The above-discussed cases are simply not issues of heightened visibility and resulting exoticization of religious minorities but also a manifestation of Islamophobia that followed the September 11 attacks (Kulwicki, Khalifa, and Moore 2008; Malos 2010). Precisely speaking, ethnic attire, such as the hijab or the headscarf has a religious significance, and the negative stereotypes associated with Muslims—for example, “brutal,” “heartless,” “terrorists,” “backwards” or “the uncivilized Other,” and “religious zealots” (Asani 2003; Shaheen 2009)—were reinforced in the United States following the 9/11 attacks. This, in turn, increased fear and suspicion of any Muslim group (from South Asia or the Middle East) that exhibited a religious appearance (Kulwicki, Khalifa, and Moore 2008; Malos 2010) and eventually, resulted in questioning their “cultural citizenship” and “belonging” in the country (Laird, Abu-Ras, and Senzai 2013). Such fears and stereotypes spread across the Sikh community as well, for sporting a look that closely resembled Muslims and hence, they were also subjected to racial and religious profiling and microaggressions at work and in the larger American society (Basu 2016; The Sikh Coalition n.d.).

Furthermore, studies show that additional cultural factors produce boundaries that racial and ethnic minority groups have to navigate in the workplace. For example, Chien-Juh Gu (2015) in her study of Taiwanese American professionals found that, due to heightened visibility in the workplace they experienced or witnessed racial discrimination (e.g., lacked promotions or wage growth, or worked long hours) and were mistreated by their White American colleagues. Also, cultural differences (e.g., religious values, behavioral traits, drinking habits, and interests in politics, sports and pop culture) and racial stereotypes (e.g., Asians as “quiet,” “submissive,” “nerdy”) excluded them from dominant social circles. These, in turn, affected their career growth

(including leadership opportunities) and job satisfaction. In other words, cultural differences prevented them from establishing professional connections with the dominant group. This resulted in the ethnic minority professionals' exclusion both at the structural and interactional level, as well as supported that the "model minority" stereotype for Asians in the U.S. is a myth (Chou and Feagin 2015).

In sum, the literature on exoticization shows that immigrant and ethnic minority workers steer through invisible cultural boundaries and microaggressions manifested by dominant groups at work. Thus, the scholarship on exoticization addresses what theories on tokenism ignore, that is, how dominant ethnic norms, such as accent and fluency in English, religion, appearance, and lifestyle (food habits or the sport and pop culture) result in the professional marginalization of immigrant and ethnic minority workers and preclude their career advancement. In other words, existing scholarship shows that immigrants and ethnic minorities lack the necessary cultural capital to fit in a foreign work setting and ethnic origin exacerbates their opportunities. Nevertheless, it is unclear how different racial and ethnic groups navigate the cultural boundaries at work. For instance, future research needs to show how immigrant White ethnic groups in the American workplace experience tokenism based on their cultural background, especially compared to their ethnic counterparts of color. Also, future research needs to explore how gender and race intersect with ethnic culture to affect the token experiences of immigrants in the workplace. Lastly, future research needs to examine exoticization and tokenism in the context of the organizational and departmental culture of diversity in order to fathom better how men, women, and racial and ethnic minorities navigate cultural norms, perceptions about themselves, and the structural barriers or experience integration and support in the workplace (see, for example, DiTomaso, Post, and Parks-Yancy 2007; Taylor 2010; Stainback and Irvin 2012). In

fact, I fill these gaps in my current study.

Tokenism, Ethnocentrism, and Exoticization in the American Academy

In the previous two sections, I discussed how tokenism, ethnocentrism, and exoticization play out in several occupations and organizations. Notwithstanding the notion that the academy is apparently a workplace that harbors awareness, ethics, and unbiased codes of conduct, research documents that it is also not devoid of unequal practices and structural barriers for women and people of color. In fact, they are tokens in the academy that face several institutional barriers to success. A culture of elitist, white masculinity looms in the U.S. academy that prevents women and racial minorities from being hired or promoted to higher ranks and leadership positions (Corrigan 2002; Jackson and O'Callaghan 2009), as they are already "presumed incompetent" (Muhs et al. 2012) or "affirmative action hires" by their male and White colleagues (Aguirre 2000b; Turner, González, and Wong 2011). For example, Yolanda F. Niemann (2012) reflects on her own experiences in the academy to show that White male colleagues view female faculty of color from a gendered and racialized lens that results in sexist behaviors and microaggressions at work. Racist behaviors on part of White colleagues became obtrusive when several of them did not attend her job talk, sent her anonymous hate mails, expressed that her recruitment was a result of political lobbying, used double standards for tenure and promotion, or devalued her work and labeled her as the "ethnic researcher." These, in fact, signaled her token minority status in the academy.

Also, despite being recruited in higher numbers than before, women and people of color are either ghettoized in non-tenure track and contractual positions or their numbers plummet as they proceed towards higher ranks from the rank of an Assistant Professor (Hart 2011; National Center for Education Statistics 2018). This leaky pipeline is a result of biased evaluation during

tenure and promotion (Menges and Exum 1983; Toren and Kraus 1987; Long, Allison and McGinnis 1993; Aguirre 2000a; Price et al. 2005; Geisler, Kaminsky, and Berkley 2007; De Luca and Escoto 2012; Ortega-Liston and Soto 2014). And excessive teaching and committee workloads—perceptions of women as 'naturally' nurturing push female faculty into mentoring activities, and those of "cultural/diversity" experts compel faculty of color to handle race-related matters—hinder the research productivity of female and racial minority faculty that is necessary for tenure and promotion (Padilla 1994; Padilla and Chavez 1995; Park 1996; Tierney and Bensimon 1996; Bird, Litt, and Wang 2004; Misra, Lundquist, and Templer 2012; Shavers, Butler, and Moore III 2015; Hart 2016). In other words, female faculty of color, especially Black female faculty, bear the double burden of the "identity taxation" (Hirshfield and Joseph 2012)—resulting from both gendered and racial expectations. This requires them to act as mothers or "mammies" (Collins 2000:72-74) and role models to their students and serve as "diversity experts" on committees at the departmental and institutional level. Ultimately, this allows White male faculty to take a back seat from additional student shepherding and service work and focus solely on research and publication (Hart 2016).

Structural inequalities also become pronounced in the wages earned, where White female faculty and faculty of color earn less than their male and White counterparts (Toutkoushian, Bellas, and Moore 2007; National Center for Education Statistics 2017). There are also additional factors that affect women's tenure and promotions, and salaries in particular. For instance, Jeni Hart and Amy S. Metcalfe's (2010) study on the knowledge produced in higher education found that, due to biased technological mediation (e.g., the number of times articles appear on databases, such as Google Scholar) and structural inequalities in the academy, qualitative feminist scholarship (e.g., about women's issues and gender) or general research by

female scholars struggle to achieve visibility post publication as well as citations in comparison to their male colleagues' works. These, in turn, affect their tenure and promotions alongside salaries.

Furthermore, White female faculty and faculty of color (both males and females) suffer exclusion in their face-to-face interactions with colleagues and students, where the latter devalue their achievements and research, especially faculty of color's race-related scholarship (e.g., Ng 1993; Aguirre 2000a; Turner and Myers 2000; Lin et al. 2004; Patton 2004; Skachkova 2007; Kim et al. 2011; Pittman 2010b, 2012) or subject them to racial and ethnic epithets and acts of prejudice (Manrique and Manrique 1999). Male and White colleagues also exclude White female faculty and faculty of color from joint decision-making, professional networks, mentoring, and collaborative research, as well as informal socialization both inside and outside the university (Menges and Exum 1983; Bronstein and Fansworth 1998; Hernandez and Morales 1999; Bradley and Holcomb-McCoy 2004; Patton 2004; Stanley 2006; Teasley 2012; Hart 2016). Likewise, students demonstrate a boorish attitude towards female faculty by not addressing them as "Dr." (e.g., Burns-Glover and Veith 1995; Miller and Chamberlin 2000; Johnson-Bailey and Lee 2005), with White male students employing passive aggressive ways to challenge the expertise and authority of female faculty of color both inside and outside the classroom (Pittman 2010a; Ford 2011). Students also write harsh evaluations for both White female faculty and female faculty of color if they appear strict or slightly disorganized (e.g., Martin 1984; Johnson-Bailey and Lee 2005; Sprague and Massoni 2005; Voeten 2013; Pacific Standard 2015). To add to it, racial minorities endure "racial microaggressions" at work, in the form of verbal and non-verbal insults by both colleagues and students (Teasley 2012; Moore 2015). Thus, women and racial and ethnic minorities feel unwelcomed and embittered in the academy (Mahtani 2004; Patton

2004). And if they speak against discrimination, White colleagues label them as “angry” or “sulky” (Lin et al. 2004).

Even though studies on immigrant faculty are inadequate, the studies that do exist note the structural barriers they face in the academy. For instance, they are hired mostly in STEM (National Science Foundation 2015; Institute of International Education 2017) and concentrated mostly in junior ranks compared to their U.S.-born colleagues (Webber 2012). In other words, immigrant faculty are scanty in fields, such as communication and journalism, applied and fine arts, legal studies, and education (Institute of International Education 2017). And with the exception of men from Asia (Beutel and Nelson 2006), the majority from outside the United States experiences the glass ceiling as they advance towards higher ranks (Turner, Myers Jr., and Creswell 1999). Immigrant faculty also struggle to find their place in administrative positions (Lin et al. 2004; Skachkova 2007). This is mainly because speaking in accented English acts as an obstacle to their upward mobility in the academy (Akomalafe 2013). Additionally, because of being trained in British English (Hutchison, Butler, and Fuller 2005; Ndemanu 2016; Odhiambo 2016) and in different writing styles, immigrant faculty fail to get research grants (Skachkova 2007). Last but not least, as pointed out by Elizabeth A. Corley and Meghna Sabharwal (2007), immigrant faculty, on average, earn less than their U.S.-born counterparts irrespective of higher levels of research productivity. This leads to their low levels of job satisfaction.

Moreover, immigrant faculty encounter and endure ethnocentrism in their face-to-face interactions with U.S.-born colleagues and students (Rubin and Smith 1990; Rubin 1992; Skachkova 2007). In fact, differences in accent and a seeming lack of fluency in English affect interpersonal relations between students and colleagues (Rubin and Smith 1990; Rubin 1992; Skachkova 2007), a glaring reality that is supported by personal accounts of immigrant faculty

(e.g., Guo 2006; Bang 2016; Mfum-Mensah 2016). For instance, U.S.-born students refuse to take classes or drop out of classes taught by immigrant instructors and challenge their teaching credibility (Rubin and Smith 1990; Lippi-Green 1997; Manrique and Manrique 1999; Guo 2006; Skachkova 2007; Nayenga 2016; Ghosh and Barber 2017). These students also poorly evaluate their immigrant instructors, as they speak English differently (Rubin and Smith 1990; Rubin 1992; Skachkova 2007; Ndemanu 2016). This is because U.S.-born students use various racial and cultural stereotypes associated with intelligence when judging ethnic faculty based on their accents (McCrocklin, Blanquera, and Loera 2018). Or, in general, they are resistant to accepting immigrant faculty, as they feel that the latter are in their country to learn and not to coach them and hence, inferior to them (Marvasti 2005; McCalman 2007). Similarly, U.S.-born faculty interact less as well as insult their immigrant colleagues with ethnocentric banters that demean their ethnic identity and accomplishments (Skachkova 2007). In other words, immigrant faculty experience "linguistic isolation" (Nawyn et al. 2012; Ghosh and Barber 2017) that results in the loss of status among their U.S.-born colleagues and students. Other cultural factors, such as religion or lifestyle (e.g., clothing styles or food habits) also exoticize and exclude them at interpersonal and institutional levels, where immigrant faculty are expected to integrate in the dominant workplace culture as well as act as diversity symbols at their employing institution and for its students (Manrique and Manrique 1999; Ghosh and Barber 2017). In fact, studies show that dominant cultural norms, such as religious traditions (in line with Christianity) of academic institutions affect faculty's sense of belonging in the organization (see Alleman 2012; Pilieci 2016).

In sum, the literature on tokenism and othering in the U.S. academy provides a glimpse of the varied structural barriers that women and racial and ethnic minorities navigate on a daily

basis. Also, it demonstrates how accented English predominantly exoticizes and excludes immigrant faculty both among colleagues and students. At the same time, it raises questions about their credibility in the academy and highlights their ‘outsider’ status in the country. In other words, the inability to speak in “Standard American English” (Lippi-Green 1997) challenges the social and professional standing of immigrant faculty in the U.S. academy. Additionally, although little explored, studies show that cultural factors other than language, such as religion and lifestyle make immigrants cultural tokens or ethnic others in the workplace, as a result of which they become highly visible and get encapsulated in diversity roles (see Ghosh and Barber 2017). Nevertheless, it is unknown how gender, race, ethnic origin, and foreign-born status intersect to impact immigrant faculty’s experiences at the interpersonal and organizational level, thereby impacting their social and professional standing in the U.S. academy. In other words, it is unclear how immigrant White male and female faculty and their counterparts of color experience the academic workplace in comparison to one another. Additionally, it is unclear how tokenism works in the context of ethnic culture, for both White ethnic groups and their counterparts of color at work, especially in the academy. I will explore these in the current study.

The Current Study

Existing scholarship shows how gender and race tokenize women and people of color at work and affect their power and privilege at the structural and interpersonal level. Also, literature shows how ethnic norms exclude immigrant and ethnic minority workers, thereby making them the ‘cultural outsiders’ in the workplace. However, ethnicity—characterized by ethnic groups and indigenous cultures—remains under theorized in work and higher education literature. Also, both theoretically and empirically speaking, intersectional research using the theory of tokenism

has not gone beyond gender and race. Thus, an intersectional analysis of gender, race, ethnic origin, and foreign-born status will uncover how these identities or social locations shape the work experiences of immigrant scholars (faculty) at the individual, interpersonal, and organizational level. It is equally important to explore how ethnic culture tokenizes immigrants especially in the academy and note how it scrutinizes and isolates different groups in varied ways, especially at the intersections of gender, race, ethnic origin, and foreign-born status. Besides, existing literature overlooks the formal and informal organizational culture of universities—and academic departments—that shapes the foreign-born faculty's work experiences, including their meaning-making opportunities of their experiences at work. It is important to study the organizational and departmental culture because it determines the ways in which employees make sense of their experiences and respond to them accordingly (see, for example, Dellinger and Williams 2002; Wolf-Wandel and Ward 2015). By formal culture, I refer to the rules and procedures followed in organizations. And by informal culture, I refer to the unwritten rules, rhetoric or scripts—laden with gendered, racial and/or ethnocentric meanings—used in particular professional contexts for managing identity and emotions, justifying work role, and guiding or comprehending interactions (e.g., Fine 1996; Barber 2016; Britton 2017). Finally, by choosing the academy I will show how a group of skilled immigrants navigate a high-status occupation (e.g., professorship) in a foreign country.

Thus, in this study, I center on the experiences of immigrant faculty in the U.S. academy to show how tokenism operates in the context of immigration or foreign-born status at work. Specifically, I explore the opportunities, challenges, and barriers that they encounter at the individual, interpersonal, and organizational level, as a result of their low representation in the U.S. academy as a whole. Additionally, I contend that not all immigrant faculty experience

tokenism in the same way. Thus, I take into account the ways in which gender, race, ethnic origin, cultural background, and foreign-born status intersect to shape their experiences. Here, I borrow from Wingfield's (2013) concept of *partial tokenization* to show that gender, race, ethnic origin, ethnic culture, and foreign-born status intersect in complex and varied ways to determine the privileges and penalties of immigrant faculty at work. Also, I expand on the concept of *cultural tokenism* (Ghosh and Barber 2017) to show the processes via which local gendered and ethnic norms and racial stereotypes hold up immigrants in the U.S. against the dominant cultural practices, thereby isolating and marginalizing them in the workplace and mainly in the context of the academy. Finally, I argue that the organizational and departmental culture of diversity plays an important role in the ways in which tokenism operates at work.

This study builds on Kanter's (1977) original work but also moves beyond the works of other scholars who have focused on tokenism purely from gendered and racial lens. I will show that gender, race, ethnic origin, cultural background, and foreign-born status intersect in multiple ways to produce unique experiences for immigrants who are a numerical rarity in the U.S. workplace. By doing this, I provide an analytical framework to rethink about tokenization at work, something that simultaneously advantages and disadvantages a specific group of people (here, immigrants), as a result of their multiple social locations and cultural background. Most importantly, it will help us to think about how tokenism operates in the context of contemporary immigration politics in the United States, especially after the 2016 election.

Summary

In this chapter, I focused on the experiences of women and racial minorities in male- and White-dominated occupations. By doing this, I discussed that due to their low numbers and social status, women and racial minorities are tokens in the workplace and so, subjected to the

tokenization process—scrutiny, performance pressures, and isolation at work. I reviewed the theories on tokenism to explain that it is not a simple process, as tokenism benefits and disadvantages some groups more so than others due to their multiple social locations. I also discussed the literature on exoticization to show that ethnic culture or cultural background, such as accent and proficiency in English, religion or lifestyle plays a dominant role to exclude immigrants and ethnic minorities in the workplace. Finally, I reviewed how the academy is also not free from the process of tokenization and exoticization of women and racial and ethnic minorities at work. At the end, I detailed how my study will address the theoretical and empirical loopholes in tokenism and add a new dimension to rethink it—by doing an intersectional analysis of gender, race, ethnic origin, ethnic culture, and foreign-born status to understand the privileges and penalties at work, but contextualizing it at the backdrop of the organizational and departmental culture of diversity.

CHAPTER 3

DATA AND METHODS

In order to gain a thorough understanding about how *cultural tokenism* operates at work, I conducted in-depth face-to-face interviews with 53 immigrant faculty—13 Whites and 40 people of color—at a large public university in the rural Midwest. I interviewed faculty from Asia (including the Middle East), Africa, Europe, North America, and South America. I recruited my interview subjects via e-mail and/or visiting them in their offices. I asked my immigrant participants about their overall work experiences in an American university, especially in comparison to their U.S-born colleagues. My questions focused on their interactions and relations with colleagues and students. I also asked them about their experiences in their respective department and in the university as a whole—related to recruitment (including salary and other benefits), tenure/promotion, leadership, teaching, research, and service—as well as their general feelings of satisfaction and/or stress at work.

I also conducted in-depth face-to-face interviews with 22 administrators (e.g., department chairs, interim directors of programs, college deans, and chancellors) and university administrative personnel (e.g., staff members of Affirmative Action, Equity and Compliance, and Human Resources). In addition, I interviewed 2 faculty, who served on faculty search committees. I interviewed the administrators, search committee members, and administrative personnel to understand how they shape the work experiences of immigrant faculty, by allocating work—teaching or service—and handling matters related to confrontation—among faculty and between faculty and students—or diversity—current faculty and student representation, and faculty recruitment (including salary and other benefits), retention and tenure/promotion. It is important to note at this point that 9 of the administrators and the 2 search committee members

are immigrants themselves and are among my 53 immigrant faculty participant pool. I emailed all the immigrant faculty, administrators, and administrative personnel in the university, made a personal visit to an administrator's office, and spoke to one administrative personnel over the phone to request their participation in my study. I asked open ended questions to each of my study participants. This gave them enough liberty to respond in any way they like, including the provisions for detailed responses or novel concerns (Rubin and Rubin 2012).

I conducted the interviews in my participants' offices, with the exception of one immigrant faculty who I interviewed at the person's residence. The interviews lasted 2 hours on average. I audio recorded and transcribed the interviews and subsequently, coded them for analysis; I noted the impact of gender, race, ethnic origin, cultural background, and foreign-born status on my immigrant participants' experiences at work. In order to prevent any loss of important information in case the audio recorder broke down, as a fall back option, I took notes on the stories, examples or any important thing (or quote) that my participants told me during the interviews. Along with interviews, I observed and noted faculty-faculty and faculty-student interactions in faculty meetings and classrooms respectively. I observed 4 faculty meetings and 31 class lectures for approximately 42 hours. I further coded these observations for themes that matched with those of the interviews and for generating follow-up questions from time to time. I collected my data from September 2017 until August 2018. In order to analyze my findings, I used the theories on tokenism that are appropriate with the emerging themes in my data.

Thus, in the following pages, I will discuss the rationale for my data collection techniques and for choosing the particular research setting. Additionally, I will describe my study sample, followed by a discussion of the codes of ethics that I observed throughout the study, the research procedure, how I coded and assured the validity and reliability of my data, and my experiences in

the field.

Data Collection Methods

I used primarily two methods to collect my data: interviews and field observations. I chose face-to-face interviews for several reasons. First, they provided “warrantable knowledge” (Oakley 2004) about the immigrant faculty’s experiences at work and how people in administrative positions handle diversity matters. Oakley (2004) refers to “warrantable knowledge” as legitimate data that clearly represent the perspectives of the individual or group under study; they adequately answer the research questions with the help of the methods that fit with the questions. Second, they allowed the faculty under study to be thoroughly immersed in building data about their own lives (Graham 1984) through open and unrestricted interaction between them as interviewees and me as a researcher (Reinharz 1992). Third, face-to-face interviews gave me access to what my participants thought or felt or remembered about any past incidents and allowed them to provide their views on real life experiences at work (Reinharz 1992). Moreover, I studied a group whose meaning-making has been explored little in earlier scholarship. Hence, the interview method provided a standpoint perspective of the immigrant faculty, based on their “situated knowledge” (Haraway 1988) and “lived experiences” (Fonow and Cook 2005). Fourth, the interview method gave me the opportunity to follow-up with my participants so that they could provide clarifications in case they did not clearly answer any of my questions (Reinharz 1992; Marshall and Rossman 2011) or respond to any of my field observation related questions. Fifth, they enabled me to observe the emotions, body language or physical cues of my research participants. Sixth, face-to-face interviews allowed me to observe the physical or social space my participants inhabit, which allowed further reflections on their daily interactions or what they mean to them (Marshall and Rossman 2011). Lastly, despite

asymmetry in the status and power of my participants and me, the interviews gave me the ability to control the topic of discussion, based on the questions I asked and how I maintained coherence in my participants' responses (see, for example, interviewing elites in Stephens 2007; Wang and Yan 2012; Anthony and Danaher 2016). Although occasionally, if my participants required clarification or were confused about the interview questions, I gave them examples from existing research or personal experiences to explain the effects of gender, race, ethnic origin, cultural background, or foreign-born status in the workplace.

I chose semi-structured interviews as they contain a restricted list of already prepared questions on a specific topic by the researcher—in my case, the questions were related to the work experiences of immigrant faculty and the organizational culture of the university under study—including plans for follow-up questions (Rubin and Rubin 2012; Patton 2015). Follow-up questions in some (not all) cases provided further detailed data or clarification on concepts or themes or something said at that moment, such as a side comment (Rubin and Rubin 2012; Patton 2015), or my observations in the faculty meetings and class lectures. However, my study had an option for "responsive interviewing" that allows flexibility in the questioning pattern or the possibility for new questions based on the participants' responses (Rubin and Rubin 2012). This interviewing style gave me the option to revise my interview guides/protocols based on my participants' responses (Dilley 2000) and observations in the faculty meetings and class lectures. However, I did not revise my interview guides during the course of my study, as my participants distinctly answered my primary research questions. Nevertheless, I was flexible with the order of questions, based on how my research participants responded to them.

Lastly, my observations in the faculty meetings and class lectures added nuance to my evaluation of faculty-faculty and faculty-student interactions, based on what I saw or heard. I

observed and took hand-written notes on the emotions, body language, or who interrupted or joked in the meetings and lectures. Similarly, I took notes on the conversations between the faculty under study and their colleagues and students, and the latter's responses or comments or what they said during interruptions or banters.

Research Site

Choosing the research site is one of the basic aspects of the research design and something that guides the researcher throughout the research process (Marshall and Rossman 2011). I selected the particular research site due to my accessibility and its rural setting and population makeup. For instance, during the time of the study, the city in which the university is located constituted a population that is about 63 percent White and 89 percent U.S.-born (U.S. Census Bureau 2017). Similarly, approximately 64 percent of the university faculty body is White, with nearly 65 percent of the faculty being U.S.-born (University Institutional Research and Studies Department 2018a). Correspondingly, 62 percent of the university student body is White, with about 91 percent of the students being U.S.-born (University Institutional Research and Studies Department 2018b). Yet, other than similar adjacent areas, the university also draws students from nearby cities and over 100 countries excluding the United States (University Center for International Education 2016). When I contacted the Human Resources department to confirm the number and identities of foreign-born faculty in the university, I also learned that approximately 38 countries other than the United States represented the university faculty body in 2017. Besides, more than half of the faculty and student body is male, with female faculty comprising about 48 percent and female students nearly 43 percent of the total population in the university (University Institutional Research and Studies Department 2018a). These socio-demographic attributes made the location ideal for the study, especially to understand how

cultural tokenism operates in such a rural, native-White- and male-dominated setting and in the process, gets highlighted. Lastly, by doing an in-depth study on one particular university, I was able to gain insights into the formal and informal processes that define its organizational culture (see, for example, Tuchman 2009) and shape the experiences of immigrant faculty in American universities more generally.

Sample

Based on the qualitative nature of my study, I used a non-probability sampling strategy. Precisely, I used purposive sampling method to recruit my participants and selected those who fit the study goals and could provide rich information on the questions in the interview guides/protocols (Patton 2015). Thus, I visited the faculty webpages of every department to determine the number of immigrant faculty that currently existed in the university. And I did this by studying their biographies and curriculum vitae that contained information about the colleges and universities from where they earned their degrees and/or where they were born and raised. Therefore, by conducting a preliminary "background research" (Dilley 2000), I estimated approximately 200 immigrant faculty in the university; they originated in Asia (including the Middle East), Africa, Europe, North America, and South America. I confirmed these numbers with the Human Resources department that maintains employee records, and also obtained information about those who I missed on the preliminary list. Additionally, I recruited 3 of my immigrant participants via references from their counterparts who I interviewed as well. I contacted the faculty via emails and/or personal visits to their offices, followed by interviewing those who agreed to participate in the study. I interviewed a total of 53 immigrant faculty (see Table 1)—2 of them served on faculty search committees (see Table 2) but did not hold any administrative positions at the time of the study or in the past.

Similarly, I visited the staff directories of the university's Affirmative Action, Equity and Compliance, and Human Resources to get their contact information (email and office phone number). Later, I contacted them via email and/or phone to request their participation in the study. Also, I emailed and/or visited the department chairs, interim directors of programs, college deans and chancellors, and requested that they participate in my study. I obtained information about them from their respective department, school or college website. I interviewed a total of 22 administrators and administrative personnel (see Tables 2 and 3)—16 department chairs and interim directors of programs, 1 college dean, 2 chancellors, and 3 staff members of Affirmative Action, Equity and Compliance, and Human Resources. Besides 9 foreign-born, the rest of the 10 administrators are U.S.-born. Thirteen administrators and administrative personnel identified themselves as male and 9 as female. Similarly, 13 identified themselves as Caucasian White, 6 as Asian, 2 as Black, and 1 as Middle Eastern.

Out of the 53 immigrant faculty who I interviewed, 19 identified themselves as female and 34 as male. Similarly, 11 of them identified themselves as Caucasian White, 2 as Hispanic White, 7 as Black, 29 as Asian, 3 as Middle Eastern, and 1 as "Other." Nineteen faculty identified their ethnic origin in South Asia, 2 in Southeast Asia, 8 in East Asia, 1 in North America, 3 in South America, 3 in Northwest Europe, 2 in Central Europe, 2 in Southern Europe, 1 in Southeast Europe, 2 in Southwest Europe, 1 in East Africa, 3 in West Africa, 3 in the Caribbean, and 3 in the Middle East. Forty-one of them earned their Ph.Ds. from the United States, 2 from North America, 7 from Europe, and 3 from Asia. Four faculty were on H1-B visa (temporary work visa for foreign workers in the U.S.), 1 on OPT status (temporary work visa for international students graduating from American institutions), 16 had green cards (permanent residency), and the rest were U.S. citizens. Out of the total immigrant participants, 6 were from

Agricultural Sciences, 14 from Liberal Arts, 2 from Mass Communication, 3 from Education, 1 from Library Science, 5 from Business, and 23 from STEM—2 participants were cross-listed with 2 departments within the same college or across 2 colleges. They were also spread across ranks—2 part-time Lecturers, 1 part-time Instructor, 19 Assistant Professors, 14 Associate Professors, and 17 Full Professors. Their ages ranged between 30 and 72 years—6 participants did not report their age. The experiences of the immigrant participants did not vary much across ranks or ages. But, their gender, race, ethnic origin, cultural background and foreign-born status, and the diversity representation among their colleagues and students played an important role in how they experienced or navigated the workplace (see, for example, Ghosh and Barber 2017). Except for one, all the immigrant participants reported speaking English in addition to their native language and/or other regional (from their country of origin) or foreign languages. Finally, the number of years the immigrant participants have lived in the United States ranged between 2.5 and 46 years.

Table 1: Immigrant Participant Demographics

Pseudonym	Gender	Race	Region of Ethnic Identification	Years Lived in the U.S.	Rank	Academic Program
Pedro	Male	Caucasian White	South America	17	Full Professor	Non-STEM
Gary	Male	Caucasian White	Northwest Europe	29.5	Full Professor	Non-STEM
Marcos	Male	Caucasian White	South America	38	Associate Professor	Non-STEM
Bianca	Female	Caucasian White	Southwest Europe	8	Assistant Professor	Non-STEM
Brad	Male	Caucasian White	Northwest Europe	46	Full Professor	Non-STEM
Nora	Female	Caucasian White	Southeast Europe	25	Associate Professor	STEM
Dennis	Male	Caucasian White	Southern Europe	3	Assistant Professor	STEM
George	Male	Caucasian White	Northwest Europe	35	Full Professor	STEM
Marc	Male	Caucasian White	Southern Europe	18	Full Professor	STEM
Emma	Female	Caucasian White	Central Europe	22.5	Associate Professor	Non-STEM
Herbert	Male	Caucasian White	Central Europe	11	Associate Professor	Non-STEM
Isabella	Female	Hispanic White	Southwest Europe	25	Associate Professor	Non-STEM
Jorge	Male	Hispanic White	North America	4.5	Associate Professor	STEM
Aretta	Female	Black	West Africa	16	Assistant Professor	Non-STEM
Bruk	Male	Black	East Africa	26	Associate Professor	Non-STEM
Kofi	Male	Black	West Africa	27	Associate Professor	Non-STEM
Aba	Female	Black	West Africa	17	Associate Professor	Non-STEM
Anet	Female	Black	Caribbean	6.5	Assistant Professor	Non-STEM
Alvita	Female	Black	Caribbean	13	Assistant Professor	Non-STEM
Lloyd	Male	Black	Caribbean	19	Associate Professor	STEM
Ting-ting	Female	Asian	East Asia	12	Assistant Professor	Non-STEM
Doyun	Male	Asian	East Asia	20	Associate Professor	Non-STEM
Leela	Female	Asian	South Asia	29	Full Professor	Non-STEM
Jihun	Male	Asian	East Asia	20	Full Professor	Non-STEM
Sunanda	Female	Asian	South Asia	8	Full Professor	Non-STEM

Table 1, Continued

Pseudonym	**Gender**	**Race**	**Region of Ethnic Identification**	**Years Lived in the U.S.**	**Rank**	**Academic Program**
Sudhansu	Male	Asian	South Asia	43	Full Professor	STEM
Benjie	Male	Asian	Southeast Asia	11	Assistant Professor	Non-STEM
Anubhav	Male	Asian	South Asia	16	Assistant Professor	STEM
Alok	Male	Asian	South Asia	12.5	Associate Professor	Non-STEM
Saad	Male	Asian	South Asia	31	Full Professor	STEM
Arif	Male	Asian	South Asia	21	Associate Professor	Non-STEM
Anirudh	Male	Asian	South Asia	18	Assistant Professor	Non-STEM
Dilip	Male	Asian	South Asia	25	Full Professor	STEM
Biyu	Female	Asian	East Asia	16	Assistant Professor	Non-STEM
Chang	Male	Asian	East Asia	16	Assistant Professor	Non-STEM
Arunava	Male	Asian	South Asia	15	Full Professor	Non-STEM
Farida	Female	Asian	South Asia	13	Part-time Lecturer	Non-STEM
Liu	Male	Asian	East Asia	11	Assistant Professor	Non-STEM
Pranab	Male	Asian	South Asia	32	Full Professor	STEM
Prannoy	Male	Asian	South Asia	20.5	Full Professor	STEM
John	Male	Asian	Southeast Asia	23	Associate Professor	STEM
Wasim	Male	Asian	South Asia	2.5	Assistant Professor	STEM
Lan	Female	Asian	East Asia	9.5	Part-time Lecturer	STEM
Avik	Male	Asian	South Asia	6.5	Assistant Professor	STEM
Lakshila	Female	Asian	South Asia	19	Assistant Professor	STEM
Inesh	Male	Asian	South Asia	14.5	Assistant Professor	STEM
Lima	Female	Asian	South Asia	13.5	Part-time Instructor	STEM
Anita	Female	Asian	South Asia	46	Full Professor	Non-STEM
Fan	Female	Asian	East Asia	14	Assistant Professor	Non-STEM
Maz	Male	Middle Eastern	Middle East	22	Full Professor	STEM

Table 1, Continued

Pseudonym	Gender	Race	Region of Ethnic Identification	Years Lived in the U.S.	Rank	Academic Program
Hamid	Male	Middle Eastern	Middle East	39.5	Full Professor	STEM
Farhad	Male	Middle Eastern	Middle East	17.5	Assistant Professor	STEM
Janet	Female	Other	South America	17	Assistant Professor	STEM/Non-STEM

Table 2: Administrator and Search Committee Member Demographics

Pseudonym	Gender	Race	Country/Region of Ethnic Identification	Academic Program
Charles	Male	Caucasian White	United States of America	Non-STEM
Ryan	Male	Caucasian White	United States of America	STEM
Linda	Female	Caucasian White	United States of America	Non-STEM
Deborah	Female	Caucasian White	United States of America	Non-STEM
Allan	Male	Caucasian White	United States of America	Non-STEM
Judy	Female	Caucasian White	United States of America	Non-STEM
Kenny	Male	Caucasian White	United States of America	Non-STEM
Frank	Male	Caucasian White	United States of America	Non-STEM
Richard	Male	Caucasian White	United States of America	Non-STEM
Michael	Male	Black	United States of America	None
Brad	Male	Caucasian White	Northwest Europe	Non-STEM
Leela	Female	Asian	South Asia	Non-STEM
Sunanda	Female	Asian	South Asia	Non-STEM
Sudhansu	Male	Asian	South Asia	STEM
Saad	Male	Asian	South Asia	STEM
Dilip	Male	Asian	South Asia	STEM
Anita	Female	Asian	South Asia	Non-STEM
Maz	Male	Middle Eastern	Middle East	STEM
Kofi	Male	Black	West Africa	Non-STEM
John*	Male	Asian	Southeast Asia	STEM
Benjie*	Male	Asian	Southeast Asia	Non-STEM

*Search committee member

Table 3: Administrative Personnel Demographics

Pseudonym	Gender	Race	Country of Origin
Martha	Female	Caucasian White	United States of America
Veronica	Female	Caucasian White	United States of America
Celine	Female	Caucasian White	United States of America

Ethics in Research

Qualitative research or value-free social science is grounded in the doctrines and practices of ethical research (see, for example, Christians 2011; Marshall and Rossman 2011).

Such principles and practices are necessary because qualitative studies are sensitive in nature. For instance, Patton (2015) argues that interviews are “interventions” that might evoke deep emotions in the participants during the Q and A sessions, by “reopening old wounds” or telling the interviewer things that they have never spoken about (p. 495). Thus, it is important to note that the majority of the female participants—with the exception of 1 male faculty—got emotional during the interviews. Their emotions were manifested in the form of shaking or low voice, nervous facial expressions or emotional upheavals while recalling their experiences and treatment by male colleagues and students—and White colleagues and students, in case of faculty of color—in their current institution or the past workplace. In other words, this manifestation of vulnerability is highly gendered.

Also, 4 of the immigrant participants expressed concerns about revealing their country of origin in the study. This is mainly because they are in low numbers in the university and/or in their respective department and hence, easily identifiable. Thus, to protect my participants' identities, I keep their national origin as well as their respective department or college affiliation confidential throughout the study. Instead, I indicate their respective region of ethnic identification and their academic program/field as STEM or non-STEM—the latter for Liberal Arts, Mass Communication, Education, Library Science, and Business—for contextual understanding. I considered STEM as the reference academic program due to a heavy concentration of foreign-born scholars in it generally (National Science Foundation 2015; Institute of International Education 2017) and their heavy presence among the STEM faculty body in the university under study particularly (University Institutional Research and Studies Department 2018a). Similarly, to protect the identities of my U.S.-born participants, I will refrain from indicating their actual positions and department or college affiliations. Therefore, my study

rests on 3 principles: respect for persons/privacy/confidentiality, beneficence—assurance of safety—and justice—accounting for who gains from the study (e.g., immigrant faculty who have been understudied) or highlighting the wrongs meted out to the people as per the study's focus (see Christians 2011; Marshall and Rossman 2011; Patton 2015).

For the purpose of ethical conduct, I submitted a research proposal, 2 email, 2 telephone and 2 face-to-face participation solicitation scripts, 2 consent forms, 2 face sheets, and 2 interview guides/protocols for both immigrant faculty and the search committee members, administrators, and administrative personnel—with provisions for flexibility in the interview questions, based on the situation and participants' responses—to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for approval (see appendix for field instruments). The email, telephone and face-to-face participation solicitation scripts informed the potential participants about how I got their contact information, the purpose of my study and data collection methods, and who approved the project, thereby requesting their participation in my dissertation project. The consent form informed the participants about my identity, who approved the project, the study goals and data collection techniques, duration of each interview, their freedom to participate or withdraw anytime, how to seek the consent of their colleagues and students (as and when needed) for observations in the faculty meetings and class lectures respectively, who owned and had access to the data, with whom the study results will be shared, who to contact in case questions arose, and their consent to quote them in my dissertation and future presentations and publications. Most importantly, the consent form ensured the anonymity and privacy of my participants to an extent it is possible (see, for example, Sarantakos 2005 in Creswell 2014). The face sheets consisted of demographic, personal, academic qualification, and employment related questions (and information) about my research participants. The interview guides/protocols consisted of questions that explored how

the structural inequalities of gender, race, ethnic origin, and foreign-born status are reinforced at work (see, for example, Hondagneu-Sotello 2001; Ghosh and Barber 2017); the questions focused on the immigrant faculty's experiences at individual, interpersonal (among colleagues and students), and organizational levels.

Procedure

I began my study by contacting the Human Resources officials to provide the numbers and identities of immigrant faculty in every department of the university under study. I got the list of existing immigrant faculty by explaining my study goals to those maintaining employee records. Based on their responses, I prepared a complete list of my potential participants. I compared this list with the list I had initially prepared and noted the overlaps and included those who I missed initially. Next, I wrote individual emails to the immigrant faculty from the list prepared and explained them my research goals as well as the policy implications of my study (e.g., acceptance and promotion of diversity in the U.S. higher education). I also disclosed that I am a foreign-born graduate student and an instructor in Sociology, who is exploring and understanding how gender, race, ethnic origin, cultural background, and foreign-born status shape their experiences at individual, interpersonal, and organizational levels. I combined emails with personal visits to the faculty's offices by making a prior appointment, where I explained my study face-to-face. I followed the same procedure for the administrators and administrative personnel; in case of an administrative personnel, I explained my research goals over the phone. By clearly revealing my study objectives, I attempted to establish rapport and a trusting relationship with my participants. I also established rapport through neutrality during the course of the interview, where I remained open-minded and unbiased yet respectful and compassionate to what my participants said (Patton 2015).

Next, for those immigrant participants who were interested in my research goals and agreed to take part in the study, I got their signature on the consent form either on the day of the interview or sometime before the actual day of interview. I did the same for filling out the face sheet. On the day of the interview, I conducted it wherever my participant was comfortable to talk about his/her experiences (e.g., office, home). I began my interviews by asking general questions (e.g., experiences of living in the U.S. so far, educational and work experiences before joining the current institution) that were intended to make my participants feel comfortable (see Dilley 2000). These were followed by questions related to my study's focus, where I asked them about how they think their gender, race, ethnic origin, cultural background, and foreign-born status impact their experiences and treatment in their department and in the university; these questions focused on their hiring (including salary and other benefits), tenure/promotion, leadership, teaching, research, and service related experiences. I also asked them about their formal interactions (e.g., networks and collaborations) as well as informal interactions (e.g., going out for lunches, dinners, coffees or drinks, gathering during weekends) with colleagues inside and outside the department and university, and what they felt about collegiality at work. Additionally, I asked them about their experiences with students both inside and outside the classroom. I also asked if they ever struggled or felt stressed about anything, or what they enjoyed about their work (e.g., teaching, research, and service). Finally, I asked them to describe the faculty composition in their department, in terms of gender, race, and ethnic origin. It is also important to note that I also asked questions that were intersectional in nature, which helped my immigrant participants to reflect on their experiences based on their multiple identities that are mutually constructed and not necessarily separate (see Bowleg 2008). For the search committee members, administrators, and administrative personnel, I repeated the same process of filling out

the face sheet and later, interviewed them. I asked them to describe the current state of diversity in their department, college, or in the university as a whole. I also asked them about how they handle diversity related matters, distribution of work, or if there are any issues between immigrant faculty and their colleagues and students.

Besides conducting interviews, I took notes on every important information, quote, story, and example that my participants cited. I also took notes during those situations in which my participants were uncomfortable with audio recording. I used verbal probes ("uh-huh," "when," "who," "where," "what," "how") if more depth, clarification or elaboration was required on my participants' responses (Rubin and Rubin 2012; Patton 2015). I also used probes (whenever needed) to keep the conversations on track (e.g., nodded head), confirmed what the interviewees said (e.g., shared a similar situation or story from personal experiences or existing research), and checked the credibility of their responses (e.g., asked for evidence in the form of examples or stories) (Rubin and Rubin 2012). These were necessary for getting quality information. I also ensured further quality information by rephrasing or asking more focused questions in case the interviewees lost track. Lastly, I used follow-up questions as and when needed. On average, each interview lasted 2 hours and was conducted in English. I audio recorded the interviews and later, transcribed and coded them using NVivo. I ended every interview by thanking the interviewee for his/her precious time, as well as praised and supported the valuable information he/she contributed (see Patton 2015).

It is also interesting to note that while interviewing the immigrant male participants, except for a couple of Caucasian White men and one Asian man, the rest of them were unable to think or articulate if their gender works in favor of them or against them in the workplace. In other words, they were oblivious about how gender shapes people's experiences at work. This

was mainly due to the male-dominated nature of the departments/programs or the university that they are affiliated to; in essence, their responses accentuated and 'naturalized' the masculine image of the "ideal worker" (Acker 1990, 2006). This, in turn, made them unconscious about the privileges associated with their social (male) identity. I was also startled to note that one of my immigrant female participants vehemently denied the impact of gender at work, despite the fact that her female counterparts provided testaments to systematic gender inequality. This is mainly because she is employed in a department where approximately 66 percent of the faculty are females (University Institutional Research and Studies Department 2018a). This, in turn, made her overlook the subtle and overt ways in which women as a whole pay the penalties that result from their gender status.

It is also noteworthy that the majority of the Asian participants reported that race or ethnic origin works neither in favor of them nor against them. They also disregarded themselves as a minority group in the U.S. academy in general and often justified it by referring to their heavy presence in the university's STEM program (University Institutional Research and Studies Department 2018a). This explicates that they embrace the "model minority" stereotype and attempt to recreate and reinforce "the color of success" (Wu 2014) or the image of "the good immigrants" (Hsu 2015) in the United States. In other words, they make efforts to live up to the rhetoric of "meritocracy" that resurfaced in the social and political landscape following Donald Trump's election in 2016. However, my data corroborate the "model minority" stereotype and at the same time, challenge such espousals and show that it is a myth (Yook 2013; Chou and Feagin 2015). Also, the administrators and the search committee members in general stressed the rhetoric of "meritocracy" when I asked them about the efforts to recruit faculty from diverse backgrounds; they emphasized that merit supersedes any form of social identities, such as

gender, race or ethnic origin.

Alongside interviews, I observed a total of 4 faculty meetings—3 at the departmental and 1 at the college level—that my immigrant participants attended. Similarly, I observed a total of 31 class lectures—27 undergraduate and 4 graduate—that they delivered. I observed both faculty meetings and class lectures for approximately 42 hours. I sat at the back of the classrooms or in a corner at the faculty meetings. I noted thick descriptions about the settings. Also, I took detailed notes on my immigrant participants' appearances and attires and their interactions with their colleagues and students, including their emotions, body language, conversations, and responses. I typed up the field notes immediately (within 24 hours) after I concluded my observations. The field notes included my "asides" (short reflections) or "commentaries" (elaborate reflections) on some specific events and interactions observed in the field (see Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw 2011), and how they connected with my interview data.

The faculty colleagues of my participants were informed beforehand about my presence in the meetings, and in a couple of class lectures, the students were also cognizant of my presence and its purpose. My immigrant participants or their respective department chair or college dean informed their faculty colleagues that I was studying workplace interactions or how immigrant faculty interacted at work, and the same was conveyed to the students. I gained access to the faculty meetings and class lectures via the verbal consents of my participants' colleagues and students. Albeit "reactive effect," that is, the impact of my presence on the behavior of the participants was unavoidable, it did not actually contaminate the ongoing social interactions (see Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw 2011). The latter was possible because, except for my immigrant participants and/or their respective department chair or college dean, both of their colleagues and students were unaware that I was also noting how they interacted with my participants. This was

a consciously taken decision or else they could have altered their behavior or my entry to the field could have been restricted. I actively took notes on the faculty-faculty and faculty-student "interactional detail"—both verbal and non-verbal—in the field and recorded the events in a chronological order (see Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw 2011). On ethical grounds, neither did I use any audio/video recorder nor any identifiers (e.g., name or position) while chronicling my observations. I further coded my field notes for analysis and matched their codes with those of the interviews.

It was interesting to note that gender, race, and the ethnic origin of my immigrant participants or the overall demographic makeup of the faculty body in the participants' respective department and those of students in the classroom determined how my participants navigated the faculty meetings and class lectures. In other words, the ways in which the White men and women or men and women of color in the study navigated the faculty meetings and class lectures varied on the basis of the gender, racial, and ethnic composition of the faculty in their respective department and the student body in their respective academic program/field and in the classroom.

Data Coding

For the purpose of coding data, I began with open coding—coding every line in the transcript—followed by focused coding—isolating the most important themes and patterns among the redundant codes from initial coding to develop bigger themes or categories (see Charmaz 2004; Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw 2011). Also, I used my interests, research questions, and existing literature to code texts and develop categories (see Creswell 2014). I used both "in vivo" codes—exact words or language of the participants (Charmaz 2004; Creswell 2014)—and my own interpretation to develop categories. I followed a similar procedure to code my field

notes written during and after the interviews, and observations of class lectures and faculty meetings. I coded body language based on peoples' eye contacts, eye movements, postures, gestures, facial expressions, and spaces occupied. Furthermore, I coded the experiences of sexism, racism and ethnocentrism, as well as those highlighting the privileges that my immigrant participants enjoy based on their gender, race, ethnic origin or cultural background.

Two overarching themes emerged in the data. The first one reveals stereotypes (negative as well as positive), performance pressures, and professional marginalization experienced by the faculty under study. The final one shows that cultural contrasts result in my immigrant participants' ethnic othering or exoticization at work, as well as heighten boundaries between them and their U.S.-born colleagues and students. These, in turn, affect my participants' legitimacy, interpersonal communications, productivity, and career growth in the academy. I will discuss these themes in detail in the findings chapters.

Validity and Reliability in Research

After each interview, I reflected and elaborated on it, especially to keep a track of what my participants "revealed" or "birthed" (Patton 2015). In other words, I checked the quality of the information received, that is, if the participants answered the questions accurately, or if the questions were ill phrased or incorrect topics were discussed, or if I failed to achieve a good rapport with my participants (see Patton 2015). I also wrote memos or research journals after every interview and field observation to note my experiences and feelings as a researcher in the field. Additionally, I used my prior knowledge and interests to note and define patterns or categories as early as possible; I included their characteristic features, experiences, and stories that supported them (see Charmaz 2004).

I used several techniques to ensure that my findings are accurate and reliable across the

interviews I conducted. For instance, after an interview ended, I listened to the audio recording to check for themes and new concerns. And in case, there was a lack of clarity in the information provided, I asked and double-checked with the concerned participants. I also gave my participants prompts or rephrased the questions when they had problems understanding the original questions and checked if they agreed or had any novel concerns (see Richards 1996); except for a few instances, they agreed with the majority. Furthermore, I ensured reliability by matching the audio recordings and transcripts at the highest level possible, followed by matching the codes, their definitions, and the data supporting them (see Creswell 2014). Lastly, to ensure the validity and reliability of my overall data, I compared the codes and themes that emerged from my interviews, field notes (based on the interviews and field observations), and my own perspectives (outlined in the research journals or memos). Furthermore, I compared the codes and themes and the overall data with existing research. Lastly, I acknowledge the personal bias that could have been produced during analysis because of my gender (being female interviewing or observing interactions with female faculty), race (being Asian interviewing or observing interactions with Asian faculty), and ethnic origin (being South Asian interviewing or observing interactions of South Asian faculty with their colleagues and students), or my foreign-born status in the U.S. in general (see Creswell 2014).

My Positionality as a Researcher: Advantages and Challenges in the Field

Past scholarship has addressed the power interplay between researchers and the elites who the former interview for the purpose of their study (e.g., Ostrander 1993; Stephens 2007; Morris 2009; Wang and Yan 2012; Belur 2014; Anthony and Danaher 2016). Neil Stephens (2007) defines “elites” as those figures who are in powerful social positions or statuses relative to the researcher or any ordinary citizen in society. Therefore, my research participants

(especially the immigrant faculty and the administrators) are certainly 'elites,' who hold more power and authority relative to me, where my status is merely that of a graduate student. Such power imbalance between my participants and me often hindered my access to the field and my research agenda (see Burnham et al. 2004; Bygnes 2008), as well as the quality of data I collected in the field. For example, as a result of my student and 'outsider' status, except for 4 occasions, I was unable to gain entry to faculty meetings at both departmental and college levels.

It is important to note that despite mentioning that neither I would use any audio/video recorder nor any identifiers while logging my observations, in 3 instances, the department chairs (who I asked directly via email and/or in person, or my immigrant participants approached on behalf of me) did not like the idea of me being present in the faculty meetings or were concerned about how they will convince their other faculty colleagues about my study or presence. In other times, my immigrant participants were uncomfortable with me observing them in the meetings. Also, in case of the classes that I was unable to observe, it was mainly because my immigrant participants simply did not want me to observe them while they taught, or their class timings clashed with those of other participants or with my existing research related commitments (e.g., interview appointments). Overall, my 'outsider' status and relatively powerless position affected not only my negotiations with the field gatekeepers or controllers—here, the 'elites'—but also my entry to the field (see Hammersley and Atkinson 2007; Reeves 2010). This, in turn, affected especially the richness of my observational data on faculty-faculty interactions.

Additionally, "elites" could also be people with certain expertise (Burnham et al. 2004; Stephens 2007). Based on their self-revelations during the course of the interview or before we met to discuss my study, 5 of my immigrant participants (and one who later dropped out) told me that they are trained qualitative researchers and hence, perfectly aware of the fundamentals of

qualitative research. Thus, they took upon themselves the professorial role of advising me how I should conduct my study or analyze my data. Precisely, they coached me about the number of people I should or should not interview, the number of questions I should ask the participants, how I should guarantee the confidentiality and anonymity of my participants, or how I should assure the validity and reliability of my data. For example, an East Asian female faculty commented that my methods are very time consuming, as I have "too many" interview questions. She also interrupted me several times during the first 20-30 minutes of the two interview sessions that I had with her and asked how long it will take to finish. This happened despite the fact that I clearly mentioned in the consent form as well as before the interview that it was expected to last for an hour on average and also, there could be follow-up sessions. In fact, she suggested that I should discuss with my advisor and dissertation committee members and consider revising my methodology, including my interview guide/protocol. She even mentioned that she took part in my study because she wanted to "help" me because I am a graduate student. However, such coaching was not only restricted to my qualitative researcher participants but also extended to a South Asian male faculty in STEM, who told me how I should analyze my data. My experiences resembled those of Stephens (2007) who studied macroeconomists, where interactions between his interviewees and him often resembled those of a supervisor-Ph.D. student. For example, his participants taught him the technical issues in macroeconomics. Nevertheless, such power dynamics produced unique struggles for me, where I had to appear respectable in my demeanor and show acknowledgement of the participants' expertise in order to prevent any interferences with my study goals.

However, to ward off such power differentials, I often adopted certain strategies in the field. For example, I dressed either in professional attires (e.g., suits) or semi-formal outfits (e.g.,

denims or cotton trousers with shirts/blouses and blazers) while interviewing the immigrant faculty and the administrators. This helped me to overcome my student appearance and made them take me more seriously and professionally. Also, I let the participants know about my experiences in the field and my expertise on the topic of research—tactics to validate a researcher's role (and expertise) and spawn empathy in participants (see Hammersley and Atkinsons 2007; Enguix 2014). For example, after encountering certain uncooperative participants at the beginning of my study, I told my later participants about my field experiences to generate empathy for me besides cooperation during the course of my research. I also made sure to talk about my expertise in the field (e.g., prior research experience, existing literature) so that my participants took me seriously. Thus, I overcame my stature (relative to my participants) or "strangeness" in the field (Enguix 2014) via "impression management" (Goffman 1989)—to control people's perceptions of the self via communication and presentation in social interactions—that is, by presenting myself professionally to my participants and as an expert in my area.

Past scholarship has also shown how social identities (e.g., gender, race, ethnicity, age), educational background or experience impact the power and interactional dynamics in the field, that is, between the researcher and the researched (e.g., Arendell 1997; Egharevba 2001; Carter 2004; Pini 2005; Hammersley and Atkins 2007; Stephens 2007; Salle and Harris III 2011; Belur 2014; Enguix 2014). For example, Ranita Ray (2018) in her study of the racialized nature of poverty among working- and under-class teenage people of color (Latinx and Black) in the U.S., discussed the insider-outsider perspective or the advantages and disadvantages she faced while interviewing and observing her participants in their family, work, and the larger community settings. She took into account her multiple social locations while discussing her field

experiences. For instance, as a result of coming from India, a relatively poor (or developing) country in comparison to the U.S., Ray gained entry to the field with no intimidation or little resistance. Also, the teenagers connected with her due to her youthful and light (brown) skin appearance, and the larger community perceived her as one of them. Contrastingly, due to her graduate student status, supervisors at the local non-profit organization (where Ray attended meetings in the presence of her research participants) were uncomfortable with Ray's presence in the meetings and tried to connect with her via "white middle-class imaginations of India" (p. 24)—yoga or vacations to India. Likewise, gender and age played an important role in building relationships or impacting interactions with the teenage youth in Ray's study. For instance, many young male teenagers sexualized their interactions with Ray, as she appeared as an attractive young woman and so, misread her research and professional inclinations.

In addition to Ray (2018), other scholars too (e.g., Egharevba 2001; Carter 2004; Belur 2014) have shown that the differences or similarities in racial and ethnic identities of the researcher and the researched affect the former's access to the field and interactions with the latter. For example, Jyoti Belur (2014) reported that being a former high-ranking police officer in India helped her to gain access to police officers working in conflict zones (left wing extremism-affected areas) in India, and ward off the power structures associated with gender and sexuality. Similarly, Belur established credibility and achieved an "insider" status among the police officers that she interviewed. In other words, both her ethnic identity and former professional status eased her way to the field.

Therefore, keeping the above discussions in mind, in the following paragraphs, I will discuss in detail my experiences in the field. I will address how my multiple social locations determined the advantages and challenges that I faced during the data collection process and

field interactions. It is important to note that my gender, race, and ethnic origin intersected with my foreign-born and graduate student status at varied levels and shaped my insider-outsider perspectives during fieldwork.

My foreign-born status and South Asian identity and the fact that I am an academician (see Stephens 2007 for interactions between an academic interviewer and academic interviewees) allowed me to approach the South Asian (and other Asian) or other immigrant faculty easily and gain their confidence to participate in my study. I also capitalized on my past contacts (mainly with people of my national origin or those part of the larger ethnic community) while I conducted my study. For example, I contacted without any hesitations and interviewed those faculty who I knew personally or had a great rapport with. In fact, they also introduced me to potential participants or provided references. Also, they made references to our country or region of origin and said things, such as "You know, how things are in…versus in the U.S."

I also did not encounter any problems while establishing credibility with participants of other races or ethnicities, as reported in existing scholarship (e.g., Egharevba 2001; Carter 2004). It is also important to note that being a woman myself eased my connections with most of my female participants (barring one) both before and during the interview. In other words, the female faculty from all racial and ethnic groups felt comfortable telling me their stories and often said, "I am sure you understand that being a woman (or a woman of color)…" I also shared my own accounts of struggles in the academy and how my gender, race, ethnicity, or foreign-born status shaped my experiences with undergraduate students, for instance. In fact, shared gender, racial, ethnic, or foreign-born status made my female participants feel comfortable in opening up their "old wounds," as well as trust and connect with me. In other words, my positionality within the group or sharing "indigenousness" with the participants facilitated my entry to the field and

allowed me to establish connections with them (see Belur 2014; Anthony and Danaher 2016). Additionally, most of my immigrant participants were excited that I was conducting a study on them, as well as supported and showed encouragement to me from time to time.

Furthermore, scholars, such as Pamela Fishman (1978), Terry Arendell (1997), Barbara Pini (2005), or Margaret W. Salle and Frank Harris III (2011) have addressed the performance of gender by both the researcher and the researched during interviews. In other words, both the researcher and the researched "do gender" (West and Zimmerman 1987) during field research, especially the female researcher who engages in "gender performativity" (Butler 1990) to establish rapport and collect data from male participants. For example, both Fishman (1978) and Arendell (1997) noted in their respective study that being female researchers they "did gender," by patiently and attentively listening to their male participants' stories, encouraging their feelings, or showing them supportive gestures—typical of what women do while conversing with men. These experiences were similar to my interview with an immigrant White male participant; the interview stretched over 2 sessions with 5.5 hours in total, thus making it my longest interview. My participant often digressed from the topic or questions asked and talked about his general frustration at work (including his frustrations with his female colleagues, students, and people in leadership positions) or life outside work. I listened to him patiently, showed compassion, and acknowledged his feelings even when I failed to bring him back on track or did not personally agree with several of his opinions. At the end of the interview, he told me, "I have not talked about my feelings to anyone else, except for my wife. And you're the second person I have spoken my heart out to." This statement suggests that I was more of a psychological relief station and less of a researcher to him. In other words, my interaction with the participant was guided by gendered expectations, that is, expectations framed by the cultural images or

stereotypes associated with gender (e.g., women as “naturally” nurturing) and internalized by people at the social psychological level (Ridgeway 2011). In this process, I ended up doing heavy “emotion work” (Hochschild 1979).

The enactment of gender (and age) and the doing of emotion work further extended to my other older immigrant male participants (irrespective of race or ethnic origin), who challenged me about the research process, instructed me about my own research or my life choices, or generally acted powerful. For example, a White male faculty suggested that there was no need for me to maintain confidentiality about his responses. He told me, “I don’t care even if people (including faculty colleagues in his department) get to know what I said. You can reveal my name or country of origin.” I got the impression that he wanted to use my study as a vent to channelize his frustrations with his department and U.S.-born colleagues. Likewise, another White male faculty was wary of providing (in fact, did not provide at all) his demographic information, such as religion, age, marital status, or who lives with him. He asked me before the interview why I needed this information. Despite telling him the rationale—analytical purposes—behind collecting such information, he told me that he considered them irrelevant to my study. On a similar note, an Asian male faculty got agitated after I probed him several times and asked to clarify some of the things that he said during the interview. He told me in an infuriated tone and a high voice, “It looks like you’re not satisfied with my answers.” I performed femininity by being patient and requested him in a low voice telling, “Sir, please calm down. I just want to make sure that I am not misunderstanding you or misquoting you later.” My deference in how I addressed him (“Sir”) and my ‘soft’ tone calmed him down. Finally, at the end of my last interview with a middle-aged immigrant Black male participant, he told me how feminists like me are destroying the social order or indicated that I should have been married by

now; these were in response to the participant's questions about my age, marital status, and intellectual dispositions after the interview.

My experiences are very similar to what Arendell (1997) noted in her study about those several male participants who challenged her about the research process. For example, many urged that there was no need to maintain confidentiality or got agitated and angry while filling out the background information sheet—showed discomfort for asking information that they were not comfortable in sharing. Additionally, throughout the study, nearly all of her participants questioned or instructed her on a wide array of topics. They interviewed her (regarding her age, religious affiliation, marital status, who she married, why she did not remarry, position on reproductive rights etc.) as well as drew conclusions about her character and lifestyle based on her responses. She also mentioned that while initiating contact with her participants, she learned that many of them felt that "only" a man would understand their stories or that two participants dropped out of the interviews perceiving the researcher as "one of *those feminists*"; she heard the term "those feminists" in several of her interviews. In fact, she did not reveal or mention about her feminist stance unless her participants asked.

In other cases, more than half of the male faculty participants acted 'busy' despite setting prior appointments (appointments were for an hour). For example, some told me in authoritative tones that I must finish my interview within an hour. Also, some of them made me wait outside their offices during and past scheduled times or did not show up at the interview location despite making prior appointments, and even cancelled two consecutive appointments. Lastly, some ended interviews abruptly to attend some other commitments, or stopped me during interviews and talked to students, or made me sit for hours in between interview sessions to talk to funding agencies for research funds or to equipment stores for industrial equipment (the latter pertaining

to a faculty in STEM). I certainly do not dismiss their important work role or job responsibilities or the fact that they are genuinely busy. But such attitudes denote display of power and masculinity, intertwined with one another. In other words, the male participants performed masculinity "by positioning themselves as busy, powerful, and important men" (Pini 2005:208). In fact, Barbara Pini (2005) noted similar instances during her interviews with men in leadership positions. Also, the location or the context constitutes power (Pini 2005), as organizations are inherently masculine in nature, that is, gendered structures (e.g., Kanter 1977; Britton 2000; Connell 2002; Acker 2006; Turco 2010; Williams, Muller, and Kilanski 2012; Harris and Giuffre 2015), including the academy (e.g., Eveline 2004; Bird 2011; National Center for Education Statistics 2015; Britton 2017). The idealization of men as the 'real' workers (Acker 1990) gives them more power and authority, which, in turn, affect the gender dynamics during interviews in male-dominated settings (Pini 2005).

The researcher's multiple identities and cultural background intersect in ways in which they affect their experiences in the field and hence, no one identity (matching with those of research participants) is enough for the researcher to overcome the challenges in the field—"sharing a trait with the social group does not automatically enact all the mechanisms of 'identity' with that group" (Enguix 2014:84). For example, my identity as a woman of color did not help me to ward off the power differentials with several female faculty of color in the study, who I believe found it easy to exhibit their 'elite' status and power due to shared social traits (e.g., gender, race and/or ethnic origin). Also, differences in gender, ethnic background, age, and (faculty-student) status resulted in the faculty's power display towards me. In other words, similarities or differences in social traits between my participants and me determined neither my insider nor outsider status. However, female researchers have an advantage in having access to

the field, as they are considered “harmless” (see Hammersley and Atkinsons 2007; Belur 2014; Enguix 2014) if not equals. In my case, I will call myself a “partial insider” (Sherif 2001)—my foreign-born status and ethnic origin allowed me to access and establish an ‘insider’ status with most of my participants in the field, but not necessarily my gender or student status permitted me the same equally. In fact, it is difficult to become a “full-time insider” because “in research settings we encounter subjects, bodies, personalities and social positions in constant fluctuation and negotiation” (Enguix 2014:90). Also, it is important to acknowledge that my gender, race, ethnic origin, and foreign-born status, or the extent of my familiarity with the study participants could affect my analysis of the people I do or do not identify or connect with.

Summary

In this chapter, I discussed that for the purpose of my study, I conducted 66 interviews with immigrant faculty, search committee members, administrators and administrative personnel, and 42 hours of observations in faculty meetings and class lectures at a large public university in the rural Midwest. The selection of the location was determined by my easy access and particular socio-demographic factors—rural area, native-White- and male-dominated, and the presence of immigrant faculty from various countries. I audio-recorded the interviews and later, transcribed them. I coded the interviews and the field notes using the qualitative software NVivo. I also matched the codes with my perspectives outlined in the research journals and memos, as well as with existing literature. Besides the established codes of ethics in qualitative research, I also discussed the steps that I took to maintain the confidentiality and anonymity of my research participants. Lastly, I discussed the advantages and challenges that I faced in the field due to my gender, race, ethnic origin, and foreign-born and graduate student status.

CHAPTER 4

STEREOTYPES, PERFORMANCE PRESSURES, AND MARGINALIZATION AT WORK

What are the experiences of immigrant faculty at interpersonal and institutional levels? And how is their social and professional standing influenced by the organizational and departmental culture of diversity surrounding hiring, tenure and promotion, leadership roles, distribution of work—teaching load and service and committee work—or the gender, racial, and ethnic representation among faculty and students? These are the two central questions that I will explore in this chapter.

Keeping the above two questions in mind, this chapter notes the stereotypes (negative as well as positive) that my immigrant participants encounter at both interpersonal (among colleagues and students) and institutional levels. These stereotypes are, in fact, racialized in nature. For instance, on the one hand, immigrant Black faculty are perceived as "incompetent," "troublemakers," or "lazy"—controlling images (i.e. negative and oppressive stereotypes) popularly associated with Blacks in the U.S. (Fergusson 2001; Collins 2004)—in their respective department and in the university. On the other hand, immigrant White faculty and their Asian colleagues are perceived more favorably at work. For instance, whilst the White faculty are seen as "smart" and "competent," the Asian faculty navigate the "model minority" stereotype—both being regarded as 'superior' compared to their Black colleagues. Nevertheless, the faculty's ethnic origin also produces compounded effects in how they are perceived by colleagues and students. For instance, faculty with a Latin or Hispanic heritage are seen as "lazy" by their non-Hispanic U.S.-born colleagues. Similarly, the Muslim faculty from South Asia and the Middle East navigate the "terrorist" image among their colleagues and students. Lastly, the racial and ethnic minority faculty are perceived as the "diversity and cultural experts" and so, serve as

token members on university wide committees and carry out an unprecedented amount of service work. This role encapsulation—seeing minorities as representatives of their groups—as Kanter (1977) describes it, in turn, result in the faculty's *real* work—research—taking a back seat and impacting their upward mobility in terms of tenure and promotion.

However, the degree to which the faculty in the study steer through racial and ethnic stereotypes is determined by the overall departmental and organizational culture of diversity. For instance, immigrant Black faculty in White- and Asian-dominated fields/departments experience professional marginalization and microaggressions to a large extent, where they feel ignored during informal interactions, or their inputs are brushed off or questioned by their U.S.-born White colleagues. But this is absent for immigrant Asian faculty, especially in the STEM program, who in comparison to other minority groups are represented in large numbers in the field as well as in the university under study more generally.

It is also worth noting that many a time, the above-mentioned stereotypes, performance pressures, and professional marginalization are *gendered* in nature. For example, immigrant Black female faculty encounter the "incompetent" trope more so than their Black male colleagues. This becomes poignant during their interactions with both U.S.-born students and colleagues, who question the faculty's expertise in the subject matter or general competence at work. However, compared to their female counterparts, immigrant White male faculty are perceived as the "ideal workers" (Acker 1990, 2006) in their respective department and in the university and so, occupy leadership positions, exercise authority, and feel integrated at work. Likewise, Asian men exercise more clout and dominance than their female counterparts, where the latter for instance, are often expected to project a "submissive" image and act as "office wives" to their White male co-workers (Kanter 1977). Additionally, female faculty of color often

face the institutional challenges associated with playing the nurturing role, where they feel compelled to act as "mothers" to their students and take care of their emotional and psychological needs. Likewise, they navigate a sexualized image about themselves, which holds true for White female faculty as well. The female faculty in general also find themselves being entrusted with "institutional housekeeping" (Bird, Litt, and Wang 2004) that includes enormous amounts of service and teaching responsibilities. This allows their male colleagues—especially White men—to escape the responsibilities associated with student shepherding and committee work and therefore, focus on their research and career growth. Overall, gender and race intersect to determine the faculty's privileges and penalties in manifold ways.

Thus, in the following pages, I will discuss the stereotypes that immigrant faculty navigate on a regular basis, and how certain controlling images produce performance pressures—due to heightened visibility and role encapsulation—and affect their assimilation and acceptance at work. Precisely speaking, I will show the racial undertones of these controlling images or positive stereotypes and will use an intersectional lens to show how differently they impact the White men and women and the men and women of color in the study. Overall, I will show how gender, race, ethnic origin, and foreign-born status intersect to impact the faculty's privileges and/or penalties, and that not every immigrant experiences tokenism to the same degree and thus, some end up being "partial tokens" (Wingfield 2013) compared to others, but that varies with the context in which they are situated.

The Incompetent, the Troublemaker, and the Lazy

"I think there [is] a perception that a Black woman [cannot] teach statistics, because I felt like if it was a Chinese professor in there, there would be more of an acceptance – or a White person, there would be more of an acceptance that, 'Oh, she knows what she's talking about,'

versus ‘Let me look at her experience versus her knowledge base.’ So, I think there are status quos in terms of the challenges that I faced,” said Aretta, an Assistant Professor from West Africa who teaches statistics in a non-STEM department on campus. She expresses concerns about being a Black female faculty in her department, which makes work very challenging for her especially due to students’ lack of faith in her competence. But the same students would hold her in high regard if she were White or Asian, according to Aretta. This experience suggests two things. First, White U.S-born students operate from racialized imaginations about Blacks as incompetent unlike Whites—the competent and smartest of all groups—and Asians—the “model minority”—which influence how they gauge people like Aretta. Second, there is a strong connection between gender and math (or STEM in general), where gendered beliefs about men as more rational than women could affect the latter’s fit (or acceptance) in the discipline (Hein 1981; Keller 1983; Fox 2001) and the resulting treatment, as Aretta’s case shows. Furthermore, White students currently comprise nearly 70 percent of the university student body in her field (University Institutional Research and Studies Department 2018a) and Aretta is among an estimated 33 percent Black and Hispanic faculty taken together in her department—Asian faculty constitute around 42 percent and White faculty is 25 percent (reported by Aretta during the interview). So, being a numerical minority as well as due to their inferior racial and gender status, Black female professionals become highly visible and thus, subjected to constant scrutiny at work (see Yoder and Aniakudo 1997; Wingfield 2007). Also, in this case, racism is gendered where students deem people like Aretta as ‘unfit’ and unwanted professors.

The experiences of gendered racism among students were common across 2 other Black female participants. They reported that whenever White students see a Black woman with a foreign accent, immediately they distrust her competence and challenge her. Anet comes from

the Caribbean and her experience highlights this distrust. As an Assistant Professor in non-STEM, Anet revealed that when she first started teaching at the university, she was frustrated, as she had to prove her credentials on a regular basis by showing her curriculum vitae to her students. This reached to a point where she would even ask them to search her name and vita on Google in order to show that she was competent enough to teach. But this did not lessen her challenges especially with White male students, who would defy her academic qualifications and authority in both overt and covert ways. The defiance Anet faced has been found to be based on the perception that Black women are not intelligent enough to be competent instructors (Ford 2011; Richards 2019).

Referring to one particular incident, Anet mentioned about receiving an email from a U.S-born White male student who was very upset with his grades in her class. She said, “He told me [in an angry tone] what he thought of me [and] his accomplishments as a student over the years. He was this young White arrogant male who was working in the corrections department. So, he felt like the authority figure. And I’m like, really?” This example is seen elsewhere in the literature, where Black female faculty were perceived as “hard graders” or “unfair” if they broke the racialized gendered norms by not showing nurturance and leniency while grading tests and assignments and, at other times, deference to White and male students (Richards 2019). Thus, Anet received a disrespectful email that challenged her expertise and authority. She went on to say, “These Zack, Hunter, Zachery, they’re always going to try and challenge me, if not by verbalizing, [but through] body language [and] gestures; they’re always going to have it.” Such disrespectful behavior—both subtle and blatant—that tries to put female faculty of color in their ‘place’ is not restricted to younger or older White males alone but also present among men of color. The following snippet of my observation during Anet’s lecture captures how male students

use covert tactics to challenge the authority of female faculty of color.

> There are 5 students present in total—2 White males, 1 Black male, 1 Brown male (looks Middle Eastern or South Asian), and 1 Brown female (looks Middle Eastern or South Asian; her head covered with a piece of White cloth). All of them sat at the back of the class. Both White and Black male students sit with their hands rested on their chairs, legs spread either in front or on the sides of the chairs and/or lean backwards…the Brown male student sits straight, with his hands across his chest [only a couple of times]. He takes notes as Anet lectures …The female student sit leaning in front with her chin resting on her left palm on the table. She makes eye contact with Anet and takes notes as she lectures…The younger White male student sits with his hands crossed around his chest and leans forward with his hands underneath the table. He always smiles when Anet lectures. He turns to his older (probably in late 40s or early 50s) White male peer behind him and chat…the Black male student sitting next to the older White man whistles (not very loudly) and at times, sits with his hands crossed across his chest. [These 3 male students chewed gums, rolled their eyes, winked at each other or laughed while Anet lectured or said anything to them]—Field Notes

As noted in the field observations above, the sitting postures of the male students (e.g., taking up space by spreading legs outside one's seat or sitting with hands crossed around the chest) or their eye movements (e.g., eye rolling) and constant smirks and chats among themselves are similar to Chavella T. Pittman (2010a) and Kristie Ford's (2011) study findings. They show how gender and race operate at both interpersonal and structural levels during faculty-student interactions. Similar to this particular incident, White male students in the aforementioned studies resorted to passive aggressive behaviors—projected in their body

language—in order to challenge female faculty of color's expertise and authority, which going forward, could be detrimental to the latter's individuality and confidence, thereby affecting their productivity and upward mobility. But such behaviors extend to students of color as well, who feel entitled to engage in "classroom incivility" (e.g., whistling during lectures) with faculty coming from the same racial background, thinking that they could easily take their faculty of color for granted, something they would be scared to do with any White professor (see Hendrix 2007).

However, these faculty's foreignness produced a triple bind for them, which forced them to constantly navigate structural barriers at work associated with gender, race, and immigrant status. And international Black female faculty find themselves at the bottom of the gender, racial, and ethnic hierarchy in the U.S.—and see themselves below African Americans. "African Americans, they perceive themselves as still being superior to the average Black international person. So, this is a different level; you're really at the bottom of this thing now. So, not only are you Black but you're Black and international. Then you add the other layer of being a female, that's another layer, and then when you speak with an accent, you [are] just stupid. That's another layer. So, you're really at the bottom of this bucket now, you [are] almost all the way out," said Anet. According to her, when immigrants in the U.S. speak with a foreign accent, they are immediately held up against hegemonic ethnic norms—American accent as superior and hence, sounds more intelligent than foreign accents—which make them the cultural tokens and affect their integration in the workplace (see, for example, Bergman, Watrous-Rodriguez, and Chalkley 2008; Ghosh and Barber 2017). Additionally, if immigrant workers are women and racial minorities, they experience the triple bind. In other words, foreign accent, and the social statuses of gender and race come together to relegate immigrant Black female workers to the

bottom of the social hierarchy; they are subjected to scrutiny at work, as they are presumed to be triply "stupid" even when compared with their African American counterparts. However, the experiences of immigrant White faculty or those of the faculty of color with an English or an American accent are fairly positive, which I will discuss in detail in the next chapter.

In fact, immigrant Black female faculty's "outsider-within" status (Collins 1986) or the fact people like them do not belong in this country was underscored during and after 2016 U.S. election. For example, Alvita, an Assistant Professor in non-STEM and from the Caribbean, said, "During the election and after the election…[students] felt [more] empowered to say [or do] things that oh, you really should not be saying [or doing] to your instructor." Alvita's experiences suggest that during 2016 election and especially after Donald Trump took the oval office in January 2017 (right before this study was conducted), it fueled xenophobia and racist harassments, and reinforced already existing stereotypes about racial and ethnic minorities in the U.S., such as Blacks or Hispanics as "lazy" and "criminals" (Okeowo 2016; Leonhardt and Philbrick 2018). Also, the Trump administration referred to African countries and Haiti and El Salvador as "shithole" countries, and that people from these countries should be barred entry or disallowed to reside in the U.S. (Dawsey 2018). Such racist rhetoric, in turn, made the social and professional standing of ethnic people from the aforementioned countries absolutely questionable in America; evident in the discussions, so far.

Heightened visibility—the process of scrutinizing the numerical minority in organizations and holding them up against hegemonic norms (Kanter 1977; Wingfield 2009; Turco 2010; Ghosh and Barber 2017; Williams 2018)—is not restricted to students alone. In fact, all 4 Black female faculty in this study reported similar experiences among their U.S.-born White and male colleagues, as well. Colleagues from the dominant group do not trust their international

Black female colleagues' abilities or treat them with the respect given to colleagues who share the same level of expertise. For instance, Aba, an Associate Professor in non-STEM and from West Africa, describes how she was viewed by her native White colleagues when she first joined the department.

> I'm here because I'm Black and so, other White people will tell me that…now the person I was hired with, [he] didn't even have a Ph.D. [when he started] and he's a White guy. I had a Ph.D.; I had like three publications. He didn't have even one publication…not intentionally prove yourself, but you'll have people who'll think you're not competent. You're there just because of the way you look and you're going to have to work harder than everybody else…frankly, being again a Black person and a woman, and I don't know whether foreign-born factors into that, but I think initially, people didn't think I was smart enough. I don't know, [general] expectations are not higher, but I do think my work is evaluated stricter than others because the default [thinking] is, 'it's probably not going to be good'…So, the [publication] outlet has to be higher in order for it to actually be able to get through that barrier.

Aba's experiences of being constantly evaluated or pitted against White and male colleagues despite higher achievements are not uncommon in White- and male-dominated departments (e.g., Bradley and Holcomb-McCoy 2004; Patton 2004). Also, the fact that Blacks are seen as "affirmative action hires" or "imposters" at work have been documented in prior studies (e.g., Aguirre 2000b; Turner, González, and Wong 2011; Wingfield 2013). Such controlling images produce additional stress for immigrant Black female faculty like Aba, who undergo the constant pressure to outperform and prove themselves daily at work—pressures to overcome the oppressive stereotypical images by which they are judged. This is because they run

into the risk of being labeled as a "failure" by their native White peers even for the slightest of slip-ups, as they are always looking for opportunities to "tear [people of color] down," as Alvita explains. According to her, the primary cause of this over scrutiny is that "…apparently, you're taking [away] jobs that [White] Americans could be having, especially in this Trump era." This statement is an example of how Alvita feels about the struggles that the Trump regime has brought in for immigrant people of color like her; they find it really hard to prove their worth on the job market especially while competing with those White Americans who feel entitled to all jobs.

Brad, who originates in Northwest Europe is a Full Professor and an administrator in non-STEM—oversees the faculty hiring process in his department and college of affiliation as a part of his job responsibilities—and like the majority of the administrators and search committee members in this study, mentioned that recruitment in a research university like the one under study is conducted simply on the principles of "best fit"—areas of expertise as required and/or those compatible with those of the existing faculty in the advertised discipline—and "meritocracy"—publication record and teaching skills being the popular parameters besides having a doctoral degree. And if women, racial minorities, or immigrants are hired, they are not hired to "fulfill quarters"—to be the diversity symbols or fill quotas—but only if they are "qualified" for the position. In other words, what Brad claims, is that, hiring in the U.S. academy is an objective process, that is, it is blind to social identities, such as gender, race, or ethnic origin. So, women and racial and ethnic minorities are hired in faculty positions because of their merit and significant achievements and not because of how they look. But Aba's reality (as discussed above) contradicts the ideal situation that Brad described; it signals that meritocracy stands for whiteness and maleness alone. Hence, the Black female faculty under study find

themselves being evaluated more harshly—considered not 'good enough'—than their U.S-born White (male) peers. This produces additional struggles for them as they try to 'fit in' or be one of their otherwise qualified native White colleagues, something White men like Brad or Aba's colleague who was hired along with her may seldom encounter or find hard to recognize; this emerges from a culture of elitist, white masculinity in the academy that protects White men from being penalized for the same mistakes as their colleagues of color or for having less achievements under their belts.

The image of the Black immigrant as "incompetent" also resulted in Black female faculty's experiences of microaggressions during their interactions with White colleagues. They mentioned that their inputs are ignored, brushed off or questioned by their native White academic peers. For instance, Anet said, "Say in a [faculty] meeting…you would come up with an idea, and it's amazing [to see] how quickly your idea will be dismissed…and so, another [White] person would come up with an idea, and it's just welcomed." She also mentioned that such dismissals or the experiences of "[ideas] being knocked down" extend beyond faculty meetings and occur during research collaborations with White colleagues, as well. Anet is in a non-STEM department that currently comprises of nearly 62 percent White and 75 percent U.S.-born faculty (reported by Anet during the interview). Besides being a numerical minority (ethnic origin wise), Anet lacks both White and male privilege, which results in her intellectual contributions often being dismissed or considered undesirable at faculty meetings and elsewhere (e.g., research projects). This signals double standards infiltrated by racialized imaginations—Whites as intellectually superior than people of color—that result in the professional marginalization of immigrant Black faculty.

Anet also mentioned that because her inputs get dismissed regularly, she tries to keep

quiet to avoid an extra label to her character—the "troublemaker" or "too ambitious"—which she already wears for voicing her opinions in the department. And as a result of knowing her "place" among her U.S.-born White and male colleagues, she sits quietly in the meetings without saying much; she is aware that she lacks the support of her colleagues who fail to recognize that she gets isolated in the department. She said, "You know what, if they say the clouds are purple, the clouds are purple! If they say it's going to rain today, great God, Jesus, I'm going to get my umbrella and my raincoat because it's going to rain! So, I made up my mind; You know what, I'm just going to go with the flow because no matter what I'm saying, I'm setting myself up for failure anyhow. It's evident that there's no support system and as I'm speaking out, I'm setting myself up for failure."

Past research has also confirmed that when women of color (Black women and Latinas) express their discontentment or opinions at work, they risk being labeled as the "troublemakers" (e.g., Wingfield 2007; García-López 2008). Again, women become less likeable—labeled as "too aggressive," "out for herself," "difficult," or "abrasive"—for being educated, hardworking, ambitious or for exhibiting leadership qualities, the same traits that are celebrated and taken-for-granted for men (Cooper 2013). Hence, to avoid any confrontations and controversies, they choose to remain silent. This was clearly captured during my visit to a faculty meeting that Anet was attending, where she sat with her hands folded under the table and spoke only once when a colleague asked her a question; she spoke in a very serious and low tone—a glaring contrast to her vibrant persona that I witnessed during the interview and class lecture. Besides ideological separation, the faculty meeting also showcased physical separation, with White faculty sitting on one side and their colleagues of color on the other side, which during a follow-up session Anet referred to as an "unspoken separation."

The fact that gender and race result in the professional marginalization of immigrant Black female faculty became further poignant during my visit to a faculty meeting that Alvita was attending. It was a warm and sunny day, and the meeting was held at a huge sunlit room that can accommodate at least 40 people. The meeting was attended by a total of 14 faculty—3 White males, 5 White females, 2 Asian males, 2 Black females (including Alvita), and 2 interracial females including Janet (an Assistant Professor cross listed with both STEM and non-STEM and from South America). As a part of the meeting's agenda, Alvita presented on the academic affairs pertaining to her department and college. On several occasions, Alvita was interrupted and scrutinized by her male and White colleagues. For instance, in between Alvita's presentation, one Asian (looked East or Southeast Asian) male and one White male faculty stopped her to ask questions or correct what she said (e.g., "what you're saying is not exactly true but…") and the rest of the male faculty chatted among themselves. The two White female faculty who sat next to Alvita talked (in a low tone) among themselves and another White female faculty remarked about the typed handout saying, "They are not clear! I'm finding it hard to read!" She also questioned about the contents in the handout that Alvita circulated to her colleagues before the presentation. This required two White female colleagues to step in on two occasions and validate Alvita's presentation or confirm or repeat what she said. At the end of the presentation, as a mark of professional courtesy, her department chair—a White female—thanked Alvita.

Besides scrutinizing and ignoring female faculty of color, the faculty interactions discussed above also demonstrate that male colleagues take it upon themselves to explain and interrupt their female colleagues when they speak. This act of providing unsolicited opinions is called "mansplaining" (Baird 2016) and has been documented in earlier studies (e.g., Ghosh and

Barber 2017). Additionally, White female colleagues often have to use their race privilege to legitimize the opinions or endorse the works of their Black counterparts. In other words, Black female faculty lack the agency to establish their authority and competence among their White and male colleagues, and hence, find their inputs being largely questioned and excluded at work as well.

The image of the Blacks as “intellectually inferior” or “incompetent” was also prevalent across my 3 Black male participants. Their experiences suggest that they find it extremely hard to seek in-group membership even among their U.S.-born White male colleagues. They feel that different standards are used to judge them versus their native White colleagues. Also, despite significant achievements and qualifications, their intelligence or competence is questioned both in their own department and in the university, where at times, during informal and formal interactions with colleagues and higher administrators, they have to produce their academic transcripts as a proof of their qualification. For instance, originating in West Africa, Kofi, an Associate Professor and an administrator in non-STEM, said, “[There’s an] outright disrespect for your humanity. [Here] is an example—[colleagues and administrators] question your intelligence until you provide your qualifications with transcripts. And then they look at the transcripts and see that you have more credit hours and a higher GPA than those [U.S.-born White men] that you are competing with.” He is in a department that has some Black faculty (including immigrant) and Kofi also mentioned that a White faculty affiliate once told the administrators that the former lack the qualifications to be employed. Subsequently, Kofi emphasized that these Black colleagues whose qualifications are put under scrutiny, are Ivy League graduates and highly accomplished in their fields with impressive records of publication. This suggests that even a Harvard or Yale education, an elitist tag usually seen as a mark of high

status, is not enough to legitimize the competence of immigrant Black faculty or to help them stand out in a racially charged work environment that refuses to see beyond what it already perceives to be true about the group.

What is noted above stands in stark contrast to Wingfield's (2013) findings of Black male professionals' experiences in White-dominated work settings (e.g., medical practice, law, engineering, and banking). She noted that despite being a numerical minority, heightened visibility actually worked out in the favor of Black male professionals. In other words, these upper- and middle-class professional men were positively visible at work; they drew the attention and social support of their White colleagues and customers who thought they were actually smart and competent. Hence, even though such positive experiences preserved and operated from the popular (oppressive) stereotype of Blacks as "incompetent," the professionals under study used their gender status to flip the discourse in their favor, by gaining recognition and upward mobility at work. However, the Black professionals in Wingfield's (2013) study did not have to navigate the additional structural barrier that comes with one's immigrant status. Black participants (from Africa and the Caribbean) in the current study constitute a little less than 2 percent of the total faculty in the university (University Institutional Research and Studies Department 2018a). So, in the current study, even when pitted against U.S.-born Black men, immigrant Black male faculty fail to earn any recognition from colleagues or higher administration who perceive these Black men as falling below their U.S.-born counterparts in status. This was again corroborated by Kofi who mentioned that when he applied for the current administrative position in his department, instead of him, the higher administration appointed an African American male faculty from outside his department, who had neither a Ph.D. nor any teaching experience. Thus, although the university makes efforts to provide leadership

opportunities to racial minorities, it fails to recognize that one's minority status is further enhanced by their foreign-born status and, as a result of unequal opportunities, these immigrant faculty end up being professionally marginalized.

Immigrant Black male faculty pay the penalties of foreign-born and inferior racial status even when they are considered for leadership roles or research grants. For instance, Bruk, an Associate Professor in non-STEM and from East Africa, said, "I wanted to join some leadership positions [in] the department. But, for reasons I don't know they skipped me and appointed my [U.S.-born White; 2 men and 1 woman] juniors as chairman [and] graduate director and also as [a] director of undergraduate studies. I don't know the reason, but they skipped me. And I would have loved to serve in those positions to gain experience and also to contribute to the department and to help students in my department." Besides being denied the department chairperson's role and both undergraduate and graduate director's positions—opportunities that could have highlighted his ability to lead and/or be a role model for minority students—Bruk mentions that he was also denied a departmental research grant when he joined the university. Instead, his department gave the grant to his U.S.-born White female colleague who was hired along with him. However, few years later, when he felt he could get the grant again, the department already decided to award it to an incoming junior faculty who was also a U.S.-born White female. He said, "I didn't complain because I just contained my anger and my concerns to myself."

As noted earlier, faculty of color are scared to express any negative emotions that would label them as "troublemakers." Wingfield (2007, 2013) found that White colleagues in middle- and upper-class occupations (e.g., finance and sales, medical practice, law, banking, engineering, teaching and research, or the military) perceived Black men as "angry" and "dangerous" that pressured the latter to make conscious efforts to portraying an unruffled, unchallenging and non-

threatening image about themselves at work. Immigrant Black male faculty in the present study are aware of this negative stereotype. Hence, to avoid any racial profiling by White colleagues, they choose to remain silent about their mistreatment and denial of opportunity at work. Bruk's department currently consists of around 83 percent U.S.-born faculty and 75 percent White faculty (reported by Bruk during the interview) and being a numerical minority—race and ethnicity wise—prevents Bruk from gaining recognition or establishing his legitimacy and demonstrating his talent because of the discrimination from his U.S.-born White colleagues.

While immigrant Black male faculty suffer due to their foreign-born and inferior racial status, nevertheless, they enjoy (male) privileges that come with their superior gender status. This became particularly evident when they mentioned about their teaching evaluations and interactions with students in the classroom. According to them, students always praise their expertise in the subject matter—contrary to what their female counterparts experience, as discussed earlier—by calling them "knowledgeable," "prepared" or "great professor." Students also rate the male faculty's teaching skills very high (at least a score of 4 on a scale of 5) and would dare not challenge their authority either inside or outside the classroom—their female counterparts experience the opposite with classroom authority, as discussed previously. For instance, coming from the Caribbean, Lloyd, an Associate Professor in STEM, describes the advantages of being a male faculty in his department.

> I think in relation to students, at least in this department, we have quite a big contingent of Saudi Arabians, but not so much the Saudi Arabians, but the Americans, especially the Midwesterners; they may have more issue[s] with gender than with race per se. Because I think they would be okay if there was a Black man in charge than a White woman…I think in terms of how students view you and interact with you, a male [professor]

probably will have a better time getting away with stuff than a female [professor], and just in terms of being comfortable.

Above, Lloyd mentions that his department has a large number of students from Saudi Arabia and Midwest America—relatively conservative cultures/areas that nurture gender ideologies that uphold patriarchy. Plus, more than 80 percent of the student and faculty body in his department is male (University Institutional Research and Studies Department 2018a). These socio-demographic factors make the work environment more conducive for male faculty (including Black men), so much so that even whiteness does not allow female faculty from the dominant group to hold much authority or other privileges among (male) students. Earlier, it has been discussed that STEM is a masculine domain that allows men to fit in it more easily than their female peers. This manifests in teaching evaluations, where students refer to male instructors as "geniuses," "brilliant," and "funny" for appearing "tough," but criticize female faculty for the same—for example, use adjectives, such as "bossy," "pushy," and "mean" (Pacific Standard 2015; Richards 2019); women in male-dominated professions tend to wear negative labels for exhibiting masculine leadership (see, for example, Paap 2006; Harris and Giuffre 2015). Similarly, unlike their female colleagues, students praise male faculty for being organized or prepared for class, no matter what. These suggest how cultural notions about men (as "naturally" tough and competent) and women (as "naturally" soft and incompetent) shape teaching evaluations, thereby showing that they are influenced by prejudiced beliefs (Boring, Ottoboni, and Stark 2016). However, Lloyd also fears that the same students will judge him for the same things that his White male colleagues do, such as missing a single class lecture. "One of my [White male] colleagues tend to miss class quite often. And I know that I could not, just in terms of how the students would respond…if I was doing [the same thing], everybody would

know it…there will be a lot of complaints…If I missed a class, I think everybody would hear it," said Lloyd.

However, the Black faculty's male privilege is not restricted to STEM alone but is also visible across non-STEM. The following observations during Bruk's lecture showcase the authority Black male faculty command in the classroom, where students appear to be attentive and respectful to the professor.

> It's a medium sized classroom filled with around 30 students—all White males except for 3 White females, 1 Black male, 1 Black female, 1 Asian (either from East or South East Asia) male, and 1 Hispanic male. Bruk begins the class by introducing the topic of today's lecture—autocratic leadership in the West and the resulting migration of ethnic groups to the United States. He takes a red marker to write on the white board while lecturing on the material—he's standing behind the podium and moves only when he's using the board. Bruk looks at his notes while lecturing. The students are taking notes [on what Bruk wrote on the board] and listening to his lecture; they sit straight and look engrossed. He asked students questions on the topic and White male students answer [every time]—Field Notes

In the above event, it can be seen that Bruk exercises authority in the classroom and students (including White males) show signs of respect not only during verbal interactions but also in their body language and gestures—sit straight, pay attention to the lecture, take notes, and respond to the professor's questions. This stands in stark contrast to the classroom dynamics discussed earlier for the Black female participants in the study. Thus, despite being a numerical minority, Black male faculty are not seen as "contrasts" (Kanter 1977) and so, find it easier to bond with students from the dominant group (also see, Black men's bonding with White men at

work in Wingfield 2013). In other words, the status accorded by their maleness allows immigrant Black men to exercise authority in the classroom and teach topics related to America or Western societies (also see, classroom experiences of male faculty of color in Manrique and Manrique 1999), as demonstrated in the students' deference towards them—both in terms of verbal and non-verbal behavior. This became further poignant when Kofi said, "No, [the students] wouldn't [challenge my authority] because I'll make sure they know that I won't tolerate it and anyone who attempts it, is out of the class. And if they continue, I'll say, 'it might be advisable for you to go and drop the class or take another section, if this is not working for you.'…they realize I know what I'm saying…and I'll be able to deliver knowledge to them."

Whereas immigrant Black male faculty claimed that students perceive them as competent, one of their female counterparts mentioned that colleagues see her as "lazy" in addition to being "incompetent"—2 Black men in the study mentioned that they suspect the "lazy" stereotype to exist at work, but did not experience them first hand. This, in turn, affects the Black female faculty's professional networking and collaborations and thus, her career growth. For instance, Aretta describes the challenges she faces when colleagues including other racial minorities believe that Blacks from African countries are not hard working.

> I think the biggest part of how my status affects my research is just the people I work with. I work with a guy from China, and he always says, "Oh, my God, [Aretta] you're so hard working! Nobody will ever believe Africans are hardworking!" I don't know why he says that, but he's a very good friend of mine too. He says, they always think only the Chinese [work hard]…He's like, "We think only Chinese people are hardworking. [But] you're very hard working." And so, it's always funny to hear him say that.

In the above narrative, Aretta describes how racialized images about Blacks in the U.S.—

“unintelligent” and “lazy”—put her in a disadvantageous position at work. Moreover, historically, Black women have been viewed as “welfare mothers” or “welfare queens” (Collins 2000)—believed to have no work ethics—and so, deemed inappropriate for the labor market or workplace, or simply perceived as beneficiaries or products of affirmative action policies by their White colleagues, if hired (Kennelly 1999). In fact, these controlling images influence discriminatory practices that end up thwarting Black women’s professional advancement but benefitting White men at work. However, in the example discussed, it can be seen that it is not only the Whites that operate from racialized imaginations but also people from Asia who are guided by popular stereotypes, both about Blacks and themselves. Hence, Asian faculty (the Chinese, here) presume that their Black counterparts are not hardworking and so, express surprise when they see otherwise. At the same time, they see and uphold themselves as “the good immigrants” or the “model minority”—an image produced and used for America’s political gains post-cold war (Hsu 2015). As per the history of U.S. immigration, its policies have always been both restrictive and selective; for example, whereas, the Chinese working-class or low-skilled workers were barred entry (e.g., the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882), its skilled or educated group has been welcomed since 1965—a political strategy to boost the U.S. economy and its capitalist agenda besides maintaining the cold war refugee politics and controlling the race politics of U.S. immigration. Nevertheless, such positive tropes used for Asians have been detrimental for other communities of color who are compelled to endure the blame game—and constant racial oppression—for failing to achieve a reasonable or comparable standing (Hsu 2015). Hence, born in the U.S., Deborah, an administrator in non-STEM, mentioned that the images of Blacks as “dysfunctional” and “incompetent” have jeopardized the careers of some Black faculty on campus and the future of the disciplines they are affiliated to.

The Model Minority

The majority of the Asian faculty (including those from the Middle East) in the study reported that their overall experiences at work and in the U.S. more generally, are very positive. Besides being productive researchers and getting the opportunities and resources to pursue their academic interests, students and colleagues see them as smart and good at math, as well as very serious and hardworking by nature. Likewise, the U.S.-born students and colleagues believe that these faculty from Asia possess a very strong work ethic. In other words, Asian faculty navigate the “model minority” stereotype or “the color of success” (Wu 2014) in their respective department and in the university. For instance, coming from South Asia, Sunanda, a Full Professor and an administrator in non-STEM, mentioned that her U.S.-born colleagues perceive South Asians as “very book-oriented, always engrossed, super studious, and no fun types,” a fundamental reason behind their research productivity and so, expect them to publish constantly. Sunanda is a minority in a department that is an estimated 88 percent U.S.-born and 75 percent White faculty (reported by Sunanda during the interview). Unlike her counterparts from the Global South (especially from Africa and the Caribbean as discussed in the previous section), Sunanda benefits from positive stereotypes about people from her background; her U.S.-born White colleagues use language to construct race-based stereotypes, consistent with findings in the literature (e.g., Algeria 2014).

Sunanda also revealed that her U.S.-born colleagues believe that people from her country are “super intelligent, super techies” and so, all of them “turn out engineers.” In fact, once one of her White American colleagues asked if she could fix his computer, as he expected her to know everything about computer related operations even if her academic or professional background had nothing to do with it. On the one hand, it can be argued that the large presence of East,

Southeast, and South Asians—69 percent—in the Silicon Valley (Randall 2019) as well as among the faculty body in STEM on campus—an estimated 41 percent (University Institutional Research and Studies Department 2018a)—can produce such perceptions. On the other hand, this treatment highlights how female faculty of color are expected to act as "private secretaries" or "office wives" to their White male colleagues and provide them personal service (Kanter 1977:89-91). Likewise, originating in East Asia, Fan, an Assistant Professor in non-STEM, describes a similar experience and how her gender and ethnic background impacted her hiring decision at her previous institution and in a White- and U.S.-born-dominated department.

> So, I do have [a] feeling that I was hired because they feel that I will be able to get along with this guy who is the senior faculty there, because they think that I am [East Asian]. And culturally, I respected the seniors, the elders, and I seemed to be very accommodating; it's either by nature or by culture or both. So, I think that really does play into the factors, especially from the Chair's point of view. She wants somebody who can work with this guy. And this guy at that time was working on a book, so he needs to have a lot of free time. And he needs somebody who takes over a lot of day to day operation of the major, so he does not want somebody who he cannot get along with. He had a colleague who is a White male as well, previous to me for two years. They didn't hire him as a permanent guy, and they hired me instead and obviously I was a lot less experienced than him. Apparently, they didn't get along. So, they let the other guy go and make the position into tenure-track…So, you know, combining all of these things, I think they hired me because of my nationality and my personality probably…because I can see that in terms of abilities, some of them were a lot better than I [were] at that time…

Fan stresses the fact that she was a fresh (as "green") Ph.D. graduate and lacked prior

work experience in comparison to her then senior White male colleague in the department or those local White men who were interviewed along with her. This led her to wonder why she was hired for the job. She felt that it was because of her “accommodating” appearance that led her former chair to believe that she would “get along” with the senior White male colleague that was behind the program’s inception and continuation. But, after she was hired, Fan felt that her senior colleague just “needed a secretary” who would shoulder the responsibilities of the program, carry out his orders, and be his proxy in the meetings that he was disinterested to attend. And as his “office wife,” Fan tried to “cover up” for him in ways that did not make him “look bad” and let him focus on his research and publication work. However, later, when Fan refused to do the “office housework” (Kanter 1977), “he viewed it as a betrayal and took it really hard.” The relationship between Fan and her former male colleague resembled that of a married couple, where like a wife, she was expected to fulfill his expectations and demands at work. Also, her Asian background added to her gendered experiences, where she was expected to project a “respectful” and “accommodating” image, especially to her senior (and older) colleagues or else be perceived as “angry” or “sulky.” This is consistent with results in the literature (e.g., Lin et al. 2004). In fact, she paid a heavy price for failing to live up to the expectations and lost the tenure votes of her native White colleagues and thus, had to leave the institution. Even at her current place of work (i.e. the institution under study), Fan feels very uncomfortable with the fact that students “tend to gravitate to [her] White colleagues instead of talking to [her]” during undergraduate committee or open house events. According to her, students perceive her in an “assisting role” and do not approach her unless they have questions about the program major. Sunanda too expressed concerns about her U.S.-born White male colleagues; they harbor the Western imagination of (East) Asian women as the “quiet,”

"tolerant," "submissive," and not the "talking back" types. These are again consistent with findings in existing literature (e.g., Shih 2006; Gu 2015).

The Asian men in the study also shared experiences that indicated how the "model minority" stereotype is used by their colleagues. For instance, Pranab, a Full Professor in STEM and from South Asia, said, "I think my department has a very high esteem about me as a teacher [and] a researcher." In fact, he was nominated twice for the outstanding teaching award in his college and won it once. Similarly, also coming from South Asia, Saad, a Full Professor and an administrator in STEM, mentioned being very successful at work. He earned tenure after 3 years of joining as an Assistant Professor and was promoted to a Full Professor within 2 years of becoming an Associate Professor, which he described as "relatively fast-tracked." And soon after, he assumed his current administrative position as the former administrator (from his department) resigned due to certain disagreements with the higher authorities. He said, "I suppose the department and [the] university saw in it their interest to keep us. So, they gave me the incentive to be [a Full] Professor. The [administrative] position came up very accidentally. I was never interested in administration. I am fairly an independent-minded individual…I was very reluctant actually being [the administrator] because, like I said, I have some strong opinions…there was not much choice [though]. So, I kind of accepted and hence, continued." Unlike Fan, Saad's not so submissive nature or strong opinions do not penalize him in any way, but in fact, propelled his professional advancement to an administrative position, without him actually expressing any interest in it. Again, Saad is in a department that is largely dominated by male and foreign-born faculty—75 percent men and approximately 83 percent foreign-born, out of which at least 50 percent are Asian (reported by Saad during the interview)—that certainly puts an Asian man like him in an advantageous position, in terms of promotion and authority

(also see, Asian men's positive experiences in higher ranks in departments they dominate in Beutel and Nelson 2006).

However, there is a caveat; not all Asian men are catapulted to administrative positions, especially when they are being considered for positions at the college or university level (e.g., dean, provost, or chancellor), as pointed out by 2 male participants. For example, coming from South Asia, Dilip, a Full Professor and an administrator in STEM, describes how challenging—if not impossible—it can be for an Asian (or a foreign-born person of color) faculty to be chosen for the position of a college dean or provost.

> I think that when I'm talking about advancement, that's what it is, up to the chair level. Because again, I think faculty [composition] plays a lot more role. So, as you can see in our department [the] majority of the faculty are foreign-born. So, in the selection of the chair, that makes a big difference. So, reaching up to that level, I think it's still a possibility. But here, you can look at the deans and the higher levels [e.g., provost]…it is very difficult for us to get [there]. I think at the higher level, some people probably feel [the U.S.-born people] are more superior in administration than the foreign-born individuals. That could be one but it's hard to find out. Because a lot of us may have similar or better qualifications, but still hard to get those jobs.

Above, Dilip points out that the diversity (in terms of foreign-born) among faculty colleagues in the department makes it easier for an international faculty to become the department chair, as they can get the votes of their foreign-born colleagues that dominate the faculty body in the department. However, being a person of color as well as a foreign-born, it is difficult to get the votes of White and U.S.-born colleagues—the dominant groups in the university (see "research site" in Chapter 3)—while being considered for higher management

positions in the university (i.e. the position of a college dean or provost), which are mostly dominated by the latter based on the perception that they are "superior" leaders. In fact, even equivalent or better qualifications do not always help Asian faculty to reach to that level, who are otherwise seen as the "model minority." In other words, the "model minority" stereotype is a myth and Dilip's concerns suggest that in the U.S. academy, Asian faculty hit the "bamboo ceiling" (Ruttimann 2009)—equivalent of "glass ceiling"—as they try to go higher up from the department chair position (also see, Asian professionals' experiences with the glass ceiling in Woo 2000; Chou and Feagin 2015).

The myth of the "model minority" was also recognized by 2 other participants, who revealed that because of their ethnic origin and/or educational attainment outside the U.S., they are denied research funding. For example, Pranab mentioned that once he applied for an internal research grant at his previous institution for his work that eventually became one of the seed technologies for top software companies in the U.S.—used by the SUN workstations. But he never received the grant because the research grant committee contested his findings. He said, "Once I applied [for a research grant] when I joined [X]…it was a pretty good [grant]. And the [research results were]…quite positive. But I have this gut feeling that since I never studied in America, I was not granted [the funds]. Because I was quite a well-known researcher even at that time, in my area. And then, the funniest thing was the stuff that I wrote and the answer I got [the research grant committee] negated that one. That's not possible. But, within 2 years, all the SUN workstations started using that [X], whatever I suggested. They probably thought that I am not from a big school...and all my degrees are from [South Asia]; I am still sure that it was the reason." Pranab argues that his academic background impacted the research grant committee's judgements about his competency; since he earned his higher education including Ph.D. from his

native country, a third world nation, his qualifications became questionable despite him being a well-known scientist in his field. Farhad, an Assistant Professor in STEM and from the Middle East, also agreed with Pranab's assertion. He said, "Getting a degree [even] from [top universities in developing countries] can evaluate [foreign-born faculty] negatively" and it will be "counted against" them because "there is a prejudice towards North American institutions." Both Pranab and Farhad assert that degrees earned from third world countries are not highly regarded in the U.S academy compared to those earned from North American (e.g., U.S.A or Canada) institutions of higher education. And so, the faculty who are trained in the former are considered inferior by their U.S. educated colleagues.

Similarly, coming from the Middle East, Maz, a Full Professor and an administrator in STEM, stated that he has lived in the U.S. for more than two decades now. But his experiences have not been very positive on the professional front, especially while receiving research grants; the external research grant that he recently applied for, got rejected. He fears that this could be because of his Muslim and/or Middle Eastern identity and expressed concerns about the current political mayhem surrounding names like his and the negative images about people like them that are projected in the news. He also worries about the funding process, where some funding agencies (e.g., NIH) do not make the grant application and review process fair. The agencies obtain information about an applicant's race and country of birth and save the responses in their databases. Maz feels that this information is used to discriminate against foreign-born faculty of color.

After the 9/11 attacks, the U.S. associated Muslims and Middle Easterners more than ever with the image or stereotype of the "terrorist" or "dangerous," and the portrayals of these negative images in the media have led to the group's collective othering at both interpersonal and

structural levels (Alsultany 2008; Joseph, D' Harlingue, and Wong 2008). Furthermore, after the 2016 election, America has witnessed the Trump administration reinforcing these negative (and oppressive) stereotypes (and Islamophobia) to uphold the national security rhetoric and thus, created policies that banned immigration to the country from seven Muslim majority countries in addition to Chad, Venezuela, and North Korea (Thrush 2017; Yuhas and Sidahmed 2017). The Muslim majority countries include those in the Middle East and Africa, such as Iran, Iraq, Yemen, Syria, Libya, Somalia, and Sudan; it is largely a 'Muslim ban' with religious sentiments underneath such policies. Again, the funding application and review process does not ensure anonymity, as mentioned by Maz. And unless anonymity or professional codes of ethics are ensured in the funding operation and serious efforts are made to develop moral consciousness in the academy, Muslim and Middle Eastern faculty like Maz will continue to experience professional marginalization and opportunity denials. This, in turn, will not only affect their professional advancement but also the intellectual capital of the U.S. higher education that rests to a large extent on its international 'brain drain.'

Just like Maz, Wasim, an Assistant Professor in STEM and from South Asia, mentioned that he is very conscious about his appearance at work. He said, "So how people look at a woman, for example, coming from the Islamic culture or Muslim society who is completely veiled or covered herself? What is the perception here if she comes over and starts teaching?... My appearance makes me more conscious, in [the] sense that I have to do a better job and deliver good quality work so that nobody judge[s] me from my appearance." Even though Wasim did not explicitly state what exactly worried him about his appearance, on the day of the interview, I noticed that he sported a long beard and donned a Pathani suit and a cap—traditional attire for South Asian Muslims—to work. And religious or ethnic clothing often results in the social

exclusion and job insecurities for Muslim professionals (Kulwicki, Khalifa, and Moore 2008; Ghumman and Ryan 2013; Pasha-Zaidi, Masson, and Pennington 2014) and so, they feel pressured to work harder in order to show their non-Muslim U.S.-born White colleagues and employers that they are "good" Muslims and not terrorists (Laird, Abu-Ras, and Senzai 2013). So, Wasim's religious and ethnic identity supersedes the otherwise positive stereotypes that people from his racial background tend to uphold in America; it makes him highly visible and subject to scrutiny among his non-Muslim U.S.-born White colleagues.

Unlike the Asian male faculty in the study, their 5 female counterparts complained that students never address them as "Dr." and in fact, call them by their first name or as "Ms. X" both during face-to-face interactions and email communications, which they find very disrespectful and uncomfortable, given the fact that they all have Ph.Ds. In fact, students just write or say "Hey" when they address the professor during communication, which according to Farida, a part-time Lecturer in non-STEM and from South Asia, is an indication of a student's disrespect for her. Studies show that students naturally assume a gender bias when they associate "Dr." with male professors (Burns-Glover and Veith 1995) and perceive male graduate instructors as "professors" whereas female professors as "teachers" (Miller and Chamberlin 2000)—suggestive of how an ideal professor should actually look. And in the case of female faculty of color, students are doubly biased and address their instructors by their first name (Pittman 2010a; Ford 2011) or as "Ms." instead of "Dr." despite the faculty's comparable academic accomplishments (Johnson-Bailey and Lee 2005).

Likewise, 3 of the female participants mentioned that male students are especially aggressive in the classroom as well as when they visit the faculty in their offices. They also expressed concerns about (native) students (both males and females) who would break classroom

rules (e.g., use cellphone) and not pay attention during class lectures. Likewise, the students do not maintain any classroom decorum; for instance, they put their feet up on the chairs, which Sunanda "does not like" at all. In fact, Lima, a part-time Instructor in STEM and from South Asia, describes how disrespectful students are in her classes.

> In my first semester, while I was teaching [X], whatever I used to say in the class, the students used to, you know, smile or laugh, or they are talking, or they are not listening to me. I mean not attentive at all in the classes. And then, yes, their attitude changed. I would say [in] the middle of the semester or at the end of the semester their attitude changed, but their body language was different…They were not listening to my classes; maybe [they] had headphones in their ears, listening to something else…I say, "Please, pay attention to the class".…But I feel those are disrespectful towards your instructor when she is trying to teach you something. And in that class, I had only one female student and maybe 16 or 17 male students. I would say my female student…was the most respectful…And one of those arrogant students was my TA [a U.S.-born White male] last semester, so it was really difficult for me… He never used to listen to me. If I say, "Please, take off your headphone; that is not necessary in the class, because I am speaking, and I don't have any microphone here," he never listened to me.

Above, Lima states that male students in her class are disrespectful towards her; they laugh and smile or have headphones in their ears when the class is on and/or she lectures. It is also very hard for her to earn the respect of especially (native White) male students who "never listen" to her or follow her instructions or show any respect. Similarly, when I attended Lima's undergraduate class, I noticed that the students were mostly White males, with the exception of 1 White female, 1 Black female, 2 Black males, and 2 Brown (looked South Asian) males. The

female students listened to Lima's lecture and took notes. The 3 White male students—one of them being an older man—who sat at the back of the classroom browsed apps and websites on their cellphones and laptops respectively. The White male student who sat next to me looked at the lecture hall's ceiling most of the time and had a notebook open in front of him but did not take any notes. The Brown male students also fiddled with their cellphones during the lecture. Towards the end of the class, even when the lecture was on, the Black male students closed their books and notebooks and laid their heads on the table in front of them. Also, a White male student left the class without informing the professor.

Similar instances were also noted in Lan's undergraduate class. She is a part-time Lecturer in STEM and from East Asia. The students in her class comprised of 7 White males, 2 White females, 2 Asian (looked East Asian) males, and 1 Hispanic male (entered class 13 minutes late). Two White male students in front sat with their legs spread and one of them put his feet up on the chair in front of him. However, both of them took notes while Lan lectured. The third White male student fiddled with his cellphone but did it occasionally, while the fourth one did not take notes but constantly browsed websites on his laptop. Likewise, the Asian male student watched videos on his phone and wore his headphones while he watched them, and the Hispanic male student browsed websites on his laptop. The White female students who sat at the back of the class also fiddled with their laptops and cellphones, and one of them put her left foot up on the chair in front of her; she left the class 23 minutes before actual class ending time but returned after 6-7 minutes and immediately got busy with her phone. She also did not have any books or notebooks with her in the class. There was an overall lack of attention and class participation on part of the students; they rarely responded to Lan's questions.

Both Lima and Lan teach in departments where the faculty body is dominated by foreign-

born men of color and the student body is mostly White and male (University Institutional Research and Studies Department 2018a) and both these women are an anomaly—they do not represent the model instructors. And as female faculty of color, both Lima and Lan find it very hard to break the structures of gender and race and garner the respect of their White and male students, who they mention about questioning their credibility and expertise in class. Studies show that students harbor the notion that female faculty of color coming from less developed countries than the U.S. lack the status to teach White American students in STEM (e.g., Skachkova 2007). Overall, Lima and Lan's experiences contradict Aretta's claims about Asian faculty (discussed at the beginning of the first section of the chapter) and show that the "model minority" stereotype does not necessarily hold true for Asian female faculty in a male- and White-dominated program, such as STEM.

Also, the above-mentioned faculty's exclusion among students as *gendered* became clearer when Farhad said, "I have very good level of authority over students. So, I can very well handle them… I'm telling you that students cannot come into the class with a can of coke. They cannot speak [on] their gadgets, their cell phones and other things in the class. They cannot send text messages…Most often [they listen], because I have strict rules in my syllabus that the use of these things [is] forbidden in my class…coming late to the class is also not acceptable." So, albeit Lima and Lan did not specifically mention about their classroom policies, their experiences with authority (as noted earlier) stand in stark contrast to those of Farhad's. Also, Farhad is in a STEM department where, except for one U.S.-born White and 2 women, the rest of the faculty are foreign-born men of color (reported by Farhad during the interview). In other words, foreign-born men of color represent the faculty body in Farhad's department and hence, they are the model instructors and are able to claim legitimacy and authority among students

(including U.S.-born).

Although the Asian male participants in general did not claim to be overtly disrespected by students, some concerns were expressed during interviews as well as observed in the classes taught by the male faculty from East and South East Asia. For example, Chang, an Assistant Professor in non-STEM and from East Asia, said, “I’m not like an alpha male, the dominant type. So, in this case, I don’t think I have an advantage in the classroom…If you are that kind, very dominant type, probably you will have less questioning from students.” Chang believes that since he is not an “alpha” male, he lacks dominance in the classroom, where students tend to question how he conducts his courses. For instance, Chang mentioned that he needs to explain his students the particular date(s) and time(s) he chooses for an exam, as they always question him about these things.

The fact that some East and South East Asian male faculty lack dominance among students became poignant when I attended John (an Associate Professor in STEM and from Southeast Asia), Benjie (an Assistant Professor in non-STEM and from Southeast Asia), and Liu’s (an Assistant Professor in non-STEM and from East Asia) undergraduate class lectures. The majority of the students in their classes remained engrossed with web browsing and other things on their laptops (e.g., played cards, watched videos), or texted, or laughed and chatted among themselves when the faculty lectured. However, in Benjie’s class, at the beginning, he asked his students to turn off their cellphones and laptops during lecture, as a professor who observed his class reported him about it and he missed noticing earlier. He told the students in a firm tone, “We’re all professionals here. You all are college students and you’ve come here to learn. This has also been mentioned in the syllabus. Is it clear to you?” But later, he allowed the students to use their laptops to only take class notes, but as noted, the students paid no heed to

Benjie's authority and watched videos or played games on their laptops. According to R. W. Connell (1995), in Western cultures, hegemonic masculinity stands for white masculinity and men of color's masculinity is marginalized. And East Asian men often lack dominant ("alpha") masculinity that relegates them to a subaltern position among their students, who challenge their authority in latent ways, as noted in case of Chang and others. Moreover, East Asian (e.g., Chinese) men in the U.S. are feminized (Chen 1999; Chua and Fujino 1999) and so, they are compelled to demonstrate toughness (and other attributes of hegemonic masculinity) in order to (re)claim their manhood (Lu and Wong 2013); noted in case of Benjie who tried to reassert his dominance among his students by reiterating the classroom rules in a firm tone.

The Ideal Worker

According to Joan Acker's (1990) theory of the gendered organization, White men are perceived as the "ideal workers" and hence, they occupy positions of authority and proclaim dominance while interacting with co-workers and subordinates. The organizational logic, which is essentially masculine automatically produces the perception of White men as "competent" and relegates women and people of color as the "outsiders-within" (Collins 1986)—subjects them to the tokenization process on a daily basis (e.g., Kanter 1977; Wingfield 2009; Stroshine and Brandl 2011; Williams, Muller, and Kilanski 2012). In fact, whereas most women and men of color in the study claimed to have a lower status at work, all the White male faculty directly or indirectly confirmed how in comparison to their female colleagues and colleagues of color they gain respect and recognition, as well as establish their authority among both colleagues and students. For instance, originating in Northwest Europe, Gary, a Full Professor in non-STEM, said, "…it's a package, because I'm White, tall and [Northwest European]. You can't dissect those. You can't. Also, I dress very formally, so I'm projecting a certain image…it's always to

my advantage. I get the gold card…I always get respect. Nobody dares [to] cross me. Nobody criticizes my opinion. No student would dare revolt. I would say they treat me with a lot of respect, and they treat me with caution." According to Gary, his judgements and opinions remain undisputed at work, as students and junior colleagues (both international and U.S.-born) especially look up to him as the "father figure" and seek his professional guidance. Also, Gary's department is essentially masculine and White—more than 70 percent of the faculty body constitutes of Whites and men and the student body is 62 percent male and 95 percent White (University Institutional Research and Studies Department 2018a)—which makes men like him the 'go-to guys'—apparently reliable and competent—in the field.

The above example suggests that White male faculty benefit from the "patriarchal dividend" (Connell 1995)—authority, respect, and recognition at the cost of women's subordination (will be discussed subsequently)—among colleagues and students. Similarly, they benefit from their superior racial status at work (also see, White male workers' privileges over women and racial minorities in Williams 1992, 1995; Schilt 2006, 2011). Plus, Northwest European countries are known for their colonial conquests including the Americas, which helps maintain the status-quo of White, male superiority for its ethnic population. Furthermore, studies exploring the impact of physical features on workplace success show that height is strongly connected with men's authority and dignity at work (e.g., Judge and Cable 2004; Gawley, Perks, and Curtis 2009), where tall men are perceived to be highly intelligent and possess leadership qualities (Blaker et al. 2013). Similarly, style of dress impacts how a person is perceived by others, and men who wear formal attire are treated with much greater respect and perceived as an authority figure and an expert at work (Molloy 1988; Sebastian and Bristow 2008). And this observation is true of professors in my interviews and field observations. All these existing

perceptions jointly push European White male faculty like Gary into dominant roles and permit them to exercise authority and prestige among colleagues and students, which often shows up in how they address the faculty during interactions. "I get called "doc" by them all. Nobody calls me [by my first name]," said Gary. Thus, the structures of gender and race and the stereotype of an ideal professor put White male faculty at an advantage where, unlike their female colleagues or colleagues of color, they get acknowledged in terms of how they get addressed by colleagues and students (Johnson-Bailey and Lee 2005; Kim et al. 2011).

The clout and authority of White European men—tall and formally dressed—became poignant especially during a faculty meeting and a graduate class that I attended. The meeting was led by Brad who introduced the agenda and the new faculty that recently joined his department and college. The class was taught by George, a Full Professor in STEM. Like Brad, he is also from Northwest Europe. Both of them are around 6 feet tall and of average built and sported masculine shades—colors that symbolize the cultural understandings about gender (see, for example, Messner 2000a; Nelson 2000). For instance, Brad wore a dark blue suit and a pair of black dress shoes. Similarly, George donned a pair of light beige cotton formal pants—with a tinge of moss green—and matched it with a light cream-colored pull-over and a pair of brown dress shoes. They stood behind the podium while talking and presenting the meeting's agenda to their colleagues and students; used PowerPoint slides while presenting. They looked poised and spoke in a moderately pitched voice so that everybody present in the room could hear them clearly; their tone remained firm yet gentle throughout. On both occasions, the faculty colleagues and students—both White males and females and their counterparts of color—made eye contact with Brad and George, and when they spoke, sat straight or with their legs crossed, and raised their hands before speaking; both faculty colleagues and students maintained a soft demeanor as

they answered questions or expressed their opinions. The faculty colleagues also took notes as Brad delivered his ideas and opinions in the meeting and the same with students during George's lecture. Furthermore, both colleagues and students laughed at the jokes that my participants would occasionally crack during the meeting and class lecture—banter serves as a tool of bonding for men (Kanter 1977; Ramirez 2011).

The above-mentioned scenarios represent a contrasting picture to what my female participants of color mentioned during interviews or what I observed in the faculty meetings they attended or the classes they taught—discussed earlier. Even though they were formally dressed on most occasions, they were marginalized or challenged directly and indirectly. In fact, Alvita informally mentioned right after the interview that some of her female colleagues would often suggest her to look tall. For instance, they would tell her, "Have some height, wear some heels!" The literature explains this situation well. For instance, Ford (2011) found whereas petite bodies disadvantaged mostly female faculty of color while exercising authority at work, appearance automatically privileged tall White male faculty in assuming power and legitimacy among students and colleagues in unchallenged ways. This was again boosted by the fact that these men already fit the ideal image of the professor. Moreover, greater physical height advantages mainly men by allowing them to exercise authority (Judge and Cable 2004; Gawley, Perks, and Curtis 2009) whilst women are expected to demonstrate a gentle and collaborative (or democratic) leadership style among co-workers and subordinates (Harris and Giuffre 2015; Heilman and Caleo 2018). Besides, Black women in authority run into the risk of being labeled as "angry" or "the crazy bitch" if they show slightest of dominance or aggressiveness at work (Reynold-Dobbs, Thomas, and Harrison 2008; McDowell and Carter-Francique 2017).

In fact, the power imbalance in authority became further visible when I attended the class

lectures that were taught by 3 White female participants in the study—Nora (an Associate Professor in STEM and from Southeast Europe), Isabella (an Associate Professor in non-STEM and from Southwest Europe), and Bianca (an Assistant Professor in non-STEM and from Southwest Europe). On all 3 occasions, the faculty-student interactions demonstrated the faculty's unchallenged authority, where students in general paid attention, behaved respectfully and professionally, and took notes. According to Bianca, her racial status advantages her so that she can exercise authority over students. "Because people consider me White, I'm the norm… so, it's interesting to see that [both students and colleagues] assume that what you have to say is smart enough," said Bianca. Besides, the White female faculty demonstrated a masculine style of leadership, where they lectured and interacted with students in firm tones or used cuss words occasionally. However, by doing this, they risked their teaching evaluations that could describe them as domineering or rude (Pacific Standard 2015).

Whiteness and maleness also allowed non-European White men to seek representation in university-wide administrative bodies and head authoritative positions in their respective department and college—an uncommon phenomenon for most women and people of color in the study. For instance, Marcos, an Associate Professor in non-STEM and from South America said, "I'm serving in the [university] faculty senate now. I used to be a member of [my college] council; I was [its] chairman twice. I serve regularly [there]. And I was the chair for the academic [council] and then I wanted to move up to the senate, and my colleagues were all trusting in me and they all voted for me." It is notable that Marcos is in a female-dominated department where women constitute more than 60 percent of the overall faculty body (University Institutional Research and Studies Department 2018a). Nonetheless, men like Marcos do not experience tokenism; instead they ride the glass escalator, where their colleagues including

women believe that White men are naturally "assertive" and "articulate" and thus, better leaders (also see, White men's advantages in female-dominated occupations in Williams 1992, 1995, 2015).

Besides faculty colleagues, Marcos mentioned about enjoying "a strong sense of leadership" among his students, as well. For instance, he referred to an incident where he replaced a U.S.-born White female faculty in a course, as students felt that she lacked expertise in the subject matter and so, challenged her regularly. As a solution for such daily faculty-student squabbles, the department chair decided to replace the existing faculty with Marcos, with whom the students were like "silk"—comfortable and conflict free—as he described. This is because they saw him as a knowledgeable and dominant older man. In fact, according to Leela from South Asia, a Full Professor and an administrator in non-STEM, in addition to women of color, sometimes White women too "don't get the same pass as the White men do," where students criticize them even for the slightest mistakes, something that would rarely happen to even a White immigrant male faculty. This is because the classroom is a "white guy habitus" (Messner 2000b) that automatically credits White men a sense of intellectual superiority and legitimizes their claim to authority; it relegates women and people of color to an inferior position and penalizes them for daring to be a part of the habitus.

However, whiteness does not assure all foreign-born White male faculty of leadership opportunities, especially if they are in departments that are largely dominated by U.S.-born faculty. This was common across 3 of my White male participants, who reported experiencing professional marginalization during promotion to leadership positions. For instance, Herbert, an Associate Professor in non-STEM and from Central Europe, mentioned that his U.S.-born colleagues voted against him when he applied for the department chair's position, as his views

appeared “foreign” to his American colleagues. He describes how his foreign-born status became the major reason behind his rejection for the department chair position.

> I think that my experience in my department is that [your] foreign-born status can negatively impact your aspiration for leadership positions when you are not in agreement with your American colleagues. When you are in agreement with them, they have no issue; they give you leadership positions, but if you’re not, they don’t. They hold you back. They make sure like in my case, when I was applying for becoming the department chair even in a situation where our department was at a great risk, they voted against me strongly. I believe that’s because of my controversial views, which eventually are because of my different academic upbringing, because of me being [Central European]. I think that was one of the moments where my [ethnic identity] had the strongest negative impact on my experience. It was a turning point in my academic life here. I have also experienced similar things at the university level. The leadership positions are held in my view, by and large, by U.S.-born [White male] faculty. And you know, you have these recruits for volunteering…and you choose your faculty to become so and so in this and that [in the] department. And I feel again on the surface, it’s all equality. But under the surface, it plays a strong role that international faculty have a lot more difficulties to rise into any leadership positions at [this institution].

According to Herbert, despite the university’s boasts to be egalitarian and to promote equal opportunities across its diverse faculty, students or staff members, the practices in his department or in the university at large depict an opposite picture, which tend to appoint mostly U.S.-born White men in leadership positions. This became largely visible when he struggled to garner votes from his U.S.-born colleagues for his appointment as the department chair or for

other voluntary leadership positions in the department or university. Herbert feels that this is mainly because his “foreignness” became visible in his inputs and perspectives, which are again rooted in a non-American academic system. However, unless foreign or diverse perspectives are incorporated in the university’s administrative body—both at the departmental and institutional level—the institution will fail to live up to its commitment to diversity and inclusion or understand the needs of its international affiliates.

Notwithstanding the fact that white masculine norms pervade the academic culture, foreign-born status complicates its operation, as noted in Herbert’s case. Thus, immigrant White male faculty are excluded from opportunities if they are in departments that are dominated by U.S.-born faculty. Besides leadership positions, their experiences of professional marginalization extend to other instances as well, where their achievements get overshadowed by those of their U.S.-born colleagues. For instance, Marc, a Full Professor in STEM and from Southern Europe, mentioned that his U.S.-born colleagues never congratulate him when he publishes in the same outlets as them, or talk about his achievements in faculty meetings. This differential treatment gets highlighted when his U.S.-born colleagues’ publications steal the limelight even when they are, for instance, the “sixteenth” author in a paper and Marc publishes solo-authored papers in journals with high impact factors. According to him, there exists a “clique” or an “old boys’ club” of U.S.-born faculty in the department and university that excludes younger faculty and outsiders like him, including their attempts to stunt the foreign-born faculty’s career growth.

While describing the obstacles to his upward mobility, Marc narrated his experiences when he applied for a fast-track promotion, from Associate to Full Professor; he went up for promotion within 5 years of earning tenure in his department. At the same time, the department chair (a U.S.-born White male) pushed one of Marc’s senior U.S.-born colleagues to apply for

full professorship, as well. Despite the fact that Marc's department colleagues voted for him, his promotion got rejected at the college level but that of his senior colleague's got accepted. According to Marc, in the first place, "…it was a little bit of a betrayal on the part of the department chair because there was absolutely no reason why he should have presented two applications for promotion at the same time. That was a strategic mistake and it was definitely putting my application at risk, especially because I was the one who initiated the process." He also emphasized that "there's no clock" or a definite rule for any faculty to become a Full Professor, and that it is completely "up to the person" when they want to apply for promotion. Second, since he was younger than this senior colleague the tenure/promotion committee at the college level decided to promote his "competitor" before him, as they believed he was "going too fast through the steps" even though he was more accomplished than his colleague and met all requirements for the promotion. Hence, Marc feels that he was a victim of nepotism that favors U.S.-born people at work. Nevertheless, his college dean and the provost approved his promotion against the recommendation of his college tenure/promotion committee.

The gendered and ethnic nature of professional marginalization got further highlighted in immigrant White female faculty's barriers to leadership roles. For instance, Nora feels that neither will she ever hold any leadership positions, nor will her views be considered by her U.S.-born colleagues in the department, where she is the lone foreign-born faculty. She describes how her U.S.-born colleagues exclude her from departmental happenings or any decision-making roles.

> I don't think I will ever be [or have any chance] in any kind of a leadership position [within my department], whatsoever. Whatever I say won't ever be counted within my department that I know. Because it's the way things work. Because it's the group of

> Americans that are in charge and they make the decisions. I think everything is discussed behind the closed doors. When it's brought in a faculty meeting it is a closed deal. So, what you have to say or what you think about it doesn't really matter very much. Because it has been discussed, it has been considered by others in a private situation and you are not [in] communion [until] just the last minute after it was taken care of, so to speak. So, I don't feel like I have a say in anything.

Above, Nora mentions that her U.S-born colleagues take all decisions "behind the closed doors," without consulting her. So, she has nothing much to contribute in faculty meetings and that her input in departmental matters is never incorporated. Nevertheless, faculty meetings are places where faculty colleagues pitch ideas that help to promote and develop the departmental programs, as well as build collegiality—a key element behind any faculty's sense of belonging to their department that helps it to run smoothly. And Nora being the only foreign-born faculty in her department feels that her U.S.-born colleagues put her in "quarantine" (Kanter 1977) and exclude her from joint decision-making and all forms of informal socialization outside of work (also see, White female faculty's professional exclusion in Bronstein and Farnsworth 1998), the latter being crucial for one's career development. This is because, during informal socialization, colleagues exchange critical information about one's department and field(s) of expertise, develop support systems, as well as build networks and collaborations on work projects (Kanter 1977; Xu and Martin 2011).

While being denied of any *real* leadership roles, the immigrant White female faculty often find themselves managing the program curricula and training graduate students to teach on their own, which they consider "enough of a leadership position." For example, Bianca describes her role as a Graduate Assistant (GA) coordinator.

> I'm a GA coordinator. So, I consider that enough of a leadership position, yeah. My duties are to provide [the GAs] with a syllabus, to create the syllabus, to create the assignments that the students take, to make sure that I train the GAs on how to teach [X] and go observe them, and help them when they need help. Or, when a conflict arises in class because the students misbehave or something like that, how to deal with that, make sure that they do their grading on time, they post those grades on time, and be available to them when they might not know how to prepare a class, [do] lesson planning, so I may help them with that.

Women are perceived to be born with "people" skills that push them into management roles that are associated with efficient interaction at work (Algeria 2019). Thus, immigrant female faculty, such as Bianca perform the role of a Public Relations specialist in the university (Lin et al. 2004), where she develops and administers her subject curriculum and coaches junior instructors (e.g., graduate teaching assistants); trains them to be effective communicators in the classroom, to conduct classes efficiently—administer the course, prepare and deliver class lectures, and ensure student learning—and to tactfully handle students or any conflicts that might arise during classroom interactions. However, such 'soft' roles hinder their upward mobility, as they get saddled with work that will never be counted towards their administrative careers. Still, they feel they should do all sorts of work (even unrewarding jobs involving extra and undocumented service work) or else be labeled as "lazy." For instance, Isabella describes the challenges of coming from a Hispanic/Latin background that put her under constant pressure to do everything that she is asked to do in her department or else be judged by her non-Hispanic U.S.-born colleagues.

> Well, in general, everyone that speaks Spanish is lazy. But I think Latin Americans here

> get the worse part. People tend to think they're even lazier and especially if you think about the typical images, you have a Mexican lying by a cactus with a big hat…just taking a siesta. That's a little bit [of] what's in mind for a lot of people, but yeah, that would be one thing definitely that we're expected [to be]. And so, generally speaking, I see it with other [non-Hispanic U.S.-born colleagues] and they many times think that we do less work just because of where we come from...And so, when review teams come [we] always get the worst [review]. There are a lot of elements that come into place and I think [U.S.-born colleagues] just think about us as, "Oh, you don't want to do the work!"

After the 2016 election, the U.S. saw the "lazy," "criminal," or "unscrupulous" image associated with Hispanics resurfacing and getting reinforced, as president Donald Trump pledged to save America from such threats by building the wall on the U.S.-Mexico border (Woodward and Costa 2016; Leonhardt and Philbrick 2018), for instance. And many Americans believe that every Hispanic irrespective of their ethnic origin are alike, as Isabella's case indicates—Isabella is not from Mexico but identifies herself as a Hispanic based on her Latin roots. Hence, according to Isabella, her non-Hispanic U.S.-born colleagues are guided by the popular American perception of the Pancho or Ramón—the Mexican in an ethnic white shirt and sarape and face covered with a giant sombrero—that perpetuates the racial trope—and myth—of the "lazy Mexican" who sleeps all day against a wall or a cactus tree. And operating from this mindset, they judge their foreign-born Hispanic colleagues and their performances based on the belief that they do not want to work. Going forward, this could have dire consequences on the professional advancement of the foreign-born Hispanic faculty, as their non-Hispanic U.S.-born colleagues will be the voting members on their tenure and promotion committee. Again, according to Isabella, she feels "paranoid" to complain or express her concerns, as her male

colleagues might think that "[she's] doing this because of [her] gender" and so, force her to act tough like a man. Likewise, if these foreign-born ethnic women are straightforward or rant (and swear in anger), they also run into the risk of being labeled as "loud," "assertive" or "aggressive"—not typical 'ladylike' conducts—as Bianca described.

The Mother and the Seductress

Kanter (1977) found that when women occupied positions of authority—a rare scenario in male-dominated organizations—male bosses and colleagues devised strategies to safeguard the conventional ways of interaction. Hence, they encapsulated these token women into four "informal role traps" or stereotypical images (p. 233-237)—"mother," "seductress," "pet," and "iron maiden"—to respond to them in ways that were relatable to the men. Keeping the current study findings in mind, I will discuss two such roles—"mother" and "seductress"—that around 50 percent of the female participants (the majority being women of color) referred being subjected to by both (male) colleagues and students.

Eight of the female participants mentioned that because they are women, they navigate cultural expectations associated with femininity that necessitate them to be extra accommodating or emotionally accessible to students and carry out nurturing tasks. For instance, Fan narrates an incident that depicts the *gendered* nature of care work, which requires female faculty to act as mother figures to their students by coming across as soft and compassionate to their emotional needs (also see, Acker and Feuerverger 1996; Thompson 2000; Misra et al. 2011; Misra, Lundquist, and Templer 2012).

> My [male] colleagues asked me to talk to female students when they [were] distressed. I think that is my advantage here of being a female. I had a student who was very distressed last year. She was hiding in the bathroom and obviously my male colleague

> cannot go in there to ask what is wrong. When I get in there, she was reluctant to talk to me too. She was very upset. But she said something very insightful too and I couldn't say anything to refute that. I said, "I care about you and I want you to sit in this class," even though it wasn't my class. But, she said, "It's your job to care about me. It is your job." I said, "Well, it is my job, but at the personal level I care about you too." But she didn't buy it. She is like "It's your job, that of course, you have to act in a particular way." So, I was like, I don't know what to say, how to respond to it. But I think it was insightful for a student to say that. And I understand that she is upset and everything, but you know, what can I say about that? But I think I was called on these missions to consult students. And I sometimes would do it myself and volunteer myself when I see somebody in distress because I think it's easier to talk to me than to talk to my male colleagues. Because I am very personable, I am younger, I don't seem to be more intimidating I think than my male colleagues.

According to Fan, it is reasonable to believe that as an amiable young woman it is often easier for her to enter restricted territories and connect and talk with her distressed female students—gender boundaries that male faculty might find hard to break. Nevertheless, being a woman makes her doubly responsible for the emotional well-being of her students and an expectation that students and male colleagues not only nurture but also take for granted. This emerges from the controlling image of the "mammy" that women of color navigate and makes them responsible for all the unrecognized and unrewarded work—nurturing and care work—in White-dominated workplaces, which, in turn, results in overshadowing their professional caliber (Collins 2000; Reynold-Dobbs, Thomas, and Harrison 2008; Hirshfield and Joseph 2012) and in producing psychological distress for them (Aguirre 2000a; Segura 2003). This became clearer

with Aretta's experiences at her past institution of work. She said, "I was not just a faculty member. I was a faculty member, a psychologist, a counselor, a medical doctor. I was assessing if a student was throwing up – is she pregnant? And I would have to say, 'Okay, I think you're pregnant; you need to go to the health center.' I was dealing with students that were trying to commit suicide and encouraging them to go [to the therapist] – I was dealing with a lot. And it was a lot because they just saw, 'Okay, she's Black; she's nice; let me just go to her. She's Black; she's a woman; I'm just going to go to her.' It was just too much." Aretta felt taxed due to her gender and race identities (Hirshfield and Joseph 2012), where she became accountable for the mental and physical health of her students, who took her for granted as a 'natural' counselor and caregiver. However, this endless emotion work (Hochschild 1979) can have further consequences; it stalls female faculty of color's professional advancement by taking away time from research and publication (Park 1996; Thompson 2000; Turner 2002)—the productive indicators of the job—but allowing their male peers to earn tenure and promotion way ahead of them (Misra, Lundquist, and Templer 2012).

The fact that men can escape from the gendered expectations associated with mentoring and advising students was confirmed by Herbert. He mentioned that when an ex-colleague retired, he left behind many students that needed proper supervision—precisely, his mentees. Following the faculty's retirement, the senior male colleagues—mainly White—in the department were reluctant to extend their tutelage to those students. Instead, a female faculty was generous enough to take them under her wings and continues to be very involved in shaping their academic careers. Herbert said, "I do think that maybe, you know, you have the typical gender issue in one sense that maybe a male colleague would have more harshly said, 'I'm not taking these students.' And maybe a male faculty would have gotten away with it and the senior faculty

would have said, 'Okay, they're not your students; you don't have to take them.' The expectation of women faculty might be more nurturing [and] caring that may play into it. But again, it's very hard to [see them directly]; those things don't surface [easily], so you don't see them directly." Herbert's department currently consists of only one female faculty and is essentially White (reported by Herbert during the interview). And the female faculty's token status gets highlighted during special circumstances, as mentioned by Herbert; she feels compelled to be sympathetic and to shoulder the mentoring responsibilities of those students that her White male colleagues can easily ignore and dump on her. This relief from the burden of student shepherding privileges White men like Herbert, whereby they can focus on their research productivity (Hart 2016).

Immigrant female faculty of color also find themselves in a unique position that necessitates them to understand and deal with the challenges that international students face in a foreign setting, something that their U.S.-born or male colleagues would not necessarily have experience dealing with or find very easy to recognize. For instance, Aba describes how being a foreign-born minority faculty helps her in understanding the problems of other foreign-born students, who navigate the structures of gender, race and/or immigration status to get jobs in the U.S. despite graduating from American institutions of higher education.

> There are some international students who are more comfortable coming to talk to me because they know that I share their experiences and they would come to me. Like last Tuesday, I spent about two hours talking to one international student about some of the things that they should be doing. They're trying to figure out what to do. They want to go to grad school; they're not sure and I had a chat with them. I'm like okay, if you're going to major in something, you want to major in something that people want to buy, not something that everybody has. [And] as a foreigner you have to know that if you have the

> same qualification, the same interest and everything as an American student, they will hire the American student before they hire you. And it makes sense because they have to figure out your paperwork and all that. And they don't have to do that for an American student. So, the only way a school or a company is willing to do that for you is if you have a skill that other Americans don't have…Now this is something that an American faculty will not even think of because that's not their experience…I think I bring that aspect because they feel I empathize, and at least, being a woman, a minority [and a] foreign-born I know where they're coming from.

Aba mentions that being an immigrant woman of color helps her to commiserate with the unique challenges that international students face on the U.S. job market, and accordingly, mentor and advise them about the academic path they should take or the skills they should master, which would put them in an advantaged position compared to their U.S.-born peers. In other words, professors like Aba become cultural interpreters to educate international students about the hurdles that they might face in a competitive labor market that is already filled with xenophobic sentiments and the fear that outsiders are stealing away jobs that White Americans are entitled to have. Nevertheless, this invisible labor that immigrant female faculty often perform should be recognized in teaching evaluations that would boost their career progression. And if not, it will linger forever as selfless work, a consequence of *cultural tokenism*.

Besides acting as mother figures, 2 female participants reported being objectified and perceived as sexually promiscuous in their respective department. For instance, Aba said, "When I'm going to class, I make sure that what I'm wearing obviously is not a low-cut shirt. I have to check all of that before I go because I've had boys try to look down my shirt." Aba expresses her anxiety about what she wears to work, as she needs to be extra careful in order to avoid the

sexual attention of her male students that have tried to peek into her shirt earlier. In fact, her anxiety stems from the fear of being labeled as the "jezebel" or the "hoochie"—whore or hypersexual woman—controlling images that result in the (sexual) oppression of Black women in America (Collins 2000, 2004). So, it can be clearly understood why Black female professionals want to avoid clothing that could not only call attention to their body curves but also factor into sexual harassment of them in the workplace, thus hurting their job satisfaction and upward mobility (Reynold-Dobbs, Thomas, and Harrison 2008; Pratt 2012).

The experience of sexual objectification was not limited to Aba alone but was echoed by a White female participant, as well. For example, Nora pointing to her track suit, sweatshirt, and sports shoes—that she wore on the day of the interview as well as to her class lecture—mentioned (and cringed) in a shaky voice that rarely does she dress nicely to work, as people in her department comment about her clothing choices. She narrates her experience to describe the dangers associated with a female scientist dressing nicely.

> I have had comments made about my dress. Therefore, I kind of very rarely dress nicer because I don't want that [to] get in the way from me [not] being taken seriously as a scientist…But when I first came here, obviously I was in a new university and I was dressing better, in a way of dressing like collar shirts, slacks, nicer shoes and skirts occasionally. And obviously, when I came [here], at the beginning, everybody left by 4 'o' clock, where we had so much to do; what goes later, this, that, and what not. And I had two male [graduate] students [who] didn't want to be there…and I am supposed to turn them into scientists. And then there was so much of gossip and talk…being said about me that I am dressed [in a] certain way, that how are the poor boys supposed to focus on research. And I was extremely upset about that because I have never in my life

> been into dressing [in a] provocative way. I don't know who said it; I don't know where it originated from. I don't know whether it came from students, from faculty, from whomever. But that very day, I went to my chair and I told him. And I dressed completely like [how I am dressed right] now, completely in a sort of drabbed clothing, and I told him if he [would] mind me if I came to work dressed like this. And he said, "Nope! You teach, you do your research all day. Don't worry about it." I told him I don't have time for [dressing up] and whatever. You know it takes too much of time? But the reason was completely [something] else. Because I didn't want to, because my feeling was that you get labeled. And as a female scientist, I always wanna be known for my science and respected for my ability and all of that. And I feel that was very malicious. I feel that was probably intentionally started by somebody. I don't know who, what, but it's very hard to get that other students come tell you what is being said about you.

Nora's story is a powerful depiction of female scientists being viewed as "seductresses" or sexually promiscuous in the academy, despite the fact that they consciously do not behave in seductive manners or dress in ways that signal their sexual availability to male co-workers or students (also see, Britton 2017). Such oppressive stereotypes, in turn, question the female faculty's moral compass and professional standing, and strip them of their status as "scientists" among their students and colleagues. Again, Nora's story denotes how people engaging in gender disruptive behaviors run into the danger of being assessed (West and Zimmerman 1987). Precisely speaking, women in general have a low representation in STEM—under 30 percent (National Science Foundation 2018)—and being a female scientist, Nora has already broken the gender codes by being ambitious and joining a traditionally masculine domain (see Laws 1975). Additionally, she is the only foreign-born faculty—an 'outsider'—in her department. So, U.S.-

born male students and colleagues concoct mendacious sexual accounts to not only debase her moral character but also to question her merit as a scientist, which going forward, could affect her professional legitimacy and advancement in the field. Furthermore, by being sympathetic to Nora's circumstances—and her need to wear informal clothing to work—her department chair ideally saved her from the sexual gaze of other male colleagues and students. However, on the flip side, such acts of kindness do not really enhance women's status in the workplace. Because being a "protector"—by virtue of superior gender and job status—a male boss endangers his female colleagues' chances of full assimilation or acceptance at work; women are unable to move past their sexual status and are always reminded of it by their male colleagues as an act of their antipathy to the man in authority (Kanter 1977).

The Diversity Expert and the Institutional Housekeeper

Both Kanter (1977) and Wingfield (2013) argue in their respective study that women and racial minority professionals are encapsulated into roles that become representative of their groups in male- and White-dominated settings. In other words, both women and racial minorities become the diversity symbols for the organizations they work at, where they are placed on numerous committees and ad hoc task forces. This has major consequences for their upward mobility in terms of taking away productive time from their *real* work. This is because women- and race-related labor is neither recognized nor compensated in any way, as it is taken-for-granted for both women and minority groups—as "natural" and "basic" for their kind (Wingfield 2013). The current study also notes similar instances for the majority of women and men of color.

The women of color participants expressed concerns about the amount of service work they are entrusted with both at the departmental and institutional level, where administrators and

colleagues ask them to serve on committees and task forces with the idea that they will add "color" to them. In other words, they receive service requests that require them to act as diversity symbols for their department and the university. For example, Aretta describes how she gets designated to diversity work ever since she joined the university.

> At [this university], we have something we call scholarship weekend. And at scholarship weekend, they always ask me [ever] since I've been here, to come in and stand for [it]. So, I [asked] my former associate dean, "Why am I the only one from the department they always ask to come and sit?" And she said, "Because we need color there. It's not very colorful and you give [color]." She was joking in [that] way…but she meant it. She meant to say, "We have to show these students that they have gotten a scholarship [and] that we are a diverse faculty body, and this is the reason why."

The university under study attracts prospective students by giving them a tour of campus life and informing about the scholarships (including minority student scholarships) and other resources that are available not only for their successful education but also to suggest the institution's excellent programs. Also, by bringing in female faculty and/or faculty of color to events like the scholarship weekend, the university pitches the image of itself being essentially diverse and equitable and has faculty that can serve as role models to both female and racial minority students. Therefore, female faculty of color like Aretta get overburdened with "identity taxations" (Hirshfield and Joseph 2012) as well as "cultural taxation" (Padilla 1994) that obligates them to demonstrate their citizenship to their institution of affiliation; they serve as race and ethnic representatives on committees and in the process, bring honors and praises for the university that does not reward or applaud their contributions in any way. This was echoed by Aba who finds it very hard to say "no" to the invisible labor associated with service work,

despite being aware that it has consequences for her research productivity and subsequently, upward mobility in terms of being promoted to the Full Professor rank. This occurred to her especially after earning tenure, where it became harder for Aba to refuse the racialized gendered pressures associated with "institutional housekeeping" (Bird, Litt, and Wang 2004; Pyke 2011; Britton 2017) that demands the presence of women and people of color practically on every university-wide committee. According to Aba, the administrators (e.g., department chairs and college deans) shelter tenure-track faculty from committee and service work more so than tenured faculty, as the former run into the risk of losing their jobs unless they focus on their research and get published—this was validated by Saad, as well. Additionally, she describes the grief that she feels for compromising her research work and the dangers associated with refusing any service work.

> Yes, a lot of service work that causes a lot of grief for me because that means I can't do research, and yet I'm going to be evaluated on research. And service is supposed to be 10% of my [work] role. So, that is a lot. Now what I find is that [even though] I am saying "no" to some of the requests, I'm still doing a lot. But then, there's a lot of "no's" [that] I'm terrible at saying, so that causes me a lot of grief like, "Oh, now I'm going to have to say 'no' to this one too…!" It does influence promotion whether we like it or not…it's only 10%, but it does, because I don't want my dean thinking I'm saying "no" to everything because he might forget that I've said "yes" to 10 things; I'm saying "no" to just like three, so that causes me grief. I wish I didn't have to say "no" to all of those, but I have to.

Above, Aba mentions that she feels sad as well as anxious for being unable to meet the service expectations associated with her job, which in fact, is a lot more than what her White

male colleagues are expected to do. In fact, she undergoes the gendered pressures of saying "yes" to every committee work in her department and in the university. Likewise, she fears that a single "no" can have repercussions on her promotion, where her dean—a White male—might overlook the enormous amount of service work that she already does; instead, he could label her as the 'lazy Black' and penalize her for breaking the gender norms associated with choice and conformity (Edwards 2004)—women are expected to affirm everything they are asked or expected to do. However, unlike the White male administrators, the male and female administrators of color admit that female faculty and faculty of color in general are pressured to serve as token members on institutional and departmental committees and realize that it can jeopardize their career progression in the long run. For instance, Leela said, "So service is given the least importance, least rating. But that's what they're doing the most. So, that's an unfair thing. I think the fact that women and people of color don't document what they do, nobody remembers it… But because they're overburdened with these two things, they don't do research and their research suffers." Here, Leela brings to attention the very fact that women and people of color do not record and report the identity and cultural taxations that they are subjected to in the academy. And she also asserts that unless such labor is "documented," it will continue to remain invisible to the White and male administrators and colleagues and thus, will end up in stalling women and people of color's professional mobility.

Invisible diversity work was also reported by the men of color in the study, where they mentioned acting as the informal guiding bodies for minority students. For instance, Kofi revealed that foreign-born Black faculty have Black students (both from Africa and the U.S.) approaching them casually to get perspectives as well as suggestions on how to deal with racism in America, which U.S.-born White faculty are unable to handle; they lack the cultural expertise

or experiences to "understand the fine nuances [and the] aspects of their struggles. And because [the minority faculty] have gone through it, [they] might be in a better position to help [the international students and students of color to] navigate [them]," said Kofi. However, he feels that even if faculty like him are competent to handle situations like this, still they end up doing an inordinate amount of emotional labor (Hochschild 1983), because the academic system is ill equipped to tackle the needs of international students and/or students of color. And they feel overwhelmed with student shepherding because, again, there are not enough minority faculty in the university to share minority student mentoring equally.

Besides handling diverse students and their needs, the men of color reported being the diversity figures for their departmental and university-wide committees, something that could be equally exasperating. For example, Kofi said, "Sometimes I'm not happy about it because the diversity they're looking for should not only be in a person, but in the training that each individual is receiving. So, they don't always have to look for a Black person to become a token voice for Black people. They should also work and understand what it is. Because the moment you're there, it's like they now have an excuse to say, 'We have somebody in there,' when they should be working to understand it…instead of getting somebody of color to always represent diversity…What they're often doing is using the minority person to cover up for the efforts that they have not made." Kofi being an administrator himself feels that the university authorities have neither made serious efforts to provide diversity training to all their faculty members including White faculty, nor taken serious steps or worked actively to hire people from underrepresented backgrounds. This, in turn, has produced two problems. First, due to a lack of training on race-related or diversity matters, White faculty do not adequately understand them. And their lack of understanding gives them a legitimate excuse to escape from the emotional

labor associated with diversity work. Second, in such situations, which is a consequence of the former, minority faculty become the token representatives of all minorities, yet helping the university to perpetuate an image about itself being deeply committed to diversity and inclusion. Even some U.S.-born White administrators recognize how the university taps into the labor of faculty of color in order to portray a diverse image about itself. For instance, Judy, a U.S.-born administrator in non-STEM said, "[The] Hispanics and [the] African[s], yeah, they get a whole lot more committee work…those two groups definitely get called upon to do a lot of student work [as well]. That is a policy on campus. We have to have these groups represented, so we can tap a lot of them to do that kind of work."

However, not all men of color feel that being diversity representatives is always negative. For instance, John describes the benefits of having a racial minority on every committee in the university.

> I think being different can be considered handicap for some people, but at times, I consider it as a strength. You see, as I have said [before], everybody needs a minority [and I am that guy]. You know, what I can bring to the table is a different perspective, things which can be valuable to the group…[So] I don't mind; I am fulfilling my role. I mean diversity is actually good because it's good to have diversity in a group and so, having that provision in the rules [that] there has to be a minority, something that I [actually] welcome…At least, there's a space reserved for you. If not, then it will go to another direction. May be all Whites; it's not good. I think it can lead to, you know, one way of thinking. So, those kinds of rules that are in place are actually beneficial, not just to the minority but also to the whole group.

According to John, having a minority on a committee enriches and expands the

perspectives of the dominant group, something they might lack. Also, by being a diversity representative, minority faculty are in a position to become the voice of every minority, whose needs might not be recognized otherwise. For instance, originating in North America, Jorge, an Associate Professor in STEM, mentioned about a Hispanic association on campus that he enjoys being a part of even if it is a kind of service work that is not compensated in any way. Nevertheless, according to him, "That's something that helps the person to grow and to relate, and to give back some things." He said, "That association is in particular to respond and defend the faculty and staff, that ethnicity in particular. So, we are represented in the university as Hispanic/Latino staff and faculty. So, any kind of situation that comes from the university government, if they ask for something, we have some response in the name of the Hispanic/Latino group…we're a very small part. It's about 2 percent or something like that. But I feel that's something very good to do. I mean joining and getting reinforced by a group that I feel I belong [to], it gives a very good sense of our own group's community strength." So, besides making their existence known on campus, minority faculty take up service work to fathom and relate to "what is going on" (Tierney and Bensimon 1996) or to "give back" to their communities (Shavers, Butler, and Moore III 2015) and in other cases, they network among themselves to strengthen their communities and build social capital (Smith 2015)—strong and influential networks are essential elements for professional advancement and success.

At the same time, having a minority on a committee can prevent biases from taking place. For instance, coming from South Asia, Arunava, a Full Professor in non-STEM, said, "I get sucked into some committees because of my ethnicity." Off the record, he mentioned about being appointed to serve on a particular committee that was formed to investigate certain race-related allegations that were made against the university; another professor from a similar

background as Arunava felt that he has been a victim of racism in the university and so, the latter was placed on the committee to make sure that the investigation was conducted in a neutral way.

Besides undertaking heavy service and committee work, except for one male participant in the study, 8 female faculty—both on tenure-track and tenured, as well as non-tenure-track—complained about shouldering massive teaching loads, in terms of doing new preparations every semester that their department chairs enforce upon them. For instance, Anet said, "Oh my God! It is crazy! So this is my third year [here] and I've already taught 8 different courses. So, you work it out. And you know, what preparation [and all the hassle] is involved if it's a course you've never taught before and when I normally [don't] know which course I'm going to teach?" Anet exclaims that she has been doing new preparations every semester besides managing large classes—around 45 students, on average. Also, sometimes she has to undertake additional teaching load beyond what she was told when she joined the university; her department chair specified that the teaching load is 2/2 for any tenure-track faculty. However, these extra teaching responsibilities were absent for her U.S.-born White colleagues, including those in non-tenure-track positions. She expressed her grief by saying, "…but it's sad to know that at this point, I'm watching seriously like a child. How do you give Sarah more candy than I got? But it's just amazing, that's what it came down to." Similarly, Farida mentioned that she is retained in her department in order to teach the classes that other tenure-track and tenured faculty colleagues refuse to teach. In other words, she acts as a buffer for her tenure-track and tenured male and U.S.-born White colleagues who judiciously utilize their spare time in doing research and get published. However, both Anet and Farida find it hard to refuse the extra teaching work they are asked to do because in Gary's words, "Women tend to be consensus builders..." And if these immigrant women of color choose to disagree and refuse to cooperate, they will be seen as both

egotistical and bad-tempered women by their U.S.-born colleagues (Lin et al. 2004; Williams 2014). Ironically, by giving in they will end up in hurting their professional careers.

The above mentioned instances signal that female faculty of color are nothing but "maids of academe" (Harley 2008) who spend a disproportionate amount of time in doing the devalued tasks—teaching and service work—which, going forward, could produce an inordinate amount of psychosocial stress for their research and promotion being in peril. However, the stress associated with additional teaching load was also reported by 2 White women in the study. For instance, Nora describes the agony that she felt when her research and tenure got endangered by extra teaching responsibilities that were dumped on her unexpectedly by her department chair.

> Teaching assignments are given, that is, who teaches [what]. [But] there is no transparency whatsoever. I just hear about, "Oh! This person is teaching this class now." I never heard discussion in our department about "who is the best person to teach this?" They are just kind of given. And certain people, especially Americans do better. It was about a year ago when I was trying to go up for tenure, probably [under] the pressure [from American] faculty [colleagues], my chair came to me, trying to increase my teaching load. And I told him outright, "I can quit and go home right now." And I was going to quit right then because I was striving hard. My projects were progressing, I was publishing. I was so close to getting funding and everything. It was just very difficult in my field because my field is very hard…you know? It's just [a] different nature of research. And then funding was lagging behind. So, instead of giving me some support to succeed, they were trying to load me with more teaching. So then, I do all the teaching and never even get the funding, a grant.

Nora mentions that the distribution of work associated with teaching is not "transparent,"

where faculty expertise does not necessarily determine what an instructor is assigned to teach in her department. This can also result in additional teaching load for an 'outsider' like Nora who unlike the 'insiders'—U.S.-born faculty—does not always get to choose what she wants to teach. This gets highlighted when her department chair, "under the pressure [from American] faculty [colleagues]," tried to increase her teaching load by assigning new courses that she has not taught before. And as a woman, if she followed the gendered protocol of saying 'yes,' she would have risked both her research grants and tenure. So, while Nora's gender might put her into the risk of attracting the criticisms of her male colleagues and boss, who could perceive her as self-centered and arrogant for refusing boldly to accommodate their interests (Heilman et al. 2004; Heilman and Okimoto 2007), her racial status (white privilege) will certainly protect her from additional (racial) labels; unlike her counterparts of color, she does not have to fear for being perceived as the 'lazy' or 'angry Black woman.'

Moreover, international faculty in general are in a unique position to provide a safe space to minority students on campus, where they use their social locations and authority to speak openly about social inequalities. For instance, Leela said, "I feel like Black students or prospective students and their parents feel very relieved when I'm the [administrator]. I actually feel people relax when they come in. I feel like in classes I'm able to talk about race very openly and in a very relaxed way…I represent a certain diversity, a certain kind of safe space on campus, and I think it's good for the university overall." By having minority faculty like Leela in the administration, it allows the university to portray itself as a safe space and thus, attract more minority students to enroll in its various programs. This, in turn, helps the university in touting and retaining an image about itself that supports and protects people from diverse backgrounds.

Additionally, due to their international background immigrant faculty are able to bridge

cultural gaps by acting as cultural brokers. They exploit their multicultural exposures to bring diverse perspectives and international examples on the table that give domestic students especially a taste of the outside world and of people who do not look like them. For instance, Sunanda mentioned that having worked in different cultures helps her to make cross-cultural references during class lectures, which students appreciate a lot. This, in fact, was prevalent in Sunanda's undergraduate class that I attended. The lecture discussed the role of media in promoting healthy foods and health practices, to explain which Sunanda brought in several cross-cultural examples. For example, she asked the class what kind of advertisements are shown during super bowl, to which a student replied "Budweiser." They discussed how such advertisements endorsing and promoting alcohol can impact people's health. Sunanda also referred to American documentaries, such as "Deadly Persuasion" to explain the health effects of alcohol and tobacco. Additionally, Sunanda showed a video of "the smoking baby" in Indonesia; a 2-year-old boy who was addicted to nicotine and smoked at least 2 packets of cigarettes every day but is in the rehab now. She also gave examples in the context of gender and racial minorities; for example, how advertisements target people of color and how alcohol-based advertisements promote violence against women worldwide. By using cross-cultural references and race- and ethnicity-based examples, Sunanda educated students about alcoholism and the effects of nicotine addiction on health. She also educated students about violence caused by alcohol consumption as a global problem and the role of international media in promoting and perpetuating it. Similarly, Anita, a Full Professor in non-STEM and an administrator from South Asia, describes the efforts that she takes in developing global perspectives among those U.S.-born students who lack diverse or international exposure.

I would say that for the native-born students, almost half our students come from rural

> areas and half come from Chicago, that not all of them have been exposed to people from other countries. And so, I think their initial reaction could be one of like hesitation. So, I feel it is helpful if the faculty who is from a different part of the world, crosses or bridges that gap because they are not familiar, they may not have left [their state]; some of them. So, I think bridging that gap is important. You know, like from day one I have addressed this gap. It may be unspoken but being able to come up and ask you questions, they may be a little hesitant because they are less familiar with somebody like you. So, I have tried to address that by making them more familiar, being able to say my name, and making myself available, going up and actually talking to them before the class starts, just so that they see you, that you are just like everybody else.

Above, Anita mentions that there is an unspoken distance between U.S.-born students and foreign-born faculty that makes the former hesitant to approach the latter either inside or outside the classroom for course related issues or any other academic struggles that they might undergo. This is mainly because, the majority of the domestic students come from predominantly White rural areas in the region or Chicago and some have not lived outside the state where they were born and raised. So, it is quite possible that they might not have been much exposed to racial and/or cultural diversity. Nevertheless, she tries to break this cultural silence by applying various strategies during her interactions with students (e.g., make them say her name or just initiate informal conversations before class hours) and being available outside the classroom. Besides contributing to their overall academic growth, by acting as cultural brokers, international faculty assist domestic students in becoming tolerant of diverse perspectives and people who look different than them, and this could aid in their professional success in diverse work settings. Moreover, the world has become a global village due to technology and digitization and cross-

cultural migration, and international faculty are at a vantage point to turn ethnic majority students into global visionaries and socially engaged individuals. They bring in international perspectives as well as conduct study abroad programs that expose native students to different cultural experiences and help them to embrace diversity. This, in the long run, would be effective for both their personal and professional growth. For instance, Marcos said, “Every semester, I give a presentation on a study abroad [program] in the dorms [and in] different places [in the university], for freshman to learn [about] the possibilities for them to travel. Because I am foreign-born, I know how important it is.”

Foreign-born faculty are also at a vantage point where they use their international educational background to understand both American and non-American education systems (Calderón 2014), especially when it requires endorsing international students by helping them to navigate the U.S. education system. For instance, George said, “I’d like to think that I bring a different educational experience because I was educated in a different system – apart from my master’s degree [from the U.S.], which helps me because I’ve personally experienced the American system. So, I’ve got a predominately [Northwest European] system with a little bit of American system, so I can appreciate both. And I understand things like when I look at a resume of grad student from a foreign country, I can sometimes understand it better than a U.S.-born person. I know especially if it’s from a Commonwealth country, I can read [their] transcript better than a U.S.-born – or I can interpret it perhaps better than an American professor could. So, I think that’s helpful.” Being educated in both Europe and the U.S. makes faculty like Brad adept in interpreting American and non-American academic transcripts. Graduate school admission outside the U.S., for instance, does not necessarily follow the 16-year education course and/or an American curriculum. This often precludes some international students from

getting graduate admission to U.S. universities, as their undergraduate transcripts read differently.

In the context of the above-mentioned situation, Brad referred to the story of a student from South Asia, who was educated in the British model of the 15-year undergraduate system and took some core undergraduate courses—as per the standard requirements of the American colleges and universities—in her high school, and was initially refused admission at the university under study. Brad said, “Looking at her transcript, the graduate school here said she can’t get in because she has got a 3-year [undergraduate] degree [and] not a 4-year degree, and that she has to take a second degree as an undergraduate. The undergraduate advisor here said, ‘Well, she doesn’t need to just do an extra year, she’s got to do the entire core curriculum, the lower division core [courses] because she’s got nothing in her transcript from [her home country] that says English, Sociology, Music, all that stuff.’ And so, they were asking her to do 50 credit hours or so. It’s ridiculous and I was trying to explain it because she’s following the British system, and she probably did all that stuff at high school.” Hence, Brad used his European (and international) educational background to explain his U.S.-born faculty colleague and the graduate school authorities about the mentioned international student’s transcript and assist her in getting admission in the graduate program of his department, who otherwise had to start from scratch.

Summary

In this chapter, I used an intersectional lens to show how the experiences of immigrant male and female faculty of color differ from those of their White counterparts and among one another. Therefore, I showed how immigrant White men and women in the study do not navigate the same challenges as their colleagues of color, where the former experience their ‘foreign’

workplace more positively; immigrant male and female faculty of color navigate controlling images and struggle to gain legitimacy or to get integrated among colleagues and students. Next, I showed that compared to women of color, men of color benefit from their gender status. They enjoy authority in the classroom, as students think they are competent professors. Likewise, I showed how whiteness and maleness advantage White men and place them in leadership positions in their departments and in the university. And even though whiteness legitimizes immigrant White women as competent instructors, ethnic origin and/or foreign-born status result in their professional marginalization (e.g., exclusion from decision-making roles) among native colleagues. Then, I showed how both women of color and White women shoulder massive teaching loads and are sexually objectified at work. Following, I showed the expectations associated with women of color to act as mother figures to their students and people of color to act as diversity symbols in their departments and in the university. Similarly, I showed how international faculty more generally act as cultural interpreters to their international students and as cultural brokers to their U.S.-born colleagues and students. Finally, I showed how the experiences of immigrant faculty are contextual, that is, they are contingent upon the departmental and organizational culture of diversity.

CHAPTER 5

CULTURAL CONTRASTS, ETHNIC OTHERING, AND BOUNDARY HEIGHTENING

How do cultural differences impact immigrant faculty's integration among their U.S.-born colleagues and students and more generally in the U.S. academy? And how do immigrant faculty navigate the practices of ethnic othering at work? I will examine and reflect on these two fundamental questions in this chapter.

In response to the above two questions, the study participants indicated that immigrant faculty are exotic anomalies and thus, visible 'outsiders' or 'ethnic others' at work. The cultural differences based on language (accents and the supposed lack of proficiency in English), food habits, clothing styles, religion, popular sports, humor, and gestures produce heightened boundaries (Kanter 1977)—invisible borders and interactional styles that protect and keep intact the hegemonic culture and the unity of the dominant group, endangered or challenged by the token's presence among them—and prevent the token faculty in the study from seeking in-group membership. In other words, the differences based on cultural traditions result in ethnic othering and prevent immigrant faculty's assimilation among their U.S.-born colleagues and students. And for those immigrant faculty who approximate or choose to conform to hegemonic ethnic markers (here, American cultural attributes)—the tokens react to boundary heightening by trying to fit in and adopting the dominant culture (Kanter 1977)—they either achieve in-group membership or still find themselves being held up against dominant cultural standards. The study findings also show that social identities (gender, race, and ethnicity) impact the extent to which immigrant faculty assimilate or experience cultural isolation in the workplace. Therefore, this chapter will discuss and show how *cultural tokenism* maneuvers at the intersections of gender, race, ethnic origin, cultural background, and foreign-born status. Additionally, it will show that

some immigrant faculty experience ethnic othering or have their cultural citizenship or belonging in America questioned more so than others.

Thus, in the following pages, I will discuss how differences in accent or the supposed lack of proficiency in English cause immigrant faculty's "linguistic isolation" (Nawyn et al. 2012) at individual, interpersonal (among colleagues and students), institutional (e.g., related to hiring and promotion to administrative positions), and scholastic (e.g., obtaining research grants) levels. Next, I will show how similarities and/or differences in food habits, clothing styles, religion, sports, humor, and gestures produce cultural 'insiders' or 'outsiders' at work. Finally, I will use an intersectional lens to show that immigrant White men and women and their counterparts of color navigate differently the ethnic boundaries—integration and isolation are determined by their respective social locations and cultural background—that emerge from the isolating effects of *cultural tokenism*.

Linguistic Isolation and the Supposed Lack of Proficiency in English

More than 65 percent of the immigrant participants mentioned that their major cultural challenge is with the English language; they perceive themselves to struggle while communicating with their U.S.-born colleagues and students at work. And this is consistent with past research findings (e.g., Skachkova 2007; Ghosh and Barber 2017). According to them, their "linguistic isolation" (Siegal, Martin, and Bruno 2000; Nawyn et al. 2012)—immigrants' social integration or cultural citizenship is obstructed (or questioned) by their dearth of linguistic capital, that is, proficiency in the host country's official language (Bourdieu 1991; Warriner 2007)—stems from the very fact that they speak with foreign accents and/or English is not the native tongue for most of them. Therefore, they feel that apparently, they are not fluent or proficient in English. This rather came up as a surprising revelation, as all my immigrant

participants are educated in English as well as read, write, publish, and talk in the language, at least, on the professional front. For example, Benjie describes his linguistic challenges during departmental faculty meetings.

> My major problem is…majority of [the faculty colleagues in the department] are English speakers. If we have faculty meetings, they speak very fast; they converse and bounce ideas quite fast…very seldom I speak in faculty meetings. That's my problem…So, what I do after the meetings [is] I would go one by one, to each of [the faculty's office] and tell them, 'Okay, so educate me. So, what are the things that you said on this particular topic?' And that's where I give my two [cents]...So, that's where I try to get back and give my opinions, even if they have discussed it already…I don't mind what the final decision was, as long as [I know] the crux of the matter well.

Above, Benjie mentions that he struggles to give his input in the departmental faculty meetings; being a non-native English speaker, he is unable to follow his colleagues when they speak in the meetings. This is because a majority of them are native English speakers and as a result of which they have smooth linguistic exchanges and can "converse and bounce ideas quite fast." But, after the meetings are over, Benjie approaches each colleague individually in their respective office and discusses the meeting memo and gives his opinions on the topics discussed. And even though he does not mind being unable to partake in the decision-making in those meetings due to his linguistic challenges, he certainly loses out on the opportunities to showcase his leadership skills and in the process, create an impression among his colleagues.

Despite linguistic challenges, my immigrant participants mentioned that they make particular efforts to make themselves comprehensible in the academy. For instance, Aba mentioned that she asks students at the beginning of the semester to read her lips and vice-versa,

and this is how they familiarize themselves with different accents. She also tries to speak "slower than normal" and tells her students to do the same along with paying extra attention when she speaks to them or lectures in class. This is needed or else it feels like immigrant faculty are "mumbling" when they speak fast, as remarked by Charles, a U.S.-born administrator in non-STEM. The rest of the faculty participants mentioned doing this additional linguistic labor by translating English terms or sentences in their native language before they speak, searching for alternative terms or phrases that are easier to pronounce or understand, looking up online to learn how certain words are pronounced the American way or asking their U.S.-born colleagues and students for American equivalents, or just reiterating the same thing often. For instance, Chang said, "I don't speak English very often actually, except when teaching and talking to colleagues. So, at home, I just speak [my native language]. Sometimes, you just don't know how to express something in quite a smooth way. And probably you need to say the same thing maybe twice to make yourself understood."

According to Charles, linguistic challenges, such as Chang's, are an "issue" especially with the faculty coming from East Asia. And so, he advises his East Asian colleagues to speak in English at home in order to "improve [their] pronunciations" and thus, avert student complaints. In other words, Charles underscores the dominant elements of his culture—here, the English language and its American diction—to highlight his immigrant colleagues' token status (also see, the dominant group's exaggeration of cultural differences in Kanter 1977). Nevertheless, linguistic isolation is not limited to my participants of color from East Asia alone but also present among those from other parts of Asia, Africa, and the Caribbean. For instance, Bruk describes his token status among students and how he handles his linguistic challenges every semester.

There are, of course, obvious challenges like language, the accent, my accent and then

their accent…those are some challenges…My culture and then my accent, which I can never make perfect. So, every semester, I meet new students and then we have to make some sort of adjustment. By the way, these students are very, very friendly. They have no problem with me. This is what I do all the time when I start classes. I tell them that English language is not my mother tongue and they're going to have a professor who has a different accent. And if you don't understand me, please ask me again and again. And if I don't understand you, I will ask you again and again. And then in one week's time, really, we will have a good understanding of each other's conversations and so on. That is how I have very good relationship with my students ever since I started teaching.

Above, Bruk mentions that not only he faces challenges while communicating with U.S.-born students in his ethnic accent but also finds it difficult to understand their accent. Therefore, as the semester starts, he clarifies with his incoming students that his native language is not English and so, both of them have to ask and repeat as and when needed, pertaining to what they discuss in class or say to each other. It is also noteworthy that Bruk feels that his accent is not "perfect" and would never become so. In other words, the cultural hegemony of the West that exoticizes non-Western cultural attributes as "inferior" (Said 1978) is ingrained in Bruk and he fails to see that having a non-American accent does not necessarily make him or his ethnic culture inferior or imperfect. Simultaneously, Bruk emphasizes that his students are "very friendly" and "have no problem" with his foreign accent; they build healthy or "good relationships" inside and outside the classroom despite linguistic differences. However, there are exceptions. For instance, according to Jihun, a Full Professor in non-STEM and from East Asia, his college and department tout students mainly from "deep rural areas" and because of accent differences and lack of diversity exposure, some of these students "become hesitant to talk to

foreign-born [faculty].”

Nevertheless, the majority of the immigrant male faculty of color in the study mentioned that students either do not complain at all about their thick foreign accents or do so a little initially but eventually adjust with their foreignness. And this was captured during my visits to the classes they taught. Students took notes, listened to lectures, or interacted very respectfully with the faculty (see, for example, Bruk’s class observations discussed in Chapter 4). In contrast, students do not show the same compassion or friendliness to their immigrant female faculty of color who speak with foreign accents, thereby suggesting that this adjustment or linguistic isolation is highly *gendered*. And this was highlighted when I observed Farida’s undergraduate class. I sat at the rear of the lecture hall and noted one White female student sitting right behind me suddenly threw her notebook on the floor—the book thudded on the ground—and angrily muttered at Farida, “Why the f**k are you so fast?” Another White female student sitting next to her nodded and agreed with what her classmate just remarked. And although Farida was adequately loud and clear, the first student kept grumbling that she could not hear or understand her professor. Her peer who sat next to her smiled and scribbled on her notebook and drew designs. In fact, they also laughed and exclaimed “Yay” when the class ended.

According to Anet, when immigrant female faculty of color speak with foreign accents, they are “just stupid”—discussed in Chapter 4. And Aba mentioned that when she teaches online, once in a while she gets the feeling that some U.S.-born students are somewhat shocked when they realize that she is a foreign-born instructor with an accent. Past research findings show that when these students (especially males) realize that their faculty speak with a foreign accent, they drop out of classes (see Ghosh and Barber 2017). This was confirmed by Fan, as well. Similarly, Alvita describes how students react and behave with her.

> There were times when students felt like they had a lot of foreign folks teaching courses with thick accents that they couldn't figure out, because they didn't see themselves as people speaking with accents. So, you as the foreigner, you were the only one with an accent! And so, it was usually a shock for them to realize that they had accents too and so, getting over that type of hurdle at times, depended on the group that I was working with. There were groups that were pretty good and then there were some groups that were horrible.

Besides the fact that students feel "shocked" to discover that a good chunk of international faculty who teach at the university speak with "thick accents," Alvita above points out that they do not realize that "they had accents too." And those native students who realize this fundamental fact are the ones that she easily gets along with. Yet, the ones that cannot come to terms with the reality about cultural differences or that these differences are natural, they complain about faculty accents in their evaluations and poorly evaluate them; this was conceded by 5 female faculty of color in the study. For instance, Fan mentioned that it is certain that domestic students will complain about foreign-born instructors while evaluating them. And in her case, they complain that sometimes she pronounces certain names wrong. According to her, "the students want to find something to complain about" and make their faculty's foreign accents as an excuse to not study. Similarly, Anita mentioned that some U.S.-born students use her accent as an alibi for not performing well in classes and so, she turns out to be the scapegoat for their failures. And this is very challenging for these faculty. "I think that's a big challenge because in our profession, we're evaluated heavily by teaching. And if these students are evaluating us…we're immigrants; we're foreign; we have an accent; they can't say your name. And sometimes, it's kind of like a balancing act [for] dealing with them," said Aretta.

These so-called "balancing acts" as Aretta described above, are xenophobic and consistent with past studies that show when immigrant instructors of color do not speak with an American accent or in the "Standard American English" (Lippi-Green 1997), students write negative things about them in teaching evaluations, including comments that question the faculty's teaching expertise and credibility (Rubin and Smith 1990; Rubin 1992; Skachkova 2007). And since teaching evaluations are one of the major deciding elements in faculty tenure, these social biases could hinder immigrant female faculty of color's upward mobility. Moreover, the Whites and the U.S.-born make up the majority of the rural population of the town in which the university is situated as well as the student body of the university (see "research site" in Chapter 3). And this demographic makeup of the university and the town in which it is located could factor into the linguistic discrimination faced by the faculty of color in the study; they are exotic anomalies in the eyes of their local White students.

It is equally intriguing that when immigrant faculty of color approximate the hegemonic ethnic markers and speak English with an American accent or very fluently, they too experience *cultural tokenism* by being subjected to scrutiny at work. And this was indicated by 4 faculty in the study—3 males and 1 female—who mentioned that both U.S.-born faculty and students are surprised while having formal or informal conversations with them. For instance, originating in South Asia, Anubhav, an Assistant Professor in STEM, said, "…since I [am] from [South Asia], everybody said, 'Oh my God…your English is so good!' Okay, so [this is] because they're not expecting my English to be good. You know, I learned English when I was in nursery. So, you can see that is there." Likewise, Janet expressed the same concerns about her U.S.-born colleagues inside the university and the ones she meets at professional conferences. She mentioned that they are always surprised by her English-speaking skills and American accent. In

fact, whenever they meet, her native colleagues automatically assume that she speaks Spanish and so, wonder when they hear her speak "perfect" English. And this bothers Janet a lot; she never knew that she is supposed to sound different than what she already sounds and if she thinks about it often, it annoys her.

Nevertheless, whiteness does not necessarily promise White immigrants in-group membership. The majority of my White participants reported having experienced linguistic discriminations that questioned their cultural citizenship among their U.S.-born colleagues and students. For instance, Bianca mentioned that whenever her U.S.-born colleagues get an opportunity, they correct or point out her grammatical or spelling errors, or her way of saying things and they do so in sarcastic tones. According to her, these types of linguistic discriminations indicate "power relations" showing that immigrants who do not speak the dominant group's language or speak with a foreign accent, are not "good enough" for "[the American] society." And this requires foreigners to prove themselves daily at work, as Nora claimed. For instance, she feels that her U.S.-born dean tries to make her look inferior if any of her research grants gets rejected. She said, "The dean says, 'Do you have somebody read those grants? Do you have [somebody] spell checked it for you?...And then, the implication being I don't know how to write. And I probably need someone to spell check everything for me, that I am not capable of writing in English…but I [have] never [ever] gotten [from grant reviewers] that 'this was not well written, or this is not understandable.' But she assumed, yeah. It's an assumption…Because even though I am at the highest level of education with all of this baggage of science and experience, I am still not capable of writing without the need of somebody spell-check for me."

But, this prejudice or the feeling of being perceived as inferior or unintelligent is also

gendered. For example, Isabella said, "Sometimes I think…we're going to be viewed differently…and that's going to play a part on how you carry yourself, how you speak, how you think. Like I tend to [think] even just for a little thing like writing an email. I tend to overthink [it], but I don't know if it's so much because of my gender [or] because of the fact that I'm foreign-born. And so, I want to sound intelligent. I want to sound like my fellow American colleagues, and I don't want people to say, "Oh, it's because she's from here or from there" [and that] I don't know [anything]!" Isabella's both gender and foreign-born status produce a double bind for her; her need to "sound intelligent…like [her] American colleagues" make her very conscious, as she wrestles to compose even a simple email. Because unlike her native male colleagues, any of her linguistic slipups might not be given the benefit of the doubt. Additionally, Isabella is of Hispanic origin and speaks Spanish (besides English); the controlling images associated with Hispanics speaking Spanish (e.g., "unintelligent" or "incompetent") could make her look extra foolish in the eyes of her U.S.-born colleagues and obstruct her assimilation among them (see, for example, Bergman, Watrous-Rodriguez, and Chalkley 2008).

The fact that linguistic isolation is gendered and racialized, as well as specific to ethnic origin got further highlighted in the testimonies of 3 White men in the study. For instance, George describes how his Northwest European accent helps him navigate workplace interactions.

> People notice. It doesn't go against me. I get the sense that people like [my ethnic] accent…people think it makes you sound more intelligent, which of course, I'm not going to disagree with. There are words that when I say [to] them, people laugh…and I just will not say the American version of these words, because it's just so unnatural for me. Sometimes I slip, but I prefer to just talk naturally. I think I've been lucky. I think I'm lucky because I'm [Northwest European]. I think because most Americans regard

> [Northwest European] people in fairly high regard, I've got an advantage. I don't sound like the Queen, but I mean they refer to the way the royal people speak, as the Queen's English or [the BBC English] pronunciation is now a template.

Above, George mentions that his Northwest European accent makes him "sound intelligent" (also admitted by Brad and Gary) even if he does not pronounce certain words the American way or makes some mistakes. This is because he gets the impression that his colleagues and students like his ethnic accent. In fact, he feels that his ethnic accent leverages him at work, because the majority of the Americans hold people from his country in very high esteem. This is more so because they perceive George to speak the "royal" language, that is, "Queen's English," or "the BBC English." In other words, the 'colonial hangover' still persists in the U.S. academy and makes it very elitist; if an immigrant, that too a White male speaks the high-class or Victorian English, they are automatically granted membership among the dominant group despite accent differences or linguistic slipups.

However, not all White men enjoy the same linguistic privileges as George, Brad, or Gary, and thus become victims of ethnocentrism in the workplace. For instance, Marc said, "At times, when people want to put you down, they can say, 'What?' Like making you repeat. But another one of their favorites when they want to put an immigrant down is 'What do you mean?' And another one of their favorite lines is 'I am confused.' When someone tells you 'I am confused,' what they are actually telling you is, 'You, my friend, are not making sense!'" Like George, Marc also recognizes the clout of royal English in the U.S. academy and remarks that if someone like him who does not speak the "Queen's English," is automatically viewed as "intellectually inferior." Besides, Marc is in a department where U.S.-born comprises an estimated 83 percent of the student body and an approximately 70 percent of the faculty body

(University Institutional Research and Studies Department 2018a), and Marc's linguistic isolation becomes inevitable. However, these overt practices of ethnocentrism or ethnic othering as Marc described were not captured during my visit to his undergraduate class; 4 White males and 4 White females were among the total number of students that attended the class. They sat upright and made eye contact with Marc as he lectured, as well as answered the questions he asked. They remained quiet, took notes, and nodded as he spoke. Marc's interactions with students show that the classroom being a "white guy habitus" (Messner 2000b) protects him (unlike Farida as discussed earlier) from becoming targets to students' ethnocentric rants.

In addition to the individual and interpersonal level, the supposed lack of proficiency in English can impact institutional level matters as well, such as those related to hiring and promotion to leadership positions. This was pointed out by 8 of my immigrant participants—6 people of color and 2 Whites. For instance, Inesh, an Assistant Professor in STEM and from South Asia, said that when his department hires especially a foreign-born person in a faculty position, other than the candidate's areas of expertise and publication record, it looks for their teaching experience in English. "…if it is a foreign applicant, we try to find out if that applicant has experience in teaching in the U.S. or in any English-speaking country," said Inesh. And such requirements for a prospective faculty are not completely unjustified. This is because English is the official language of the U.S. and the majority of the students that attend the university under study are U.S.-born (see "research site" in Chapter 3). However, it could get tricky if the foreign-born applicants' proficiency in English is assessed merely on the basis of their accents. For instance, originating in South Asia, Avik, an Assistant Professor in STEM, describes his experience while getting hired for his current role.

Interestingly, [my accent] apparently played a role in terms of taking the hiring decision

> about me. Because one of the issues that departments have with hiring foreign-born faculty is the accent. Because when you are teaching in the class, students [should] understand what you are teaching. I know that is incorrect, that isn't fair…[But] that was a big decision. So, the very first interaction I had with [my] department was over the phone. The first conversation was like, "Oh, your English is perfect! I mean you speak like an American!"

As discussed earlier, the isolating effects of *cultural tokenism* continue to prevail even when immigrants approximate the dominant linguistic markers and it can be seen in Avik's case as well; his accent and fluency in English called attention among his prospective departmental colleagues and the hiring committee who interviewed him over the phone. In fact, instead of focusing on his past teaching experience in higher education—which Avik did not have much, except for a few months as a TA while in grad school in the U.S. and a short visiting faculty gig in his home country—the hiring committee and his prospective U.S.-born colleagues chose to focus on how he sounded; they wanted to ensure that they hired someone who sounded like them and the domestic students. And although such practices are "incorrect" or "unfair," according to Avik, they still suggest what defines "perfect" English, as underlined by an American accent—also highlighted by Bruk earlier.

The so-called "perfect" English skills could also impact immigrant faculty's chances of being promoted to administrative ranks. For instance, Lloyd said, "I think if you're U.S.-born, you're better able to get an administrative position, [as] it has to do with…language, the communication skills that they perceive you to have or not to have." And Lloyd's assumptions cannot be entirely disregarded, as past studies have shown that when immigrants lack the linguistic capital or the communication styles of the host country, their upward mobility or other

rewards on the job are automatically thwarted (e.g., Bleakley and Chin 2004; Shih 2006; Bergman, Watrous-Rodriguez, and Chalkey 2008). This also holds true for the U.S. academy, where immigrant faculty struggle to climb up the ladder due to linguistic barriers (see Akomalafe 2013).

Besides teaching and administrative roles, immigrant faculty also experience challenges in securing research grants funded by the U.S. agencies. Although the majority of my non-STEM participants mentioned that they are not necessarily required to write and/or obtain research grants to be considered for tenure and promotion, those who occasionally apply for them reported facing challenges with their writing style. For instance, according to Herbert, the major challenge is about fitting the research ideas into the limited space specified by the grant agency. And immigrant faculty "tend to use more space for writing," as they struggle to succinctly express their thoughts in a non-native language, claimed Herbert. He said, "I think part of that is not intellectual. It is linguistic. It has to do with writing in a foreign language, not that my thoughts are more clouded than [my] American faculty [colleagues]." This is consistent with literature that explains that the American style of writing research grants is "direct, very concise, and formal" (Torres 2002:80)—acknowledged by Saad, as well—and the U.S. grant agencies refuse to accept or fund proposals that are written in a style that is not American (Skachkova 2007) or in a non-American lingo, as George claimed. Similarly, even in a technical field like STEM, there could be challenges too. For instance, Wasim describes his linguistic challenges while applying for research grants and how he manages them.

> As a foreign-born, you will always face the language barrier; how you can spell out, how you can convince your reviewers. Secondly, even though a grant system, I mean, they are maybe transparent, but again you come to know like connections really matter. You need

> to know some people who can help you out to facilitate this process. And in that way, that means to learn a skill, which is networking, a multi facet skill. It is not only about communication and it is also about having [found] a good match...So, as a foreign-born, you probably think it's a new skill. [And] since you are from [a] different culture, your communication is different...my struggle about writing grants [is that] language is a barrier. Also, [the] writing style is a barrier. How to write? What are the main components?...[I] collaborate with native speakers and that often helps…in a sense like maybe it straightens your language.

Above, Wasim mentions that as a non-native English speaker, he finds it difficult to articulate and convey his research ideas to the grant reviewers. And since the review process might not always be transparent, it is necessary to network with the 'right' people—U.S.-born scientists—in order to obtain grants. Also, it has been already noted in Chapter 4 that when minority researchers with Muslim names apply for federal or state sponsored grants, it is quite possible that they would not receive them. Hence, by collaborating with non-Muslim scholars and native speakers, it helps immigrant Muslim faculty like Wasim to "straighten" their language and increase the chances of getting the research funds. This is again very important because the academic careers of STEM faculty are heavily dependent on the amount of research funds they can procure in addition to having a good publication record (see, for example, Sheridan et al. 2017).

Other Cultural Attributes and Reminders of Difference

Besides language barriers, cultural differences in general remind immigrant faculty that they are 'outsiders' in the U.S. academy and so, do not belong among their U.S.-born colleagues and students. Yet, many do recognize that these cultural isolations or boundaries are "natural," as

a result of different upbringings, traditions, or experiences. For instance, John said, "So of course, there are things…that I cannot say to [American colleagues] that they cannot or would not understand [due to] cultural references and things like that. So, there's a limit to what can be shared, you know, because of different experiences and different backgrounds…It is hard to really be in the same circle…because there are things that are important to you but not important to them and vice-versa."

But there are times when boundaries are consciously imposed or heightened to remind that immigrant faculty are what Georg Simmel referred to as the "stranger," "who is beyond being far and near" (Levine 1971:144) to the dominant group. And so, U.S.-born faculty maintain social distance with their immigrant colleagues to remind them that they are "no owner[s] of land" (ibid.:144). For instance, Marc, Herbert, and Pedro (a Full Professor in non-STEM and from South America) complained that their U.S.-born colleagues either never visit their houses when invited or never return their invitations. Marc said, "I invited people, faculty, to my house; probably half of them, I would say, the ones I felt close to, including those that later on stabbed me in the back. I am yet to be invited to any of my [American] colleagues' house for dinner, lunch or even a social drink…So you invite a family to your place and…you expect reciprocity, but I think it should come naturally at some point. Maybe not right away but when there is an opportunity. Nothing. Nothing. Nothing at all..." Marc also specified that it is only the international faculty colleagues inside and outside his department that invite him to their houses. And this absence of social exchanges or rendezvous between immigrant and U.S.-born faculty became further poignant in Nora's description of her U.S.-born colleagues' indifferent attitude towards her.

I can honestly tell you that none of my [U.S.-born] colleagues have ever asked me, "Oh,

how is [your country]? How was the world you lived there? How was this? How was that?" No, I never got questions about anything to do with me. There is no curiosity to know how your culture is, how you function, how you think, how you grew up. Nothing about that…they don't even care to understand because it's "us" and "those foreign people".…You know, what I am saying? And that is [why] I never had any of my colleagues [who] has asked me anything about my culture, where I am from or anything like that. I am…generally just the foreign, unknown so to speak. That's how it feels. You know, just kind of [an] unknown blub that nobody cares for what it is...

Above, Nora mentions that her U.S.-born colleagues never ask her about her "culture," her "world," or "how she grew up." According to Kanter (1977), the dominant group's "holding back" or lack of interest in the token's indigenous culture is very "natural," as the latter dared to intrude in their world. This culture of silence further separates and reinforces the binary division between "us"—U.S.-born faculty—and "they" (Said 1978)—foreign-born faculty. But these isolating processes have bigger consequences for cultural tokens like Nora who are made to feel like a 'stranger' in their own workplace; she is a "foreign" or an "unknown blub that nobody cares for what it is." And to avoid any emotional distress that could result from this "curtain" (as Nora described) or its potential consequences on immigrant faculty's productivity—especially someone like her who is the only foreign-born faculty in her department—Nora deeply wishes that U.S.-born faculty initiated a discourse with their immigrant colleagues about their cultures or showed some interest in them.

Nevertheless, having a dialogue or showing interest in foreign cultures is not enough to minimize the isolating effects of *cultural tokenism*. This is because appreciating diversity, that is, cultural differences is equally important, or else it can often result in the exoticization or

judgement of the immigrants' ways of living—their food habits, for instance—by holding them up against hegemonic ethnic norms and in the process, endanger their professional integration. For example, Farida mentioned that once she overheard her U.S.-born colleagues calling Indian food "stinky" and so, she never brings her ethnic foods to any departmental potlucks. Instead, she always sticks to salads, breads, and cheese—the likes of the dominant group—in order to make sure that her native colleagues eat what she brings to these social events. Fan also confirms this xenophobia or the fear of the unknown. She said, "I became quite aware in terms of food. Used to be in the parties [where] I used to bring some [ethnic] cakes and stuff and nobody would touch it because they are afraid of it, because they don't know what it is. So, I learned my lesson there and tried to [be] a bit more accommodating." This accommodation extends to the personal level, as well. The fear of being labeled as "smelly" or "stinky" outsiders often prevents immigrant faculty from Asia, Africa, and the Caribbean from bringing ethnic foods even for their own consumption at work. And this clears up with Anet's revelation. "…and don't bring fish for God's sake. Don't bring your fish; don't bring curry. So, I'll never bring curry. I never bring fish. No! I'll bring something like fries or probably rice or chicken, but [not] things that have the Caribbean stink…you know what I mean? I don't bring those," said Anet. She mentioned that by not bringing her Caribbean food to work, she tries to evade her U.S.-born colleagues' questions about "what" her food smells like or their phobic tones as they inquire about it. In fact, she gets fries or chicken—more American and acceptable—so that she can fit in among them.

In contrast, my White (both Caucasian and Hispanic) participants from Europe and North and South America did not express any anxieties about their ethnic foods being perceived as "stinky" or "smelly" by their native colleagues or students. Apart from George who said that his U.S.-born colleagues jokingly call his food "awful," the rest mentioned that whenever they have

gatherings at home or in the department, colleagues enjoy and appreciate the ethnic foods they bring or feed them. For instance, Jorge said, "…I don't feel that whatever I put there, people don't like it, or they don't trust it, or they wouldn't like to try. They ask for it. They say, 'Why don't you bring those things?' And I say, 'Well, why not?'" Hispanic (e.g., Mexican) and European cuisines are a dominant part of the American food culture and very popular among Americans. And it is plausible to believe that since these foods have a Western or colonial touch, they shelter the White participants from being perceived as the exotic anomalies and allow them a certain degree of closeness with their U.S.-born colleagues.

However, the expectations associated with cooking and bringing ethnic foods to social events are very *gendered*. For instance, Emma, an Associate Professor in non-STEM and from Central Europe, mentioned that her native colleagues presume that she already knows how to prepare a particular ethnic beef stew and expect her to bring it to potlucks or parties held inside and outside the department. She said, "As a [Central European], you know, the only thing you hear is 'Oh [X]! You must be good at making [X]. [X] is a beef stew. It is made with [ethnic] spice, paprika, and [my country] is famous for that…[U.S.-born colleagues expect me] you know, to bring it to a party or a potluck or something like that." The fact that unlike men, women are expected to act as "office wives" and carry out the orders of their male co-workers and bosses (Kanter 1977)—also discussed in Chapter 4—and this contrast got underscored during my interview with Saad. He made it very clear that he is the one who controls the party food menus and tells others what to bring. Saad said, "Most of the time, I take kind of charge in these things. And I am the one who is telling, doing things."

Furthermore, different food habits produce interactional barriers and obstruct immigrant faculty's networking opportunities with their native colleagues. For instance, Lakshila, an

Assistant Professor in STEM and from South Asia, said, "Foreign-born, I'm used to them, especially let's say somebody is from India, they're used to seeing people, vegetarian and non-alcoholic. But when it comes to U.S.-born, some are not exposed. Some are, but majority [of the] U.S.-born [are] not. But you have to make an effort. You have to describe yourself like, 'It's not [that] I [don't] enjoy with everybody; it's just that I don't eat this, I don't drink this.' You have to be specifying." Lakshila feels that she often needs to make efforts in order to explain her U.S.-born White male colleagues that she does not eat meat or drink alcohol, as many of them unlike her Indian and other foreign-born colleagues are not "used to seeing people, vegetarian and non-alcoholic." Here, it is crucial to note that Lakshila hails from a relatively conservative South Asian society, where both social and legal norms restrict women from alcohol consumption. And even though her native male colleagues genuinely want to integrate her during formal or informal socialization events, the masculine culture associated with drinking reminds Lakshila of her token status and heightens the boundary between her male colleagues and her (see Kanter 1977). Likewise, Wasim describes how his religious (Islamic) background limits his socialization with native faculty colleagues.

> When you connect in a Western culture, definitely people would like to have drinks. Okay, so, that is a perfect example. I would say people make connections when they have beer and that is a part of their socialization. And if you are coming from [a] culture or a faith group, which resists, I mean, drinking, especially I would say like alcoholic drinking, then definitely it creates a big barrier, where it is basically, I mean, [the] main factor to get connected. So, that means you have to find ways or wait for the moments when it's not the part of the communication or networking, and then, you can just go ahead and try to connect with people. Or, I would say, like people sort of like respect,

> even though they respect or they appear to show their respect towards a different culture or religion, but again, that is the part of their own culture; they don't feel connected when they don't have that sort of particular ambience or environment. So, it is all about the value differences; value differences are connected with cultural differences.

Wasim mentions above that since he is a Muslim, he is not permitted to drink alcohol as per Islamic laws. This restricts his professional socialization in a Western faculty community like the one in the U.S. He feels that professional connections in the U.S. are formed dominantly over beer or other alcoholic beverages. And although his U.S.-born colleagues respect his cultural traditions and religious values, they might find it difficult—if not impossible—to connect and socialize with him beyond work and vice-versa. Moreover, existing research shows that cultural barriers produced by religion and lifestyle differences among many other things often prevent Asians from finding entry to the inner circles of the organization comprised mostly of native White men, and this hinders their upward mobility, professional success, and job satisfaction (see Shih 2006; Gu 2015).

Ethnic clothing is another cultural aspect that reminds immigrants of their token status, and this was pointed out by 3 female faculty from South Asia. For instance, Sunanda explained why she never wears her ethnic clothes to work. She mentioned that when she was hired for the job, she learned that one of her former South Asian colleagues who wore ethnic clothing to work was discussed among her departmental colleagues and staff. And so, Sunanda decided to wear only Western outfits to work. According to her, she always wanted to avoid the exotic gaze of her native colleagues that her "flashy" and "colorful" ethnic clothes could draw and so, decided to "acculturate" in the culture in which she "lives and works in;" she tried to fit in by conforming to the Western professional codes of dressing. And through her acculturation, she was successful

in circumventing any gossip or ethnic boundaries at work. On a similar note, Ting-ting, an Assistant Professor in non-STEM and from East Asia, mentioned that she does not wear her ethnic clothes to work unless there are any cultural events at the university. She said, "We may have the traditional [ethnic] costume like the [X]. I rarely wear them, only when I have to. For example, when we have foreign language day, when we showcase [my ethnic] culture, that's the only day when I wear that kind of clothes and I feel it's good to showcase my [culture]." By donning ethnic costumes during university-sponsored events, such as the annual foreign language day, ethnic minority women like Ting-ting are required to do the emotional labor associated with diversity work and educate their domestic colleagues and students about foreign cultures (also see, Ghosh and Barber 2017).

When immigrants do not wear ethnic clothing to work, they still undergo scrutiny. For example, Farida mentioned that her non-Muslim U.S.-born colleagues are surprised to see how she dresses at work. They take it for granted that since she is a Muslim woman, she must be required to wear the hijab or the burka. And they are surprised when they see her not donning either of them or even when she dresses modestly. Farida also mentioned that she just wishes that she could explain her native colleagues that not all Islamic societies are necessarily conservative or oppressive and require their women to stay behind the purdah (i.e. curtains) or cover themselves up in public. In fact, it is her personal choice in terms of how she dresses.

It is indeed true that Farida's experience is nothing like those Muslims whose employability post 9/11 attacks have been jeopardized for donning religious attire at work (e.g., Pasha-Zaidi, Masson, and Pennington 2014) or those who faced microaggressions for the same, or had questions hurled at them requiring proof of their cultural citizenship in the U.S. (e.g., Kulwicki, Khalifa, and Moore 2008; Malos 2010; Ghumman and Ryan 2013; Laird, Abu-Ras,

and Senzai 2013). But, her colleagues' scrutiny of her clothing style suggests their Western imagination of all Islamic societies as conservative and every Muslim woman as oppressed. Moreover, non-Christian faculty struggle to gain in-group membership in the U.S. academy that is built essentially on Christian traditions and norms (see, for example, Alleman 2012; Pilieci 2016). And even though the university under study does not actually claim to endorse any particular religious tradition, Marc's interaction with a Christian U.S.-born colleague indicates the presence of Islamophobia in his academic work setting. He mentioned that when he first joined his department and was a Muslim convert at that point in time, one of his colleagues was shocked to learn about his practicing faith. Marc said, "And you know, the first question he had for me when we met in the office? '[Marc], which church do you go to?' Not 'What is your field of study?' 'What is your research area?' 'Which church do you go to!' And I looked at him straight in the eyes and told him, 'Well, actually I don't go to a church. I go to a mosque.' And I felt that the guy was going to fall of a heart attack at that point. He was really shocked because he had no idea that they had just hired a freaking Muslim! He had no idea!"

Since my participants come from different parts of the world, their interests in sports have been shaped by the culture in which they were born and raised. And different sport interests limit their interactions with native colleagues. For example, Chang said, "…if they talk about football, those kinds of things, I won't be able to say anything of that. I guess when I talk about that, if I could say something, that will be good. But I just need to keep silent." Although Chang's U.S.-born colleagues might not intend to exclude him during informal socialization, he recognizes his 'outsider' status through his inability to partake in their discussions about American football—a very popular U.S. sport. However, immigrant faculty can achieve an 'insider' status by participating in the dominant group's sports, and this was brought up by

Benjie. He said, "So being a male, usually for me, I find it of course easier to bond with male colleagues…Just the interests, probably. So, for example, there is one colleague of mine [who] is very much into fishing and he invited me once to go fishing. And so, I would go there and just participate and talk to my colleague beyond professional work [and] develop a friendship." Besides fishing, Benjie also goes out for hunting with his male colleagues in the department. However, it is interesting to note that Benjie emphasizes male bonding, that is, he finds it easier to bond with his male colleagues than his female colleagues. And he does so over masculine sports, such as fishing and hunting. In other words, by participating in these rural outdoor sports, Benjie tries to conform to normative masculinity (see Silva 2017) and hence, is successful in gaining in-group membership among his native White male colleagues. But these gendered strategies that are employed in building collegiality or professional networks exclude women from their potential networks, and this was illuminated by Sunanda. She mentioned that being a woman, she is unable to discuss soccer or football with her male colleagues, which they discuss most of the time. This, in turn, excludes her from the inner circles.

Professional boundaries are further heightened via banter and humor and their cultural underpinnings, and this was expressed by 3 faculty in the study—2 females and 1 male. They mentioned that they do not get the cultural references made by their American colleagues when they joke and vice-versa. For instance, Isabella said, "I mean at any gathering, formal or informal and I meet someone from [my country], it's like immediately everything changes. It's like we start talking and joking…it's true [about] the sense of humor. It's just entirely different. No one will get a joke I tell. But, if I'm with someone from my own country, or my culture, other Hispanics too, they will usually get the joke. Now we've talked about this many, many times. I've talked about this with other people too, and they feel the same way. So, I imagine for

Americans it's the same." Although these could be seemingly trivial things, but banter facilitates communication, followed by bonding and shared understanding among co-workers (e.g., Kanter 1977, Ramirez 2011). And as tokens, women are unable to partake in the "dirty" jokes that their male colleagues crack (Kanter 1977). Thus, due to varied gendered cultural understandings, immigrant female faculty like Isabella fail to establish that bond or shared understanding with their U.S.-born and male colleagues at work.

Finally, although this was not brought up by any of my immigrant participants in the study, but one of the U.S.-born administrators mentioned that gestures or non-verbal behaviors that have a foreign cultural undertone, are often met with resistance especially from the domestic students' end. For instance, Judy describes how some U.S.-born students reacted to the gestures of a former immigrant Black male faculty colleague who originated in Africa.

> So, I had a faculty member, it's been a while back. So, not my current faculty, but he had sort of a different way of presenting. In one of his affects, and I don't know if this was a cultural effect or not. And I don't know how to describe this on your tape recorder, but he would take – let me borrow your pen, if this was a pencil, and it was sharpened too – I mean needle sharp, he would go around, and he would do this into a student's face, kind of: "You need to pay attention, and you need to …" and it came across as really threatening to the students, you know? And he was pretty loud and would stomp his feet. But he was doing it as an intention like really trying to keep the students' attention, but it was very disconcerting for many of the students in the room. I don't know if that was his personal thing or if that was a cultural thing. So, I can't speak to that. But that was an issue for a while.

Above, Judy explained me that some years ago there were certain issues with a former

immigrant Black male faculty in her department. The domestic students seemed to be very upset and threatened with his body language and gestures; for instance, he would point pencils in the students' face and very loudly "stomp his feet" on the floor during class lectures. According to Judy, she would give him the benefit of the doubt thinking his interactional styles might have a cultural underpinning and he probably did that to hold or "keep the students' attention" during lectures, without any intentions of scaring them. It is indeed true that finger pointing or pointing in general means different things in different cultures and especially in the American context, it is perceived as rude and exertion of one's authority. Nevertheless, studies have also shown that Black men are presumed to be "angry" and "dangerous" and that affects how they are received at work (e.g., Wingfield 2007, 2009, 2013). And cultural misunderstandings compounded by these racialized gendered stereotypes made Judy's former immigrant Black male colleague unwelcomed among his domestic students.

Summary

In this chapter, I discussed how cultural differences produce heightened boundaries and prevent immigrant faculty from integrating among their U.S.-born colleagues and students; these faculty are 'strangers' in the U.S. academy and are unable to gain in-group membership. My immigrant participants reported that their major challenge emerges during interpersonal communications, as they speak English with ethnic or foreign accents. In other words, they experience "linguistic isolation" (Nawyn et al. 2012) among native colleagues and students for not speaking the "Standard American English" (Lippi-Green 1997). However, this linguistic isolation is gendered, racialized, and specific to ethnic origin. For instance, I showed that both White female faculty and their colleagues of color experience linguistic isolation or discrimination more so than their male counterparts at work. Native colleagues and students

question these female faculty's intelligence and credibility on the basis of how they speak or write in English. I also showed that Northwest European White men who speak the "Queen's English" are automatically perceived as "intellectually superior" by their native colleagues and students and so, easily gain in-group membership. Finally, I showed that linguistic challenges emerging from foreign accents hinder immigrant faculty's employment and leadership opportunities, and their non-American writing styles reduce their chances of obtaining research grants sponsored by the American grant agencies.

Next, I discussed how different food habits exoticize people of color from Asia, Africa or the Caribbean more so than their White counterparts from Europe and North and South America, where the former are perceived as the "smelly" or "stinky" outsiders by their U.S.-born colleagues. I also showed that whereas female faculty are expected to act as "office wives" (Kanter 1977) and cater to their native male colleagues' ethnic food requests during departmental gatherings and potlucks, male faculty control the food menus during these social events. Additionally, I showed how the masculine and Western culture associated with alcohol consumption produce interactional barriers and hamper immigrant female faculty as well as religious and ethnic minority faculty's networking opportunities. Next, I showed how ethnic clothing styles exoticize immigrant female faculty of color from Asia and require them to act as diversity symbols in the university and educate native colleagues and students about foreign cultures. At the same time, ethnic clothing turns immigrant women into native colleagues' subject of scrutiny. However, those who adopt the dominant or Western professional dress codes are successful in evading ethnic barriers or scrutiny at work. After that, I discussed how Islamophobia prevails in the academic work setting and prevents the assimilation of Muslim faculty among their Christian colleagues. Next, I discussed how immigrant male faculty gain

‘insider’ status and build professional networks by participating in dominant masculine sports, something their female counterparts are unable to achieve. Finally, I showed how humor and gestures with cultural underpinnings preclude immigrant faculty’s integration among their U.S.-born colleagues and students.

CHAPTER 6

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this dissertation, I explored how *cultural tokenism* play out among immigrant male and female faculty—both Whites and people of color. Additionally, I explored how the organizational and departmental culture of diversity shapes the faculty's meaning-making experiences about their job satisfaction and/or stress at work. Based on 66 in-depth interviews and 42 hours of ethnography (i.e. field observations) at a large public research university in the rural Midwest, I found that immigrant faculty's tokenization—scrutiny, performance pressures, and isolation—is shaped by their multiple social locations, cultural background, and the organizational and departmental culture of diversity.

The Black women in the study reported that their U.S.-born White and male colleagues and students perceive them as "incompetent," "troublemakers" and "lazy," and this goes along with the literature (e.g., Collins 2000; Wingfield 2007; Richards 2019). They question these women's credibility and show them their 'place' during interpersonal exchanges. And this is a major factor for these ethnic women's unending stress at work. The Black men in the study also mentioned that their U.S.-born White colleagues perceive them as "incompetent" (Wingfield 2009). But they specified that students respect their authority and consider them competent and give credit to their overall expertise in the field. In other words, unlike their female counterparts inside and outside the classroom, these Black men enjoy the privileges bestowed by their gender status.

Furthermore, the Asian faculty reported that overall they feel satisfied at work. One of the major reasons behind their job satisfaction is that their U.S.-born colleagues and students perceive them as "diligent" and "smart." In other words, they navigate the trope of the "model

minority" (Wu 2014; Hsu 2015) in the U.S. academy. But my findings also show that the "model minority" stereotype is a myth (Yook 2013; Chou and Feagin 2015); some of my participants mentioned that their credibility is questioned if they earned their higher education from their home (or a third world) country. Similarly, some of them feel that they hit the glass ceiling when higher administrative positions (i.e. those of college deans or the academic provost) in the university are concerned; U.S.-born and White colleagues do not always vote for these faculty, as they might feel that their Asian colleagues do not possess the required leadership qualities. Moreover, the female faculty described that their U.S.-born White male colleagues expect them to be "quiet," "submissive," "tolerant" or "accommodating" (Shih 2006; Gu 2015) and carry out their orders. And U.S.-born White and male students disrespect these women and challenge their authority and expertise, which they would not necessarily do to most of their male faculty from Asia—with the exception of the faculty from East and Southeast Asia, who feel emasculated while trying to exercise their dominance among students.

In contrast to the experiences of Black and Asian faculty in the study, the White male faculty reported high levels of job satisfaction for being treated very favorably at work; their colleagues and students perceive them as the "ideal workers" (Acker 1990, 2006). This is demonstrated in the clout they exercise or the respect they get from their colleagues and students, as well as the leadership roles they are pushed into during their academic career. Contrastingly, their female counterparts do not always enjoy the same advantages on the job; they are excluded from 'insider' information or any decision-making roles, and this adds to their job-related stress. However, whiteness protects these women's authority from being challenged especially while interacting with students, as well as shields them from being subjected to the controlling images (i.e. negative and oppressive stereotypes) that their counterparts of color navigate at work. Yet, if

these White women have Hispanic roots, their non-Hispanic U.S.-born colleagues perceive them as “lazy” like the “sleeping Mexican.”

Additionally, I found that U.S.-born White and male colleagues and administrators perceive the women and men of color in the study as “diversity experts” (Kanter 1977; Padilla 1994; Tierney and Bensimon 1996; Wingfield 2013) and so, expect them to participate in the university-sponsored multicultural events and serve on numerous university-wide committees—to add “color.” And the women of color particularly often end up doing the “institutional housekeeping” (Bird, Litt, and Wang 2004)—the unrewarded job associated with committee and service work. Plus, both White women and their counterparts of color shoulder a disproportionate amount of teaching and student advising compared to their White and male colleagues. Nevertheless, the immigrant faculty in general provide a safe space for minority students on campus and act as cultural brokers by bringing in cross-cultural perspectives on the table. This aids in the development of diverse perspectives in their U.S.-born students and colleagues. Finally, White women and women of color are perceived as “mothers”—expected to nurture and understand students’ problems—and “seductresses”—sexually promiscuous—at work (Kanter 1977), the latter mainly by male colleagues and students. This threatens the female faculty’s professional legitimacy and upward mobility.

Next, I found that, due to different cultural upbringing or orientations, immigrant faculty are automatically relegated to the “outsider-within” status (Collins 1986), as their U.S.-born colleagues and students perceive them as exotic anomalies. In other words, cultural contrasts accorded by language (e.g., ethnic accents and the assumed lack of proficiency in English), food habits, religion, clothing styles, interests in sports, humor, and gestures heighten boundaries and stymie immigrant faculty’s assimilation, including their formal and informal interactions—

networking opportunities and social hangouts—with their U.S.-born colleagues and students. However, the degree to which immigrant faculty's strangeness or assimilation at work is affected, depends on their gender, race, and ethnic origin. For instance, White women and their counterparts of color experience "linguistic isolation" (Nawyn et al. 2012) more so than their male colleagues, irrespective of the latter's race or ethnic origin. U.S.-born colleagues and students use the former's foreign accent as an alibi to question their credibility and expertise and in turn, make them very conscious and stressed during interpersonal communications. In contrast, the same colleagues and students excuse the linguistic slipups committed by White men especially from Northwest Europe. They perceive these men to be "intellectually superior" for speaking the "Queen's English" or "the BBC English." My findings also show that linguistic challenges prevent immigrant faculty's hiring and promotion to administrative positions, as well as impact their chances of obtaining research grants sponsored by federal and state agencies. It was also very interesting to note that when immigrant faculty of color approximate the hegemonic linguistic norms and speak with an American accent or fluent English, U.S.-born colleagues and students still scrutinize and hold them up against the dominant cultural standards. Overall, I found that language is the primary obstacle to immigrant faculty's integration in the U.S. academy.

Additionally, I found that unlike the White (both Caucasian and Hispanic) faculty from North and South America or Europe, the food habits of the faculty of color from Asia, Africa, and the Caribbean mark them as "smelly" or "stinky" outsiders especially among their U.S.-born colleagues. Nevertheless, the expectations associated with cooking and serving ethnic foods to U.S.-born colleagues are often shouldered by immigrant female faculty, who are the "office wives" (Kanter 1977) to their native male colleagues. Also, ethnic clothing styles, religion, and

varied interests in sports, sense of humor or gestures impact how immigrant faculty—compounded by their gender and/or racial status—navigate the cultural boundaries and establish professional connections and legitimacy among their U.S.-born White and male colleagues and students. Finally, I found that Islamophobia persists in the U.S. academy and this makes Muslim faculty feel very unwelcomed.

Lastly, I found that the organizational and departmental culture of diversity is crucial to understanding the experiences of immigrant faculty; it provides a contextual understanding of the faculty's experiences that varies across departments. For instance, immigrant Black faculty—both men and women—are subjected to scrutiny and isolation in departments that are dominated by U.S.-born and White faculty and students. But that is not always the case for the faculty from Asia, especially in the STEM program that is dominated largely by Asian (including the Middle Eastern) and U.S.-born White men. Nonetheless, the experiences of Asian female faculty in STEM shows that they are an anomaly given the existing image of the program's model instructor—native White men and foreign-born men of color—and its male- and White-dominated student body. Similarly, not all immigrant White men are privileged at work, especially in departments that are dominated by U.S.-born White male faculty; they are excluded from leadership opportunities or treated unfavorably by native colleagues. Lastly, the White women in the study experience scrutiny, performance pressures, and isolation in departments that are dominated largely by male and U.S.-born faculty. And these are often heightened when these ethnic women have Latin/Hispanic roots.

Based on my overall findings, I conclude that immigrant faculty are cultural tokens in the U.S. academy (Ghosh and Barber 2017), where they are held up against local hegemonic gendered and ethnic norms and racial stereotypes. In other words, male, White, and dominant

cultural (here, American) norms are used to negatively stereotype women and racial and ethnic minorities in their work settings. As a result, they are subjected to performance pressures and professional marginalization. And this becomes poignant especially in juxtaposition to the positive stereotypes that immigrant male and White faculty navigate or the favorable (cordial) treatment they receive at work. Likewise, cultural contrasts accentuated by local standards further heighten boundaries and preclude immigrant faculty's assimilation and networking opportunities among their U.S.-born colleagues and students. Furthermore, an intersectional analysis shows that not every immigrant faculty experiences tokenism in the same way, that is, some are "partial tokens" (Wingfield 2013) in comparison to others. In other words, the immigrant faculty's social locations (gender, race, ethnic origin, and foreign-born status) and cultural background, as well as their departmental and organizational culture of diversity—associated with hiring, tenure/promotion, leadership roles, work distribution, and the demographic makeup of its faculty and student body—determine the privileges they enjoy and/or the penalties they pay—at both interactional and institutional levels—as they navigate a foreign academic work setting.

Strengths and Limitations of the Current Study

This dissertation makes significant contributions to the scholarship of social inequalities, work, occupations and organizations, and immigration and culture. First, I show how gender, race, ethnic origin, cultural background, and foreign-born status intersect to determine the privileges that immigrant faculty enjoy and/or the penalties they pay in the U.S. higher education—an understudied group. Next, I contextualize immigrant faculty's experiences within their departmental and organizational culture of diversity—scantily explored. My study findings thus highlight the overall social and professional standing of a group of skilled and qualified

immigrant workers in a foreign country. Moreover, my study findings contribute to the understanding of how immigrants in high-status occupations—beyond science and engineering—navigate structural inequalities at the interpersonal and organizational level.

Second, by including a numerical rarity like immigrants, I extend the tokenism theory that has previously studied only the experiences of women and racial minorities in male- and White-dominated settings. Most importantly, I use an intersectional lens to understand how tokenism works differently for immigrant male and female professionals (faculty) of color and their White counterparts. Thus, I show that not every immigrant experiences tokenism—scrutiny, performance pressures, and isolation—in the same way; it is largely dependent on their multiple social locations, cultural background, and their departmental and organizational culture of diversity. Essentially, I provide a new theoretical framework to reconsider how tokenism operates through the concept of *cultural tokenism*.

Finally, my dissertation highlights the challenges that a highly skilled group of immigrants are facing after the 2016 election in America and the dangers it poses for the future. Precisely, I show how anti-immigrant sentiments and rhetoric—rooted in meritocracy and race- and ethnicity-based perceptions—determine the job satisfaction and/or stress of immigrant professionals in the U.S. Therefore, I show how certain existing racial and ethnic stereotypes—for example, Blacks and Hispanics as "incompetent," "dangerous" or "lazy," or Whites and Asians as "competent" or "intellectually superior," or Muslims as "terrorists" (Leonhardt and Philbrick 2018)—that the Trump administration has reinforced both prior to and after the 2016 election are similarly used in the workplace to gauge the meritocracy and legitimacy of immigrant professionals in the U.S. Specifically, I show how such perceptions are produced and reinforced in the university setting, a place that is believed to be a haven for social consciousness

and ethical conduct. And these controlling images that operate at both interactional and institutional levels determine the overall job satisfaction and/or stress of immigrant faculty. Furthermore, my study findings imply that if structural inequalities continue to prevail, immigrant professionals like the ones in my study would be pressured to constantly prove their worth not just in the workplace but also in the country more generally. And this would affect their productivity, career growth, and even their mental health, especially if they are women and people of color or come from the so-called “shithole” countries as termed by Donald Trump (Dawsey 2018; Kendi 2019).

There are two major limitations of my dissertation. First, my immigrant sample is skewed across gender and race. For instance, it has more male than female participants, and the number of Asians supersede participants from other racial backgrounds. Plus, there are only 2 participants with Hispanic and 3 with Middle Eastern roots. This makes my study findings not generalizable across a wide range of immigrant faculty. Second, since my entry to the faculty meetings was restricted, I was unable to collect sufficient and quality data on faculty-faculty interactions.

Directions for Future Research

Future research on higher education should particularly consider digging deeper into the experiences of Middle Eastern and Hispanic male and female faculty. Scholars should also attempt to observe faculty meetings in order to capture better the nuances in verbal and non-verbal interactions among faculty. Additionally, they should consider doing a content analysis of teaching and course evaluations to get closer insights into students’ perceptions and assessments of foreign-born faculty. They should also do a comparative analysis of the experiences of foreign-born faculty and their U.S.-born colleagues. Moreover, future research should consider

conducting surveys besides doing in-depth interviews with immigrant faculty; it is a strategy to include more participants and get additional (and quantifiable) data on their work experiences. Scholars should also undertake quantitative projects that can actually test the correlations between social identities and foreign-born status and the various aspects of *cultural tokenism*, as discussed in this dissertation.

Furthermore, future studies should consider the following questions: How does *cultural tokenism* operate in occupations and organizations beyond faculty jobs in colleges and universities? How does *cultural tokenism* operate in women's colleges, historically Black colleges and universities or in Hispanic serving institutions, or in institutions with a significant number of first-generation and undocumented students? What are the experiences of immigrant faculty in institutions located in urban and racially and ethnically diverse settings? How does age, rank, or sexuality impact immigrant faculty's work experiences? How do the experiences of first-generation immigrant faculty in the U.S. differ from those of the second-generation (i.e. those born and/or raised in the country)? How do immigrant faculty in countries other than the U.S. navigate the academic workplace? How do immigrant faculty cope with xenophobia or other stressors at work? What steps do colleges and universities take to incorporate and support their foreign-born faculty?

Recommendations for Diversity and Inclusion in Higher Education

Scholars studying diversity in the U.S. higher education system have suggested ways to make it more inclusive (see, for example, Stewart and Valian 2018)—a mission for most colleges and universities across the country. Similarly, keeping my study findings in mind, I will also recommend certain measures to increase and support diversity and inclusion in higher education more generally. First, colleges and universities should provide diversity training to their entire

faculty and student body. This, in turn, will create and foster a safe environment for people coming from minority backgrounds, including foreign-born. For instance, as a part of diversity training, colleges and universities should make the Hidden Bias Tests or the Implicit Association Tests—developed by psychologists at Harvard University and the Universities of Virginia and Washington—mandatory for their faculty and students; this will uncover any hidden biases against women, racial and ethnic minorities, and other disadvantaged groups, yet maintaining the anonymity of their test takers. Based on the test responses and more generally, institutions should give training to their faculty and students about the prevalent types of biased attitudes and stereotypes. Also, besides university-sponsored multicultural events, institutions should hold workshops that discuss world cultures and, in the process, develop awareness and tolerance for their racial and ethnic minority affiliates, including language minorities. They should also organize colloquiums for faculty and students to have an open dialogue about their lived experiences. Last but not least, the school curricula should make community-based learning models compulsory, that is, courses and assignments involving field based experiential learning of diverse racial and ethnic groups and their ways of life. They should also be designed in ways in which students can come up with solutions to fight community specific problems. By doing this, they would aid in the development of students' awareness and sensitivity towards diverse groups. Additionally, diversity training would also equip male and White faculty with better comprehension of diverse student issues—and lighten female and racial and ethnic minority faculty's burden of student shepherding—in addition to acceptance of faculty colleagues who do not look like them.

Second, administrators should take serious steps towards equitable distribution of service and committee work among all faculty members and simply not push women and racial and

ethnic minority faculty into roles that require them to act as diversity symbols for their institution. This will allow them to focus more on research and publication, necessary for tenure and promotion. Additionally, administrators should recognize and value the labor associated with committee and service work and count it towards faculty tenure and promotion. Lastly, equitable distribution of work should also include teaching, where the teaching load should be distributed equally among all faculty. Plus, the opinions of female and racial and ethnic minority faculty should be solicited regarding the courses they can and are willing to teach; they should not be pressured to act consensually and conduct a disproportionate amount of teaching.

Third, institutions should actively hire more women and racial and ethnic minorities in faculty positions across all departments. For that, besides posting faculty job ads containing a diversity statement or "cues of belonging," or diversifying the hiring committee in itself or coaching its members about diversity, or the steps they should take to identify a diverse pool of faculty candidates (e.g., build networks at professional conferences and prepare a list of "people to watch out for") and interview and evaluate them equitably (Stewart and Valian 2018), institutions of higher education need to make additional efforts to broaden their search outcomes. For instance, Michael, a U.S.-born administrator in my study, suggested that every department and its college of affiliation should sincerely consider developing a "diversity plan." He said, "We want every department to have a diversity plan. We want to have a benchmark so that we can go from there." He emphasized that without a diversity plan, it is difficult to ascertain where the diversity is actually lacking and hire faculty accordingly. He also mentioned that due to a dearth of women and racial minorities (e.g., Blacks, Hispanics, or Native Americans) in the STEM faculty body, female and racial and ethnic minority students drop out—and a leaky pipeline is produced—as they do not find faculty who look like them or could be their role

models and mentors. What Michael implies is that a vicious circle is produced; a lack of diverse faculty results in the absence of diverse students, and if women and racial and ethnic minority students continue to drop out, the diverse faculty pool will further narrow down. Similarly, Veronica, a U.S.-born administrative personnel, mentioned that Humanities and Liberal Arts particularly do not make any extra efforts in seeking and/or recruiting a diverse group of faculty across most of its departments, despite the fact there actually exists a considerable amount of racial and ethnic (including foreign-born) graduates in these disciplines. She also pointed out that the STEM program is an exception in this regard, where they actually try to reach out to a diverse faculty applicant pool. She highlighted that the College of Engineering, for example, publishes their job ads in "Blacks in Engineering" (i.e. the National Society of Black Engineers) a professional organization for Black engineers. Likewise, Saad admitted trying to increase diversity among faculty by posting job ads among women, African American, and Hispanic scientist groups besides the regular domains. So, unless these types of steps are taken or funds are allocated for posting job ads in multiple locations, the university under study or any other institution of higher education will fail to achieve its overall mission related to diversity and inclusion. Last but not least, more female and racial and ethnic minority faculty should be recruited in administrative positions based on their merit and potential and without holding any internal biases against them. Thus, institutions should provide assertiveness training to their female and racial and ethnic minority faculty so that they are able to convey self-confidence while exercising authority in leadership roles as well as during interpersonal communications at work.

Summary

In this chapter, I highlighted the key findings from my study, where I discussed the

implications of gender, race, ethnic origin, cultural background and foreign-born status, and how they intersect to determine immigrant faculty's advantages and/or disadvantages on the job. Also, I discussed that it is important to consider the organizational and departmental culture of diversity, as it helps us to contextualize immigrant faculty's work experiences and understand that not every immigrant experiences the workplace in the same way. Next, I discussed the strengths and limitations of my study, followed by suggesting directions for future research. In the last section, I made recommendations for diversity and inclusion in higher education.

REFERENCES

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

______. 2006. "Inequality Regimes: Gender, Class, and Race in Organizations." *Gender & Society* 20(4):441-464.

______. 2012. "Gendered Organizations and Intersectionality: Problems and Possibilities." *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal* 31(3):214-224.

Acker, Sandra and Grace Feuerverger. 1996. "Doing Good and Feeling Bad: The Work of Women University Teachers." *Cambridge Journal of Education* 26(3):401-422.

Aguirre, Adalberto Jr. 2000a. *Women and Minority Faculty in the Academic Workplace: Recruitment, Retention, and Academic Culture*. San Francisco, LA: Jossey-Bass.

______. 2000b. "Academic Story Telling: A Critical Race Theory Story of Affirmative Action." *Sociological Perspectives* 43(2):319-339.

Akomolafe, Soji. 2013. "The Invisible Minority: Revisiting the Debate on Foreign-Accented Speakers and Upward Mobility in the Workplace." *Journal of Cultural Diversity* 20(1):7-14.

Algeria, Sharla. 2014. "Constructing Racial Difference Through Group Talk: An Analysis of White Focus' Groups Discussion of Racial Profiling." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 37(2):241-260.

______. 2019. "Escalator or Step Stool? Gendered Labor and Token Processes in Tech Work." *Gender & Society* 33(5):722-745.

Alleman, Nathan F. 2012. "Insider-Outsiders: Integration and Exclusion Experiences of Religious Nonadherent Faculty Members." *Christian Higher Education* 11(4):228-240.

Alsultany, Evelyn. 2008. "The Prime-Time Plight of the Arab Muslim American after 9/11." Pp. 204-228 in *Race and Arab Americans Before and After 9/11: From Invisible Citizens to Visible Subjects*, edited by A. Jamal and N. Naber. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Anthony, Amanda K. and William F. Danaher. 2016. "Rules of the Road: Doing Fieldwork and Negotiating Interactions with Hesitant Public Figures." *Qualitative Research* 16(4):392-410.

Arendell, Terry. 1997. "Reflections of the Researcher-Researched Relationship: A Woman Interviewing Men." *Qualitative Sociology* 20(3):341-368.

Asani, Ali S. 2003. "'So That You May Know One Another': A Muslim American Reflects on Pluralism and Islam." *The Annals of the American Academy* 588:40-51.

Baird, Julia. 2016. "How to Explain Mansplaining." *The New York Times*, April 20. Retrieved January 2, 2017 (http://www.nytimes.com/2016/04/21/opinion/how-to-explain-mansplaining.html?emc=eta1&_r=1).

Banerjee, Payal. 2006. "Indian Information Technology Workers in the United States: The H-1B Visa, Flexible Production, and the Racialization of Labor." *Critical Sociology* 32(2-3):425-445.

Bang, Hyeyoung. 2016. "Challenges and Self-Efficacy of Female East Asian-Born Faculty in American Universities." Pp. 88-99 in *Experiences of Immigrant Professors: Cross-Cultural Differences, Challenges, and Lessons for Success*, edited by C. B. Hutchison. New York: Routledge.

Barber, Kristen. 2016 "'Men Wanted': Heterosexual Aesthetic Labor in the Masculinization of the Hair Salon." *Gender & Society* 30(4):618-642.

Basu, Moni. 2016. “15 Years After 9/11, Sikhs Still Victims of Anti-Muslim Hate Crimes.” *CNN*, September, 15. Retrieved March 12, 2019 (https://www.cnn.com/2016/09/15/us/sikh-hate-crime-victims/index.html)

Belur, Jyoti. 2014. “Status, Gender and Geography: Power Negotiations in Police Research.” *Qualitative Research* 14(2):184-200.

Bergman, Mindy E., Kristen M. Watrous-Rodriguez, and Katherine M. Chalkley. 2008. “Identity and Language: Contributions to and Consequences of Speaking Spanish in the Workplace.” *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 30(1):40-68.

Beutel, Ann M. and Donna J. Nelson. 2006. “The Gender and Race-Ethnicity of Faculty in Top Social Science Research Departments.” *The Social Science Journal* 43(1):111-125.

Bird, Sharon R. 2011. “Unsettling Universities’ Incongruous Gendered Bureaucratic Structures: A Case-study Approach.” *Gender, Work and Organization* 18(2):202-230.

Bird, Sharon R., Jacqueline Litt, and Yong Wang. 2004. “Creating a Status of Women Report: Institutional Housekeeping as Women’s Work.” *National Women’s Studies Association Journal* 16(1):194-206.

Blaker, Nancy M., Irene Rompa, Inge H. Dessing, Anne F. Vriend, Channah Herschberg, and Mark van Vugt. 2013. “The Height Leadership Advantage in Men and Women: Testing Evolutionary Psychology Predictions About the Perceptions of Tall Leaders.” *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations* 16(1):17-27.

Bleakley, Hoyt and Aimee Chin. 2004. “Language Skills and Earnings: Evidence from Childhood Immigrants.” *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 86(2):481-496.

Boring, Anne, Kellie Ottoboni, and Philip B. Stark. 2016. “Student Evaluations of Teaching (Mostly) do not Measure Teaching Effectiveness.” *Science Open Research*.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1991. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Translated by G. Raymond and M. Adamson, edited by J. B. Thompson. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bowleg, Lisa. 2008. "When Black + Lesbian + Woman # Black Lesbian Woman: The Methodological Challenges of Qualitative and Quantitative Intersectional Research." *Sex Roles* 59:312-325.

Bradley, Carla and Cheryl Holcomb-McCoy. 2004. "African American Counselor Educators: Their Experiences, Challenges, and Recommendations." *Counselor Education and Supervision* 43(4):258-273.

Brierton, Thomas D. 1988. "Religious Discrimination in the Workplace: Who's Accommodating Who?" *Labor Law Journal* 39(5):299-306.

Britton, Dana M. 2000. "The Epistemology of the Gendered Organization." *Gender & Society* 14(3):418-434.

______. 2017. "Beyond the Chilly Climate: The Salience of Gender in Women's Academic Careers." *Gender & Society* 31(1):5-27.

Bronstein, Phyllis and Lori Farnsworth. 1998. "Gender Differences in Faculty Experiences of Interpersonal Climate and Process of Advancement." *Research in Higher Education* 39(5):557-585.

Brumley, Krista A. 2014. "The Gendered Ideal Worker Narrative: Professional Women's and Men's Work Experiences in the New Economy at a Mexican Company." *Gender & Society* 28(6):799-823.

Budig, Michelle J. 2002. "Male Advantage and the Gender Composition of Jobs: Who Rides the Glass Escalator?" *Social Problems* 49(2):258-277.

Bun, Ku Hok. 2006. "Body, Dress, and Cultural Exclusion: Experiences of Pakistani Women in

‘Global’ Hong Kong.” *Asian Ethnicity* 7(3):285-302.

Burnham, Peter, Karin G. Lutz, Wyn Grant, and Zig Layton-Henry. 2004. *Research Methods in Politics*. Basingstoke, U.K.: Palgrave Macmillan.

Burns-Glover, Alyson L. and Dale J. Veith. 1995. “Revisiting Gender and Teaching Evaluations: Sex Still Makes a Difference.” *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality* 10(4):69-80.

Butler, Judith. 1990. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.

Bygnes, Sussane. 2008. “Interviewing People-Oriented Elites.” *Eurosphere Online Working Paper Series*. Bergen: University of Bergen.

Calderón, Daniela X. V. 2014. “Socialization of International Faculty.” PhD dissertation, Department of Education, University of Maine.

Carter, John. 2004. “Research Note: Reflections on Interviewing Across the Ethnic Divide.” *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 7(4):345-353.

Charmaz, Kathy. 2004. “Grounded Theory.” Pp. 496-521 in *Approaches to Qualitative Research: A Reader on Theory and Practice*, edited by S. N. Hesse-Biber and M. L. Yaiser. New York: Oxford University Press.

Chen, Anthony S. 1999. “Lives at the Center of the Periphery, Lives at the Periphery of the Center: Chinese American Masculinities and Bargaining with Hegemony.” *Gender & Society* 13(5):584-607.

Chiswick, Barry R. and Paul W. Miller. 1995. “The Endogeneity between Language and Earnings: International Analyses.” *Journal of Labor Economics* 13(2):246-288.

______. 2002. “Immigrant Earnings, Linguistic Concentrations, and the Business Cycle.” *Journal of Population Economics* 15:31-57.

Chou, Rosalind S. and Joe R. Feagin. 2015. *The Myth of the Model Minority: Asian Americans Facing Racism*. 2nd ed. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Christians, Clifford G. 2011. "Ethics and Politics in Qualitative Research." Pp. 61-80 in *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research*, edited by N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln. Los Angles and Washington DC: Sage publications.

Chua, Peter and Fujino Diane. 1999. "Negotiating New Asian American Masculinities: Attitudes and Gender Expectations." *The Journal of Men's Studies* 7(3):391-413.

Chused. Richard H. 1988. "The Hiring and Retention of Minorities and Women on American Law School Faculties." *University of Pennsylvania Law Review* 137(2):537-569.

Cognard-Black, Andrew J. 2004. "Will They Stay, or Will They Go? Sex-Atypical Work Among Token Men Who Teach." *The Sociological Quarterly* 45(1):113-139.

Collins, Patricia H. 1986. "Learning from the Outsider Within: The Sociological Significance of Black Feminist Thought." *Social Problems* 33(6):S14-S32.

______. 1993. "Toward a New Vision: Race, Class and Gender as Categories of Analysis and Connection." *Race, Sex & Class*:25-45.

______. 2000. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge.

______. 2004. *Black Sexual Politics: African Americans, Gender, and the New Racism*. New York: Routledge.

Connell, Catherine. 2012. "Dangerous Disclosures." *Sexuality Research and Social Policy* 9(2):168-177.

Connell, R. W. 1987. *Gender and Power: Society, the Person and Sexual Politics*. Cambridge, U.K.: Polity Press.

______. 1995. *Masculinities*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

______. 2002. *Gender*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Cooper, Marianne. 2013. "For Women Leaders Likability and Success Hardly Go Hand-in-hand." *Harvard Business Review*, April 30. Retrieved December 21, 2019 (https://hbr.org/2013/04/for-women-leaders-likability-a)

Corley, Elizabeth A. and Meghna Sabharwal. 2007. "Foreign-born Academic Scientists and Engineers: Producing More and Getting Less than their US-born Peers?" *Research in Higher Education* 48(8):909-940.

Corrigan, Melanie E. 2002. *The American College President*. Washington DC: The American Council on Education Center for Policy Analysis.

Crenshaw, Kimberlé. 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* 139-167.

______. 1991. "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color." *Stanford Law Review* 43(6):1241-1299.

Creswell, John W. 2014. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Los Angeles and Washington DC: Sage Publications.

Cromwell, Jeff B. 1997. "Cultural Discrimination: The Reasonable Accommodation of Religion in the Workplace." *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal* 10(2):155-172.

Dawsey, Josh. 2018. "Trump Derides Protections for Immigrants from 'Shithole' Countries." *The Washington Post*, January 12. Retrieved March 15, 2020 (https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/trump-attacks-protections-for-immigrants-from-shithole-countries-in-oval-office-meeting/2018/01/11/bfc0725c-f711-11e7-91af-

31ac729add94_story.html)

De Luca, Susan M. and Ernesto R. Escoto. 2012. "The Recruitment and Support of Latino Faculty for Tenure and Promotion." *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education* 11(1):29-40.

Dellinger, Kirsten and Christine L. Williams. 2002. "The Locker Room and the Dorm Room: Workplace Norms and the Boundaries of Sexual Harassment in Magazine Editing." *Social Problems* 49(2):242-257.

Department for Professional Employees, AFL-CIO (DPEAFLCIO). 2018. "Library Workers: Facts and Figures." Retrieved March 3, 2019 (https://dpeaflcio.org/wp-content/uploads/Library-Workers-Facts-Figures-2018-Format-Update.pdf)

Dilley, Patrick. 2000. "Conducting Successful Interviews: Tips for Intrepid Research." *Theory into Practice* 39(3):131-137.

DiTomaso, Nancy, Corinne Post, and Rochelle Parks-Yancy. 2007. "Workforce Diversity and Inequality: Power, Status, and Numbers." *Annual Review of Sociology* 33:473-501.

Edwards, Nadine P. 2004. "Why Can't Women Just Say No? And Does It Really Matter?" Pp. 1-30 in *Informed Choice in Maternity Care*, edited by M. Kirkham. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Egharevba, Itohan. 2001. "Researching an-'Other' Minority Ethnic Community: Reflections of a Black Female Researcher on the Intersections of Race, Gender, and Other Power Positions on the Research Process." *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 4(3):225-241.

Emerson, Robert M., Rachel I. Fretz, and Linda L. Shaw. 2011. *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Enguix, Begonya. 2014. "Negotiating the Field: Rethinking Ethnographic Authority, Experience,

and Frontiers of Research." *Qualitative Research* 14(1):79-94.

Eveline, Joan. 2004. *Ivory Basement Leadership: Power and Invisibility in the Changing University*. Perth: University of Western Australia Press.

Ferguson, Ann A. 2001. *Bad Boys: Public Schools in the Making of Black Masculinity.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Fernandez, Marilyn. 1998. "Asian Indian Americans in the Bay Area and the Glass Ceiling." *Sociological Perspectives* 41(1):119-149.

Fine, Gary A. 1996. "Justifying Work: Occupational Rhetorics as Resources in Restaurant Kitchens." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 41(1):90-115.

Fishman, Pamela M. 1978. "Interaction: The Work Women Do." *Social Problems* 25(4):397-406.

Floge, Liliane and Deborah M. Merrill. 1986. "Tokenism Reconsidered: Male Nurses and Female Physicians in a Hospital Setting." *Social Forces* 64(4):925-947.

Flores, Glenda. 2011. "Racialized Tokens: Latina Teachers Negotiating, Surviving and Thriving in a White Woman's Profession." *Qualitative Sociology* 34(2):313-335.

Fonow, Mary M. and Judith A. Cook. 2005. "Feminist Methodology: New Applications in the Academy and Public Policy." *Signs* 30(4):2211-2236.

Ford, Kristie A. 2011. "Race, Gender, and Bodily (Mis)Recognitions: Women of Color Faculty Experiences with White Students in the College Classroom." *The Journal of Higher Education* 82(4):444-478.

Fox, Mary F. 2001. "Women, Science, and Academia: Graduate Education and Careers." *Gender & Society* 15(5):654-666.

Fukuda, Chie. 2006. "Resistance Against Being Formulated as Cultural Other: The Case of a

Chinese Student in Japan." *International Pragmatics Association* 16(4):429-456.

García-López, Gladys. 2008. "'NUNCA TE TOMAN EN CUENTA [THEY NEVER TAKE YOU INTO ACCOUNT]': The Challenges of Inclusion and Strategies for Success of Chicana Attorneys." *Gender & Society* 22(5):590-612.

Gawley, Tim, Thomas Perks, and James Curtis. 2009. "Height, Gender, and Authority Status at Work: Analyses for a National Sample of Canadian Workers." *Sex Roles* 60:208-222.

Geisler, Cheryl, Debbie Kaminski, and Robyn A. Berkley. 2007. "The 13+ Club: An Index for Understanding, Documenting, and Resisting Patterns of Non-promotion to Full Professor." *NWSA Journal* 19(3):145-162.

Ghosh, Debaleena. 2013. "Immigrant Female Professors as Gendered 'Cultural Tokens' in University." MA research paper, Department of Sociology, Southern Illinois University Carbondale.

Ghosh, Debaleena and Kristen Barber. 2017. "Cultural Tokenism: Effects of Gender, Race, and Ethnicity for Immigrant Women at Work." Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of American Sociological Association, Montreal, Canada.

Ghumman, Sonia and Ann M. Ryan. 2013. "Not Welcome Here: Discrimination Towards Women Who Wear the Muslim Headscarf." *Human Relations* 66(5):671-698.

Goffman, Erving. 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Doubleday.

Graham, Hilary. 1984. "Surveying Through Stories." Pp. 104-124 in *Social Researching: Politics, Problems, Practice*, edited by C. Bell and H. Roberts. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Greenhouse, Steven. 2010. "Muslims Report Rising Discrimination at Work." The *New York Times*, September 23. Retrieved March 11, 2019

(https://www.nytimes.com/2010/09/24/business/24muslim.html)

Gu, Chien-Juh. 2015. "Racial Glass Ceilings, Gendered Responses: Taiwanese American Professionals' Experiences of Otherness." *Sociological Focus* 48(2):126-149.

Guo, Yan. 2006. "Between the Worlds: Searching for a Competent Voice." Pp. 211-232 in *"Strangers" of the Academy: Asian Scholars in Higher Education*, edited by G. Li and G. H. Beckett. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Hammersley, Martyn and Paul Atkinson. 2007. *Ethnography: Principles in Practice*. 3rd ed. New York: Routledge.

Haraway, Donna. 1988. "Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective." *Feminist Studies* 14(3):575-599.

Harley, Debra A. 2008. "Maids of Academe: African American Women Faculty in Predominantly White Institutions." *Journal of African American Studies* 12(1):19-36.

Harris, Deborah A. and Patti Giuffre. 2015. *Taking the Heat: Women Chefs and Gender Inequality in the Professional Kitchen*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Hart, Jeni and Amy Scott Metcalfe. 2010 "Whose Web of Knowledge™ is it Anyway?: Citing Feminist Research in the Field of Higher Education." *The Journal of Higher Education* 81(2):140-163.

Hart, Jeni. 2011. "Non-Tenure Track Women Faculty: Opening the Door." *The Journal of the Professoriate* 4(1):96-124.

______. 2016. "Dissecting a Gendered Organization: Implications for Career Trajectories for Mid-Career Faculty Women in STEM." *The Journal of Higher Education* 87(5):605-634.

Heikes, Joel E. 1991. "When Men are the Minority: The Case of Men in Nursing." *The Sociological Quarterly* 32(3):389-401.

Heilman, Madeline E., Aaron S. Wallen, Daniella Fuchs, and Melinda M. Tamkins. 2004. "Penalties for Success: Reactions to Women Who Succeed at Male Gender-Typed Tasks." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 89(3):416-427.

Heilman, Madeline E. and Suzette Caleo. 2018. "Gender Discrimination in the Workplace." Pp. 73-88 in *The Oxford Handbook of Workplace Discrimination*, edited by A. J. Colella and E. B. King. New York: Oxford University Press.

Heilman, Madeline E. and Tyler G. Okimoto. 2007. "Why are Women Penalized for Success at Male Tasks?: The Implied Communality Deficit." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 92(1):81-92.

Hein, Hilde. 1981. "Women and Science: Fitting Men to Think About Nature." *International Journal of Women's Studies* 4:369-377.

Hendrix, Katherine G. 2007. "'She Must Be Trippin'": The Secret of Disrespect from Students of Color Toward Faculty of Color." Pp. 85-96 in in *Neither White Nor Male: Female Faculty of Color*, edited by K. G. Hendrix. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Hernandez, Thomas J. and Nestor E. Morales. 1999. "Career, Culture, and Compromise: Career Development Experiences of Latinas Working in Higher Education." *The Career Development Quarterly* 48(1):45-58.

Hirshfield, Laura E. and Tiffany D. Joseph. 2012. "'We Need a Woman, We Need a Black Woman': Gender, Race, and Identity Taxation in the Academy." *Gender and Education* 24(2):213-227.

Hochschild, Arlie R. 1979. "Emotion Work, Feeling Rules, and Social Structure." *American Journal of Sociology* 85(13):551-575.

______. 1983. *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling*. Berkeley and Los

Angeles: University of California Press.

Hondagneu-Sotelo, Pierrette. 2001. *Domestica: Immigrant Workers Cleaning and Caring in the Shadows of Affluence*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

hooks, bell. 1981. *Ain't I A Woman: Black Women and Feminism*. Boston, MA: South End Press.

Hsu, Madeline Y. 2015. *The Good Immigrants: How the Yellow Peril Became the Model Minority*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Hultin, Mia. 2003. "Some Take the Glass Escalator, Some Hit the Glass Ceiling? Career Consequences of Occupational Sex Segregation." *Work and Occupations* 26(4):483-509.

Hutchison, Charles B., Malcolm B. Butler, and Sherell M. Fuller. 2005. "Pedagogical Communication Issues Arising During International Migrations to Teach Science in America." *Electronic Journal of Science Education* 9(3).

Institute of International Education. 2017. "Major Field of Specialization of International Scholars, 1999/00-2016/17, Selected Years." Open Doors Report on International Educational Exchange. Retrieved February 28, 2019 (https://www.iie.org/Research-and-Insights/Open-Doors/Data/International-Scholars/Major-Field-of-Specialization)

______. 2018. "International Student Totals by Place of Origin, 2012/13-2017/18." Open Doors Report on International Educational Exchange. Retrieved February 28, 2019 (https://www.iie.org/research-and-insights/open-doors/data/international-students/places-of-origin)

Jackson, Jerlando F.L. and Elizabeth M. O'Callaghan. 2009. "What Do We Know about Glass Ceiling Effects?: A Taxonomy and Critical Review to Inform Higher Education Research." *Research in Higher Education* 50(5):460-482.

Johnson-Bailey, Juanita and Ming-Yeh Lee. 2005. "Women of Color in the Academy: Where's

Our Authority in the Classroom?" *Feminist Teacher* 15(2):111-122.

Joseph, Suad, Benjamin D'Harlingue, and Alvin K. H. Wong. 2008. "Arab Americans and Muslim Americans in the *New York Times*, Before and After 9/11." Pp. 229-275 in *Race and Arab Americans Before and After 9/11: From Invisible Citizens to Visible Subjects*, edited by A. Jamal and N. Naber. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Judge, Timothy A. and Daniel M. Cable. 2004. "The Effect of Physical Height on Workplace Success and Income: Preliminary Test of a Theoretical Model." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 89(3):428-441.

Kane, Mary J. and Jane M. Stangl. 1991. "Employment Patterns of Female Coaches in Men's Athletics: Tokenism and Marginalization as Reflections of Occupational Sex-Segregation." *Journal of Sport and Social Issues* 15(1):21-41.

Kanter, Rosabeth M. 1977. *Men and Women of the Corporation.* New York: Basic Books.

Keller, Evelyn F. 1983. "Gender and science." Pp. 187-205 in *Discovering Reality: Feminist Perspectives on Epistemology, Metaphysics, Methodology and Philosophy of Science*, edited by S. Harding and M. B. Hintikka. Holland: Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht.

Kendi, Ibram X. 2019. "Unthinkable: The Day *Shithole* Entered the Presidential Lexicon." *The Atlantic*, January 13. Retrieved March 16, 2020 (https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2019/01/shithole-countries/580054/)

Kennedy, John F. 1964. *A Nation of Immigrants*. New York: Harper and Row.

Kennelly, Ivy. 1999. "That Single-Mother Element: How White Employers Typify Black Women." *Gender & Society* 2(13):168-192.

Kim, Christina L., M. Elizabeth Lewis Hall, Tamara L. Anderson, and Michele M. Willingham.

2011. “Coping with Discrimination in Academia: Asian American and Christian Perspectives.” *Asian American Journal of Psychology* 2(4):291-305.

Krimmel John T. and Paula E. Gormley. 2003. “Tokenism and Job Satisfaction for Police Women.” *American Journal of Criminal Justice* 28(1):73-88.

Kulwicki, Anahid, Rose Khalifa, and Gary Moore. 2008. “The Effects of September 11 on Arab American Nurses in Metropolitan Detroit.” *Journal of Transcultural Nursing* 19(2):134-139.

Laird, Lance D., Wahiba Abu-Ras, and Farid Senzai. 2013. “Cultural Citizenship and Belonging: Muslim International Medical Graduates in the USA.” *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs* 33(3):356-370.

Laws, Judith L. 1975. “Psychology of Tokenism: An Analysis.” Se*x Roles* 1(1):51-67.

Leonhardt, David and Ian P. Philbrick. 2018. “Donald Trump’s Racism: The Definitive List.” *The New York Times*, January 15. Retrieved March 11, 2020 (https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2018/01/15/opinion/leonhardt-trump-racist.html)

Levine, Donald N., ed. 1971. *Georg Simmel on Individuality and Social Forms*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Lin, Angel, Rachel Grant, Ryuko Kubota, Suhanthie Motha, Gertrude T. Sachs, Stephanie Vandrick, and Shelley Wong. 2004. “Women Faculty of Color in TESOL: Theorizing Our Lived Experiences.” *TESOL Quarterly* 38(3):487-504.

Lippi-Green, Rosina. 1997. *English with an Accent: Language, Ideology, and Discrimination in the United States*. New York: Routledge.

Long, J. Scott., Paul D. Allison, and Robert McGinnis. 1993. “Rank Advancement in Academic Careers: Sex Differences and the Effects of Productivity.” *American Sociological Review*

58(5):703-722.

Lu, Alexander and Y. Joel Wong. 2013. "Stressful Experiences of Masculinity Among U.S.-born and Immigrant Asian American Men." *Gender & Society* 27(3):345-371.

Lupton, Ben. 2000. "Maintaining Masculinity: Men Who do Women's Work." *British Journal of Management* 11:S33-S48.

______. 2006. "Explaining Men's Entry into Female-Concentrated Occupations: Issues of Masculinity and Social Class." *Gender, Work and Organization* 13(2):103-128.

Mahtani, Minelle. 2004. "Mapping Gender and Race in the Academy: The Experiences of Women of Colour Faculty and Graduate Students in Britain, the US and Canada." *Journal of Geography in Higher Education* 28(1):91-99.

Malos, Stan. 2010. "Post-9/11 Backlash in the Workplace: Employer Liability for Discrimination Against Arab- and Muslim-Americans Based on Religion and National Origin." *Employ Repons Rights J* 22:297-310.

Man, Guida. 2004. "Gender, Work and Migration: Deskilling Chinese Immigrant Women in Canada." *Women's Studies International Forum* 27(2):135-148.

Manrique, Cecilia G. and Gabriel G. Manrique. 1999. *The Multicultural or Immigrant Faculty in American Academy*. Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press.

Marshall, Catherine and Gretchen B. Rossman. 2011. *Designing Qualitative Research*. 5th ed. Los Angeles and Washington DC: Sage Publications.

Martin, Elaine. 1984. "Power and Authority in the Classroom: Sexist Stereotypes in Teaching Evaluations." *Signs* 9(3):482-492.

Martin, Susan E. 1994. "'Outsider Within' the Station House: The Impact of Race and Gender on Black Women Police." *Social Problems* 41(3):383-400.

Marvasti, Akbar. 2005. "U.S. Academic Institutions and Perceived Effectiveness of Foreign-born Faculty." *Journal of Economic Issues* 39(1):151-176.

McCall, Leslie. 2005. "The Complex of Intersectionality." *Signs* 30(3):1771-1800.

McCalman, Claudia L. 2007. "Being an Interculturally Competent Instructor in the United States: Issues of Classroom Dynamics and Appropriateness, and Recommendations for International Instructors." *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* 110:65-74.

McCrocklin, Shannon, Kyle P. Blanquera, and Deyna Loera. 2018. "Student Perceptions of University Instructor Accent in a Linguistically Diverse Area." Pp. 141-150 in *Proceedings of the 9th Pronunciation in Second Language Learning and Teaching Conference*, University of Utah, edited by J. Levis. Ames, IA: Iowa State University.

McDowell, Jacqueline and Akilah Carter-Francique. 2017. "An Intersectional Analysis of the Workplace Experiences of African American Female Athletic Directors." *Sex Roles* 77:393-408.

McManus, Walter, William Gould, and Finis Welch. 1983. "Earnings of Hispanic Men: The Role of English Language Proficiency." *Journal of Labor Economics* 1(2):101-130.

Menges, Robert J. and William H. Exum. 1983. "Barriers to the Progress of Women and Minority Faculty." *Journal of Higher Education* 54(2):123-144.

Messner, Michael A. 2000a. "The Barbie Girls versus the Sea Monsters: Children Constructing Gender." *Gender & Society* 14(6):765-784.

______. 2000b. "White Guy Habitus in the Classroom." *Men and Masculinities* 2(4):457-469.

Mfum-Mensah, Obed. 2016. "Negotiating the Trilogy of Blackness, 'Africanness,' and 'Accentness': A 'Native-Alien' Professor's Tale." Pp. 144-154 in *Experiences of Immigrant Professors: Cross-Cultural Differences, Challenges, and Lessons for Success*,

edited by C. B. Hutchison. New York: Routledge.

Miller, JoAnn and Marilyn Chamberlin. 2000. "Women are Teachers, Men are Professors: A Study of Student Perceptions." *Teaching Sociology* 28(4):283-298.

Misra, Joya, Jennifer H. Lundquist, and Abby Templer. 2012. "Gender, Work Time, and Care Work Among Faculty." *Sociological Forum* 27(2):300-323.

Misra, Joya, Jennifer H. Lundquist, Elissa Holmes, and Stephanie Agiomavritis. 2011. "The Ivory Ceiling of Service Work." *Academe* 97(1):22-26.

Molloy, John T. 1988. *New Dress for Success*. New York: Warner Brooks.

Moore, Ariel W. 2015. "The Life of a Black Male Scholar: Contesting Racial Microaggressions in Academe." Pp. 23-32 in *Black Faculty in the Academy: Narratives for Negotiating Identity and Achieving Career Success*, edited by F. A. Bonner II, A. F. Marbley, F. Tuitt, P. A. Robinson, R. M. Banda, and R. L. Hughes. New York: Routledge.

Morris, Zoë S. 2009: "The Profession: The Truth About Interviewing Elites." *Politics* 29(3):209-217.

Muhs, Gabriella G., Yolanda F. Niemann, Carmen G. Gonzalez, and Angela P. Harris, ed. 2012. *Presumed Incompetent: The Intersections of Race and Class for Women in Academia*. Boulder, CO: The University Press of Colorado.

Muow, Ted and Sergio Chavez. 2012. "Occupational Linguistic Niches and the Wage Growth of Latino Immigrants." *Social Forces* 91(2):423-452.

National Center for Education Statistics. 2015. "The Condition of Education 2016 (NCES 2016-144): Characteristics of Postsecondary Faculty." Washington DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved August 28, 2016 (https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=61)

______. 2017. "Average Salary of Full-time Instructional Faculty on 9-month Contracts in

Degree-granting Post-secondary Institutions, by Academic Rank, and Control and Level of Institution: Selected Years, 1999-2000 through 2016-17." Washington DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved March 21, 2019 (https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d17/tables/dt17_316.20.asp)

______. 2018. "Characteristics of Postsecondary Faculty." Washington DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved March 21, 2019 (https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_csc.asp)

National Science Foundation. 2015. "Immigrants' Growing Presence in the U.S. Science and Engineering Workforce: Education and Employment Characteristics in 2013." Retrieved September 20, 2016 (http://www.nsf.gov/statistics/2015/nsf15328/)

______. 2018. "Women and Minorities in the S&E Workforce." Retrieved December 30, 2019 (https://www.nsf.gov/statistics/2018/nsb20181/report/sections/science-and-engineering-labor-force/women-and-minorities-in-the-s-e-workforce#women-in-the-s-e-workforce)

Nawyn, Stephanie J., Linda Gjokaj, DeBrenna LafaAgbényiga, and Breanne Grace. 2012. "Linguistic Isolation, Social Capital, and Immigrant Belonging." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 41(3):255-282.

Nayenga, Peter F. B. 2016. "My Professional Teaching Experience in the United States, 1977-2014: The Case of an African-Born Immigrant." Pp. 133-143 in *Experiences of Immigrant Professors: Cross-Cultural Differences, Challenges, and Lessons for Success*, edited by C. B. Hutchison. New York: Routledge.

Ndemanu, Michael T. 2016. "Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack of African-Born Professor's Identity in the U.S. Academe." Pp. 166-176 in *Experiences of Immigrant Professors: Cross-Cultural Differences, Challenges, and Lessons for Success*, edited by C. B.

Hutchison. New York: Routledge.

Nelson, Adie. 2000. "The Pink Dragon is Female: Halloween Costumes and Gender Markers." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 24:137-144.

Ng, Roxana. 1993. "'A Woman Out of Control': Deconstructing Sexism and Racism in University." *Canadian Journal of Education* 18(3):189-205.

Niemann, Yolanda F. 2012. "The Making of a Token: A Case Study of Stereotype Threat, Stigma, Racism, and Tokenism in Academe." Pp. 336-355 in *Presumed Incompetent: The Intersections of Race and Class for Women in Academia*, edited G. G. Muhs, Y. F. Niemann, C. G. González, and A. P. Harris. Boulder, CO: The University Press of Colorado.

Oakley, Ann. 2004. "Response to Quoting and Counting: An Autobiographical Response to Oakley." *Sociology* 38(1):191-192.

Odhiambo, Eucabeth. 2016. "Not so Fast: Navigating the Complexities of Teaching in an American University as a Foreign-Born Teacher Educator." Pp. 122-132 in *Experiences of Immigrant Professors: Cross-Cultural Differences, Challenges, and Lessons for Success*, edited by C. B. Hutchison. New York: Routledge.

Okeowo, Alexis. 2016. "Hate on the Rise After Trump's Election." *The New Yorker*, November 17. Retrieved March 11, 2020 (https://www.newyorker.com/news/news-desk/hate-on-the-rise-after-trumps-election)

Ortega-Liston, Ramona and Isa Rodriguez Soto. 2014. "Challenges, Choices, and Decisions of Women in Higher Education: A Discourse on the Future of Hispanic, Black, and Asian Members of the Professoriate." *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education* 13(4):285-302.

Ostrander, Susan A. 1993. "Surely You're not in This Just to be Helpful: Access, Rapport, and

Interviews in Three Studies of Elites." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 22(1):7-27.

Paap, Kris. 2006. *Working Construction: Why White Working-Class Men Put Themselves and Labor Market Movement in Harms Way*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Pacific Standard. 2015. "Beyond Bossy or Brilliant: Gender Bias in Students Evaluations of Teaching." March 24. Retrieved November 2, 2016 (https://psmag.com/beyond-bossy-or-brilliant-gender-bias-in-student-evaluations-of-teaching-97cc72b0a621#.9twm06tt7)

Padela, Aasim I., Huda Alam, Maha Ahmad, Zahra Hosseinian, and Farr Curlin. 2016. "Religious Identity and Workplace Discrimination: A National Survey of American Muslim Physicians." *Ajob Empirical Bioethics* 7(3):149-159.

Padilla, Amado M. 1994. "Ethnic Minority Scholars, Research, and Mentoring: Current and Future Issues." *Educational Researcher* 23(4):24-27.

Padilla, Raymond V. and Rudolfo C. Chavez, ed. 1995. *The Leaning Ivory Tower: Latino Professors in American Universities*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Park, Shelly M. 1996. Research, Teaching, and Service: Why Shouldn't Women's Work Count?" *Journal of Higher Education* 67(1):46-84.

Pasha-Zaidi, Nausheen, Tiffany Masson, and M. Nan Pennington. 2014. "Can I Get a Job if I Wear Hijab?: An Exploratory Study of the Perceptions of South Asian Muslim Women in the US and the UAE." *International Journal of Research Studies in Psychology* 3(1):13-24.

Patton, Michael Q. 2015. *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*. 4th ed. Los Angeles and Washington DC: Sage Publications.

Patton, Tracey O. 2004. "Reflections of a Black Woman Professor: Racism and Sexism in

Academia." *The Howard Journal of Communications* 15(3):185-200.

Pew Research Center. 2009. "Sikh Americans and Religious Liberty." *Religion and Public Life*, December 3. Retrieved March 11, 2019 (http://www.pewforum.org/2009/12/03/sikh-americans-and-religious-liberty/)

Pierce, Jennifer L. 1995. *Gender Trials: Emotional Lives in Contemporary Law Firms*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Pilieci, Kimberly M. 2016. "The Impact of Denominational Affiliation on Organizational Sense of Belonging and Commitment of Adjunct Faculty at Bible Colleges and Universities." PhD dissertation, Department of Educational Leadership, Research and Technology, Western Michigan University.

Pini, Barbara. 2005. "Interviewing Men: Gender and the Collection and Interpretation of Qualitative Data." *Journal of Sociology* 41(2):201-216.

Pittman, Chavella T. 2010a. "Race and Gender Oppression in the Classroom: The Experiences of Women Faculty of Color with White Male Students." *Teaching Sociology* 38(3):183-196.

______. 2010b. "Exploring how African American Faculty Cope with Classroom Racial Stressors." *The Journal of Negro Education* 79(1):66-78.

______. 2012. "Racial Microaggressions: The Narratives of African American Faculty at a Predominantly White University." *The Journal of Negro Education* 81(1):82-92.

Pratt, Carla D. 2012. "Sisters in Law: Black Women Lawyers' Struggle for Advancement." *Michigan State Law Review* 2012(5):1777-1796.

Price, Eboni G., Aysegul Gozu, David E. Kern, Neil R. Powe, Gary S. Wand, Sherita Golden, and Lisa A. Cooper. 2005. "The Role of Cultural Diversity Climate in Recruitment, Promotion, and Retention of Faculty in Academic Medicine." *Journal of General*

Internal Medicine 20(7):565-571.

Pyke, Karen. 2011. "Service and Gender Inequity Among Faculty." *Political Science and Politics* 44(1):85-87.

Ramirez, Hernan. 2011. "Masculinity in the Workplace: The Case of Mexican Immigrant Gardeners." *Men and Masculinities* 14(1):97-116.

Randall. 2019. "Asian Immigrants Transforming Silicon Valley." AsAmNews, April 7. Retrieved January 25, 2020 (https://asamnews.com/2019/04/07/asian-immigrants-transforming-silicon-valley/)

Ray, Ranita. 2018. *Making of a Teenage Service Class: Poverty and Mobility in an American City*. Oakland, CA: University of California Press.

Reeves, Carla L. 2010. "A Difficult Negotiation: Fieldwork Relations with Gatekeepers." *Qualitative Research* 10(3):315-331.

Reinharz, Shulamit. 1992. *Feminist Methods in Social Research*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Reskin, Barbara F. 1988. "Bringing the Men Back In: Sex Differentiation and the Devaluation of Women's Work." *Gender & Society* 2(1):58-81.

Reskin, Barbara F. and Irene Padavic. 1994. *Women and Men at Work*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Reskin, Barbara F. and Patricia A. Roos. 1990. *Job Queues, Gender Queues: Explaining Women's Inroads into Male Occupations*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Reynold-Dobbs, Wendy, Kecia M. Thomas, and Matthew S. Harrison. 2008. "From Mammy to Superwoman: Images that Hinder Black Women's Career Development." *Journal of Career Development* 35(2):129-150.

Richards, Bedelia N. 2019. “Faculty Assessments as Tools of Oppression: A Black Woman’s Reflections on Color-blind Racism in the Academy.” Pp. 136-151 in *Intersectionality and Higher Education: Identity and Inequality on College Campuses*, edited by W. C. Byrd, R. J. Brunn-Bevel, and S. M. Ovink. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Richards, David. 1996. “Elite Interviewing: Approaches and Pitfalls.” *Politics* 16(3):199-204.

Ridgeway, Cecilia L. 2011. *Framed by Gender: How Gender Inequality Persists in the Modern World*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Risman, Barbara. 2004. “Gender as a Social Structure: Theory Wrestling with Activism.” *Gender & Society* 18(4):429-450.

Roth, Louise M. 2004. “The Social Psychology of Tokenism: Status and Homophily Processes on Wall Street.” *Sociological Perspectives* 47(2):189–214.

______. 2011. “Selling Women Short.” Pp. 366-367 in *The Kaleidoscope of Gender: Prisms, Patterns, and Possibilities*, edited by J. Z. Spade and C. G. Valentine. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Rubin, Donald L. 1992. “Nonlanguage Factors Affecting Undergraduates’ Judgments of Nonnative English-speaking Teaching Assistants.” *Research in Higher Education* 33(4):511-531.

Rubin, Donald L. and Kim A. Smith. 1990. “Effects of Accent, Ethnicity, and Lecture Topic on Undergraduates’ Perceptions of Nonnative English-speaking Teaching Assistants.” *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 14(3):337-353.

Rubin, Herbert J. and Irene S. Rubin. 2012. *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Ruttimann, Jacqueline. 2009. “Breaking Through the ‘Bamboo Ceiling’ for Asian American

Scientists." *AAAS*: Washington DC. Retrieved January 25, 2020. (https://www.sciencemag.org/features/2009/05/breaking-through-bamboo-ceiling-asian-american-scientists)

Said, Edward. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Sallee Margaret W. and Frank Harris III. 2011. "Gender Performance in Qualitative Studies of Masculinities." *Qualitative Research* 11(4):409-429.

Schilt, Kristen. 2006. "Just One of the Guys?: How Transmen Make Gender Visible at Work." *Gender & Society* 20(4):465-490.

______. 2011. *Just One of the Guys?* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Sebastian, Richard J. and Dennis Bristow. 2008. "Formal or Informal?: The Impact of Style of Dress and Forms of Address on Business Students' Perceptions of Professors." *Journal of Education for Business* March/April:196-201.

Segura, Denise A. 2003. "Navigating Between Two Worlds: The Labyrinth of Chicana Intellectual Production in the Academy." *Journal of Black Studies* 34(1):28-51.

Shaheen, Jack G. 2009. *Reel Bad Arabs: How Hollywood Vilifies a People*. Northampton, MA: Olive Branch Press.

Shavers, Marjorie C., J. Yasmine Butler, and James L. Moore III. 2015. "Cultural Taxation and the Over-Commitment of Service at Predominantly White Institutions." Pp. 41-51 in *Black Faculty in the Academy: Narratives for Negotiating Identity and Achieving Career Success*, edited by F. A. Bonner II, A. F. Marbley, F. Tuitt, P. A. Robinson, R. M. Banda and R. L. Hughes. New York: Routledge.

Shenoy-Packer, Suchitra. 2015. "Immigrant Professionals, Microaggressions, and Critical Sensemaking in the U.S. Workplace." *Management Communication Quarterly*

29(2):257-275.

Sheridan, Jennifer, Julia N. Savoy, Anna Kaatz, You-Geon Lee, Amarette Filut, and Molly Carnes. 2017. “Write More Articles, Get More Grants: The Impact of Department Climate on Faculty Research Productivity.” *Journal of Women’s Health* 26(5):587-596.

Sherif, Bahira. 2001. “Insider/Outsider Status. The Ambiguity of Boundaries in the Fieldwork Experience: Establishing Rapport and Negotiating.” *Qualitative Inquiry* 7(4):436-447.

Shih, Johanna. 2006. “Circumventing Discrimination: Gender and Ethnic Strategies in Silicon Valley.” *Gender & Society* 20(2):177-206.

Shinnar, Rachel S. 2007. “A Qualitative Examination of Mexican Immigrants’ Career Development: Perceived Barriers and Motivators.” *Journal of Career Development* 33(4):338-375.

Siegal, Paul, Elizabeth Martin, and Rosalind Bruno. 2000. “Language Use and Linguistic Isolation: Historical Data and Methodological Issues.” Paper Presented at the FCSM Statistical Policy Seminar, Bethesda, MD.

Silva, Tony. 2017. “BUD-SEX”: Constructing Normative Masculinity among Rural Straight Men That Have Sex with Men.” *Gender & Society* 31(1):51-73.

Skachkova, Penka. 2007. “Academic Careers of Immigrant Women Professors in the U.S.” *Higher Education* 53:697-738.

Smith, Buffy. 2015. “Engaging Mentoring Relationships in Academia.” Pp. 115-122 in *Black Faculty in the Academy: Narratives for Negotiating Identity and Achieving Career Success*, edited by F. A. Bonner II, A. F. Marbley, F. Tuitt, P. A. Robinson, R. M. Banda and R. L. Hughes. New York: Routledge.

Smith Rolston, Jessica. 2014. *Mining Coal and Undermining Gender: Rhythms of Work and*

Family in the American West. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Snyder, Karrie A. and Adam I. Green. 2008. "Revisiting the Glass Escalator: The Case of Gender Segregation in a Female Dominated Occupation." *Social Problems* 55(2):271-299.

Sprague, Joey and Kelley Massoni. 2005. "Student Evaluations and Gendered Expectations: What We Can't Count Can Hurt Us." *Sex Roles* 53(11-12):779-793.

Stainback, Kevin and Matthew Irvin. 2012. "Workplace Racial Composition, Perceived Discrimination, and Organizational Attachment." *Social Science Research* 41:657-670.

Stanley, Christine A. 2006. *Faculty of Color: Teaching in Predominantly White Colleges and Universities*. Bolton, MA: Anker.

Stephens, Neil. 2007. "Collecting Data from Elites and Ultra Elites: Telephone and Face-to-face Interviews with Macroeconomists." *Qualitative Research* 7(2):203-216.

Stewart, Abigail and Virginia Valian. 2018. *An Inclusive Academy: Achieving Diversity and Excellence*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Stroshine, Meghan S. and Steven G. Brandl. 2011. "Race, Gender, and Tokenism in Policing: An Empirical Elaboration." *Police Quarterly* 14(4):344-365.

Sue, Derald W., Christina M. Capodilupo, Gina C. Torino, Jennifer M. Bucceri, Aisha Holder, Kevin L. Nadal, and Marta Esquilin. 2007. "Racial Microaggressions in Everyday Life: Implications for Clinical Practice." *American Psychologist* 62(4):271-286.

Tang, Joyce. 1993. "The Career Attainment of Caucasian and Asian Engineers." *The Sociological Quarterly* 34(3):467-496.

Taylor, Catherine. 2010. "Occupational Sex Composition and the Gendered Availability of Workplace Support." *Gender & Society* 24(2):189-212.

Teasley, Martell. 2012. "Pitfalls and Struggles in Progress: Challenges in Negotiating Organizational Culture as an African American Within a Predominantly White College and University." Pp. 153-171 in *Integrated but Unequal: Black Faculty in Predominantly White Space*, edited by M. Christian. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.

The Sikh Coalition. n.d. "Fact Sheet on Post-9/11 Discrimination and Violence Against Sikh Americans." Retrieved March 12, 2019 (https://www.sikhcoalition.org/images/documents/fact%20sheet%20on%20hate%20against%20sikhs%20in%20america%20post%209-11%201.pdf)

The Sikh Coalition. 2016. "Sikh Doctor Stands up to Employment Discrimination." Retrieved March 11, 2019 (https://www.sikhcoalition.org/blog/2016/sikh-doctor-stands-employment-discrimination/)

Thompson, J. J. 2000. "Finding their Way." *ASSEE Prism* 9(7):20-25.

Thrush, Glenn. 2017. "Trump's New Travel Ban Blocks Migrants from Six Nations, Sparing Iraq." *The New York Times*, March 6. Retrieved September 5, 2019 (https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/06/us/politics/travel-ban-muslim-trump.html)

Tierney, William G. and Estela M. Bensimon. 1996. *Promotion and Tenure: Community and Socialization in Academe*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Toren, Nina and Vered Kraus. 1987. "The Effects of Minority Size on Women's Position in Academia." *Social Forces* 65(4):1090-1100.

Torres, Myriam N. 2002. "Reflecting on the Games of Academia: A View from 'the Porch.'" Pp. 77-94 in *The Politics of Survival in Academia: Narratives of Inequality, Resilience, and Success*, edited by L. Jacobs, J. Cintrón, and C. E. Canton. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Toutkoushian, Robert K., Marcia L. Bellas, and John V. Moore. 2007. “The Interaction Effects of Gender, Race, and Marital Status on Faculty Salaries.” *Journal of Higher Education* 78(5):572-601.

Trejo, Stephen J. 1997. “Why do Mexican Americans Earn Low Wages?” *Journal of Political Economy* 105(6):1235-1268.

Tuchman, Gaye. 2009. *Wannabe U: Inside the Corporate University*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Turco, Catherine J. 2010. “Cultural Foundations of Tokenism: Evidence from the Leveraged Buyout Industry.” *American Sociological Review* 75(6):894-913.

Turner, Caroline S. V. 2002. “Women of Color in Academe: Living with Multiple Marginality.” *The Journal of Higher Education* 73(1):74-93.

Turner, Caroline S. V., Juan C. González, and Kathleen Wong. 2011. “Faculty Women of Color: The Critical Nexus of Race and Gender.” *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education* 4(4):199-211.

Turner, Caroline S. V. and Samuel L. Myers Jr. 2000. *Faculty of Color in Academe: Bittersweet Success*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Turner, Caroline S. V., Samuel L. Myers Jr., and John W. Creswell. 1999. “Exploring Underrepresentation: The Case of Faculty of Color in the Midwest.” *Journal of Higher Education* 70(1):27-59.

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2018a. “Foreign-born Workers: Labor Force Characteristics-2017.” Washington DC: U.S. Department of Labor. Retrieved March 4, 2019 (https://www.bls.gov/news.release/pdf/forbrn.pdf)

______. 2018b. “Household Data and Annual Averages: Employed Persons by Detailed

Occupation, Sex, Race, and Hispanic or Latino Ethnicity." Washington DC: U.S. Department of Labor. Retrieved February 28, 2019 (https://www.bls.gov/cps/cpsaat11.pdf)

U.S. Census Bureau. 2017. "Quick Facts." U.S. Department of Commerce.

University Center for International Education. 2016. "Countries Represented."

University Institutional Research and Studies Department. 2018a. "Demographic Information of the University."

______. 2018b. "Factbook 2017-2018."

Valdivia, Corinne and Lisa Y. Flores. 2012. "Factors Affecting the Job Satisfaction of Latino/a Immigrants in the Midwest." *Journal of Career Development* 39(1):31-49.

Varma, Roli. 2002. "HI-TECH COOLIES: Asian Immigrants in the US Science and Engineering Workforce." *Science as Culture* 11(3):337-361.

Voeten, Erik. 2013. "Student Evaluations of Teaching are Probably Biased. Does it Matter?" *The Washington Post*, October 2. Retrieved November 2, 2016 (https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2013/10/02/student-evaluations-of-teaching-are-probably-biased-does-it-matter/)

Wallace, Jean E. and Fiona M. Kay. 2012. "Tokenism, Organizational Segregation, and Coworker Relations in Law Firms." *Social Problems* 59(3):389-410.

Wang, Jinjun and Ying Yan. 2012. "The Interview Question." Pp. 231-242 in *The Sage Handbook of Interview Research: The Complexity of the Craft*, edited by J. F. Gubrium, J. A. Holstein, A. B. Marvasti, and K. D. McKinney. Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.

Warriner, Doris S. 2007. "Language Learning and the Politics of Belonging: Sudanese Women

Refugees *Becoming* and *Being* ‘American.’” *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 38(4):343-359.

Webber, Karen L. 2012. “Research Productivity of Foreign-and US-born Faculty: Differences by Time on Task.” *Higher Education* 64(5):709-729.

West, Candace and Don H. Zimmerman. 1987. “Doing Gender.” *Gender & Society* 1(2):125-151.

Williams, Christine L. 1989. *Gender Differences at Work: Women and Men in Nontraditional Occupations*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

______. 1992. “The Glass Escalator: Hidden Advantages for Men in the Female Professions.” *Social Problems* 39(3):253-267.

______. 1995. *Still a Man’s World: Men who do “Women’s Work.”* Berkeley: University of California Press.

______. 2006. *Inside Toyland: Working, Shopping, and Social Inequality*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

______. 2013. “The Glass Escalator Revisited: Gender Inequality in Neoliberal Times.” *Gender & Society* 27(5):609-629.

______. 2015. “Crossing Over: Interdisciplinary Research on Men Who do Women’s Work.” *Sex Roles* 72:390-395.

______. 2018. “The Gender of Layoffs in Oil and Gas Industry.” Pp. 215-241in *Precarious Work*. Vol. 31, *Research in the Sociology of Work*, edited by A. L. Kalleberg and S. P. Vallas. U.K.: Emerald Publishing Limited.

Williams, Christine L., Chandra Muller, and Kristine Kilanski. 2012. “Gendered Organizations in the New Economy.” *Gender & Society* 26(4):549-573.

Williams, Joan C. 2014. "Double Jeopardy? An Empirical Study with Implications for the Debates Over Implicit Bias and Intersectionality." *Harvard Journal of Law and Gender* 37:185-242.

Wingfield, Adia H. 2007. "The Modern Mammy and the Angry Black Man: African American Professionals' Experiences with Gendered Racism in the Workplace." *Race, Gender & Class* 14(1/2):196-212.

______. 2009. "Racializing the Glass Escalator: Reconsidering Men's Experiences with Women's Work." *Gender & Society* 23(1):5-26.

______. 2013. *No More Invisible Man: Race and Gender in Men's Work*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Wingfield, Adia H. and John H. Wingfield. 2014. "When Visibility Hurts and Helps: How Intersections of Race and Gender Shape Black Professional Men's Experiences With Tokenization." *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology* 20(4):483-490.

Wolf-Wendel, Lisa and Kelly Ward. 2015. "Academic Mothers: Exploring Disciplinary Perspectives." *Innovative Higher Education* 40(1):19-35.

Woo, Deborah. 2000. *Glass Ceilings and Asian Americans: The New Face of Workplace Barriers*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Woodhams, Carol, Ben Lupton, and Marc Cowling. 2015. "The Presence of Ethnic Minority and Disabled Men in Feminised Work: Vertical Segregation and the Glass Escalator." *Sex Roles* 72:277-293.

Woodward, Bob and Robert Costa. 2016. "Trump Reveals How He Would Force Mexico to Pay for Border Wall." *The Washington Post*, April 5. Retrieved February 27, 2020 (https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/trump-would-seek-to-block-money-transfers-

to-force-mexico-to-fund-border-wall/2016/04/05/c0196314-fa7c-11e5-80e4-c381214de1a3_story.html)

Wu, Ellen D. 2014. *The Color of Success: Asian Americans and the Origins of the Model Minority*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Xu, Yonghong J. and Cynthia L. Martin. 2011. "Gender Differences in STEM Discipline: From the Aspects of Informal Professional Networking and Faculty Career Development." *Gender Issues* 28:134-154.

Yoder, Janice D. 1994. "Looking Beyond Numbers: The Effects of Gender Status, Job Prestige, and Occupational Gender-Typing on Tokenism Processes." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 57(2):150–159.

Yoder, Janice D. and Patricia Aniakudo. 1997. "'Outsider Within' the Firehouse: Subordination and Difference in the Social Interactions of African American Women Firefighters." *Gender & Society* 11(3):324-341.

Yook, Eunkyong L. 2013. *Culture Shock for Asians in U.S. Academia: Breaking the Model Minority Myth*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Yuhas, Alan and Mazin Sidahmed. 2017. "Is This a Muslim Ban? Trump's Executive Order Explained." *The Guardian*, January 31. Retrieved September 5, 2019 (https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/jan/28/trump-immigration-ban-syria-muslims-reaction-lawsuits)

Zimmer, Lynn. 1988. "Tokenism and Women in the Workplace: The Limits of Gender Neutral Theory." *Social Problems* 35(1):64–77.

APPENDIX A

FIELD INSTRUMENTS

Email Solicitation Script for Immigrant Faculty

Sender's Name ("from line"): Debaleena Ghosh (dghosh@siu.edu)

Subject Line: "Research Request"

Message:

Dear Professor X,

I am an international graduate student and instructor in the Department of Sociology at SIUC. For my Ph.D. dissertation, I am exploring the work experiences of immigrant (i.e. foreign-born) faculty in the American academy, under the supervision of Dr. William F. Danaher, Professor and Chair of Sociology. Precisely speaking, I am studying how gender, race, and national origin and ethnic culture of the immigrant faculty shape their experiences at individual, institutional and interpersonal levels. By studying these, I aim to contribute to the scholarship of immigration, work and organizations, and higher education. Most importantly, my study has policy implications, related to the acceptance and promotion of diversity in American college and university campuses.

I obtained your email address from the faculty website of your department, and I am contacting you to solicit your participation in my study. For the purpose of my research, I need to conduct face-to-face interviews with foreign-born faculty, as well as observe the faculty meetings they attend and the classes they teach. I selected you for this study due to your foreign-born status in the U.S. Thus, I will need your co-operation and support to conduct my study, as well as finish my Ph.D. in a timely and successful manner.

Kindly let me know if you would like to participate in my research and/or meet me in person as per your convenience to learn more about my work. I will be extremely happy to meet you and explain my study personally. Please let me know when and where should I meet you to discuss my research, obtain your formal consent for participation in my study and/or conduct my interview.

You may choose to have your name removed from any future mailings or communications by replying "opt-out." If you do not respond to this email or return the opt-out message, you will be contacted again with this request once every week for the next 7 weeks.

If you need any additional information pertaining to my study, please contact me at dghosh@siu.edu or via 618-303-3497, or my supervisor at danaherw@siu.edu or via 618-453-7614.

I will eagerly wait to hear back from you.

Thank you and sincerely,

Debaleena Ghosh
Ph.D. Candidate and Instructor
Department of Sociology
Southern Illinois University
1000 Faner Drive, Faner Hall 3429
Carbondale, IL 62901
Office Phone: (618) 453-7621
Departmental Office Phone: (618) 453-2494
Email: dghosh@siu.edu

This project has been reviewed and approved by the SIUC Human Subjects Committee. Questions concerning your rights as a participant in this research may be addressed to the Committee Chairperson, Office of Sponsored Projects Administration, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL 62901-4709. Phone: 618-453-4533. Email: siuhsc@siu.edu.

Email Solicitation Script for the Staff Members of Affirmative Action/Title IX (Equity and Compliance)/Human Resources, and Search Committee Members and Administrators

Sender's Name ("from line"): Debaleena Ghosh (dghosh@siu.edu)

Subject Line: "Research Request"

Message:

Dear Professor/Mr./Ms. X,

I am an international graduate student and instructor in the Department of Sociology at SIUC. For my Ph.D. dissertation, I am exploring the impact of the organizational culture (related to diversity) on the experiences of immigrant (foreign-born) faculty in the American academy, under the supervision of Dr. William F. Danaher, Professor and Chair of Sociology. By studying this, I aim to contribute to the scholarship of immigration, work and organizations, and higher education. Most importantly, my study has policy implications, related to the acceptance and promotion of diversity in American college and university campuses.

I obtained your email address from your department/college/school/university website, and I am contacting you to solicit your participation in my study. For the purpose of my research, I need to conduct face-to-face interviews with those holding positions in Affirmative Action/Title IX/Human Resources/search committees/administration and are supervising or dealing with matters related to diversity in higher education. I selected you for this study due to your position that includes the supervision of and/or dealing with diversity related matters at [your current institution of employment]. Thus, I will need your co-operation and support to conduct my study, as well as finish my Ph.D. in a timely and successful manner.

Kindly let me know if you would like to participate in my research and/or meet me in person as per your convenience to learn more about my work. I will be extremely happy to meet you and explain my study personally. Please let me know when and where should I meet you to discuss my research, obtain your formal consent for participation in my study and/or conduct my interview.

You may choose to have your name removed from any future mailings or communications by replying "opt-out." If you do not respond to this email or return the opt-out message, you will be contacted again with this request once every week for the next 7 weeks.

If you need any additional information pertaining to my study, please contact me at dghosh@siu.edu or via 618-303-3497, or my supervisor at danaherw@siu.edu or via 618-453-7614.

I will eagerly wait to hear back from you.

Thank you and sincerely,

Debaleena Ghosh
Ph.D. Candidate and Instructor
Department of Sociology
Southern Illinois University
1000 Faner Drive, Faner Hall 3429
Carbondale, IL 62901
Office Phone: (618) 453-7621
Departmental Office Phone: (618) 453-2494
Email: dghosh@siu.edu

This project has been reviewed and approved by the SIUC Human Subjects Committee. Questions concerning your rights as a participant in this research may be addressed to the Committee Chairperson, Office of Sponsored Projects Administration, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL 62901-4709. Phone: 618-453-4533. Email: siuhsc@siu.edu.

Telephone Solicitation Script for Immigrant Faculty

Message:

Good morning/afternoon Professor X,

My name is Debaleena Ghosh, and I am a Ph.D. Candidate in Sociology at SIUC. I obtained your office number from the faculty website of your department, and I am calling you to request some assistance regarding my Ph.D. dissertation. If you're free to talk for a few minutes, I can explain my research in brief and the reason for calling you.

[If the professor does not agree to speak further, I will say the following:]

Thank you for your time. Good-bye.

[If the professor agrees to speak further, I will say the following:]

First of all, thank you very much for agreeing to talk. It's my immense pleasure to inform you that the purpose of my study is to explore the work experiences of immigrant (i.e. foreign-born) faculty in the American academy, especially how gender, race, and national origin and ethnic culture shape their experiences at individual, institutional, and interpersonal levels. By studying these, I aim to contribute to the scholarship of immigration, work and organizations, and higher education. Most importantly, my study has policy implications, related to the acceptance and promotion of diversity in American college and university campuses. Dr. William F. Danaher, Professor and Chair of Sociology, is supervising this study.

Thus, for the purpose of my research, I need to conduct face-to-face interviews with foreign-born faculty, as well as observe the faculty meetings they attend and the classes they teach. I selected you for this study due to your foreign-born status in the U.S. I will be extremely grateful if you participate in my study and help me finish my Ph.D. in a timely and successful manner.

[If the professor agrees to take part in my study, I will say the following:]

Kindly let me know if you would like to meet me in person as per your convenience to learn more about my work. I will be extremely happy to meet you and explain my study personally. Please let me know when and where should I meet you to discuss my research, obtain your formal consent for participation in my study and/or conduct my interview.

[I will end the conversation by saying the following:]

Thank you very much for your time (and agreeing to participate in my study). If you need any additional information pertaining to my study, please contact me at dghosh@siu.edu or via 618-303-3497, or my supervisor at danaherw@siu.edu or via 618-453-7614.

This project has been reviewed and approved by the SIUC Human Subjects Committee. Questions concerning your rights as a participant in this research may be addressed to the

Committee Chairperson, Office of Sponsored Projects Administration, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL 62901-4709. Phone: 618-453-4533. Email: siuhsc@siu.edu.

Telephone Solicitation Script for the Staff Members of Affirmative Action/Title IX (Equity and Compliance)/Human Resources, and Search Committee Members and Administrators

Message:

Good morning/afternoon Professor/Mr./Ms. X,

My name is Debaleena Ghosh, and I am a Ph.D. Candidate in Sociology at SIUC. I obtained your office number from your department/college/school/university website, and I am calling you to request some assistance regarding my Ph.D. dissertation. If you're free to talk for a few minutes, I can explain my research in brief and the reason for calling you.

[If the professor (including search committee members and administrators) or designated staff member does not agree to speak further, I will say the following:]

Thank you for your time. Good-bye.

[If the professor (including search committee members and administrators) or designated staff member agrees to speak, I will say the following:]

First of all, thank you very much for agreeing to talk. It's my immense pleasure to inform you that the purpose of my study is to explore the impact of the organizational culture (related to diversity) on the work experiences of immigrant (i.e. foreign-born) faculty in the American academy. By studying these, I aim to contribute to the scholarship of immigration, work and organizations, and higher education. Most importantly, my study has policy implications, related to the acceptance and promotion of diversity in American college and university campuses.

Thus, for the purpose of my research, I need to conduct face-to-face interviews with those holding positions in Affirmative Action/Title IX/Human Resources/search committees/administration and are supervising or dealing with matters related to diversity in higher education. I selected you for this study due to your position that includes the supervision of and/or dealing with diversity related matters at [your current institution of employment]. Dr. William F. Danaher, Professor and Chair of Sociology, is supervising this study. I will be extremely grateful if you participate in my study and help me finish my Ph.D. in a timely and successful manner.

[If the professor agrees to take part in my study, I will say the following:]

Kindly let me know if you would like to meet me in person as per your convenience to learn more about my work. I will be extremely happy to meet you and explain my study personally. Please let me know when and where should I meet you to discuss my research, obtain your formal consent for participation in my study and/or conduct my interview.

[I will end the conversation by saying the following:]

Thank you very much for your time (and agreeing to participate in my study). If you need any

additional information pertaining to my study, please contact me at dghosh@siu.edu or via 618-303-3497, or my supervisor at danaherw@siu.edu or via 618-453-7614.

This project has been reviewed and approved by the SIUC Human Subjects Committee. Questions concerning your rights as a participant in this research may be addressed to the Committee Chairperson, Office of Sponsored Projects Administration, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL 62901-4709. Phone: 618-453-4533. Email: siuhsc@siu.edu.

Face-to-face Solicitation Script for Immigrant Faculty

Message:

Good morning/afternoon Professor X,

It's my immense pleasure to finally meet you.

[If I've not spoken to the Professor before either over telephone or email, I will first introduce myself by saying the following:]

My name is Debaleena Ghosh, and I am a Ph.D. Candidate in Sociology at SIUC. I obtained your office address from the faculty website of your department, and I am here to request you some assistance regarding my Ph.D. dissertation. If you're free to talk for a few minutes, I can explain my research in brief and the reason for coming to your office.

[If the professor does not agree to speak further, I will say the following:]

Thank you for your time. Hope to see you later.

[If the professor agrees to speak further, I will say the following:]

First of all, thank you very much for agreeing to talk. I am very happy to inform you that the purpose of my study is to explore the work experiences of immigrant (i.e. foreign-born) faculty in the American academy, especially how gender, race, and national origin and ethnic culture shape their experiences at individual, institutional, and interpersonal levels. By studying these, I aim to contribute to the scholarship of immigration, work and organizations, and higher education. Most importantly, my study has policy implications, related to the acceptance and promotion of diversity in American college and university campuses. Dr. William F. Danaher, Professor and Chair of Sociology, is supervising this study.

Thus, for the purpose of my research, I need to conduct face-to-face interviews with foreign-born faculty, as well as observe the faculty meetings they attend and the classes they teach. I selected you for this study due to your foreign-born status in the U.S. I will be extremely grateful if you participate in my study and help me finish my Ph.D. in a timely and successful manner.

[If the professor agrees to take part in my study, I will say the following:]

I will be glad to provide any additional information that you may require regarding my study. Also, please feel free to ask anything regarding your participation in the study. Finally, kindly note that you need to sign the consent form if you agree to participate in my study. The consent form explains the study goals, your rights as a participant, the study procedures, and the contact details of associated individuals for additional information.

[I will hand them over the consent form, and will end the conversation by saying the following:]

Thank you very much for your time (and agreeing to participate in my study). If you need any additional information pertaining to my study, please contact me at dghosh@siu.edu or via 618-303-3497, or my supervisor at danaherw@siu.edu or via 618-453-7614.

This project has been reviewed and approved by the SIUC Human Subjects Committee. Questions concerning your rights as a participant in this research may be addressed to the Committee Chairperson, Office of Sponsored Projects Administration, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL 62901-4709. Phone: 618-453-4533. Email: siuhsc@siu.edu.

Face-to-face Solicitation Script for the Staff Members of Affirmative Action/Title IX (Equity and Compliance)/Human Resources, and Search Committee Members and Administrators

Message:

Good morning/afternoon Professor/Mr./Ms. X,

It's my immense pleasure to finally meet you.

[If I've not spoken to the professor (including search committee members and administrators) or the designated staff member before either over telephone or email, I will first introduce myself by saying the following:]

My name is Debaleena Ghosh, and I am a Ph.D. Candidate in Sociology at SIUC. I obtained your office address from the website of your department/college/school/university, and I am here to request you some assistance regarding my Ph.D. dissertation. If you're free to talk for a few minutes, I can explain my research in brief and the reason for coming to your office.

[If the professor (including search committee members and administrators) or designated staff member does not agree to speak further, I will say the following:]

Thank you for your time. Hope to see you later.

[If the professor (including search committee members and administrators) or designated staff member agrees to speak further, I will say the following:]

First of all, thank you very much for agreeing to talk. I am very happy to inform you that the purpose of my study is to explore the impact of the organizational culture (related to diversity) on the work experiences of immigrant (i.e. foreign-born) faculty in the American academy. By studying these, I aim to contribute to the scholarship of immigration, work and organizations, and higher education. Most importantly, my study has policy implications, related to the acceptance and promotion of diversity in American college and university campuses.

Thus, for the purpose of my research, I need to conduct face-to-face interviews with those holding positions in Affirmative Action/Title IX/Human Resources/search committees/administration and are supervising or dealing with matters related to diversity in higher education. I selected you for this study due to your position that includes the supervision of and/or dealing with diversity related matters at [your current institution of employment]. Dr. William F. Danaher, Professor and Chair of Sociology, is supervising this study. I will be extremely grateful if you participate in my study and help me finish my Ph.D. in a timely and successful manner.

[If the professor (including search committee members and administrators) or designated staff member agrees to take part in my study, I will say the following:]

I will be glad to provide any additional information that you may require regarding my study. Also, please feel free to ask anything regarding your participation in the study. Finally, kindly note that you need to sign the consent form if you agree to participate in my study. The consent form explains the study goals, your rights as a participant, the study procedures, and the contact details of associated individuals for additional information.

[I will hand them over the consent form, and will end the conversation by saying the following:]

Thank you very much for your time (and agreeing to participate in my study). If you need any additional information pertaining to my study, please contact me at dghosh@siu.edu or via 618-303-3497, or my supervisor at danaherw@siu.edu or via 618-453-7614.

This project has been reviewed and approved by the SIUC Human Subjects Committee. Questions concerning your rights as a participant in this research may be addressed to the Committee Chairperson, Office of Sponsored Projects Administration, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL 62901-4709. Phone: 618-453-4533. Email: siuhsc@siu.edu.

Consent Form for Immigrant Faculty

Consent to Participate in Research
(Signature of the Participant is Required)

I ____, agree to participate in this research project conducted by Debaleena Ghosh, a Ph.D. Candidate in Sociology at Southern Illinois University Carbondale.

I understand the purpose of this study is to explore the experiences of immigrant (i.e. foreign-born) faculty in the American academy and therefore contribute to the scholarship of immigration, work and organizations, and higher education.

I understand that Debaleena Ghosh has selected me for her study due to my "foreign-born" status in the United States. I also understand my participation is strictly voluntary and that I may refuse to answer any question without penalty. I can also end this interview at any time. Debaleena Ghosh informed me that 1) my participation will last for approximately 60 minutes and if needed there will be follow-up sessions, 2) she will keep my responses confidential within reasonable limits, and 3) only those who are directly involved with the project (i.e. Debaleena Ghosh and her dissertation supervisor) will have access to the data. Debaleena Ghosh also informed me that she will be taking notes during the interview, and in the classes I teach and/or the faculty meetings I attend. Also, Debaleena Ghosh informed me that in order to observe these faculty meetings and class lectures, she will obtain my consent/permission and/or the consent/permission of my colleagues/department chair/chairperson at the faculty meetings, and the consent/permission of my students in the classrooms as and when needed. Finally, I understand that Debaleena Ghosh will take reasonable steps to protect my identity, and hence, she will use a pseudonym for both my name and the university for which I work while quoting me in her dissertation, and in future presentations and publications.

I understand that Debaleena Ghosh will audio-record the interview, and that she will transcribe these audio recordings and keep them until December 31, 2020 in a locked file cabinet. After this time, she will destroy these recordings. I also understand that all field notes that Debaleena Ghosh will collect while interviewing me, and observing my classroom lectures and faculty meetings, she will keep them in a locked file cabinet as well, and only Debaleena Ghosh and her supervisor will have access to them. Debaleena Ghosh also informed me that she will share the results from this study with her dissertation committee, what she publishes at a later date, and present at professional conferences. Finally, I understand and have been informed by Debaleena Ghosh that as an agent of SIUC she is mandated to report any acts of gender or sexual based harassment to the corresponding university authorities.

I understand that questions or concerns I have about this study are to be directed to Debaleena Ghosh at dghosh@siu.edu or via 618-303-3497, or to her supervisor, Dr. William F. Danaher (danaherw@siu.edu / 618-453-7614), Chair and Professor of Sociology at Southern Illinois University Carbondale (1000 Faner Drive, Faner Hall 3384, Mail Code 4524, Carbondale, IL 62901).

I have read the information above and all questions I asked Debaleena Ghosh has answered to my satisfaction. I agree to participate in this interview and know that Debaleena Ghosh will audio-record my responses. I understand that Debaleena Ghosh will make available a copy of this form to me for the relevant information and phone numbers.

“I agree _____ I disagree _____to have Debaleena Ghosh record my responses on audio tape.”

“I agree_____ I disagree _____ that Debaleena Ghosh may quote me in her dissertation, and in future presentations and publications.”

____

Participant Signature and Date

This project has been reviewed and approved by the SIUC Human Subjects Committee. Questions concerning your rights as a participant in this research may be addressed to the Committee Chairperson, Office of Sponsored Projects Administration, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL 62901-4709. Phone: 618-453-4533. Email: siuhsc@siu.edu.

Consent Form for the Staff Members of Affirmative Action/Title IX (Equity and Compliance)/Human Resources, and Search Committee Members and Administrators

Consent to Participate in Research
(Signature of the Participant is Required)

I ____, agree to participate in this research project conducted by Debaleena Ghosh, a Ph.D. Candidate in Sociology at Southern Illinois University Carbondale.

I understand the purpose of this study is to explore the experiences of immigrant (i.e. foreign-born) faculty in the American academy and the impact of the organizational culture (related to diversity) on their experiences, therefore contributing to the scholarship of immigration, work and organizations, and higher education.

I understand that Debaleena Ghosh has selected me for her study due to my position that includes the supervision of and/or dealing with diversity related matters at [my current institution of employment]. I also understand my participation is strictly voluntary and that I may refuse to answer any question without penalty. I can also end this interview at any time. Debaleena Ghosh informed me that 1) my participation will last for approximately 60 minutes and if needed there will be follow-up sessions, 2) she will keep my responses confidential within reasonable limits, and 3) only those who are directly involved with the project (i.e. Debaleena Ghosh and her dissertation supervisor) will have access to the data. Debaleena Ghosh also informed me that she will be taking notes during the interview. Finally, I understand that Debaleena Ghosh will take reasonable steps to protect my identity, and hence, she will use a pseudonym for both my name and the university for which I work while quoting me in her dissertation, and in future presentations and publications.

I understand that Debaleena Ghosh will audio-record the interview, and that she will transcribe these audio recordings and keep them until December 31, 2020 in a locked file cabinet. After this time, she will destroy these recordings. I also understand that all field notes that Debaleena Ghosh will collect while interviewing me, she will keep them in a locked file cabinet as well, and only Debaleena Ghosh and her supervisor will have access to them. Debaleena Ghosh also informed me that she will share the results from this study with her dissertation committee, what she publishes at a later date, and present at professional conferences. Finally, I understand and have been informed by Debaleena Ghosh that as an agent of SIUC she is mandated to report any acts of gender or sexual based harassment to the corresponding university authorities.

I understand that questions or concerns I have about this study are to be directed to Debaleena Ghosh at dghosh@siu.edu or via 618-303-3497, or to her supervisor, Dr. William F. Danaher (danaherw@siu.edu / 618-453-7614), Chair and Professor of Sociology at Southern Illinois University Carbondale (1000 Faner Drive, Faner Hall 3384, Mail Code 4524, Carbondale, IL 62901).

I have read the information above and all questions I asked Debaleena Ghosh has answered to my satisfaction. I agree to participate in this interview and know that Debaleena Ghosh will

audio-record my responses. I understand that Debaleena Ghosh will make available a copy of this form to me for the relevant information and phone numbers.

"I agree _____ I disagree _____to have Debaleena Ghosh record my responses on audio tape."

"I agree_____ I disagree _____ that Debaleena Ghosh may quote me in her dissertation, and in future presentations and publications."

Participant Signature and Date

This project has been reviewed and approved by the SIUC Human Subjects Committee. Questions concerning your rights as a participant in this research may be addressed to the Committee Chairperson, Office of Sponsored Projects Administration, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL 62901-4709. Phone: 618-453-4533. Email: siuhsc@siu.edu.

Face Sheet for Immigrant Faculty

To be Filled by the Researcher

Date: ____________________________________ Interview #: ___________

Pseudonym for the Participant: ____

To be Filled by the Participant

Name: ____

Department (including affiliation if any): ___________________________________

____

School / College: ____

Email: ____

Phone #: ____

Demographic Information:

Gender Identity: ______________________________

Race / Ethnicity: ____

National Origin: ____

Religion: ___________________________

Age: ______________

Individual Annual Income: (USD) Below 50,000 / 50,000 to 59,999 / 60,000 to 69,999 / 70,000 to 79,999 / 80,000 to 89,999 / 90,000 to 99,999 / Above 100,000

Marital Status: Single / Dependent / Partnered / Divorced / Widowed / Married

Sexual Orientation: Straight / Gay / Lesbian / Bisexual / Queer / Other (Specify) _____________

Personal Information:

Where were you born and raised (City / Country)? _____________________________________

____

When did you first come to the U.S.? _______________

For how many years have you lived in [the current city]? ______________________

Where else have you lived in the United States (and for how long)? ________________________

____

Are you a citizen of the United States at present? _______________

If not, what kind of visa you hold currently? ____

Number of people living in your household: __________________

List of family members living in your household: ____

____

Academic and Employment Information:

What is your highest academic degree (and in what field)? _______________________________

____

From where did you earn it (Name of the University / Country)? ___________________________

____

What languages do you speak? ____

____

Current position held at [your present institution of employment]:
____

How long have you worked at [your current institution]? _____________________________

Did you work / teach elsewhere prior to [your current institution]? Yes / No

If yes, where and for how long? ____

How many years have you worked with a university in total? ________________

How many hours do you dedicate to teaching (including preparation, lecturing, and grading) per

week? ___________________

What courses do you teach? ____

____

____

How many hours do you dedicate to research per week? ____________________

What are your areas of research? ____

____

____

How many hours do you dedicate to service (University / College / Department Level) per week?

____

What are your committee work responsibilities? _______________________________________

____

____

Face Sheet for the Staff Members of Affirmative Action/Title IX (Equity and Compliance)/Human Resources, and Search Committee Members and Administrators

To be Filled by the Researcher

Date: ____________________________________ Interview #: ___________

Pseudonym for the Participant: ____

To be Filled by the Participant

Name: ____

Department (including affiliation if any): ___________________________________

____

School / College: ____

Email: ____

Phone #: ____

Demographic Information:

Gender Identity: _______________________________

Race / Ethnicity: ____

National Origin: ____

Citizenship: ____

Age: ______________

Employment Information:

Current position(s) held at [your present institution of employment]:
____

How long have you worked in your current position? ____________________________

How long have you worked at [your current institution] in total?
____

Did you work / teach elsewhere prior to [your current institution]? Yes / No

If yes, where and for how long? ____

How many years have you worked with a university in total? _______________

Interview Guide/Protocol for Immigrant Faculty

1. How would you describe your experiences in the U.S. so far? What are your feelings about those experiences?
2. I see that you studied at (referring to the name of the institution) and worked at (referring to the name of the organization/university) before you came to [your current institution of employment]; can you tell me a bit about how you felt studying and working at these places?
3. Would you tell me the story about how you came to [your current institution of employment]? How did you make that decision?
4. How did your previous job compare to [your current institution of employment]? What are your feelings about working at both places?
5. I am very eager to know how you feel working in an American university; can you tell a bit about your experiences so far? How are these experiences similar or different from what U.S-born faculty experience?
6. Can you talk a bit about how you feel integrated with your colleagues? How does this differ by whether they are U.S. or foreign-born?
7. Can you describe a bit the faculty composition in your department, in terms of gender, race, and ethnic origin?
8. Can you tell a bit about any tensions in yours or other departments on campus related to hiring, promoting, retaining, teaching or service? How do you feel about this?
9. Can you talk about the atmosphere/general culture in your department for men/women, Whites/people of color, and U.S.-born/foreign-born people, especially during hiring, tenure/promotion, retention, and the amount of teaching, research or service work they

do? What are your feelings or views about how such things work for these particular groups, and if there are particular norms that your department and university follow for these groups in such matters?

10. I am interested in knowing about the stereotypes and corresponding expectations specific to foreign-born faculty (if any); can you talk about them? How do you think these vary by race or ethnicity (national origin), and gender? Can you also talk a bit about these in the context of foreign-born male/female White faculty/faculty of color (if any)?
11. I am very keen to know how your multiple identities influence your work experiences in your department and university:
    a. How do you think your gender influences your work experiences in your department and university? Can you talk a bit about it?
    b. How do you think your race influences your work experiences in your department and university? Can you tell me a bit about it?
    c. How do you think your nationality and ethnic culture (e.g., language, religion, style of dress, food or drinking habits) influence your work experiences in your department and university? Can you talk a bit about it?
    d. Can you tell me a bit about your experiences in your department and university when you were being recruited/hired for the job? How do you think your foreign-born status, gender, race or ethnicity (national origin) influenced your hiring experiences? How did you feel about those experiences as a foreign-born male/female faculty of color/White faculty? How do you think your experiences were similar or different in comparison to your colleagues who were hired along with you (if any)?
    e. Can you talk a bit about what you think of others in the same position as you in your

department make annually (i.e. salary and other benefits)? If so, how do you think or feel you are compensated in comparison to them? How do you think your foreign-born status, gender, race or ethnicity (national origin) influenced these experiences, both when you joined [your current institution of employment] and currently? What do you think about these experiences as a foreign-born male/female faculty of color/White faculty?

f. Can you talk a bit about your experiences during tenure/promotion (if applicable)? How did you feel like your status as an immigrant (foreign-born) faculty member had an influence on it? How do you feel your gender, race or ethnicity (national origin) had an influence on it? How did you feel the entire process went for you as a foreign-born male/female faculty of color/White faculty in the department/college/university level? How do you feel the process is similar or different for non-immigrant (U.S.-born) faculty and for colleagues in the same position as you who are (were) tenured/promoted before and after you?

g. Can you tell me a bit about how you think your gender, racial and/or ethnic status influences your promotion to leadership positions in your department, college/school, and university? What are your views regarding your leadership experiences as a foreign-born male/female faculty of color/White faculty?

12. Next, I would like to talk with you about what is included in your job:

a. Can you tell me a bit about your research and its related experiences? What are your thoughts/feelings about the research you do, and the funds/grants that you receive or don’t receive? As a foreign-born male/female faculty of color/White faculty, how do you think/feel your research is evaluated or received in your department,

college/school, and university?

b. I am interested in knowing about your teaching responsibilities; can you talk a bit about them? How do you think your foreign-born status, gender, race or ethnicity (national origin) influence your teaching responsibilities? What are your views about these responsibilities in comparison to those undertaken by your colleagues who are men/women, Whites/people of color, and U.S-born? What do you think/feel about these responsibilities as a foreign-born male/female faculty of color/White faculty?

c. I would also like to know about your experiences in doing service and committee work; can you talk a bit about how feel your foreign-born status, gender, race or ethnicity (national origin) influence your service and committee work? What are your views about these experiences in comparison to those undertaken by your colleagues who are men/women, Whites/people of color, and U.S-born? What are your thoughts/feelings about the service and committee work you do as a foreign-born male/female faculty of color/White faculty?

13. Moving on, I would like to talk with you about the formal (e.g., formal get-togethers, and professional networks and research collaborations) and informal (e.g., going out for coffees/drinks, breakfasts, brunches, lunches or dinners, and informal get-togethers outside your department and university) interactions you have with your colleagues both inside and outside your department and university, and how multiple identities shape or influence those interactions:

a. How do you think these interactions seem to vary by gender? How do you think these interactions are similar or different to your colleagues who are men/women?

b. How do you think these interactions seem to vary by race? How do you think these

interactions are similar or different to your colleagues who are Whites/people of color?

c. How do you think these interactions seem to vary by national origin and ethnic culture (e.g., language, religion, style of dress, food or drinking habits)? How do you think your national origin and ethnic culture shape your interactions with your U.S-born colleagues? How do you think these interactions are similar or different to your colleagues who are U.S.-born?
d. What are your feelings about these interactions as a foreign-born male/female faculty of color/White faculty?

14. Similarly, I would like to talk with you about the interactions you have with your students both inside and outside the classroom or in any other ways you work with them (e.g., collaborations), and how multiple identities shape or influence those interactions:
    a. How do you think these interactions seem to vary by gender? How do you think these interactions are similar or different to your colleagues who are men/women?
    b. How do you think these interactions seem to vary by race? How do you think these interactions are similar or different to your colleagues who are Whites/people of color?
    c. How do you think these interactions seem to vary by national origin and ethnic culture (e.g., language, religion, style of dress, food or drinking habits)? How do you think your national origin and ethnic culture shape your interactions with your U.S-born students? How do you think these interactions are similar or different to your colleagues who are U.S.-born?
    d. What are your feelings about these interactions as a foreign-born male/female faculty

of color/White faculty?

15. Can you talk a bit about how the experiences, expectations, and treatment at work seem to vary by gender? What are your experiences, expectations and treatment at work versus your male/female colleagues?
16. Can you talk a bit about how the experiences, expectations, and treatment at work seem to vary by race? What are your experiences, expectations and treatment at work versus your White/non-White colleagues?
17. Can you talk a bit about how the experiences, expectations, and treatment at work seem to vary by where one is born? What are your experiences, expectations and treatment at work versus your U.S.-born colleagues?
18. Can you tell me a bit about your experiences, expectations and treatment at work as a foreign-born male/female faculty of color/White faculty?
19. How do you feel satisfied with your work? What are the satisfactions and dissatisfactions of your job? Can you talk a bit about them?
20. How do you feel about stress at work, and what causes it? How do you think others in your position feel about the same?
21. What do you think might improve your work experience?
22. Is there anything else you would like me to know about your work experience that I didn’t ask?

Interview Guide/Protocol for the Staff Members of Affirmative Action/Title IX (Equity and Compliance)/Human Resources, and Search Committee Members and Administrators

1. Can you describe your job responsibilities?
2. Did you hold any different positions at [your current institution of employment] in the past? If so, can you tell me the story about your journey from your past work role to your present work role?
3. I see that you worked elsewhere for “x” number of years before coming to [your current institution of employment] (in case); can you tell me the story about how you came to [your current institution of employment]? How did you make that decision about changing institutions, and what was involved in making that decision?
4. Can you talk a bit about how your previous job compares to [your current institution of employment]? What are your feelings about working at both places?
5. I see that you are originally from outside the United States (in case); can you describe your experiences, in terms of your recruitment and/or promotion? How would you describe your feelings regarding those experiences as a foreign-born White person/person of color?
6. Can you describe the current state of diversity in your department/college/school/university? What are your views about diversity representation in your department/college/school/university?
7. What do you see as the current efforts to increase diversity in your department/college/school/university? What are your views and feelings about these efforts?
8. Can you talk a bit about the atmosphere/general culture or the rules and procedures that your department/college/school/university follows in recruiting, promoting, and retaining

faculty from diverse backgrounds, in terms of gender, race, and nationality? What are your views and feelings about those rules and procedures or the atmosphere/general culture?

9. Can you tell me a bit about the efforts of your department/college/school/university to employ and retain foreign-born faculty, which are at par with their U.S-born colleagues? What are your views and feelings about those efforts? Can you share your personal experiences in dealing with these matters (if any)?
10. Can you tell me a bit about what you think and feel about the work (related to teaching or service) that is allocated to men and women, Whites and people of color, and foreign-born and U.S.-born people in your department/college/school/university? What is the general culture/atmosphere of work done by these groups? Also, what are your views about how their teaching, research, and service are evaluated or received in your department/school/college/university? Can you share your personal experiences in handling these matters (if any)?
11. Can you talk a bit about the efforts of your department/college/school/university to make sure that all foreign-born faculty members are entitled to equal provision of benefits just like their U.S-born colleagues, and irrespective of their gender and race? What are your views and feelings about such efforts?
12. How does your department/college/school/university confront issues related to a lack of diversity among faculty in it (if any)? What are your views and feelings about why the diversity among faculty is lacking, and the efforts taken by your department/college/school/university to increase it?
13. How does your department/college/school/university confront issues related to a lack of

diversity between faculty and students in the classroom (if any)? What are your views and feelings about why the diversity between faculty and students is lacking, and the efforts taken by your department/college/school/university to increase it?

14. I want to talk with you about issues between foreign-born and U.S.-born faculty you are aware of or have experienced (if any); can you talk about it (them)? What are the efforts of your department/school/college/university to handle them?
15. I also want to know about issues between foreign-born faculty and U.S.-born students inside and outside the classroom you are aware of or have experienced (if any); can you talk about it (them)? What are the efforts of your department/school/college/university to handle them?
16. Can you tell me a bit about if foreign-born faculty seem to experience more than their fair share of stress in your department/college/school/university or inside and outside the classrooms? What are the efforts that your department/college/school/university take to reduce it?
17. I am also interested in knowing about how satisfied faculty members from diverse backgrounds in your department/college/school/university feel with their experiences here at [your current institution of employment]; can you talk about the general culture or atmosphere from your experience or anything that you have dealt with (or are dealing with) in the past (or currently)?
18. Is there anything else that I did not ask you that you think I should know about your department/college/school/university?

VITA

Graduate School
Southern Illinois University

Debaleena Ghosh

debaleena.ghosh85@gmail.com

St. Xavier's College, Kolkata (Calcutta)
Bachelor of Arts, Sociology, August 2006

University of Calcutta
Master of Arts, Sociology, August 2008

Southern Illinois University Carbondale
Master of Arts, Sociology, August 2013
Graduate Certificate, Women, Gender and Sexuality Studies, May 2015

Special Honors and Awards:
J. Mark Wehrle Dissertation Scholarship, Department of Sociology, Southern Illinois University Carbondale, 2018
Dissertation Research Assistantship Award, Graduate School, Southern Illinois University Carbondale, 2017

Dissertation Paper Title:
U.S. Higher Education in the Construction of "Good" and "Bad" Immigrants: Foreign-born Faculty's Tales of Sexism, Racism, and Xenophobia at Work

Major Professor: Dr. William F. Danaher