THE EXPERIENCES OF RACIALIZED FEMALE FACULTY AT QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY

by

Natalia Maharaj

A thesis submitted to the Department of Sociology

In conformity with the requirements for

the degree of Master's of Arts

Queen's University

Kingston, Ontario, Canada

(May, 2009)

Abstract

Racialized female faculty frequently experience discrimination in the academy. However, few scholars have attempted to understand such experiences. This study helps to fill this void by exploring the experiences of racialized female faculty within the university. More specifically, in this study I interviewed racialized female faculty from Queen's University and asked them to discuss their experiences with discrimination on campus. I was interested in conducting this study at Queen's due to The Henry Report (2004) which examined the experiences of racialized faculty at Queen's and found that the university suffers from a 'culture of whiteness'. Moreover, I also wished to conduct this study at Queen's with racialized female faculty specifically because of the difficulties the university has in retaining these women, due to their experiences with racism on campus. From the interviews, I was able to conclude that racialized female faculty experience both racial and sexual discrimination at Queen's. Moreover, I was also able to conclude that this university still suffers from a 'culture of whiteness' and racism, and needs to make greater efforts to confront these issues or continue to have difficulties retaining racialized female faculty.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my friends, family and supervisor for their support and guidance during the last two years.

I would also like to thank my participants for understanding the importance of this study. Thank-you for sacrificing some of your time and emotions for the greater good.

Table of Contents

Chapter One

Introduction

Racialized female faculty often experience discrimination in academia. However, there is a paucity of literature that examines these women's experiences, especially from their personal perspectives. Thus, this study contributed to this sparse literature by examining the experiences of racialized female faculty within the university. More specifically, in this study racialized female faculty were recruited and interviewed and asked to discuss their experiences of racism and sexism on campus.

This study was conducted at Queen's University. Queen's was chosen as the site for the study for a number of reasons. First, I am a Queen's student and thus had easy access to the university and its faculty. Moreover, Queen's is known to have difficulties retaining racialized female faculty. Indeed, 'Systemic Racism Towards Faculty of Colour and Aboriginal Faculty at Queen's University: Report on the 2003 Study, "Understanding the Experiences of Visible Minority and Aboriginal Faculty Members at Queen's University" ' (2004) (herein referred to as 'The Henry Report'), a study which examines the experiences of racialized faculty members at Queen's, was spurred by such difficulties (see Appendix A for an executive summary of the background to the report and its recommendations). This report concluded that Queen's is dominated by a culture of whiteness and suffers from racism. The current study therefore served as a follow-up to The Henry Report and the events that spurred the report. The Henry Report was released approximately five years ago and a contemporary study examining if and how the experiences of racialized faculty had changed since then is needed. Moreover, a study which

specifically and thoroughly examines the experiences of racialized female faculty is especially required considering the difficulties the university has retaining these women.

This paper reports the findings of the study. It begins by contextualizing the study within the Queen's University community by examining The Henry Report, incidents of racism on campus and initiatives created at the university to prevent such incidents from occurring. This is followed by a brief overview of the literature and theories that structured the study. More specifically, Critical Race Theory, Critical Whiteness Studies and Critical Race Feminism are reviewed. This review will also include a discussion of Critical Race 'counter-stories', which provided the methodology for the study. The methods utilized in the study and the results and analysis of the interviews are then presented. The latter section will discuss certain themes that united the interviews. The themes are as follows: racial and sexual discrimination experienced at Queen's University and within the wider Kingston community; reactions to discrimination; coping with discrimination; perceptions of Queen's in terms of inclusivity, representation and retention of racialized female faculty; and suggested solutions that may help to diminish discrimination at the university. The then paper closes with some concluding remarks on the implications of the study.

Chapter Two

Background

It is important to understand the context in which the current study was conducted. Thus, this section will present the findings of The Henry Report. Moreover, it will discuss some of the incidents that have occurred at the university that has created a particularly hostile environment for racialized people on campus. Finally, it will note a few of the initiatives that have been implemented at Queen's in an attempt to prevent such incidents from occurring.

The Henry Report

In April 2004, The Henry Report was released by Dr. Frances Henry, now a professor emeritus from York University and an expert on anti-racism. Dr. Henry was asked to compose the report at the request of the Queen's Senate Educational Equity Committee (SEEC) and the Vice-Principal Academic after six racialized female faculty left Queen's, claiming to have experienced racism at the university. The Henry Report explored the experiences of faculty at Queen's, with a particular focus on racialized faculty.

In her study, Dr. Henry used a web survey developed by SEEC which was distributed to all faculty members listed within the Queen's Human Resources system. Two hundred and seventy faculty responded to the survey (15.4% of a total of 1378 faculty). Survey participants were first asked questions pertaining to the 'foundation principles and values' of the university (Henry, 2004: 2). More specifically, participants were asked whether their colleagues treated them with respect, their knowledge and work was valued, all in their department were accepted as equal members, there is an equitable tenure/promotion process and there is a fair hiring process. Between 9-16% disagreed with the statements in these questions. Participants were

also asked about representation and inclusiveness at the university. They were asked whether anti-racism research is supported at the university; 6% disagreed, while 72% said they did not know. Participants were also asked whether Queen's has difficulties retaining racialized faculty; 10% disagreed, while 59% did not know. They were asked whether racialized people are adequately represented at Queen's; 46% disagreed. Moreover, participants were asked whether Queen's is inclusive for racialized faculty; 25% disagreed. Finally, participants were asked whether the climate at Queen's supports diversity; 24% disagreed. Dr. Henry disaggregated responses to questions based upon whether participants identified as racialized or not. She found that 10% more racialized compared to white participants disagreed with the following statements: my colleagues treat me with respect, my knowledge and work is valued, in my department all are accepted as equal members, there is an equitable tenure/promotion process and the climate at Queen's supports diversity.

The survey also asked participants to discuss their experiences with discrimination at the university. One hundred and nine of the total sample claimed to have experienced discrimination at Queen's. Amongst the most frequently cited forms were double standards (30% of total study participants), stereotyping (25%), isolation/exclusion (23%) and derogatory language or condescension (23%). Of the 109 participants who reported discrimination, the reasons given were largely due to gender (40%); ethno-racial status, disability or sexual orientation and political views (21%); and seniority and research area (34%). Participants were asked whether their teaching style was constrained by 'other's perceptions of'; those who answered affirmatively noted that they were constrained mostly due gender (42 participants), cultural background including accent (30) and status as racialized faculty (14). Finally, participants were asked whether their authority was challenged by students. Participants who said they were

4

challenged noted that this was mostly because of their gender (51 participants), age (45), cultural background (18) and ethno racial status (13).

A series of survey questions were asked of racialized participants specifically. Fifty-three racialized participants responded to these survey questions (of a total of 117 self-identified racialized faculty at the time at the university). However, only 43 of these 53 surveys were used in the final tabulations discussed here. The majority of racialized faculty said that their status had no effect/played no role in their initial appointment, progress thru ranks, relations with colleagues, relations with persons of authority, receiving merit assessment, relations with students, departmental participation and the university community (51%-74% percent of racialized respondents). However, very few felt it had a positive effect (0%-17%). A nucleus of 7-19 racialized participants believed that their status had a negative effect. The issues that received the highest negative effect responses related to relations with peers (32% of racialized respondents), those who have authority over them (33%) and students (32%); receiving merit assessment (37%); and progress thru the ranks (31%). Forty-five percent of racialized participants said that they had experienced overt discrimination or harassment at the university; those most frequently cited as the source of discrimination were department heads (11), colleagues (10) and students (5). Of those who experienced discrimination, more than half (56%) sought advice and assistance, primarily from colleagues and QUFA. Twelve said they received support at that time and 7 said the situation was resolved to their satisfaction. Of the 45% of racialized participants that have experienced discrimination, 29% said they have experienced systemic discrimination at Queen's.

Dr. Henry also utilized focus groups and interviews in her study. There were two focus group discussions held with 3 racialized people each and 9 interviews conducted. Participants in

the focus groups and interviews discussed a number of issues. One of the issues they discussed was employment equity (EE). Some participants explained that they were uncertain whether they were hired because of EE or because of their abilities. Moreover, there was a general agreement amongst participants that merit should be the first criterion for hiring; however, this is sometimes ignored for 'political correctness.' Participants further explained that fellow colleagues seemed unsure why racialized faculty were hired, as they were perceived as being undeserving of their positions at the university due to EE. Participants noted that this affected the latter's self-esteem, but also reinforced the belief that 'others' are only admitted to the university because of EE, not because of merit. Moreover, participants explained that their colleagues resented them because they believed that racialized faculty had 'too much power' as they could not be disciplined or denied promotion due to EE. Thus, participants explain that EE can be harmful to racialized people as it makes it more difficult for them to be accepted within the academic community.

Racialized faculty also discussed their experiences with students. They explained that students challenged their expertise, authority and competence. A number of participants also claimed to have experienced racism by students. They noted that one of the major problems amongst the student body is the lack of ethno-racial diversity. Most students are from white suburbs or small towns and have not encountered those from different ethno-racial backgrounds. Consequently, students often react negatively to faculty who have unique teaching styles that diverge from the typical dominant anglo-eurocentric models of teaching. Moreover, participants explained that students often complain about the accents of faculty. This is especially the case within the applied sciences, where there is a large population of professors who have come from outside of North America. Finally, participants explained that students can be especially hostile

to racialized faculty when they are teaching courses on racism. They noted that faculty who teach such courses must lower their standards, as white students at Queen's are generally ignorant about issues of race.

Some participants discussed difficulties they had with their research. More specifically, participants who study racism/anti-racism explained that they were discouraged from publishing on such topics, as they were told it was not a legitimate area of study and it would not be taken seriously during tenure/promotion. They further noted that their publications in non-North American journals were seen as possessing little value compared to their colleagues' work. Moreover, participants explained that research on racism/anti-racism is not fully incorporated into the curriculum at Queen's. Indeed, courses on such topics are included sparingly in the curriculum.

Dr. Henry also reflected on a previous study conducted at Queen's: 'Towards Diversity and Equity at Queen's: A Strategy for Change. Final Report by the Principal's Advisory Committee on Race Relations' (1991) (Herein referred to as 'The PAC Report'). This report was composed from 1989-1991 when the Principal at the time became aware of problems of racism at Queen's through university reports and accounts from those who had experienced racism at the university. For the study, Queen's consulted a variety of groups and individuals within the university and the wider community and created a number of recommendations to contribute to increased inclusivity and diversity within the institution. In her report, Dr. Henry explains there was an initial drive to implement some of the recommendations in the PAC report. For example, following the release of the report, the university created the Human Rights Office, the Employment Equity Council and SEEC. Moreover, Queen's also began to collect data on diversity and equity at the university and enhanced efforts to recruit racialized faculty. However,

she notes that these initiatives simply provided 'lipservice' to equity and diversity, since few of the recommendations in the report have been actually implemented.

From her study, Dr. Henry was able to conclude that Queen's is dominated by a culture of whiteness. She explained that the experiences described by racialized faculty are a reflection of this culture. She noted that that university is dominated by the beliefs and values of white men. Moreover, the Queen's community is mostly composed of white students, staff and faculty. Consequently, racist beliefs are incorporated in the everyday discourse of the university and shape all interactions within it. Thus, racialized faculty feel marginalized, stigmatized and inferiorized at Queen's. However, certain discourses, such as discourses of 'blame the victim' and 'otherness', prevent the university from acknowledging racism on campus (Henry, 2004: 11). Moreover, because of their whiteness, whites at the university are unable to understand the experiences of racialized faculty. Consequently, racial inequalities are maintained at Queen's.

Interview and focus group participants explained that certain things need to change at Queen's if their experiences are to improve at the university. They provided a number of suggestions for change. Participants explained that they need to be provided with more opportunities to interact with the rest of the Queen's community. This may contribute to the acceptance of those from different ethno-racial backgrounds within this community. They further explained that there is a perception of Queen's that it is not inclusive for racialized people. Thus, participants insisted that there needs to be targeted recruitment of racialized students and faculty. This makes the university environment more comfortable for racialized students and faculty, increases the quality of the university and enables racialized faculty to play a greater role in the university community. Moreover, participants noted that there needs to be greater administrative commitment to diversity and equity at the university. They explained that

this commitment may be more readily made if there was improved training on issues of diversity for administrators. Moreover, they noted that the staff and faculty at Queen's also need better training. Finally, participants explained that the structures which confront racism at the university need improvement.

Finally, Dr. Henry explained that difficulties racialized faculty experienced at Queen's are amplified by their experiences within the greater Kingston community. Kingston is largely composed of white immigrants from the United States and United Kingdom. Indeed, Cuthbertson (2006) explains that at the time of the 2006 census, Kingston was composed of only 4.7% visible minorities compared to 13% in Canada. Thus, faculty members are socially isolated not only within Queens, but within the town within which the university is embedded. This social isolation is amplified by the geographical isolation of Kingston which separates it from more diverse cities like Toronto and Montreal (Cuthbertson, 2006). Cuthbertson (2006) notes that the town is gradually becoming more diverse; however, this is occurring at a much slower rate compared to cities similar in size. This slow rate could explain why Kingston has the second highest rate of hate crimes amongst census metropolitan areas, or an urban region with a population of at least 100, 000 people (Dauvergne et al., 2006). This rate takes into account the relative populations of all census metropolitan areas.

Incidents and Initiatives

Certain incidents at Queen's would suggest that Dr. Henry was correct in her conclusion that Queen's is dominated by a culture of whiteness and suffers from racism. A few examples follow. In 1993-1994, the white supremacist group The Heritage Front was active on campus through the activities of an undergraduate student. In 2005, a Queen's student dressed in

9

blackface as Miss Ethiopia for Halloween. In 2006, a banner near the Queen's Student Muslim Association (QUMSA) was set on fire, while an anonymous email was sent through the Queen's Listserv claiming that Islam encourages hate and violence. In November 2007, a racialized female professor was forced off the sidewalk on campus after being harassed by Queen's students taunting her with racial slurs. In September 2008, a poster outside the QUMSA office was vandalized with a racist comment, and the office was broken into a number of times. Moreover, a number of Muslim women wearing hijabs claimed to have experienced racist verbal harassment both on and off campus around this time. In November 2008, the ASUS president Jacob Mantle made Islamophobic comments on a friend's 'Facebook' page; he refused to step down as president while reluctantly offering an apology for his comments.

Regardless of these events, recent attempts have been made both by Queen's administration and certain groups on campus to alleviate discrimination and create a more inclusive environment at the university for racialized people. A few of these are noted here. For example, a number of conferences and council meetings have been held which address diversity at Queen's. There was the hiring of a diversity officer to report to the Vice Principal academic. All committee members involved in senior appointments now receive equity training. Greater efforts have been made to recruit racialized students to the university. Certain student groups have been created like the Queen's Coalition against Racial and Ethnic Discrimination (QCRED) and Queen's Student Muslim Association (QUMSA) which address issues of racial and ethnic diversity on campus. There has been an increase in the number of courses on social justice and equity at the university. Mentoring programs for racialized students have been created. Training sessions for equity and diversity have been held for councillors and student leaders at Queen's.

The Diversity, Anti-Racism and Equity (DARE) panel has been assembled to explore issues of diversity, anti-racism and equity on campus.

Chapter Three

Literature Review

Before conducting the present study, the academic literature was reviewed to try to gain an understanding of the general experiences of racialized female faculty within the academy. The literature discusses difficulties these women have with their scholarship, students, work responsibilities, collegial support networks and tenure/promotion. It also discusses the affects such experiences have on these women.

Scholarship

The voices of racialized women have largely been excluded from academia (hooks, 1988). This is partly because of the limited number of racialized women found in the academy. For example, there are very few racialized and virtually no aboriginal female faculty found within post-secondary institutions in Canada (Statistics Canada, 2006). Consequently, there are a proportionately limited number of racialized female scholars found within academic texts such as scholarly books and journals (Carty, 1991; Etter-Lewis, 1997). When these women's voices are incorporated in the academy, they are held within certain confines. Spafford et al. (2006) explain that it is assumed that racialized women are solely interested in or capable of studying their 'own' race/ethnicity. Thus, these women are usually 'ghettoised' in race/ethnic studies, and often further concentrated in subfields within these areas of study depending on their race/ethnicity (Henry and Tator, 1994). Locke (1997), for example, notes that most African American female scholars find themselves in 'Black Studies' departments or jointly-appointed with such departments. This usually occurs due to streaming that takes place during their undergraduate and graduate academic careers (Henry and Tator, 1994). However, Garcia (2005)

explains that further streaming can occur when these women become faculty members. That is, racialized female scholars are often pressured and at times given no other option but to specialise in race/ethnic studies when they are first admitted to work at their respective academic institutions. This can even occur when these women have specialities in other areas.

While racialized female scholars are often strongly encouraged to specialise in race/ethnicity, they are restricted in terms of what they can study under these specialisations. According to Razack (2003), there is an expectation that these women will become 'native informants' for the academy. That is, they will dedicate their work to examining and criticizing those of similar race/ethnicities/cultures. Moreover, it is expected that they will conduct 'non-threatening' research and not discuss such controversial issues as racism and anti-racism (Patton, 1999; Razack, 2003). When these women do focus on such issues, their institutions are unresponsive or unsupportive of their work (Patton, 1999; Razack, 2003).

Academic institutions are also unsupportive and unresponsive to theoretical work by racialized women. Native informants are expected to merely report on the experiences of racial/ethnic/cultural groups, not develop theory (Razack, 2003). Thus, it is assumed that racialized women do not 'do' theory (Garcia, 2005). However, hooks (1988) and Garcia (2005) explain that racialized women do actually create theory, but this theory is seen as possessing little value. This is because conventional theory follows a complex 'linguistically convoluted' format, which most racialized women do not use to compose their scholarship; the result is that their work is not accepted as theoretical.

Finally, although racialized women are often 'streamed' into race/ethnic studies, their work in these areas is not very highly regarded. This is because studies in race/ethnicity are

viewed as possessing secondary worth in academia (Garcia, 2005). This becomes apparent when those who focus on race/ethnicity are expected to be well-aware of 'mainstream' areas of study; however, the reverse is not true for mainstream scholars (Garcia, 2005). Burgess (1997) further explains that scholarship on race/ethnicity is not fully recognized in the academy. She explains that publications on 'minority issues' in 'minority' journals are often not acknowledged in academia. The result is that non-mainstream journals are not widely distributed within the academy. This limited distribution is problematic for all racialized female scholars, even those who do not publish on race/ethnicity, as their work is often rejected by mainstream journals and is thus found concentrated within these minority journals. This is why Kawewe (1997), for example, explains that the work of black women can only be found within black feminist journals. Finally, although as native informants racialized women are expected to solely focus on 'experiential' scholarship to the neglect of theoretical research, these women are often criticized for this (Burgess, 1997). Theoretical work is held in higher esteem compared to the 'experiential'; indeed, the latter is viewed by administrators and fellow colleagues as containing minimal 'substance' and significance in the academy.

<u>Students</u>

Dua and Laurence (2000) explain that students have more power to oppress racialized female professors than is commonly acknowledged in academia. Students hold certain preconceived notions of these women that act to justify this oppressive treatment. For example, Johnson-Bailey and Lee (2005) note that female professors are expected to behave in particular stereotypical ways because of their gender. Thus, these women are expected to be especially kind, soft-spoken, cooperative, friendly, and warm to their students (Anderson and Smith, 2005; Johnson-Bailey and Lee, 2005). However, when these professors embody such characteristics in

14

the classroom, they are judged to be less professional and thus inferior professors compared to their male colleagues (Anderson and Smith, 2005). Conversely, when these women are more authoritative and rigorous as professors, they are viewed as being too masculine and are again labelled as inferior.

Regardless of the trait chosen, racialized female professors are consistently subject to more negative evaluations by students compared to white female professors (Anderson and Smith, 2005). This is because students more easily find fault with racialized female professors. Moreover, when their abilities are assessed by students, they are less willing to overlook mistakes made by these women. Johnson-Bailey and Lee (2005) explain that this is because students do not view racialized women to be legitimate sources of academic knowledge or as people who generate such knowledge. This means that their expertise and ability to administrate and teach are not readily accepted by students (Bannerji, 1991). Thus, Bannerji (1991) explains that racialized women are perceived as being inferior professors and scholars compared to their colleagues. Beoku-Betts and Njambi (2005) explains what this means for African American female professors:

> To be a black, African, woman professor is to be forced to constantly dispel doubts and anxieties on the part of students...who have already conceptualized blackness, Africanness, and femaleness as markings of inferiority (119).

Finally, this belief in the inadequacy of racialized female professors is amplified when these women are non-native English speakers, as students identify this as a 'communication barrier' to teaching and learning (Johnson-Bailey and Lee, 2005).

Further doubt is cast on the abilities of racialized female professors when these women teach courses on race/ethnicity or gender. Anderson and Smith (2005) note that female professors who teach on gender are often accused of being biased and having political agendas

which they support through their teaching. Consequently, these women are met with resistance and scepticism in the classroom. Students are even more resistant and sceptical when racialized professors teach courses on race/ethnicity (Anderson and Smith, 2005). This is true for both racialized men and women, but is augmented for the latter. Spafford et al. (2006) and Dua and Laurence (2003) explain that racialized female professors who teach on race/ethnicity are often accused by students of 'protecting their own' and being prejudiced against white students. Thus, they are charged with grading white students unfairly, making the classroom uncomfortable for them, being 'too negative' about whiteness, talking too much about race and forcing white students to learn the personal cultural beliefs of their professors (Dua and Laurence, 2003). These women are also viewed as being unsympathetic, aggressive and incompetent when they teach such courses. Johnson-Bailey and Lee (2005) note that students hold these views regardless of the content of courses. Thus, they found that even when white senior male faculty create courses on race/ethnicity and these courses are then taught by racialized women, students still perceive these women as holding biases within the classroom and thus being unsuitable teachers. These perceptions can be harmful not only to these women as professors, but to the students themselves. For example, Anderson and Smith (2005) explain that when students hold negative beliefs about professors, their ability to learn within the classroom is reduced substantially. Finally, although racialized women who teach on race/ethnicity are often subject to especially strong criticism by students, these women are perceived as not possessing enough authority to teach on other subjects (Spafford et al., 2006). Thus, Johnson-Bailey and Lee (2005) conclude that these women are delegitimized in the classroom regardless of what they teach.

Students express their displeasure with racialized female professors in a variety of ways. Students can become overtly angry and verbally and physically harass these women (Dua and

Laurence, 2003; Johnson-Bailey and Lee, 2005). In class students can be rude, talk back, interrupt, be patronizing or apathetic to course content. This behaviour is especially prevalent amongst white male students in courses taught on race/ethnicity (Dua and Laurence, 2003; Johnson-Bailey and Lee, 2005). Moreover, these students more readily behave this way when such courses are taught by women who possess non-English accents. Dua and Laurence (2003) note that students who act this way serve to alter the classroom environment and throw the legitimacy of the instructor into question.

Students can also question the legitimacy of racialized female professors in more subtle ways. Students often seek 'corroboration' or 'verification' of information from white faculty when taking courses taught by racialized women (Beoku-Betts and Njambi, 2005; Johnson-Bailey and Lee, 2005). This is most evident in courses co-taught by white professors (Johnson-Bailey and Lee, 2005). Racialized women are treated as 'second-class' professors when teaching these courses; this often holds true even when these women are the sole creators of such courses (Bannerji, 1991; Johnson-Bailey and Lee, 2005). Finally, students can be supportive of racialized female professors in the classroom, but can question their authority again outside of class. Beoku-Betts and Njambi (2005) note that while students may praise these women in class, they usually still seek academic support and supervision from white faculty members. Moreover, they explain that when students do seek support and supervision from racialized female professors, they must first be convinced of their competence and referred to these women by white faculty.

Students question the legitimacy of racialized female faculty partly because of their limited numbers in the academy (Johnson-Bailey and Lee, 2005). Students possess certain expectations of what professors should look and sound like based upon previous experience;

when they encounter faculty who challenge such expectations, they judge them to be inferior (Johnson-Bailey and Lee, 2005). Burgess (1997), for example, explains that when students encounter African American female professors in the classroom their authority automatically becomes suspect as these students have likely never come-across such professors before. The authority of these women is destabilized further when there is a general paucity of the courses they teach on race/ethnicity in the university (Henry and Tator, 1994). This often occurs because there is a belief held by administrators that such courses are 'dispensable' and of little importance (Henry and Tator, 1994; Luther et al., 2003). Moreover, there are a restricted number of racialized scholars in the academy, and thus faculty who are willing to create these courses (Segura, 2003). Because of their low numbers, these courses are not properly integrated into the curriculum and the thought relayed in them is consequently marginalized and delegitimized (Dua and Laurence, 2003).

Finally, it is important to note that racialized women do not receive much support from administrators and colleagues to help them cope with the prejudices and associated discriminatory behaviour directed at them by students. Pope and Joseph (1997), for example, note that when African American women experience harassment by students, the reactions of administrators and colleagues usually vary from indifference to 'blaming the victim'. Indeed, when these women are harassed in the classroom, they can often be criticized by their colleagues for being unable to control their students. Johnson-Bailey and Lee (2005) explain that such reactions are most common when perpetrators are white and male. The result is that these women are left vulnerable to further victimization as students are sent the message that there are no consequences for discriminatory behaviour. It is not surprising then that although racialized women are the most likely amongst professors to experience harassment by students, they are the

least likely to report it (Pope and Joseph, 1997). These women are aware that if they report harassment, their respective institutions will likely not respond; however, their status/credibility as professors may suffer and they may even have to fear retaliation by students. Thus, they often minimize these incidents by claiming that they are not serious enough to warrant reporting or by attempting to handle the situations privately. Finally, racialized women also receive little support when they teach courses on race/ethnicity (Pope and Joseph, 1997). Although these courses are quite difficult to teach and can often result in academic burnout, there is no recognition of this. On the contrary, when racialized female professors teach courses on race/ethnicity they are often subject to more rigorous and critical evaluations by administrators.

Responsibilities

Racialized female faculty are burdened with an excess of responsibilities in the academy. For example, these women are expected to sit on an uncommonly high number of committees (Guillory, 2001). Because there are so few racialized faculty in the academy, racialized women are often asked to sit on an assortment of committees to ensure that the perspectives of racialized people are adequately represented in the academy (Garcia, 2005; Luther et al., 2003). This is because they are assumed to be experts on race/ethnicity (Bernard, 2003; Garcia, 2005; Luther et al., 2003). Moses (1997), for example, explains that African American women are often assumed to be valid representatives of all people racialized as black when sitting on academic committees. Conversely, racialized women are not invited to speak on issues other than race/ethnicity when they participate in these committees; when they do, they are not taken seriously or are believed to be unqualified to speak on these other topics (Beoku-Betts and Njambi, 2005; Luther et al., 2003). Moreover, they are seldom admitted to committees that look at things other than race/ethnicity. This is true even when these women possess expertise in

other areas (Moses, 1997). Thus, Baraka (1997) notes that academic institutions have yet to see

the potential use of racialized faculty for purposes other than 'service to minorities'. Racialized

women are not only expected to represent issues of race/ethnicity within committees, but they

are also required to take certain 'positions' for racial/ethnic diversity. That is, they are often

expected to fill roles of 'race advisor', 'equality opportunity representatives' or 'trainer on

equality issues' (Burke et al., 2000). Finally, although racialized women are pressured by others,

such as administrators and fellow colleagues, to sit on committees and hold position for

race/ethnic issues, they also feel personally pressured to assume these responsibilities (Burgess,

1997). This is because typically no one else wants to provide these services. Thus, these women

feel obliged to be part of these committees/positions so the voices of racialized groups and

racialized women are at least partly heard in the academy (Burgess, 1997; Garcia, 2005).

Luther et al. (2003) explain that when racialized women do take-part in committees and

hold positions for race/ethnicity, their opinions on the latter are only heard or respected when

they speak in non-challenging ways. When they address controversial issues like discrimination,

their concerns are trivialized and they are constructed as 'trouble makers' who are too

uptight/serious, not objective, or acting out of self-interest (Luther et al., 2003; Garcia, 2005;

Baraka, 1997). Moreover, Garcia (2005) notes that sometimes gender-specific accusations of

being too sensitive/emotional or angry/bitchy are utilized. These women's voices are usually

silenced through these charges and they are consequently placed in the role of

participant/observer to be 'seen but not heard' (Luther et al., 2003).   Luther et al. (2003) note

that when this silencing strategy is ineffective these women are simply removed from these

committees/positions. What is most interesting is that this experience does not hold true for all

racialized people. Garcia (2005) explains that it is more acceptable for racialized men to be

'outspoken'. Thus colleagues and administrators are more prone to overlook, ignore, attack and dismiss 'controversial' commentary provided by racialized women compared to men.

Racialized women must not only serve on a variety of committees and hold a number of positions for race/ethnicity, but they also assume the extra responsibility of providing support to a relatively large amount of students. These women regularly act as mentors, role models and unofficial counsellors for racialized students, especially racialized female students (Bernard, 2003; Spafford et al., 2006). Moreover, they sometimes provide support to white students who wish to, for example, confront their whiteness and personal racism (Bernard, 2003). Because there are so few racialized faculty, these women are approached by large numbers of students to perform these duties (Spafford et al., 2006). The result is that racialized women must commit more time to providing services to students compared with their colleagues (Guillory, 2001). This is especially true when they are compared with their white colleagues (Moses, 1997). Finally, racialized female professors not only spend a greater amount of time with students due to the support services they provide, but also because of the courses they teach. Luther et al. (2003) note that these women often teach more courses and their class sizes are usually larger compared with their colleagues. Thus, these women have unusually high teaching loads and must give more of their time to teaching compared to fellow professors (Burke et al., 2000; Guillory, 2001; Luther et al., 2003). This is again found to particularly hold true when they are compared to white professors (Guillory, 2001).

In addition to academic responsibilities, racialized women also have extra-academic commitments they have to meet. That is, racialized women must provide services to their communities and maintain their family lives as well. These women are expected to 'give back' to their communities by utilizing their now 'privileged' position to help community members

(Luther et al., 2003). Thus, they are required to, for example, provide leadership in their communities, and offer support to community members, such as racialized youth (Guillory, 2005; Luther et al., 2003). Consequently, they frequently serve as mentors even outside the academy (Guillory, 2005). Moreover, racialized women often have family responsibilities they have to meet as mothers and wives. Although many faculty provide community services and have family responsibilities, it has been found that racialized women actually give more of their time to both of these activities compared to their colleagues (Guillory, 2005).

Satisfying all these extra responsibilities means that racialized women commonly 'burnout' (Spafford et al., 2006). However, there is rarely any recognition of this on the part of administrators and colleagues (Garcia, 2005). In fact, racialized women are often criticized for being unable to commit more time to research and publications (Burke et al., 2000). This is especially problematic as the academy prizes the latter above any other kind of work (Garcia, 2005). Despite all this, most institutions do not attempt to alleviate the responsibilities that disproportionately burden racialized women (Kawewe, 1997). Thus, some women attempt to at least skirt some of their academic responsibilities by being 'less visible' within academia and committing more time to research and publications (Moses, 1997). However, when they do this, they are criticized for not fulfilling their 'obligations'.

Support Networks

The success of faculty is partly dependent upon support they receive within the academy (Moses, 1997). However, racialized female faculty frequently report being excluded from academic support networks. For example, these women experience a lack of support from administrators. This is manifest in a number of ways. First, administrators provide insufficient

support for the work of racialized female academics. As mentioned, although racialized women assume particularly difficult teaching assignments, there is no recognition of this; indeed, they are usually subject to especially negative teaching evaluations by administrators (Moses, 1997). Moreover, these administrators sometimes fail to recognize the racism and harassment these women experience at the hands of students. They are also unsupportive of the research conducted by racialized women (Aganthangelou and Ling, 2002). For example, administrators usually offer these women inadequate information on how to receive research support and funding for their work (Singh et al., 1995). This stunts their ability to develop their scholarship (Singh et al., 1995). Agathangelou and Ling (2002) further report that there are less efforts by administrators to integrate these women into the academy compared to their colleagues. For example, African American women report participating in fewer orientation programs compared to their African American male colleagues when first admitted to their respective institutions (Singh et al., 1995). Singh et al. (1995) explain that this is likely because administrators and heads of departments are more concerned about the professional socialization of male versus female colleagues. This is problematic for a number of reasons. Through participation in these programs, faculty are able to become acquainted with their school, become comfortable in the school environment, gain knowledge on the culture of the institution and learn what is expected of their work. Moreover, without taking-part in these programs, racialized women find it difficult to obtain information on fellow racialized scholars and events for racialized peoples on campus. The result is that they experience even greater difficulties garnering support and socially integrating into their institutions.

Racialized women also receive insufficient support from fellow colleagues. In fact, these women report the lowest levels of acceptance by colleagues compared to all other faculty (Singh

et al., 1995). This is manifest in, for example, being excluded from formal networks, such as collaborative research teams (Luther et al., 2003; Singh et al., 1995). They are also excluded from informal networks; for example, racialized women report not being invited by co-workers to extra-academic affairs, such as going for coffee, and drinks, and being left out of intra-office gossip (Dua and Laurence, 2000; Luther et al., 2003). Finally, many of these women report that they are not only excluded from collegial networks, but they frequently experience outright hostility, condescension and indifference from colleagues (Dua and Laurence, 2000).

It is sometimes intuitively assumed that racialized women will at least receive support within the academy from fellow female or racialized male colleagues. However, this is often not the case. While racialized women receive most support from other racialized women, there is little support provided by white female colleagues. Dua and Laurence (2000) explain that white women place more emphasis on gender concerns versus issues of race in the academy. Indeed, these women sometimes fear that addressing race issues might detract from more salient gender concerns (Burke et al., 2000). The result is that white women often homogenize women of all races, and consequently ignore the specific experiences of their racialized female colleagues. Thus, when the latter experience such things as racial harassment on campus, they do not receive the support of white women in the academy. Racialized women do not receive much support from racialized male colleagues either. Similar to white women, racialized men can find it difficult to understand the specific experiences of racialized women in the academy (Baraka, 1997). Consequently, they too are frequently unsupportive of their fellow racialized female colleagues.

As mentioned, racialized women in the academy usually receive the most support from other racialized women. However, because there are so few of these women found in academia,

24

the amount of support available is not very substantial (Dua and Laurence, 2000; Henry and Tator, 1994; Patton, 1999). Moreover, because of the excess responsibilities these women assume both in and outside the academy, they are often too busy to collectivize and create supportive networks (Luther et al., 2003). Agathangelou and Ling (2002) further explain that racialized women who choose to address issues of race/ethnicity within the academy can sometimes create resentment amongst fellow racialized colleagues who choose not to address these issues. This can serve to weaken networks otherwise available to these women (Baraka, 1997).

The lack of collegial support networks available to racialized women can negatively influence their ability to be successful in the academy. This becomes especially evident when examining the case of mentors. Spafford et al. (2006) explain that mentors often select mentees that are similar to themselves. Thus, because there are so few racialized female faculty, these women must sometimes seek mentors from other departments and institutions (Moses, 1997). However, some are unable to find mentors even then and are therefore left without one (Garcia, 2005; Moses, 1997; Singh et al., 1995). This situation is exacerbated by the fact that racialized female faculty often hold 'contingent' positions at their institutions; because mentors can only take-on a limited number of mentees, they sometimes reject those who hold these unstable positions in favour of mentees who are more securely situated in the academy (Spafford et al., 2006). This is problematic as mentors can help with academic career advancement; that is, they help acquaint mentees with academia, locate/acquire research funds/grants, co-author scholarship and thus increase research productivity, develop proposals, present/publish scholarship, gain access to professional networks, and provide general assistance and counsel (Burgess, 1997;

Garcia, 2005; Moses, 1997; Singh et al., 1995). Thus, without mentors, the professional

development of racialized female faculty can be greatly compromised.

<u>Tenure/Promotion</u>

Success in academia is often measured by the ability of faculty to be promoted and

receive tenure (Agathangelou and Ling, 2002). However, the rate of tenure/promotion of

racialized female faculty is the lowest in academia (Singh et al., 1995). This finding consistently

holds true across time and space, that is, across cohorts and institutions in North America.

Consequently, these women are disproportionately concentrated in the least desirable academic

ranks of assistant and adjunct professor or in year-to-year appointments (Guillory, 2001; Moses,

1997; Singh et al., 1995). Conversely, their colleagues are more likely to be found amongst the

ranks of tenured full professors. There are a variety of reasons that the academy gives for the

lower rate of tenure/promotion of racialized women. First, the disproportionately negative

evaluations these women receive for the courses they teach can affect their ability to be

promoted (Dua and Laurence, 2003). Moreover, negative evaluations of their research and

scholarship can also influence promotions (Burgess, 1997; Dua and Laurence, 2003).

Conducting research and publishing are considered to be the most important responsibilities of

an academic (Anderson and Smith, 2005). However, because racialized women receive less

support from administrators and colleagues for research/publications and must also commit more

time to both academic and extra-academic services and duties, they are unable to

research/publish at the same rate as their colleagues; this can also impact their chances of career

advancement (Guillory, 2001; Singh et al., 1995). Finally, Etter-Lewis (1997) finds that

although racialized women are commonly denied tenure/promotions based upon these reasons,

racialized women are regularly found to be as or more qualified and experienced compared to

their colleagues of equal ranking. This is found to especially hold true when the latter are white men. Thus, she concludes that these women must do more work and acquire more qualifications to receive the same rewards as their colleagues.

Lower ranking or untenured professors are disadvantaged in a number of ways in the academy. For example, they are burdened with heavier workloads, receive less professional development support and are provided with restricted benefits (Guillory, 2001; Spafford et al., 2006). Moreover, their salaries are lower. Singh et al. (1995) explain that this is partly the reason why racialized female faculty have the lowest average earnings in academia. However, Guillory (2001) notes that even when the rank, qualifications and experience of academics are held constant, the average salaries of racialized women are still lower on average than their colleagues. While this is only slightly noticeable at lower ranks, these wages increasingly diverge at higher levels. Finally, tenured academics are provided with more job and economic security (Agathangelou and Ling, 2002). This is because their positions are less contingent compared to untenured colleagues. Moreover, when job-hunting, other institutions more readily hire them because they possess seemingly superior qualifications. The instability experienced by untenured academics is especially problematic for racialized women who experience such things as discrimination on campus or feel the need to discuss particularly contentious issues. Because they are less secure at their jobs, they must often keep silent, so as not to risk jeopardizing their already uncertain positions in the academy (Pope and Laurence, 1997; Spafford et al., 2006).

Effects

As noted in this section, racialized women often have a variety of negative experiences within the academy. It is not surprising then that many of these women report feeling

disappointed and disenchanted with the academy (Patton, 1999; Singh et al., 1995). Indeed, compared to their colleagues, racialized women report feeling the lowest levels of satisfaction with academia (Singh et al., 1995). However, Garcia (2005) explains that these negative experiences can influence more than these women's perspectives on the academy; in fact, she explains that these experiences can impact the emotional, mental and physical well-being of racialized women. For example, as a result of these experiences, racialized women can suffer from depression and fatigue, and feelings of continual anger (Dua and Laurence, 2000; Garcia, 2005; Luther et al., 2003). Moreover, these women sometimes internalize negative experiences by blaming or doubting themselves. This can affect their self-confidence and self-esteem. The result is that many of these women end-up questioning their abilities and judgement and devaluing their own way of thinking and seeing things. This is especially problematic when these women experience such things as harassment on campus or unjust criticism, but are not confident enough to confront these issues (Luther et al., 2003). Indeed Luther et al. (2003) explain that criticism by administrators, colleagues and students can often push racialized women to work harder, and become perfectionists, as they fear further criticism and failure. This fear is amplified by the concern that their failures may be generalized to other racialized women. Consequently, these women feel pressured to work even harder and often overwork and exhaust themselves. Some women cope with these compromises to their well-being by 'removing' themselves physically/emotionally/psychologically from especially problematic situations (Luther et al., 2003). However, Luther et al. (2003) explain that sometimes these women are unable to manage the stresses of the academy independently and thus must enlist the support of therapists and councillors. Finally, Agathangelou and Ling (2002) note that some women

become so dissatisfied with the academy that they simply drop-out. The result is that racialized

women have the lowest retention rates in academia.

Chapter Four

Theory and Methods

A number of theories were employed in the present study. More specifically, Critical Race Theory, Critical Whiteness Studies and Critical Race Feminism provided the epistemological and methodological frameworks for the study. These are reviewed below. This is followed by a discussion of the data collection methods that were employed in the study.

Critical Race Theory

Critical Race Theory (CRT) was created by a group of radical American legal scholars led by Derrick Bell and Alan Freeman in the mid 1970's (Delgado, 1995; Matsuda et al., 1993). The development of CRT was spurred by a number of criticisms directed at three major legal discourses: legal liberalism, Critical Legal Studies and civil rights legislation.

Critical race theorists were critical of the civil rights laws of the 1960s. These scholars believed that the civil rights movement had stalled and many of the gains won through the movement had been 'rolled-back' (Delgado, 1995). This was because the goals of civil rights laws and the understanding of racism through these laws were too narrow and conservative (Crenshaw, 1995). More specifically, while civil rights laws had acted to suppress explicit racism directed at racialized groups through formal equal opportunity legislation, they did not confront the more covert systemic racism that permeated American society and maintained inequalities between racialized groups and whites (Crenshaw et al., 1995; Delgado, 1995; Gillborn, 2006; Yosso and Solorzano, 2002). The result was that civil rights laws were increasingly unable to provide racial justice for racialized peoples (Matsuda et al., 1993). Indeed

most of these laws that were meant to benefit racialized people actually acted to benefit whites, most notably white women (Delgado, 1995; Matsuda et al., 1993).

Critical race scholars were also critical of the tenets of legal liberalism (Aylward, 1999). Liberal legal ideology emphasized such things as individual rights, objectivity, colour-blindness, meritocracy, rationality, universality, neutrality and normative shared values (Aylward, 1999; Crenshaw et al., 1995; Delgado, 1995; Eiposito and Murphy, 2000; Lynn et al., 2002; Yosso and Solorzano, 2005). Supporters of legal liberalism believed that the gradual implementation of these ideologies into the legal system would ultimately result in racial equality (Lynn et al., 2002). However, critical race scholars believe that such ideologies were simply tools used to maintain the supremacy of whites. Consequently, critical race theorists contend that western laws based on liberal discourse are both products and promoters of racism (Matsuda et al., 1993).

Finally, critical race scholars were critical of Critical Legal Studies (CLS). CLS examines the way in which legal ideologies uphold and reproduce class inequalities (Eiposito and Murphy, 2000; Yosso and Solorzano, 2002). Moreover, it challenges such legal liberal concepts of neutrality and objectivity as it recognizes that these concepts act to legitimate unbalanced distributions of wealth and power (Aylward, 1999). Although the pioneers of CRT appreciated CLS' critical analysis of the law, they noted that the latter failed to include race and racism in this analysis (Lynn et al., 2002; Romero and Margolis, 2005). More specifically, CLS overlooked the role that race and racism played in constructing the law and neglected the experiences of racialized peoples (Lynn et al., 2002). Consequently, CLS were unable to articulate means to eliminate racism in the law and the general society (Aylward, 1999).

These three major criticisms have led to the creation of contemporary critical race

scholarship. Critical race scholarship is united by a number of major themes. They are as

follows: racism as endemic and normative; race as a social construct; analyses of race/racism in

social institutions; cross-epistemological analyses of race/racism; contextual examinations of

race/racism; and a commitment to social justice and change

Race as a social construct

Critical race scholars believe that race is socially constructed. More specifically, it is a

fluid concept that is shaped by social and political pressures (Delgado, 1995; Yosso and Parker,

2002). However, while critical race scholars acknowledge that race is socially fabricated, they

also acknowledge that this concept has real and substantial consequences for the lives of

racialized people. Indeed, Delgado (1995) argues that race is constructed as a social reality by

whites to promote and maintain their privileged status compared to racialized groups. Thus,

CRT aims to examine the ways in which race and racism have been negotiated in the collective

social consciousness and the resulting consequences of this negotiation (Crenshaw et al., 1995).

Racism as endemic and normative

Critical race scholars believe that racism is normal, endemic and a permanent part of

society (Solorzano and Yosso, 2002). This is because racism is both socially and

psychologically ingrained through historical consciousness and ideologies (Yosso and Parker,

2002). Moreover, racism directly shapes laws and institutional policies (Parker, 1998). Thus,

CRT explains that racist incidents should not be viewed as acts of individual prejudice, but as

larger, systemic, structural and cultural (Matsuda et al., 1993). Consequently, through their

work, critical race scholars examine the 'taken-for-granted' notions of race and racism (Ladson-

Billings, 2003). As Delgado (1995) notes, only by examining these concepts can they become less natural and alternative forms of reality become possible.

Race/racism in social institutions

Critical race scholars primarily examine institutional racism in their work. These scholars believe that institutional racism is the most longstanding and challenging barrier to racial equality for racialized peoples (Barnes, 1990; Eiposito and Murphy, 2000). Consequently, they attempt to expose how the latter have been systematically mistreated by supposedly race neutral laws and policies (Bernard, 2002; Eiposito and Murphy, 2000). Through these analyses, they are able to deconstruct the racist ways in which these laws and policies are structured and offer means through which they can be reconstructed that enables racial equality and justice (Parker et al., 1998).

Contextual analyses of race/racism

Critical race scholars believe that analyses of race and racism must be contextualized. They explain that legislation and social policies are commonly based upon liberal ideologies of universality and neutrality; however, these ideologies fail to take into account the specific and unique experiences of racialized peoples (Almstead, 1998; Delgado, 1995; Eiposito and Murphy, 2000). Consequently, these laws, policies and ideologies wrongly assume the uniform experience of racialized people and whites (Delgado, 1995; Eiposito and Murphy, 2000). Critical race scholars therefore call for a deeper analysis of legislation and social policy that considers the experiences of racialized people within both current and historical social contexts (Solorzano and Yosso, 2002). They contend that only then can racist injustices be named and deconstructed (Benard, 2002; Solorzano and Yosso, 2002). Thus, critical race scholars employ

methodologies in their work that centers the experiential and situational knowledges of marginalized people (Aylward, 1999; Lynn, 1999). Please see section 'Methodology' for a further discussion of this.

Crossing epistemological boundaries

Critical race scholars utilize interdisciplinary knowledges in their work, such as ethnic studies, women's studies, sociology and history (Solorzano and Yosso, 2002). This is partly because CRT has deep roots in a number of schools of thought, including postmodernism, Marxism, feminism and Black Nationalism (Lynn, 2005). The result is that critical race scholars often enlist intersectional analyses in their work, drawing relationships between racism and other forms of subordination (Fernandez, 2002; Yosso and Parker, 2002). This enables critical race theorists to avoid the pitfalls of scholarship which groups racialized peoples into one monolithic group possessing a unified history and experience (Barnes, 1990; Romero and Margolis, 2005). This kind of grouping silences the multiple voices of racialized people, and thus make it impossible to fully understand racism and consequently achieve social justice for racialized people (Romero and Margolis, 2005). Conversely, CRT's use of cross-disciplinary intersectional analyses allows for a more complete understanding of racism which enables the creation of more effective strategies for the elimination of racial injustices (Crenshaw et al., 1995; Romero and Margolis, 2005; Solorzano and Parker, 2002). See section 'Critical Race Feminism' for the discussion of a theory derived from CRT's dedication to multi-disciplinary intersectional analyses.

Social justice and change

Finally, critical race scholars are committed to the ultimate goal of social justice. They define social justice as the elimination of oppression and the empowerment and liberation of marginalized groups (Crenshaw et al., 1995; Solorzano and Yosso, 2005). Thus, through their work, they provide guidelines for the transformation of oppressive cultural ideologies and social institutions (Solorzano, 1998). Moreover, they provide encouragement for subordinate groups to resist their oppressors and for the ongoing engagement of critical race scholars in anti-racist political activism (Matsuda et al., 1993; Solorzano and Yosso, 2002).

Critical Whiteness Studies

Many critical race scholars examine the concept of whiteness in their work. Scholarly studies of whiteness in North America began in the 1980's and 1990's (Gillborn, 2002). However, McKinney (2005) notes that similar studies have existed outside of academia for much longer than this as racialized people have historically been forced to understand whiteness to merely survive. Thus, for example, the first writings on whiteness in the United States did not come from academics but from the reflections of everyday African Americans (Garner, 2007). However, as both society and academia have become more diverse and concerns with racial equality have heightened, the academy has also adopted studies of whiteness (Roediger, 2002). Contemporary scholars of whiteness focus on a range of concerns; namely: whiteness as socially constructed identity; whiteness as a simultaneously visible and visible culture and identity; the existence of white privilege in contrast to non-white disadvantage; and the deconstruction of whiteness and white privilege.

Whiteness as a socially constructed identity

Whiteness studies contend that whites have a distinct identity which functions to shape their experiences and perspectives (Kendall, 2006). However, Seidman (2004) explains that this identity is socially constructed. This is exemplified through the examination of the history of whiteness. There are many different accounts of this history; Garner (2007) provides just one of them. He explains that whiteness as a social identity originally arose with colonialism in the 16th and 17th century. During this time period, white Europeans increasingly encountered racialized people from such places as Africa, the Americas and Asia and began to notice supposedly distinguishing cosmetic and cultural features between these groups and themselves. In the late 17th century, these distinctions were cemented in western ideology when concerns for the voting rights of racialized subjects arose on Western European colonies. In fear of potential uprisings amongst the colonies, white colonial leaders created racial hierarchies which placed racialized people at the bottom and effectively denied them the same rights as their supposedly superior white colonizers (Garner, 2007; Wander et al., 1999). In the 18th century to the mid 19th century, scientific enlightenment discourse further solidified the subordinate status of racialized peoples as supposedly empirical and objective evidence came to 'prove' their inferiority (Garner, 2007). What is most interesting is that this evidence also acted to explain and maintain inequalities between those currently considered to be white (Seidman, 2004). Thus, for example, in the United States enlightenment discourses served to subordinate not only African Americans but also Irish and Italian Americans as these latter groups were also considered to be 'non-white' at the time.

Whiteness as a simultaneously visible and invisible culture and identity

Whiteness scholars also discuss the culture of whiteness. Delgado (1997) explains that whiteness is pervasive in North America; for example, white models and actors dominate the media, while holidays normally celebrated by whites determine the work and vacation schedules of almost all employees. McKinney (2005) notes that 'white' ideologies are also prevalent in North America; these includes ideologies of rationalism, order, individualism, personal responsibility, strong work ethic and mastery over nature. Consequently, whiteness has become enshrined in the overall North American culture and has become the central component of everyday social discourse. The result is that white identity and culture have become hyper-visible. However, this hyper-visibility simultaneously contributes to the invisibility and normalization of whiteness. More specifically, whiteness has become *the* culture of civilization, whites as the colourless 'default' race, and the interests of whites as the interests of all of humanity (Seidman, 2004). Conversely, racialized people are constructed as 'non-white', 'coloured' and raced. Moreover, they are measured against the standards of whiteness and are consequently viewed as being abnormal, inferior, primitive, weak and savage (Garner, 2007; Kendall, 2006; Wildman and Davies, 1999).

Because of the invisibility of the culture of whiteness, whites are usually unable to identify their own culture (McKinney, 2005). Moreover, most whites do not usually note their race as a major component of their identity. Thus, McKinney (2005) explains that whiteness is a 'prompted' identity. Conversely, racialized people are easily able to identify whiteness and often note their race as a central part of their identity. This is partly because while whites are for the most part safe from discriminatory treatment, racialized people are not. Thus, the latter are constantly made aware of their race. Moreover, whiteness usually remains invisible to whites

because they infrequently venture outside their white social circles. Consequently, surrounded by white culture and others like themselves, whites have no need to think about their white identity. However, with such processes as globalisation, McKinney (2005) explains that whites will increasingly encounter racialized people and their racial identities will become more personally evident and salient. Moreover, these encounters may help to increase the sense of empathy that whites possess for racialized people and destroy stereotypes of the latter in the minds of whites. However, it is important to note that while this may change the prejudices of individual whites, inequalities are perpetuated through social systems; thus, simply changing attitudes of individuals through interaction with racialized people will not effectively act to dismantle racism (McKinney, 2005). Instead, the social structures and accompanying ideologies which perpetuate racial discrimination and the culture of whiteness need to be defeated.

White privilege in contrast to non-white disadvantage

Whiteness exists in contrast to non-whiteness. 'Whites' as a racial group cannot exist without also constructing those considered to be 'of colour' (Garner, 2007; Seidman, 2004). Consequently, many whites create their identities from what they are not—i.e., *not* black, brown, etc (McKinney, 2005). Moreover, the privileges that whites benefit from cannot exist without the disadvantages non-whites suffer from (Seidman, 2004). Thus, Seidman (2004) explains that race as a social construct exists as a means of establishing boundaries which enable the exclusion and the denial of privileges to racialized groups. Consequently, the simple appearance of white skin becomes a marker of privilege (Kendall, 2006; Seidman, 2004). These privileges are maintained by a reign of white supremacy where social systems are run by whites for the benefit of whites (Garner, 2007). Moreover, the ideologies and norms created by the culture of whiteness act to cement these privileges (McKinney, 2005).

Whites benefit from a number of privileges. These include economic, social and political privileges. For example, whites have access to cultural capital from a young age which ensures their success in society. More specifically, because whites create societal norms through the culture of whiteness, they readily have access to the standards and behaviour patterns that ensure societal success (Garner, 2007). When their disproportionate success as a racial group is questioned, other white cultural norms such as the liberal ideologies of merit and individual effort act to dismantle these criticisms (Wildman and Davies, 1999). Whites are also privileged in that they do not have to be constantly concerned with either their own race/ethnicity or the race/ethnicity of others. On the contrary, because of the invisibility of whiteness, identifying ones race/ethnicity is a choice (McKinney, 2005). Indeed, individuals who choose to identify as white only do so to reap the benefits and superior status of whiteness. This is not true for racialized people. Racialized groups must always possess a 'double consciousness'—or an awareness of both their own race and the white race--to merely survive. Whites also possess the privilege of not having to be concerned with racial oppression or the participation in the struggle for racial equality (McKinney, 2005). However, racialized people must continuously worry about racial oppression as its consequences permeate all aspects of their lives. Furthermore, more often than whites, racialized people feel the need to participate in fights against racial oppression as these battles are key to their emancipation.

Finally, it is important to note that not all whites uniformly benefit from white privilege. On the contrary subordinate class, gender, ability, age, sexuality, etc identities may act to remove some of their privilege (McKinney, 2005). However, on average, whites are still more privileged than racialized people. Moreover, although subordinate social statuses may act to disadvantage

some whites, the fact that that they possess white skin still acts to alleviate some of these disadvantages (Wildman and Davies, 1995).

Deconstruction of whiteness and white privilege

Scholars of whiteness advocate for and participate in the deconstruction of whiteness and white privilege. This deconstruction entails the dismantling of the myths and assumptions that surround whiteness (Gillborn, 2006). Such deconstructions act to displace the invisibility and universality of whiteness with visibility and particularity (Wander et al., 1999). Moreover, this process helps to dismantle and halt the perpetuation of white privilege (Wildman and Davies, 1997). However, Garner (2007) notes that although whiteness scholars encourage the deconstruction of whiteness, he does not believe that whiteness can ever be abolished completely. Indeed, he notes that such beliefs reflect 'wishful thinking'; thus, he supports 'oppositional whiteness' or deconstructions which do not attempt to destroy whiteness, but instead produce counter-hegemonic discourses to whiteness.

There are a number of barriers to the deconstruction of whiteness. First, most analyses of race do not explore whiteness; instead these studies largely examine the construction of 'others' as victims of racism (Supriya, 1999; McKinney, 2005). McKinney (2005) explains that such work is beneficial as it can help racialized groups cope with racism while producing the counter-hegemonic discourses advocated by Garner (2007). However, without examining whiteness and white privilege, this kind of work cannot hope to effectively dismantle either (Supriya, 1999). Kendall (2006) notes that analyses which do deconstruct whiteness need to be conducted not only by racialized people, which has historically been the case, but by whites themselves. As she explains, the oppressed should no longer be expected to teach their oppressors about their

mistakes. Instead, whites need to take responsibility for the subordination of racialized people; only then will there be any possibility of racial equality. However, most whites are unaware of their whiteness and white privilege. Moreover, those who are aware of both of these often do not like to discuss them. Such discussions make most whites feel uncomfortable as they are fearful being offensive, creating resentment, being accused of racism and being rejected by racialized people (Kendall, 2006; McKinney, 2005). Thus, whites enact certain discourses to dismiss these discussions, reject their complicity in the reproduction of racism and consequently re-assert their privilege (McKinney, 2005; Wander et al., 1999). One of the discourses whites use is the discourse of color-blindness; this is where whites claim to view all races as the same. However, claims of colorblindness are problematic as they fail to contextualize the lives of racialized people, mistakenly assume the uniform experience of racialized people with whites and consequently overlook racial oppression (Kendall, 2006; McKinney, 2005). Another discourse whites commonly use is one of equal oppression due to reverse racism, their ethnicity or subordinate class, gender, etc status (Kendall, 2006; McKinney, 2005). McKinney (2005) explains that whites who utilize these claims are often accused of possessing false empathy for racialized people and drawing attention away from the latter's experiences with racism (McKinney, 2005). Finally, whites commonly use the discourse of apologia, where they assert their positive moral standing and 'non-racism' (Wander et al., 1999). However, Wander et al. (1999) explains that such discourses only act to assuage the guilt of whites and do not act to effect change for racial equality.

Critical Race Feminism

Critical Race Feminism (CRF) includes the scholarship of a variety of disciplines such as the social sciences, philosophy, literary studies and a number of anti-racist feminisms (Allen, 2007; Wing, 1997). However, this body of work is mainly derived from the criticisms of racialized female legal scholars, directed at feminist jurisprudence and CRT (Wing, 2000). Early critical race feminists believed that both CRT and feminist jurisprudence neglected the specific experiences of racialized women. More specifically, these women felt excluded from CRT as they believed that critical race scholars assumed the uniform experience of racialized people, regardless of gender (Wing, 1997). Critical race feminists also felt excluded from jurisprudential feminism, as this form of feminism was based almost completely on the experiences of white middle/upper class women (Wing, 1997). Thus, while the former suffered the double-burden of race and gender oppression, a discourse did not yet exist in legal studies which could simultaneously confront these oppressions (Crenshaw et al., 1995). Indeed, CRT and jurisprudential feminism forced racialized women to 'divide their allegiances' and fragment their experiences in ways that did not reflect the reality of their lives (Crenshaw et al., 1995; Roberts, 1995). Thus, critical race feminists rejected the essentialism of CRT and jurisprudential feminism and created a new body of work which re-centered the experiences of racialized women, enabling them to confront the multiple oppressions they experienced in their everyday lives (Wing, 2000).

Contrary to jurisprudential feminism and CRT, CRF holds that racialized women are not simply white women with 'colour added' or racialized men with gender added (Wing, 1997). Instead, critical race feminists believe that relationships between race and sex are relational; that is, one does not exist outside the other (Yosso and Parker, 2002). Thus, they contend that racism

and sexism are inseparable as they sustain and rearticulate one another making it impossible to isolate one form of oppression and its accompanying experiences from another (Roberts, 1995; Yosso and Parker, 2002). As a result, racialized women experience overlapping/conflicting identities or a 'multiple consciousness' which creates an awareness of the oppression they face based simultaneously on their race and gender (Allen, 2007; Wing, 2000).

Wing (1997) further explains that CRF does not simply focus on race and gender; on the contrary, CRF is aware of the importance of examining the multiple identities of racialized women based upon class, sexuality, ability, age, etc, and locating them within social and historical contexts (Roberts, 1995; Wing, 1997). Critical race feminists are also cognizant of the complex social relationships racialized women must contend with. That is, they are sensitive to the way in which these women must carefully manoeuvre themselves amongst multiple social groups as a consequence of their multiple identities (Allen, 2007). Some argue that this makes it impossible for racialized women to unite in the fight against racial and gender oppression. However, critical race feminists believe that differences amongst these women can contribute to the formation of diverse, creative and thus potentially more effective strategies for political activism and change (Allen, 2007; Wing, 1997). Consequently, critical race feminists encourage multi-vocality and recognize the equal value of all perspectives and paths to justice (Wing, 1997).

Finally, regardless of their criticisms of CRT and jurisprudential feminism, critical race feminists still build-upon the core tenets of these two theories. Like jurisprudential feminists and critical race scholars, critical race feminists also examine ideologies such as patriarchy, whiteness and liberalism (Wing, 2000). Moreover, critical race feminists also scrutinize the manner in which racialized women are subordinated by ideologies which reify race and gender

43

as objective, inherent, fixed and biological (Allen, 2007; Wing, 1997). However, CRF extends beyond CRT and jurisprudential feminism by examining the way in which these various ideologies converge to create overlapping systems of subordination, compounding the oppression experienced by racialized women and placing them at the bottom of racial and gendered hierarchies (Crenshaw, 1993). Further, these scholars examine the manner in which these same ideologies influence structures such as social institutions, legislation and public policy which then act to reinforce social inequalities directed at racialized women through racist and sexist social practices (Allen, 2007; Limber and Bullock, 2005; Parker and Roberts, 2005).

Methodology

Scholars of Critical Race Theory and its associated theories utilize and promote certain methodologies in their work. One of these methodologies includes the use of counter-stories created by marginalized groups (Solorzano and Yosso, 2002). These stories serve to center the experiences of these groups while questioning the authority of elite 'truths'. Critical race scholars utilize these stories in their work as they provide a number of benefits to racialized people.

Critical race scholars believe that reality is socially constructed. Thus, they reject the notion of objective and universal truths and instead hold that truth is multiple, contingent, partial and situated (Allen, 2007; Lynn et al., 2002). Moreover, they contend that truth is constructed by the formulation and circulation of stories or narratives (Delgado, 1995; Parker et al., 1998). Thus, social truths are created by widely circulated stories which come to dominate everyday social discourse and represent the shared reality of society (Delgado, 1995). However, these stories are told from the perspective of the storyteller; thus, they reflect the storyteller's personal

ontology and epistemology, which is in-turn influenced by the shared history of the social groups they belong to (Allen, 2007; Lynn et al., 2002). Consequently, these stories serve to only perpetuate one view of reality (Delgado, 1995).

Critical race scholars explain that the stories which most widely circulate in society are those which are forcefully and repeatedly told by privileged groups (Delgado, 1995). Consequently, Barnes (1990) explains that much of history and thus reality has been constructed by the stories of white Judeo-Christian men. These stories serve to maintain societal power as elite groups selectively 'pick and choose' facts which exemplify their supposedly superior natures compared to 'deficient' 'others' (Crenshaw, 1995; Delgado, 1995; Solorzano and Yosso, 2002). This acts to present the dominant position of elite groups as natural and justify the subordination of these others (Delgado, 1995). Thus, through these stories, dominant groups act to re-define themselves, racialized groups and relations within and between these groups (Eiposito and Murphy, 2000). Finally, Eiposito and Murphy (2000) note that dominant groups do not only incorporate facts garnered from their own experiences to compose their stories; on the contrary, the former also utilize 'minority tales' told by marginalized groups. However, these tales are modified to again support the position of elite groups, while neglecting the needs of subordinate groups.

Critical race scholars recognize that oppressed groups are also holders and creators of knowledge (Bernard, 2002). Thus, these scholars advocate for the creation of *counter*-stories, or stories constructed by racialized people (Solorzano and Yosso, 2002). Consequently, critical race scholars often employ methodologies in their work which enable the recording, collection and distribution of these counter-stories. Counter-stories serve a number of functions. They act to center the everyday experiential knowledge of racialized people (Solorzano and Yosso, 2002;

Stovall, 2006). This allows for the complex experiences of racialized people that are commonly ignored by dominant groups to gain visibility and understanding (Duncan, 2002; Lynn et al., 2002). By extension, counter-stories enable a deeper appreciation of how marginalized groups experience and comprehend their own oppression (Fernandez, 2002; Parker et al., 1998). However, Allen (2007) and Aylward (1998) explain that critical race scholars not only look at these stories as providing personal and closely interpersonal accounts of racism; indeed, these scholars also examine how such stories reveal oppression through structural and ideological discrimination. Thus, critical race scholars utilize these stories to analyze the way in which subordinate groups interact with oppressive social institutions and how dominant ideologies have served to create and maintain this oppression (Allen, 2007; Lynn et al., 2002). Crenshaw et al. (1995) explain that counter-stories accompanied by such examinations act to deconstruct and dismantle these forms of oppression (Crenshaw et al., 1995). That is, they present oppositional accounts of truth which function to challenge and transform dominant and supposedly 'objective' stories and notions of truth (Crenshaw et al., 1995; Delgado, 1995; Fernandez, 2002). Moreover, these accounts serve to challenge such notions as white culture, identity, white privilege and the values of liberalism (Delgado, 1995; Fernandez, 2002; Solorzano and Yosso, 2002). Finally, Lynn et al. (2002) explain that critical race scholars do not only utilize counter-stories to examine race and racial oppression. Indeed, although critical race scholars foreground race and racism when analyzing these stories, they are also interested in examining the way in which racialized people experience intersecting social identities (Lynn et al., 2002; Solorazano and Yosso, 2002).

Counter-stories provide a number of benefits to racialized people. These stories can be a source of pain as racialized people recall and relive the racism they have experienced (Wing,

1997). However, they can also be a source of knowledge, strength and power (Solorzano and

Yosso, 2002; Wing, 1997). Counter-stories can empower racialized groups as they act to

legitimate their cultures, languages and perspectives (Gillborn, 2006). Moreover, the readers and

writers of these stories can become empowered by simply participating in alternative discourses

through creation and consumption, respectively (Montoya, 1995). The telling of counter-stories

can also cause subject's to reflect on their experiences, learn how racism is structured and how

they have come to be oppressed (Parker et al., 1998; Solorzano and Yosso, 2002; Fernandez,

2002). This can help racialized people un-internalize their oppression, stop blaming themselves

for the racism they have experienced, and thus contribute to their own psychic self-preservation

(Parker, 1998; Parker et al., 1998). Moreover, with a better understanding of oppression,

racialized people can develop strategies to change social institutions and ideologies which

perpetuate this oppression (Solorzano and Yosso, 2002).

The publication and distribution of counter-stories can help to make the experiences of

racialized people more public, bringing greater awareness to their oppression (Fernandez, 2002).

Solorzano and Yosso (2002) and Delgado (1995) note that this can help to make other racialized

people aware that they are not alone in their experiences and build communities amongst them.

These communities can be a source of strength and support for racialized people (Delgado,

1995). Moreover, within these communities racialized people can compare similar encounters

with racism and create a 'consciousness of common experience' (Fernandez, 2002). With this

common consciousness, racialized groups can collectively derive plans for social action and

change. Allen (2007) explains that such plans are often most effective for change as they are

based directly on the experiences of racialized people and what 'makes sense' to them.

Counter-stories can also help whites become aware of the way in which they discriminate against racialized people (Parker, 1998). Delgado (1995) and Stovall (2006) explain that whites who read these stories oscillate between their personal world and the storyteller's, comparing the storyteller's reality to their own. This enables a greater understanding of their role in racial subordination and their white privilege (Parker, 1998). With this understanding they too can sincerely join in the fight for racial equality. However, Allen et al. (1990), explain that this can only occur with critical reflection and the desire/willingness to learn and grow.

Finally, it is important to also note some of the conceptual issues critical race scholars encourage researchers to consider when documenting and analyzing counter-stories. They explain that researchers should be self-reflexive and conscious of their positionality when conducting their research (Fernandez, 2002; Lynn et al., 2002). That is, they should be cognizant of their particular social identities and the way in which they influence the research process. More specifically, they should be aware that their scholarship is constructed through their personal lens and is thus directly shaped by their experiences as academics and raced, gendered, classed, etc individuals (Fernandez, 2002). Limber and Bullock (2002) note that self-reflexivity can act to enhance the work of researchers. For example, they explain that scholars who possess and are aware of their own subordinate racial identities have specific competencies or vantage points which they can tap to help them create a more authentic study (Limber and Bullock, 2002; Parker, 1998).

Allen (2007) explains that researchers should not only be conscious of their personal identities when conducting their research, but also their motivations. Thus, she insists that researchers ask themselves certain questions: why are they conducting such research? For what means/gains? Is it for the emancipation/liberation of informants, to satisfy personal curiosity or

48

perpetuate mainstream ideologies? Who is their main audience? That is, who are they writing

for and why? She explains that scholars should be aware of the answers to such questions as

they influence how they conduct their work, their findings and its implications (Allen, 2007).

Critical race scholars also encourage researchers to blur participant/observer relations

when conducting research (Duncan, 2002). Consequently, they believe researchers should not

view their participants simply as objects of study, but as 'conversation partners' (Lynn et al.,

2002). Thus, they ask that subjects actively engage in the research process, not only by

contributing their stories, but by, for example, reading and critiquing the work of the researcher

(Duncan, 2002). Finally, critical race scholars explain that a researcher should never consider

their work complete. On the contrary, as we attempt to name realities, they change and we

consequently have to rename them (Matsuda et al., 1993).

Criticisms

There are a number of criticisms that have been directed at Critical Race Theory, Critical

Whiteness Studies and Critical Race Feminism. First, critics have noted some particular

shortcomings of Critical Whiteness Studies. They explain that studies of whiteness shift

attention away from racialized people and racism (Anderson, 2005; Gillborn, 2006). The result

is that both remain unexamined and 'invisible' in the literature (Anderson, 2005). Moreover,

Gillborn (2006) explains that Whiteness Studies risks colonizing and de-radicalizing anti-racist

studies. Indeed, Anderson (2005) notes that such studies mostly benefit white scholars, enabling

them to renounce their racism and easily travel across racial and ethnic lines. Critics also explain

that studies of whiteness can serve to reify whiteness as an identity and culture, and thus detract

from its socially constructed nature (Anderson, 2005). Moreover, they explain that these studies

focus too heavily on white identity and white consciousness, while ignoring the material manifestations of white privilege (Anderson, 2005). This is problematic as it then makes it impossible to destabilize white privilege. Finally, Anderson (2005) explains that through Whiteness Studies, whiteness has come to represent anything associated with racial domination and consequently risks losing all meaning. Thus, she suggests that scholars practice greater discretion when using this term in their work.

Some critics have noted problems with scholarship on CRT and its associated theories as a whole. For example, they note that this scholarship does not fully examine the complexities that exist within and between racialized groups. For example, some note that scholars of these theories rarely include analyses of class; this is problematic as class and race often interact in society, placing racialized people at the bottom of class hierarchies (Henry and Tator, 2006). Moreover, analyses that ignore class fail to acknowledge the complexity amongst racialized people and their diverse experiences. Seidman (2004) further explains that these scholars often essentialize whites, ignoring difference between them. Others note that these scholars neglect examinations of relationships within racialized groups; that is, few have yet to analyze racism that occurs within these groups (Trevino et al., 2008). Moreover, Lynn et al. (2002) note that scholars of critical race focus almost entirely on relations between blacks and whites, while ignoring interactions between other racialized groups.

Critics further explain that critical race scholars do not make fruitful connections between theory and practice. Consequently, these scholars are unable to propose effective strategies that would enable the levelling of racial inequalities (Eiposito and Murphy, 2000). They simply 'name' oppression through stories; however, to bring about change these scholars must make greater attempts to engage in social activism for their cause (Almstead, 1998; Lynn et al., 2002).

Finally, critics explain that the methodologies utilized by critical race theorists are unverifiable, unreliable, unrepresentative and lack intellectual rigor (Levit, 1999; Parker, 1998; Villalpando, 2003; Wing, 2000). For example, Bernard (2002) explains that proponents of these theories rely too heavily on individual experiences in their work. This is problematic for a number of reasons. First, accounts of personal experiences are difficult to debate and analyze objectively (Bernard, 2002). For example, it is not possible to operationalize and measure the concepts offered in these personal accounts (Wing, 2000). Furthermore, it is impossible to generalize and thus verify the validity of individual experience (Villalpando, 2003). Moreover, studies that rely too heavily on individual experience can sometimes neglect examinations of institutional and structural power (Anderson, 2005; Eiposito and Murphy, 2000). Some critics further explain that theorists of critical race cannot simply attack agreed upon truths, reason and moral certainties and attempt to replace them with subjective experiences provided by counter-stories (Faber and Sherry, 1993; Levit, 1999). Such a replacement can be problematic as 'truths' provided by counter-stories may be atypical, untrue, unauthentic and thus misleading (Delgado, 1995; Faber and Sherry, 1999). Moreover, scholars of critical race may distort these stories and utilize them to support their particular notions of reality (Faber and Sherry, 1993). Finally, although such distortions may occur, these scholars often escape criticism as it impossible to objectively judge the counter-stories they provide in their work based upon standards of scholarly merit.

Before concluding, it is important to note some of the rebuttals aimed at the previous criticisms. Proponents of critical race theories contend that it is impossible for scholarship to be objective and held to any particular standards of 'right' and 'wrong'. Indeed, they note that all scholarship and standards are subjective; thus, what is judged to be right/wrong is a moot point

(Villalpando, 2003). Villalpando (2003) further explains that evaluations based upon supposedly objective standards are often biased as they are created and imposed by elite groups. Moreover, critical race scholars explain that although it is often difficult to operationalize and measure the concepts provided in their counter-stories, this does not detract from their rich content. Furthermore, critical race scholars contend that their stories are indeed generalizable, as they derive their generalizablity through their resonance with the lived experiences of racialized people. Moreover, they note that they are not attempting through their work to replace objective certainties with subjective experience; indeed, critical race scholars explain that such certainties do not exist, as all supposed 'truths' are derived from particular 'positionalities'. Furthermore, critical race scholars explain that their stories may in fact be misleading; however, elite stories can also mislead, but this is rarely acknowledged (Delgado, 1995). Finally, critical race scholars explain that it is not only their own scholars who distort their work based upon individual biases; indeed, whether intentional or not, all scholars' work is shaped by personal perspective.

Usefulness of Critical Race in this Study

There are a number of reasons why critical race theories and methodologies have been used in the current study. The critical race theories discussed enabled the analysis of both overt and covert forms of racism at Queen's. Moreover, it allowed the examination of how racism is manifest through certain structures, policies, ideologies, discourses and practices within the institution. These theories also enabled a contextual analysis of the experiences of racialized female academics at Queen's. Critical Race Feminism especially helped to provide an understanding of how these women experienced intersecting forms of subordination within this environment. That is, it allowed for an examination of how these women experienced racism and sexism along with other forms of subordination within the context of the university. Critical

52

Whiteness Studies was also especially useful in this study. It enabled an examination of the culture of whiteness at Queen's. Furthermore, it allowed for an analysis of the disadvantages non-white faculty suffer from within a largely white university. Moreover, it allowed me to challenge, deconstruct and make visible the white privilege and whiteness that functions within the university.

Critical race methodologies have also been useful in the current study. Interviews conducted with racialized female academics provided me with counter-stories (Lynn et al., 2002). These stories were used for the present project as they acted to shed-light on these women's experiences at Queen's. More specifically, they allowed me to document and analyze their specific experiences of discrimination at the university form their personal perspectives. Counter-stories were also utilized in the current study as I believed they may have provided a number of benefits to participants. That is, the telling of these stories may have enabled participants to divest themselves of the oppression they experienced at Queen's. Moreover, counter-stories helped to center the experiences of these women and I hope that they consequently helped to empower participants. The stories and the finished project will also help to bring awareness to the experiences of these women within the university. I hope that this awareness will encourage those within the Queen's community to heighten efforts for inclusivity and diversity at the university.

Finally, I utilized other methodological suggestions provided by critical race schools in the current study. I attempted to be self-reflexive while conducting the research project. For example, prior to the study, I was aware of my motivation for conducting the study. That is, I was aware of my commitment to the levelling of racial inequalities in academia and the wider society and my belief that my study would contribute to this process. Moreover, I was aware of

my particular identity as a racialized woman at Queen's. Thus, I was cognizant of the fact that my identity may have made it easier for participants to be candid with me during interviewing. Furthermore, as suggested by critical race scholars, I attempted to blur participant/observer roles during the project. For example, I did this during interviewing by not simply asking defined questions, but by engaging participants in conversation and adopting questions in such a way that was conducive to this conversation considering the progress of the interview. I further blurred participant/observer roles by asking the participants to read and edit the completed transcripts from their interviews if they so desired.

Data Collection Methods

There was a variety of data collection methods employed in the present study. Racialized female faculty from Queen's University were interviewed for the study. I chose interviewing as the primary method of data collection after reviewing the literature on feminist methodologies (FM). Driscoll and MacFarland (1989) note that those who use FM are primarily interested in understanding the personal experiences of oppressed groups. Thus, they center the 'lived experiences' of these groups as told in their 'own voice' (Byrne and Lentin, 2000). Consequently, scholars who utilize FM usually employ qualitative methods, often interviews, as they enable participant's to use these voices and speak openly about their experiences. Moreover, these methods are useful as they give researchers the opportunity to thoroughly examine and thus come to an understanding of participant's experiences (Driscoll and MacFarland, 1989; Maynard and Purvis, 1994). Thus, considering the purpose of the present study was to understand the personal experiences of racialized female faculty, while bringing these experiences to the fore within the academy, I believed that interviewing was the most appropriate method to use in the present study.

The women who were initially chosen to participate in the interviews were those who were recommended by my supervisor. Thus, purposive convenient sampling was utilized. Researchers often use this kind of sampling based upon their knowledge of the sampling population and the purpose of the study (Babbie and Benaquisto, 2002). I was aware that the population of racialized female academics is particularly small at Queen's and that only a few of these women would be willing to participate in the project due to its contentious nature. Thus, I utilized my supervisor's social connections through her anti-racism work on campus to generate a list of those women who might be willing to take part in the study. Those who did agree to take part were asked during interviewing to suggest other women like themselves who might also want to participate in the study. Consequently, snowball sampling was also utilized to recruit research subjects. This kind of sampling is employed when participants are again part of a small population (Atkinson and Flint, 2001).

The potential participants were recruited via email. I determined that this would be the quickest and easiest way to contact participants as many faculty are only sporadically found in their offices, and their office hours are often unlisted. I emailed 15 women from my supervisor's list. 4 women took part in the project from this list. The rest either did not respond to the email requesting their participation or were unable to participate. Moreover, 2 participants who initially were interviewed chose to withdraw from the study following their interviews. After these withdrawals I decided to recruit more participants. However, having exhausted my supervisor's list of potential participants, I decided to peruse online faculty profiles from the Queen's University Website and compile an additional list. From this list I was able to recruit 1 more participant for a total of 5 participants. Pseudonyms were used for all participants; they are as follows: Cathy, Eve, Brenda, Irene and Diana. Those who agreed to participate were

interviewed mostly in their offices; however one participant was interviewed in a library group study room. Locations were chosen based upon what was most convenient for participants and what would ensure the most privacy. Privacy during interviewing was of vital importance considering the sensitive nature of the interview questions. Interviews were expected to be only 1 hour each, which took into account the number of questions that were to be asked during interviewing and the anticipated time it would take to answer each. Actual interviews lasted between 30 minutes to 1.5 hours. Only one interview was conducted with each participant. I did not believe more than one interview was necessary to answer the all the research questions.

A list of open-ended questions guided the interviews; please refer to Appendix B for this list. Open-ended questions were used as they allowed participants to speak freely about their personal stories (Piore, 1979). Moreover, because the interviews were unstructured, it enabled me to adjust questions as the interview progressed according to previous answers and thus thoroughly examine the particular experiences of participants (Babbie and Benaquisto, 2002). The questions asked during interviewing were adapted from The Henry Report (2004). However, unlike The Henry Report, participants were not asked any demographic information such as their faculty, how long they had been at Queen's, etc. This was done in an attempt to protect participants' identities considering the particularly small sampling pool.

At the conclusion of the interviews I asked participants whether they would like to view the interview transcript. This enables participants to remove or add details, or change the transcript if they are uncomfortable with its content (Forbat, 2005). Two of the final participants asked to view their transcripts. Both altered their original transcripts. Changes to transcripts related to grammar, wording used during interviewing and the belief one participant had that she had answered a certain question incorrectly. Following the completion of the transcripts, I began

to review the transcripts. During this review, I utilized qualitative content analysis to manually

code and organize the transcripts according to repeated themes that became evident within and

between transcripts (Babbie and Benaquisto, 2002; Morgan, 1993).

Chapter Five

Results

There were certain themes that united the interviews. The themes are as follows: racial and sexual discrimination experienced at Queen's University and within the wider Kingston community; reactions to discrimination; coping with discrimination; perceptions of Queen's in terms of inclusivity, representation and retention of racialized female faculty; effects of discrimination; and suggested solutions that may help to diminish discrimination at the university. These themes are discussed below.

The Experience of Discrimination

Three of the participants claimed to have personally experienced discrimination at Queen's. Two explained that this discrimination was mostly overt, while one noted that it was predominantly covert. During the course of the interviews, participants discussed both their own experiences with discrimination as well as the experiences of other racialized female faculty at Queen's. Participants largely discussed encounters with racism; however, some also discussed sexism. Thus, this section will mainly examine the former; however, it will also briefly explore the latter.

Racism

A number of participants explained that racialized women at Queen's experience discriminatory treatment with respect to their research. Three participants discussed difficulties racialized women encounter when they examine issues of race or ethnicity in their work. Cathy and Eve note that work on such issues is labelled as 'fringe' and 'radical' and consequently

marginalized. Eve explains that such marginalization occurs because dominant groups in the university are threatened by scholarship on race/ethnicity. She discusses what this has meant for her as a racialized anti-racist feminist:

> The most painful racialization for me personally has come from white feminists who...have appropriated anti-racism...there are two ways in which this happens. Some want to speak for women of colour...and the other way...is the active resistance towards anti-racist feminism because it is a threat, (and) that is something that has gone on at Queen's and continues to go on at Queen's. (Eve, Interview, pp. 5)

Dua and Laurence (2000) explain that this resistance is common amongst white feminists as they are fearful that race issues may detract from gender concerns. Moreover, they are afraid that racialized women may destabilize their hegemony in feminism. Eve explains that the marginalization of scholarship on race/ethnicity means that she cannot speak freely about her work amongst her colleagues. Moreover, it also means that she has had to struggle to legitimize her work and gain recognition in the academy. Burgess (1997) notes that this struggle is common amongst scholars of race/ethnicity. Irene further explained that although scholarship on race/ethnicity is marginalized in the academy, racialized women are often assumed to be the authority on such issues. For example, she explains that she has repeatedly been approached by one particular colleague and asked to give her opinion on incidents of racism presented in the media; she notes that this is because it is believed that she is '... the only person who can answer these questions of race' (Irene, Interview, pp. 3). Thus, she is tokenized and is expected to be a legitimate representative of racialized people (Moses, 1997). This is most interesting as she does not study race/ethnicity in her own work. Indeed, Garcia (2005) notes that racialized women are expected to be authorities on race/ethnicity regardless of their personal or research interests.

Participants explained that the marginalization of certain kinds of research and knowledge results in a limited curriculum at Queen's. Brenda notes that her department has

largely refused to admit non-western thought; the result is that courses in her department mostly examine Western European knowledge. She explains her frustration as such a narrow curriculum does not reflect the diversity of Canada and is contrary to '21st century reality'. Cathy notes that this limited curriculum is problematic for racialized faculty, as they are mostly the ones who study non-western thought. Henry and Tator (1994) explain that the limited curriculum reflects the belief that the latter is of little value in the academy (Henry and Tator, 1994). Moreover, Carty (1991) notes that the narrow curriculum also reflects the desire of dominant groups to maintain their supremacy in the academy. More specifically, she explains that these groups control the production of knowledge in academia. The result is that they only allow thought in the academy that reflects their interests and concerns. Thus, the world in the academy is presented from a male, white, European perspective. This means that maleness and whiteness is constructed as the reference point for all knowledge, while 'other' knowledge is suppressed. This denies legitimacy to the knowledge of 'others' which acts to maintain the subordination of these 'others' and the supremacy of dominant groups in the academy.

Diana and Eve explain that the marginalization of 'alternative' knowledge means that white students who attend classes which examine such knowledge can become easily resentful. This is particularly apparent when these courses examine race/ethnicity. Eve notes that this is because these students are ingrained with normative notions of whiteness which are rarely challenged in the academy. Thus, when these notions are questioned in courses on race/ethnicity, they become angry as their dominant position in the system of whiteness is threatened (Dua and Laurence, 2000; Johnson-Bailey and Lee, 2005). Moreover, Johnson-Bailey and Lee (2005) note that such anger can be exacerbated when racialized women teach these courses. Because there are so few racialized female academics, their legitimacy and

60

authority as professors is questionable; thus, when students encounter these women, they are often resistant to their teachings. Indeed, this might explain some of the student hostility described by participants as all agreed that there are very few racialized female faculty at Queen's.

Participants further explained that their identities as racialized women could either make students hesitant about interacting with them, or conversely, draw students to them. For example, Irene notes that few graduate students choose her as their supervisor, as they 'go for the stereotype' of the 'white old man' (Irene, Interview, pp. 1). This occurs again because students perceive racialized female faculty as possessing limited legitimacy in the academy; this is especially the case when these women are compared to the more prevalent and authoritative white male academic. Conversely, Diana explains that her identity as a racialized woman attracts students to her. More specifically, she explains that because she is a racialized woman, racialized female students are drawn to her:

> ...in some cases...I'm a bit of an iconic figure for some of the women in my classroom who are women of colour who have told me that they have sought me out to take a course with me knowing that I'm teaching a class, because in their entire experience at Queen's, they have not had women of colour teaching their course. (Diana, Interview, pp. 3)

Moreover, both white and racialized students feel comfortable discussing certain issues with her because she is a racialized person

> ...when students...(encounter)...racist incidents...they feel like they don't have the power to do something and so they come to me to ask me what they can do... (Diana, Interview, pp. 3)

Participants not only discussed how their authority and legitimacy is doubted by students, but by colleagues as well. For example, three participants described situations where their

performance was questioned by fellow co-workers. However, there seemed to be no valid reason

for this; thus, they concluded that this had occurred because they were judged to be inferior

academics as racialized women. Brenda's experience was particular interesting. She explains

that she was having a conversation with one of her students when a fellow colleague intervened

asking whether the student understood her as she possesses a non-English/North American

accent. She notes that this could have been potentially very problematic, as

> ...this creates an ambiguity and creates...a space where the student can take advantage of (me), and I am very happy to say that very rarely do students do it...I haven't had that in my experience of teaching here—that there is such advantage taken--but the students realize (that they can take advantage)... (Brenda, Interview, pp. 1)

Thus, once her authority is questioned by one person, she becomes vulnerable to further attacks.

Moreover, she explains that her accent makes everyone initially unsure of her legitimacy as a

professor. Her situation exemplifies the additional difficulties racialized female faculty

encounter in academia when they have 'non-English' accents. More specifically, Beoku-Betts

and Njambi (2005) explain that women with such accents are automatically judged to be inferior

academics when they speak. Thus their already diminished legitimacy as racialized women is

further called into question because of their accents. Finally, Eve notes that racialized women

can also experience discrimination in the academy when they are left unquestioned. She

explains that this is manifest in 'over-politeness' which can be another form of racism:

> (Racism) is sometimes...just an inability to have a full human relationship with people...I know a good friend of mine is (racialized) and we were at a meeting...and she said some things she shouldn't have said...and no one would call her on it because they were terrified of calling a (racialized) person, and saying, you know, that was an inappropriate thing to say...(they were) just afraid to have a normal relationship because they (were) afraid of offending someone who's not white... (Eve, Interview, pp. 1)

Thus, over-politeness includes 'guarded conversations', which entails

> ...just being afraid to let go and let loose...always qualifying one's words, oh, but, not, wriggling around and using language in a way that it makes it clear that you just can't be comfortable. (Eve, Interview, pp. 2)

Irene notes that over-politeness and guarded conversations can result in 'special case' treatment where whites seem hyper-sensitized to issues of race around racialized people; however, she explains that this kind of treatment acts to alienate the latter and make the work environment uncomfortable. This is because such behaviour often reflects a concern with political correctness; a covert form of racism which acts to subtly oppress racialized groups by masking the underlying racist beliefs of whites (Coates, 2006).

Participants explained that racialized women also experience special treatment with respect to their workload and productivity. For example, Brenda notes that racialized women are expected to accept an excess of responsibilities to receive the same rewards as their colleagues. This is consistent with the literature which finds that racialized women must work twice as hard to be equally as successful as their co-workers, especially their white male co-workers (Kawewe, 1997). Cathy agrees, explaining that racialized women must excel to be successful in the academy:

> ...you had to excel, which is often the experience of racialized persons...You can't just come with qualifications that are the same or equal to someone else's. You have to be clearly superior in your qualifications and experience... (Cathy, Interview, pp. 2)

Thus, as Diana notes, racialized women must prove that they are deserving academics. However, both Cathy and Brenda explain that their hard work has created resentment amongst their colleagues. Agathangelou and Ling (2002) findings parallel these observations, as they explain that racialized women are mistreated if they 'overachieve', but white men are rewarded for all their achievements as they are expected to be successful in the academy. Brenda further notes that her heavy workload is often overlooked, as her department head and colleagues

explain that she is given extra work because she is simply 'good at it.' Garcia (2005) explains that because there is an expectation that racialized women will work harder in the academy, it is often the case that their excess labour is ignored. Thus, racialized women are placed in a double-bind in academia, where they are expected to work harder than their colleagues, but are often left unrewarded or even punished for their superior performance. Finally, Irene notes that because racialized women are expected to out-perform their colleagues, when she makes a mistake, it is repeatedly discussed in her department. Conversely, when her white male colleagues make similar mistakes, excuses are provided for them. This is because although the academy claims to utilize universal standards, the standards by which racialized women are judged are different from the standards that are applied to white men (Barnes, 1990). Carty (1991) explains that this is because it is these men who create such standards and perform these evaluations. Thus, the latter are structured in such a way that results in favourable results for these men, maintaining their dominance in the academy. However, Eve and Diana explain that racialized women should be treated differently in some respects compared to their colleagues; as Eve notes 'the standard of sameness is not necessarily the standard of equity' (Eve, Interview, pp. 3). Indeed, Kendall (2006) explains that equal treatment often results in unequal results for racialized women. Thus, the academy needs to take this into account when attempting to confront discrimination directed at racialized women.

Sexism

Two participants explained that they had experienced sexism at Queen's. Irene notes that men and women are referred to differently in her department:

> ...the men in the faculty, they are all white men, they are referred to as doctor, mister so and so, whereas all the women, not just the women of colour, are referred to by their first name. (Irene, Interview, pp. 3)

She notes that this demonstrates a lack of respect for female faculty. This is likely again because staff members perceive women as possessing limited power and authority compared to the men in her department. Diana's experiences with sexism were less benign than Irene's. She explains that she was repeatedly relayed the message in her department that women were incapable of working in her field. She was also explicitly told that female professors should only supervise female graduate students. Moreover, she notes she was subject to sexual harassment as she was pressured to go on dates with male colleagues. Moses (1997) explains that this is a common experience amongst racialized women as the same perceived lack of power and authority evident in Irene's situation make these women especially vulnerable to sexual harassment. All other participants did not note any experiences with sexism. Brenda explains that this is likely because she does not easily take notice of such experiences, as she has 'been a woman all (her) life' (Brenda, Interview, pp. 3). However, she has never experienced such explicit and continual racism as she has at Queen's. Irene agrees with Brenda's latter assessment. However, Diana explains that she cannot separate her experiences of racism and sexism:

> In terms of sexism as well in relation to my gender, I rarely can dissociate the racism and the sexism when I am both a visible minority and a woman, and so the two do play together in that sense. (Diana, Interview, pp. 1)

Indeed, Critical Race Feminists note that race and gender and their associated forms of discrimination do not exist outside one another; thus, it is impossible to differentiate between the two as a racialized woman (Roberts, 1995; Yosso and Parker, 2002). However, it is important to note the complexity of participants' experiences. Feminist Intersectionality explains that we cannot group all women's experiences together. This is apparent from the diversity of

participants' experiences with sexism. For example, some participants were able to separate

their experiences of racism and sexism; however, some were not. Moreover, some believed that

sexism had a strong influence on their experiences at Queen's, while some did not.

Kingston

Participants also discussed their experiences with discrimination within the wider

Kingston community. Diana explains that while she has not experienced either racism or sexism

at Queen's, she has been subject to racism in Kingston. Moreover, she notes that she feels like

an 'outsider' in Kingston; a feeling she has never experienced in any other city. This is likely

because of Kingston's relatively low level of racial diversity. Cathy agrees with Diana; she

explains that the Kingston community is not a welcoming one. She notes that this is not only

problematic for racialized faculty, but their families:

> ...the fact that Queen's is imbedded...in the Kingston community is a huge factor, because
> even when people come and think, as an academic I can deal with this...they have their
> families to consider, and the Kingston community is not necessarily a welcoming
> community. (Cathy, Interview, pp. 5)

Diana explains that the university needs to make certain efforts to help improve diversity in

Kingston. She believes that if the university prioritized ethno-racial diversity in hiring, the

Kingston community would follow suit. Diana explains that enhanced diversity within Kingston

is vital to her happiness at Queen's:

> ...for me, it's not that it's more important for me to feel accepted outside of Queen's in
> the Kingston community, but that is also as much a part of my everyday life, you know,
> going shopping, meeting shopkeepers, being a good citizen and having opportunities to
> be engaged in that space is as important to me as being effective as a teacher, researcher,
> a colleague in my department. (Diana, Interview, pp. 10)

Reactions to Discrimination

Participants discussed how they reacted to discrimination at the university. A number of participants attempted to defend either themselves or others against this discrimination. For example, Brenda and Irene explain that they tried to protest against inequalities in their department; however, when they spoke-out they were silenced. Irene notes that she was explicitly told to 'keep things...behind closed doors' when it became known that she had complained about the discriminatory treatment of students in her department (Irene, Interview, pp. 3). Moreover, Brenda explains how she was silenced:

> ...(as a racialized women) opportunities to speak-up are denied to you and then when you do speak-up...one is erased from the minutes, literally... (Brenda, Interview, pp. 2)

She notes that this is because racialized women are expected to be docile. As Agathangelou and Ling (2002) explain, racialized women are supposed to play the role of the 'grateful outsider'; the 'othered' individual who has been admitted to the academy with the expectation that they will not disrupt its patriarchal white hegemonic order. If the 'other' does not fill this role, they are viewed as a threat, unusual and troublemaking and are consequently silenced (Hao, 2003).

Participants also discussed how others in the Queen's community reacted to their personal experiences of discrimination. Brenda and Irene explain that when they experienced racism and sexism at the university, their colleagues and administrators were unresponsive. Irene notes that she was continually subject to explicit racism by one of her co-workers; however, no one was willing to confront him:

> ...none of the faculty members wanted to deal with the fact that this guy was totally out of line. I was told that I should learn to cope with it like they did. (Irene, Interview, pp. 3)

This may be because the majority of faculty at Queen's is white, and as Garcia (2005) explains, passivity to racism reflects one of the privileges of whiteness. More specifically, whites have the privilege of choosing whether they will participate in the struggle to level racial inequalities (McKinney, 2005). However, this is a luxury that racialized people are often denied. Eve explains that certain discourses are used to justify this passivity. For example, she explains that discourses of anti-racism, diversity and 'surficial anti-essentialism' are frequently utilized in the university; she explains what she means by the latter term:

> ...the vast majority of people in the academy would say, oh ya, race and sex, or gender...are social constructions. We know they're social constructions...and people will spout this (in) what has become a canonical approach to understanding social construction, but act in ways that suggest that there is something that isn't socially constructed, something that is inevitable. (Eve, Interview, pp. 2)

Critical race scholars explain that dominant groups utilize such discourses to dismiss discussions on discrimination, reject complicity in the reproduction of inequalities and re-assert their privilege (McKinney, 2005; Wander et al., 1999).

Perception of Queen's

Inclusivity

Participants were asked a number of questions pertaining to their perception of Queen's. Participants were first asked whether they believe Queen's creates an inclusive and welcoming environment for themselves and other women like them. Three participants answered no and two participants answered that Queen's is successful in creating this kind of environment in some ways, but not in others.

Three participants explained that in their personal experience, the environment at Queen's has evolved over time. Cathy noted that her arrival at Queen's was not welcoming;

however, when asked whether Queen's created an inclusive and welcoming environment for her currently, she replied that it did. Moreover, she explained that while her experiences at the university were generally pleasant, she was aware of other racialized women who have not had such positive experiences. Brenda's notes that she initially felt welcomed at Queen's as 'everyone was putting their best foot forward'; however, as time progressed, this feeling diminished (Brenda, Interview, pp. 1). Irene explains that she never felt that the Queen's environment was inclusive or welcoming; more specifically, she felt that she was initially resented in her department because it was believed that women were incompetent in her field. Moreover, the longer she stayed within the department, the worse this situation became, until she felt trapped:

> Back then, (when I first became a faculty member), there was a definite sense of resentment, and it was something that you discovered bit by bit, the longer you stuck it out, until it was too late to leave. (Irene, Interview, pp. 1)

A number of participants explained that the environment created at Queen's for racialized female academics varies depending on the different parts of the university these women encounter. For example, Cathy notes that in her experience, there are some individuals and departments that are welcoming, while others are not. Diana explains that her department made special efforts to be welcoming as they attempted to integrate both her and her research. However, she notes that she is aware that outside of her department, the wider university community is not necessarily this open to racialized women. Conversely, Irene explains that her negative experiences at Queen's have all occurred within her department, but she believes that outside her department there is 'good intention' and commitment to inclusivity at the university.

Some participants explained that the creation of an inclusive and welcoming environment for racialized women depends on the existence of university-wide programs which specifically

69

attempt to integrate these women into the university community. However, Cathy explains that

no such programs exist:

> I'm not aware that Queen's does anything specifically to create such an (inclusive and
> welcoming) environment...I can't think of any specific program or any such thing.
> Certainly, I was not exposed to such a program when I came. (Cathy, Interview, pp. 1)

Indeed, Cathy explains that inclusivity at the university is treated as an 'individual thing' where

departments separately decide what efforts will be made to integrate faculty members. This

inconsistent approach to integration may explain the diversity of participant responses and

experiences through time and across campus.

Representation

Participants were asked whether they believe racialized female faculty are adequately

represented at Queen's. All participants answered no. They provided a number of reasons why

they think this is the case. Eve explains that Queen's does suffer from poor representation;

however, this is not a problem that is particular only to this university, but to all universities.

More specifically, she notes that poor representation partly results from the limited number of

racialized women in PhD programs. Etter-Lewis (1997) explains that this may be due to

discrimination these women experience during their undergraduate and graduate academic

careers. Moreover, Owens-Patton (2004) explains that racialized female students may be

discouraged from continuing their education and entering the academy professionally because

they see other racialized women like themselves being unsuccessful or encountering difficulties

as professors. Diana further explains why there is a problem of representation at Queen's,

specifically. She notes that this problem may be a result of passive recruitment techniques

directed at racialized female faculty; she explains:

70

...you can't just sit there and expect a community of individuals to come to you, you have to actively recruit, you have to phone people and say, we are looking for people to fulfill the complement, we are missing people in terms of representation. (Diana, Interview, pp. 9)

Cathy believes that representation is also a problem at Queen's because of discriminatory hiring procedures following recruitment. These procedures stem from the privilege of dominant groups in academia:

...privilege (allows) people to...recreate the world in their image, because they have the power to do so, and that's why it's important to have diversity in the decision making structures of the institutions. (Cathy, Interview, pp. 5)

Thus, because the academy is dominated by white male men who control the hiring process, they are able to decide who composes the university (Moses, 1997). However, white men are least likely to hire racialized women as they perceive themselves to have little in common with these women due to their phenotypic differences (Baraka, 1997). Moreover, hiring these women compromises their position of power in the academy and is therefore avoided. Eve explains that the recruitment and hiring process at Queen's needs to be altered. She notes that the university has policies for equity in recruitment and hiring; however:

Equity is viewed as just going through the motions and nobody ever connects the policies that we have with the outcomes. Nobody is going to any significant lengths to recruit differently. Nobody is asking the questions why subtle discrimination is expressed from people who would not claim to be racist, but don't understand what racism is. No effort is being made to change the situation. (Eve, Interview, pp. 8-9)

Finally, Brenda believes that poor representation could be explained by discrimination experienced following hiring. That is, racialized women come to Queen's, experience discrimination, are unable to cope, and consequently leave. Thus poor representation stems from difficulties the university has with retention.

71

Retention

Participants were asked whether they believe Queen's has difficulties retaining racialized women. All participants answered yes. Participants explained why the university has such difficulties. Irene notes that Queen's cannot retain racialized women prior to hiring. She says that in her department, a number of racialized women have come to Queen's to be interviewed for faculty positions; however, they later decided they did not want to work at the university. This could be due to discrimination they experienced during the hiring process. However, as Diana suggests, this could be because they became aware of the Queen's reputation of being discrimination against racialized women. Indeed, a number of participants note that they have formed friendships with other racialized female faculty both at Queen's and other universities. When these women meet to socialize, they discuss their experiences at work; that is, they discuss both their own personal experiences with discrimination at the university as well as other's experiences that they have become aware of. Consequently, faculty outside of Queen's become knowledgeable about the discrimination experienced at the university by its own faculty members. Consequently, this can influence the former's decision if they are offered a position at the university. Eve believes that Queen's has difficulties retaining racialized female faculty due the subtle but constant oppression these women are subject to following hiring. As Cathy explains, this oppression can manifest in the marginalization of their work. This denies these women the opportunity to discuss issues that are important to them and feel appreciated within the university. Diana elaborates:

> If representation is all they want, they might attract faculty, but they will leave, because ...if you don't have recognition that these people have skills they are contributing...these individuals will leave. (Diana, Interview, pp. 9)

Thus, Diana insists that Queen's must make efforts to integrate these women's work into the academy. Such integration enables faculty to thrive, progress in their careers and simply feel more comfortable within the university; all these factors positively contribute to retention rates (Carty, 1991; Singh et al., 1995). Finally, Cathy explains that Queen's has difficulties retaining racialized women because of their isolation within the university:

> ...one of the reasons (for low retention) is the isolation, the fact that there are so few (racialized people), that there is not enough to have a critical mass to provide the kind of support that every human being needs in order to survive and do well. (Cathy, Interview, pp. 5)

Indeed, Smith and Calasanti's (2005) find that isolation is yet another important factor that influences faculty retention rates.

Coping with Discrimination

Participants coped with the discrimination they experienced at Queen's in a number of ways. Brenda explains that she copes by speaking-out against her racist treatment on campus. Indeed, Critical Race Scholars explain that speaking-out and telling their stories can act to empower racialized women and liberate them from racial oppression (Almstead, 1998; Montoya, 1995). A number of participants explained that their social networks helped them manage discrimination. For example, Brenda, Cathy, Diana and Eve noted that they have a few racialized female friends who they depend on for support within the academy. As Diana explains:

> ...there are other women of colour in this faculty, they sought me out, and did a few informal check-ins: how's it going, you know, are you having any difficulties, are you struggling... (Diana, Interview, pp. 6)

This parallels the literature which finds that racialized women receive the most support within academia from other racialized women. However, this support is limited because of the few

73

racialized women found within the university (Dua and Laurence, 2000; Henry and Tator, 1994; Patton, 1999). Indeed, as mentioned, most participants explained that they are the only racialized women in their department and know of few others like themselves elsewhere in the university. Irene explains that social networks outside her department and the university help her manage racism and sexism at work; however, she has chosen to isolate herself within her department, as she experiences most discrimination there:

> '...my plan is to avoid the coffee room, avoid the interaction as much as possible, choose who I talk to. I basically see myself as becoming a bit of a loner in the department... (Irene, Interview, pp. 4)

Diana further notes that she knows of a number of racialized women who also choose to isolate themselves, but from the wider Kingston community. Thus, they avoid discriminatory treatment within Kingston by living in the more diverse cities of Toronto or Montreal and commuting to Kingston for work. Eve explains that although she does not physically remove or isolate herself from either the university or Kingston, she sometimes must remove herself mentally and 'close (her) ears' to racism on campus (Eve, Interview, pp. 8). This physical and mental removal reported by Brenda, Eve and Diana acts as a shield for racialized women, which enables these women to protect themselves from discrimination experienced within the university (Carty, 1991; Luther et al., 2003). Finally, some participants explained that they are more easily able to manage oppression at the university due to their tenured positions. More specifically, these women are not as frequently subject to discriminatory treatment because of their seniority in the university. As Cathy explains, because she has tenure, it is more difficult for people to 'get at her'. Moreover, Eve notes:

> '...the extent to one is actually effected by a racialized system decreases if you can make your way through it...I've done that battle of getting through tenure and getting promoted to full professor, so it's behind me...' (Eve, Interview, pp. 4)

Conversely, Diana explains that her gender, race and lack of seniority combine to leave her with little power in the university. Indeed, Critical Race Feminists note that multiple subordinate identities can interact in the academy to place racialized women in especially inferior positions. Such positions can leave these women particularly vulnerable to discrimination at the university.

Effects of Discrimination

Experiences with discrimination affected participants in a variety of ways. Brenda and Irene explain that their work and home lives are influenced by the racism and sexism they encounter at the university. More specifically, they note that these forms of discrimination hinder their ability to advance in their careers. Moreover, they explain that they 'carry home' the stress created at work by experiences with racism and sexism. Eve agrees with Brenda and Irene; she explains that she is constantly affected by discrimination at Queen's. Some participants also described the way they feel when they or other racialized women experience discriminatory treatment at the university. A number of participants explained that these experiences are upsetting and emotionally taxing. Indeed, a few participants became noticeably distraught when describing their personal encounters with racism and sexism. Moreover, Brenda explains that she is not only upset by the racism she experiences, but feels confusion why nothing is being done to help women like her. Finally, while Diana claims to have never personally experienced discrimination at the university, she notes that she still feels distressed when she hears of other racialized women who have suffered through such experiences.

Recommended Solutions

Participants explained that certain changes need to be made at Queen's if it is to become more inclusive for racialized female faculty. A number of participants noted that certain

structures that have been put in place at Queen's to confront discrimination on campus need improvement. More specifically, participants mentioned such structures as the Human Rights Office, The Equity Office and QUFA. Irene explains that improvements could be made by conducting periodic reviews which monitor the effectiveness of these structures. Irene further notes that these structures have been playing more of a reactive role to racism on campus; however, the university needs to be more proactive to level inequalities directed at racialized faculty. Henry and Tator (1994) note that this is not to unique to Queen's as most universities fail to be proactive about racism on campus. Participants also explained that commitment is required by the administration at Queen's, such as the Dean and Vice-Principal Academic, to improve these structures and confront racism at Queen's. However, this commitment has yet to be made. Indeed, Cathy suggests that certain positions created at Queen's that supposedly demonstrate this commitment merely provides 'lip service' to diversity and equity. For example, she describes the role of the Equity Advisor as '...putting a position people can point to and say, we've done something' (Cathy, Interview, pp. 3). Carty (1991) explains that universities often have positions, committees and policies in place which make them appear to be equitable, but the university itself actually does little to level inequalities in the institution. Luther et al. (2003) further note that this appearance makes the university feel justified in claiming that they have fulfilled their commitment to equity and diversity; however, such claims only act to detract attention away from racism and maintain the status quo within the institution.

Participants explained that changing the composition of the administration at Queen's would help improve administrative commitment. Diana notes that she has only seen white Deans and Principals at Queen's. Henry and Tator (1994) explain that this is not uncommon, as the academy is especially non-representative of racial diversity at senior management and

administrative levels.   However, Diana explains that it is difficult for white administrators to understand the perspectives of racialized women. Indeed, Spafford et al. (2006) note that their specific social locations and thus experiences make this impossible. Thus, Cathy insists that more racialized women are needed in high-ranking administrative positions to bring alternate perspectives and concerns that are relevant to racialized women to the fore. This would help to change the way the university is structured, dismantle its white patriarchal and consequently make it more equitable

Participants believed that active recruitment and employment equity could improve both administrative and faculty diversity. Cathy and Diana explained that the university needs to recruit directly from the communities in which racialized people are found. Cathy explains:

> ...you then go to the communities where you find those people, you advertise in the magazines and newspapers that those people like to read...You go to the communities and you say to the communities...we need these kinds of people, where are they in your community? (Cathy, Interview, pp. 3)

Participants also believed that diversity could be improved through employment equity. Cathy explained that employment equity is the only way to get greater numbers of racialized women at Queen's and thus create a positive environment at the university for other women like this. However, a number of participants also explained that they know of many academics who are opposed to employment equity. For example, Cathy notes that she is aware of both racialized men and women who believe that employment equity puts them at a disadvantage as white colleagues feel warranted questioning whether they deserve their positions in the university. Moses (1997) explains that this is because whites are threatened by employment equity as it compromises their economic well-being and jeopardizes their dominant position in the academy. Eve notes that whites disguise these fears by claiming that equity and merit are incompatible.

However, such claims are based upon misunderstandings of equity. Moreover, McKinney

(2005) explains that merit is defined in such a way in the academy that is beneficial to whites.

For example, as Eve notes:

> ...a huge number of people actually believe that equity and merit are not compatible, and that's nonsense...and they continue to define merit in normative terms, so they define jobs that (are) only likely to get white candidates for those jobs... (Eve, Interview, pp. 8-9)

Finally, participants noted that although they approve of employment equity, it needs to be

improved at Queen's to function effectively. Eve describes the way in which employment equity

is structured currently:

> At Queen's, we have to fill out these silly forms that look at the composition of the committee and whether people have taken the equity course, which white faculty at Queen's just think it's a joke, and faculty of colour think it's a joke for a different reason...equity is viewed as just going through the motions and nobody ever connects the policies with the outcomes... (Eve, Interview, pp. 8)

Participants suggested that improvements could be made through enhanced training of hiring

committees and clearer guidelines indicating the responsibilities of equity representatives during

hiring. Finally, participants explained that such improvements may not guarantee diversity in the

university. Indeed, they note that scholarly integration is required if the university is to retain

racialized women at the university. Participants explained that such integration would require a

diversified curriculum. Thus, participants insist that the university include more non-Western

thought in the current curriculum. Diana explains that social integration of racialized women

must be prioritized at the university as well. She believes that this could best be achieved at the

departmental level, as she was socially integrated through her department and consequently feels

quite comfortable at Queen's. This is because colleagues and department heads interact

frequently with faculty within their departments; thus, it is easy for them to identify and target

certain faculty members that are especially in need of integration.

Finally, participants explained that if Queen's is to become more inclusive for racialized women, the university must consult with these women. Thus, Cathy believes the university should specifically gather these women together and simply ask 'what can we do for you?' (Cathy, Interview, pp. 3). By extension, a number of participants expressed their appreciation of the current study and insisted that similar studies specifically examining the experiences of racialized women in the academy be conducted.

Chapter Six

Analysis and Conclusion

There were a number of consistencies between the current study and the academic theory and literature. This section will briefly analyze these consistencies. It will begin by examining similarities between the results of this study and the literature which explores discrimination experienced by racialized female faculty. These similarities relate to the marginalization of scholarship, student discrimination, excessive workloads, tenure, an absence of support and social isolation, and the resulting affects of discrimination. This section will also explore the parallels between this study and the critical theories discussed previously. More specifically, it will examine the ways in which the racial and gendered hegemony of the academy is maintained ensuring the continued oppression of racialized female faculty. Finally, this section will close with a few concluding comments on this study.

<u>Analysis</u>

Literature

The scholarship of racialized female faculty is often marginalized in the academy. This occurs especially when these women examine race/ethnicity or non-western thought in their work. Indeed, study participants explained that Queen's labels such work 'fringe' and radical'. This is because this kind of work is believed to possess secondary academic worth. Moreover, it is perceived as a threat to whites in the academy. This is reflected in Eve's experience; she explains that her anti-racist feminist work is viewed as a threat and is consequently resisted by white feminists at Queen's. Fellow colleagues and administrators are thus unsupportive and unresponsive to scholarship on 'other' knowledges. The result is that women who concentrate on these areas of study find it difficult to gain recognition and establish themselves in the

academy. Thus, Eve explains that women who choose to study race/ethnicity must struggle to be successful in the academy. However, although scholarship in such areas is marginalized in academia, racialized women are tokenized and expected to be experts in these areas. This was apparent in Irene's case; because she is racialized she was frequently assumed to be the authority on racism in her department. Finally, the marginalization of scholarship on race/ethnicity and non-western thought often results in a limited curriculum in the academy. Indeed, participants explained that Queen's has largely refused to diversify its curriculum outside the confines of Western-European knowledges and disciplines.

Racialized female faculty are often subject to discrimination in the academy by students. Because there are so few of these women in academia, they are assumed to be illegitimate scholars and teachers. Thus, students frequently question the authority of these women in a variety of ways. For example, Irene explains that racialized women are not seen as legitimate scholars in her faculty; thus, graduate students often approach the more authoritative white male to be their supervisors. Their lack of legitimacy can make racialized female faculty particularly susceptible to mistreatment by students. This is especially evident when these women teach courses on race/ethnicity amongst white students. Participants in the current study explained that teaching such courses can be particularly difficult at Queen's because it is a largely white campus composed of white students who have rarely if ever encountered racialized female educators. Moreover, the limited curriculum in the academy means that students have likely never been exposed to teachings on race/ethnicity. The result is that the thought relayed these teachings is delegitimized. Thus, when white students encounter racialized female faculty for the first time in classes on unfamiliar topics in race/ethnicity, they can become hostile. This

hostility is exacerbated by the content of these classes which can be threatening to white students.

Racialized women are often given an excess of responsibilities in the academy. However, they are usually left unrewarded for these extra responsibilities. This partly explains why these women are frequently found to be more qualified than fellow colleagues in the same positions. Brenda and Cathy's experiences support these findings. Brenda explained that she is assigned extra duties and responsibilities in her department compared to her colleagues; however, she noted that there is no recognition of this, as racialized women are expected to work harder than others in the academy. Moreover, Cathy explained that racialized faculty must excel in the academy to progress and be successful. The already heavy workload assumed by racialized female faculty can be heightened when they become student mentors. These women are often approached to be mentors because of the particular sensitivities they are assumed to possess as racialized women. For example, Diana explains that racialized female students are drawn to her as they assume she can empathize with their experiences of discrimination on campus. Moreover, white students also come to her to discuss incidents of racism at the university, as they believe that she can better understand such incidents compared to their white professors.

Racialized women often have difficulties obtaining tenure. This can be problematic as an absence of tenure can make these women particularly susceptible to discrimination in the academy. In this particular study, only two participants noted that discrimination affected their ability to advance in their careers. However, one participant explained that her lack of seniority in her department leaves her especially vulnerable to discrimination. Conversely, two participants explained that their seniority protects them against racism and sexism at the university.

Racialized female faculty frequently experience a lack of support and isolation within the academy. Their research and scholarship is often unsupported by colleagues and administrators. Moreover, the discrimination they experience usually goes unrecognized by others in the academy. Indeed, some participants explained that their colleagues and administrators were unresponsive when they experienced racism or sexism at Queen's. Moreover, participants also explained that they were silenced when they tried to speak out against discrimination. Racialized female faculty are also largely isolated in the academy. For example, these women are frequently excluded from collegial support networks. Although participants in the current study did not report such exclusion, discrimination experienced by fellow colleagues still acted to isolate these women. For example, Irene explained that she has learned to avoid most social interaction in her department due to previous experiences of discrimination. Moreover, participants were aware of other racialized faculty who choose to minimize interaction at the university and in the wider Kingston community by living elsewhere and commuting. The support received from other racialized female faculty can help to alleviate the isolation these women experience in the academy. Indeed, racialized women receive the most support within the academy from other women like themselves. Study participants noted that they received substantial support from other racialized female faculty; however, their support networks were not restricted to such women. In fact, a number of participants explained that these networks included both white and racialized male and female faculty both at Queen's and elsewhere.

Discrimination experienced by racialized female faculty can have a number of affects on these women. For example, it can be emotionally and psychologically distressing. This was true for participants, as they explained that both their own and others' experiences with discrimination on campus can leave them distraught. Moreover, participants explained that

83

negative experiences in the university are at times so upsetting that they can influence not only their professional lives, but their personal lives as well.

Theory

Critical race scholars explain that racialized female faculty are oppressed in the academy because they threaten its white patriarchal hegemony. Thus, the white men who control the academy marginalize and subordinate these women to maintain their dominant positions within it. Indeed, Critical Whiteness Studies note that social systems are run by powerful groups in such a way that is beneficial only to them. These groups maintain their position of power in the academy through certain social practices. For example, they actively exclude 'others' from the academy. Indeed, Cathy noted that the white men that control the academy exclude racialized women from Queen's through the hiring process. They can easily do this without much protest as the senior administrators at Queen's have always been white, and mostly white men. Powerful groups also maintain their dominant positions in the academy through the use of liberal white discourses which act to dismiss discussions on discrimination. Participants in the current study explained that discourses of 'political correctness', 'merit' and 'universal standards' are utilized at Queen's to draw attention away from racism at the university. Moreover, dominant groups put certain positions and committees in place that appear to address discrimination; however, in reality these again serve to direct attention away from it. This tactic is utilized at Queen's, as one participant noted that there are a number of structures in place that simply pay 'lip service' to diversity and equity at the university but actually do little to diminish inequalities. Powerful groups also maintain their hegemony in the academy by silencing those who wish to make it more equitable. Indeed, a number of study participants explained that they were silenced through various means when they tried to speak out against discrimination.

Finally, critical scholars explain that the sometimes near invisibility of whiteness and racism can act to justify passivity to discrimination. This again contributes to the maintenance of the academic hegemony. Critical Whiteness Studies note that because whiteness is pervasive it becomes embedded in the everyday social discourse of the academy. The result is that whiteness becomes natural and invisible and can be difficult to identify and confront, especially by whites. This is likely true at Queen's, a university which is mostly composed of white students, faculty and staff, and which is located in the predominantly white city of Kingston. Moreover, Critical Race scholars explain that the systemic nature of racism can also make it difficult to identify as it is subtle and covert. The consistency between interviews suggests that Queen's suffers from systemic discrimination; however, participant responses indicated that the university does not recognize this as it manages discrimination reactively on an individual basis. This is problematic as Critical Race scholars explain that systemic racism is the most challenging obstacle to racial equality within social institutions. However, it is important to note that only one participant noted that the discrimination they experienced at Queen's was predominantly covert. Moreover, there have been many recent incidents of overt racism on campus. Thus, both overt and covert forms of racism are obstacles to racial equality at Queen's.

<u>Conclusion</u>

The study presented in this paper explored the experiences of racialized female faculty at Queen's University. More specifically, it examined these women's experiences of racial and sexual discrimination at the university. This study was needed as few scholars have attempted to understand the experiences of such women. Moreover, this study was especially needed at Queen's, specifically, due to the difficulties the university has retaining racialized female faculty. Furthermore, according to The Henry Report, Queen's suffers from a culture of whiteness and

racism which negatively affects the experiences of racialized faculty at the university. Thus, a contemporary follow-up study to The Henry Report was needed to verify whether the findings of the report still hold true.

There were a number of potential limitations of the present study. Interviews provided rich sources of data. However, I had to restrict how much of this data was included in the final written version of the study as much of what was said during interviews would have compromised participants' identities. Thus, although I would have liked to include more interview data in the written study, this was not possible. Five racialized female faculty were interviewed for the study. The small number of participants could have potentially limited the generalizability of the study. However, as Villalpando (2003) notes, stories by racialized people derive their generalizability from their resonance with the lived experiences of other racialized people. Thus, I was confident with the results of the study due to repeated consistencies between the interviews, and between the interviews and literature. Moreover, according to Critical Race scholars, stories by racialized people are valuable due to the richness of their stories (Villalpando, 2003). Indeed, the small number of participants did not detract from the rich content of their stories.

From the interviews, I was able to come to a number of conclusions. First, I was able to conclude that racialized female faculty are subject to both racism and sexism at Queen's. However, these women especially suffer from racism at the university. What is most interesting is that in many instances, the experiences of participants were consistent with the experiences of racialized participants from The Henry Report. That is, participants from both studies had similar experiences of racism at the university. Thus, I was able to conclude that Queen's is still dominated by a culture of whiteness and suffers from racism. This is not surprising considering

the numerous incidents of racism that have occurred on campus since The Henry Report was released in 2004. Moreover, it is evident from participant responses to the current study that Queen's still has difficulties retaining racialized female faculty. Indeed, at least one racialized female faculty has left the University since the release of The Henry Report. Thus, I suggest that the university heighten efforts to level inequalities at Queen's directed at racialized female faculty and other racialized people. The 'solutions' provided by the participant's of the present study, The Henry Report and the PAC Report could help to shape initial efforts. However, as mentioned by study participants, the university has to be willing to make a commitment to such efforts. Without this commitment and significant changes at Queen's, racialized female faculty will continue to have negative experiences at the university and the university will continue to have difficulties retaining these women. This is problematic not only for these women but the university itself, as a lack of diversity in the institution reduces its quality. Moreover, the university has garnered much media attention due to racism on campus. Thus, increased commitment to initiatives for diversity and equity would help to improve this reputation and draw not only diverse faculty, but students and staff, to the institution. As Brenda notes, a more diverse institution will become increasingly necessary as Canada diversifies with such processes as globalization. Thus, the university will have to learn how to adapt to the realities of the current global era, or get left behind.

Finally, I would like to conclude with some suggestions for future research. Future studies could include both racialized men and women. A comparison between these two groups would enable researchers to better understand the specific ways in which discrimination directed at racialized people can vary based upon gender. Moreover, future studies could explore the way in which gender and race combine with other social identities such as ethnicity, sexuality, class,

ability, etc to shape faculty experiences within the university. Finally, this was mainly an empirical study which has implications for policy change at Queen's University. However, it would be interesting if future studies were able to more thoroughly examine the theoretical implications of their studies, possibly suggesting ways in which these studies could advance the critical theories discussed previously and also suggesting ways in which such theories could be integrated into a coherent whole.

References

Agathangelou, Anna M, and L.H.M. Ling. 2005. "An Unten(ur)able Position: The Politics of Teaching of Colour in the U.S." *International Feminist Journal of Politics.* 4(3): 368 398.

Allen, Katherine R. 2007. "Integrating Black Consciousness and Critical Race Feminism into Family Studies Research." *Journal of Family Issues.* 28(4): 452-473.

Allen, Brenda J, Mark P. Orbe and Margarita Refugia Olivas. 1999. "The Complexity of Tears: Disenchantment an (In)difference in the Academy." *Communication Theory.* 9(4): 402 429.

Almstead, Audrey. 1998. "Word are Acts: Critical Race Theory as Rhetorical Construct." *The Howard Journal of Communications.* 9(4): 323-331.

Anderson, Margaret. 2005. 'Whitewashing Race—A Critical Perspective on Whiteness.' Pp. 21-34. In *White Out: The Continuing Significance of Racism,* edited by A. Doane and E. Bonilla-Silva. New York, NY: Routledge.

Anderson, Kristin J, and Gabriel Smith. 2005. "Students' Preconceptions of Professors: Benefits and Barriers According to Ethnicity and Gender." *Hispanic Journal of Behavioural Sciences.* 27(2): 184-201.

Atkinson, Rowland, and John Flint. 2001. "Accessing Hidden and Hard-to-reach Populations: Snowball Research Strategies." *Social Research Update.* 33. Retrieved April 26, 2009 (http://sru.soc.surrey.ac.uk/SRU33.html).

Aylward, Carol. 1999. *Canadian Critical Race Theory: Racism and the Law.* Halifax, NS: Fernwood Publishing.

Babbie, Lucia and Earl Babbie. 2002. *Fundamentals of Social Research.* Scarborough, ON: Nelson Education.

Bannerji, Himani. 1991. 'But Who Speaks for Us? Experience and Agency in Conventional Feminist Paradigms.' Pp. 67-107. In *Unsettling Relations: The University as a Site of Feminist Struggles,* edited by H Bannerji, L Cary, L Dehli, S Heald, and K McKenna. Toronto: ON: Women's Press.

Baraka, Nefta J. 1997. 'Collegiality in the Academy: Where Does the Black Woman Fit?' Pp. 234-245. In *Black Women in the Academy: Promises and Perils,* edited by L. Benjamin. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida.

Barnes, Robin D. 1990. "Race Consciousness: The Thematic Content of Racial Distinctiveness in Critical Race Scholarship." *Harvard Law Review.* (103), 8: 1864-1871.

Beoku-Betts, Josephine, and Wairimu Ngaruiya Njambi. 2005. "African Feminist Scholars in Women's Studies: negotiating spaces of Dislocation and Transformation in the Study of Women." *Meridians: Feminism, Race and Transnationalism.* 6(1): 113-132.

Bernard, Dolores Delgado. 2002. "Critical Race Theory, Latino Critical Theory and Critical Race-Gendered Epistemologies: Recognizing Students of Colour as Holders and Creators of Knowledge." *Qualitative Inquiry.* 8(1): 105-126.

Bernard, Wanda Thomas. 2003. 'Claiming Voice: An Account of Struggle, Resistance and Hope in the Academy.' Pp. 71-71. In *Seen but not Heard: Aboriginal Women and Women of Colour in the Academy, Second Edition,* edited by R. Luther, E. Whitmore and B. Moreau. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women.

Burgess, Norma J. 1997. 'Tenure and Promotion Among African American Women in the Academy: Issues and Strategies.' Pp. 227-234. In *Black Women in the Academy: Promises and Perils,* edited by L. Benjamin. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida.

Burke, Beverly, Andrea Cropper and Philomena Harrison. 2000. "Real of Imagined—Black Women's Experiences in the Academy." *Community, Work and Family.* 3(3): 297-310.

Byrne, Anne and Ronit Lentin. 2000. 'Feminist Research Methodologies in the Social Sciences.' Pp. 1-60. In *(Re)searching women: Feminist Research Methodologies in the   Social Science,* edited by A.Byrne and R Lentin. Dublin, Ireland: The Institute of Public Administration.

Carty, Linda. 1991. 'Black Women in Academia: A Statement From the Periphery.' Pp. 13 44. In *Unsettling Relations: The University as a Site of Feminist Struggles,* edited by H Bannerji, L Cary, L Dehli, S Heald, and K McKenna. Toronto: ON: Women's Press.

Coates, Rodney D. 2006. "Covert Racism in the USA and Globally." *Journal of Law and Society.* 33(1): 109-125.

Crenshaw, Kimberle. 1993. 'Beyond Racism and Misogyny: Black Feminism and 2 Live Crew.' Pp. 111-133. In *Words that Wound: Critical Race Theory, Assaultive Speech and the 5th Amendment,* edited by M.J. Matsuda, C.R. Laurence III, R. Delgado and K.W. Crenshaw. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Crenshaw, Kimberle, Neil Gotanda, Gary Peller and Kendal Thomas. 1995. 'Introduction.' Pp. xiii-xxxii. In *Critical Race Theory: The Key Writings that Formed the Movement,* edited by K. Crenshaw, N. Gotanda, G. Peller and K. Thomas**.** New York, NY: The New York Press.

Cuthbertson, Ken. 2006. "Making Queen's a Better Place." *Queen's Alumni Review*, November 20, p. 14.

Dauvergne, Mia, Cathy Skri and Shannon Brennan. 2006. "Hate Crime in Canada." Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics. Ottawa, ON.

Delgado, Richard. 1995. *Critical Race Theory: The Cutting Edge.* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Driscoll, Kathleen, and Joan MacFarland. 1989. 'The Impact of Feminist Perspective on Research Methodologies.' Pp. 185-203. In *The Effects of Feminist Approaches on Research Methodologies,* edited by Winnie Tomm. Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

Dua, Enakshi, and Bonita Laurence. 2000. "Challenging White Hegemony in University Classrooms: Whose Canada is it?" *Atlantis.* 27: 302-324.

Duncan, Garrett Albert. 2002. "Critical Race Theory and Method: Rendering Race in Urban Ethnographic Research." *Qualitative Inquiry.* 8(1): 85-104.

Eipositio, Luigi and John W. Murphy. 2000. "Another Step in the Study of Race Relations." *Sociological Quarterly.* 41(2): 171-187.

Etter-Lewis, Gwendolyn. 1997. 'Black Women in Academe: Teaching/Administration Inside the Sacred Grove.' Pp. 81-90. In *Black Women in the Academy: Promises and Perils,* edited by L. Benjamin. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida.

Fenandez, Lilia. 2002. "Using Critical Race and Latino Critical Theories to Document Latina/Latino Education and Resistance." *Qualitative Inquiry.* 8(1): 45-65.

Forbat, Liz. 2005. "Theoretical and Practical Reflections on Sharing Transcripts with Participants." *Qualitative Healthy Research.* 15(8): 1114-1128.

Garcia, Alyssa. 2004. "Stories of Race and Gender: Situating Experiences of Latinas in the Academy." *Latino Studies.* 3: 261-273.

Garner, Steve. 2007. *Whiteness: An Introduction.* London, UK: Routledge Publishing.

Gillborn, David. 2006. "Critical Theory and Education: Racism and Anti-Racism in Educational Theory and Praxis." *Discourse Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education.* 27(1): 11-32.

Guillory, Elizabeth A. 2001. "The Black Professoriate: Explaining the Salary Gap for African American Female Professors." *Race, Ethnicity and Education.* 4(3): 224-244.

Henry, Frances. 2004. "Systemic Racism Towards Faculty of Colour and Aboriginal Faculty at Queen's University. Report on the 2003 Study 'Understanding the Experiences of Visible Minority and Aboriginal Faculty Members at Queen's University.'" Report for the Queen's Senate Educational Equity Committee and Suzanne Fortier, Vice Principal Academic. Queen's University, Kingston, ON.

Henry, Frances and Carol Tator. 1994. "Racism and the University." *Canadian Ethnic Studies.* 26(3): 74-91.

Henry, Frances and Carol Tator. 2006. *The colour of Democracy: Racism in Canadian Society.* Scarborough, ON: Thomson-Nelson.

hooks, bell. 1988. *Talking Back: Thinking Feminist and Thinking Black.* Toronto, ON: Between the Lines.

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

Kawewe, Saliwe M. 1997. 'The Dynamics of Patriarchal Meritocracy in the Academy: A Case Study.' Pp.246-251. In *Black Women in the Academy: Promises and Perils,* edited by L. Benjamin. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida.

Kendall, Frances E. 2006. *Understanding White Privilege.* New York, NY: Routledge Publishing.

Ladson-Billings, Gloria. 2003. "It's Your World, I'm Just Trying to Explain it: Understanding our Epistemological and Methodological Challenges." *Qualitative Inquiry.* 9(1): 5-12.

Levit, Nancy. 1999. "Critical Race Theory: Race, Reason, Merit and Civility." *Georgetown Law Review.* 87(3). Retrieved April 30, 2009 (http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1299735)

Limber, Wendy M, and Heather E. Bullock. 2005. "Playing the Fool: U.S. Welfare Policy from a Critical Race Perspective." *Feminism and Psychology.* 15(3): 253-274.

Locke, Mamie E. 1997. 'Striking the Delicate Balances: The Future of African American Women in the Academy.' Pp. 340-346. In *Black Women in the Academy: Promises and Perils,* edited by L. Benjamin. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida.

Luther, Rashmi, Elizabeth Whitmore, and Bernice Moreau. 2003. 'Making Visible the Invisible: The Experience of Faculty of Colour and Aboriginal Faculty in Canadian Universities.' Pp. 7-27. In *Seen but not Heard: Aboriginal Women and Women of Colour in the Academy, Second Edition,* edited by R. Luther, E. Whitmore and B. Moreau. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women.

Lynn, Marvin. 2005. 'Critical Race Theory, Afrocentricity and their Relationship to Critical Pedagogy.' Pp. 237-139. In *Critical Pedagogy and Race,* edited by Z Leonardo. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Lynn, Marvin, Tara Yosso, Daniel Solorzano and Laurence Parker. 2002. "What's Race Got to doWith it? Critical Race Theory and Connections to Qualitative Research Methodology and Epistemology." *Qualitative Inquiry.* 8(1): 7-22.

Matsuda, Mari J, Charles R Laurence III, Richard Delgado and Kimberle Williams Crenshaw. 1993. *Words that Wound: Critical Race Theory, Assaultive Speech and the First Amendment.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Maynard, Mary, and Jane Purvis. 1994. 'Doing Feminist Research.' Pp. 1-9. In *Researching Women's Lives from aFeminist Perspective,* edited by M. Maynard and P. Purvis. London, England: Taylor and Francis Publishing.

McKinney, Karyn D. 2005. *Being White: Stories of Race and Racism.* Abingdon, UK: Routledge Publishing.

Montoya, Margaret E. 1995. 'Mascaras, Tranza, Y Grenas--Unmasking the Self whil Un/braiding Latin Stories and Legal Discourse.' Pp. 514-525. In *Critical Race Theory: The Cutting Edge,* edited by R. Delgado. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Morgan, David L. 1993. "Qualitative Content Analysis: A Guide to Paths Not Taken." *Qualitative Health Research.* 3(2): 112-121.

Moses, Yolanda T. 1997. 'Black Women in the Academe: Issues and Strategies.' Pp. 23-35. In *Black Women in the Academy: Promises and Perils,* edited by L. Benjamin. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida.

Nielsen, Joyce McCarl. 1990. 'Introduction.' Pp. 1-41. In *Feminist Research Methods: Exemplary Readings in the Social Sciences,* edited by J.M. Nielsen. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Parker, Laurence. 1998. "Race is...Race ain't: An Exploration of the Utility of Critical Race Theory in Qualitative Research in Education." *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education.* 11(1): 43-55.

Parker, Laurence, Donna Sofia Villenas and Kristin Crossland Nebeker. 1998. "Guest Editors' Introduction: Critical Race Theory and Qualitative studies in Education." *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education.* 11(1): 5-6.

Parker, Laurence and Lorna Roberts. 2005. 'Critical Theories of Race.' Pp. 74-81. In *Research Methods in the Social Sciences*, edited by B. Somekh and C. Lewin.

Patton, Tracey Owens. 1999. "Ethnicity and Gender: An Examination of Its Impact on Instructor Credibility in the University Classroom." *The Howard Journal of Communications.* 10(2): 123-144.

Pope, Jaqueline, and Janice Joseph. 1997. 'Student Harassment of Female Faculty of African Descent in the Academy.' Pp. 252-260. In *Black Women in the Academy: Promises and Perils,* edited by L. Benjamin. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida.

Razack, Sherene. 2003. 'Racialized Immigrant Women as Native Informants in the Academy.' Pp. 51-60. In *Seen but not Heard: Aboriginal Women and Women of Colour in the Academy, Second Edition,* edited by R. Luther, E. Whitmore and B. Moreau. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women.

Roberts, Dorothy E. 1995. 'Punishing Drug Addicts who have Babies: Women of Colour, Equality and the Right to Privacy.' Pp. 384-429. In *Critical Race Theory: The Key Writings that Formed the Movement,* edited by K. Crenshaw, N. Gotanda, G. Pellar and K. Thomas. New York, NY: The New York Press.

Roediger, David R. 2002. *Coloured White: Transcending the Racial Past.* Berkley, CA: University of California Press.

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

Seidman, Steven. 2004. *Contested Knowledge in Social Theory Today.* Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Singh, Kusum, Adriane Robinson, and Joyce Williams-Green. 1995. "Differences in Perceptions of African American Women and Men Faculty and Administrators." *The Journal of Negro Education.* 64(4): 401-408.

Spafford, Marlee M, Vicki L Nygaard, Fran Gregor, and Marcia A Boyd. 2006. "Navigating the Different Space: Experiences of Inclusion and Isolation Among Racially Minoritized Faculty in Canada." *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education.* 26(1): 1-27.

Statistics Canada. 2006. *2001 Census public use microdata file. Individuals flat files (ASCII), Second Revision.* Ottawa, ON: Statistics Canada.

Stovall, David. 2006. "Forging Community in Race and Class: Critical Race Theory and the Quest for Social Justice in Education." *Race, Ethnicity and Education.* 9(3): 243-259.

Supriya, K.E. 1999. "White Difference—Cultural Constructions of White Identity." In *Whiteness: The Communication of Social Identity,* edited by T.K. Nakayama and J.N. Martin. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

"Towards Diversity and Equity at Queen's: A Strategy for Change. Final Report of the Principal's Advisory Committee on Race Relations." 1991. Queen's University, Kingston, ON

Trevino, A. Javier, Michelle A. Harris and Derron Wallace. "What's so Critical about Critical Race Theory." *Contemporary Justice Review.* 11(1): 7-10.

Villalpando, Octavio. "Self-Segregation or Self-Preservation? A Critical Race Theory and Latina/O Critical Theory Analysis of a Study of Chicana/O College Students." *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education.* 15(5): 619-646.

Wander, Philip, Judith Martin and Thomas Nakayama. 1999. 'Whiteness and Beyond—Socio historical Foundations of Whiteness and Contemporary Challenges.' In *Whiteness: The Communication of social Identity,* edited by T.K. Nakayama and J.N. Martin. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Wildman, Stephanie and Adrienne D. Davies. 1999. 'Language and Silence: Making Systems of Privilege Visible.' Pp. 573-579. In *Critical Race Theory: The Cutting Edge,* edited by Richard Delgado. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Wing, Adriene Katherine. 1997. 'Introduction.' Pp. 1-6. In *Critical Race Feminism,* edited by A.K. Wing. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Wing, Adriene Katherine. 2000. 'Global Critical Race Feminism for the Twenty-First Century.' Pp. 1-23. In *Global Critical Feminism,* edited A.K. Wing. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Yosso, Tara, and Daniel Solorzano. 2002. "Critical Race Methodology: Counter-Sotrytelling as and Analytical Framework for Education Research." *Qualitative Inquiry.* 8(1): 23-24.

Yosso, Tara and Daniel Solorzano. 2005. 'Conceptualizing a Critical Race Theory in Sociology.' Pp. 117-146. In *The Blackwell Companion to Social Inequalities,* edited by M Robero and E Margolis. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Appendices

Appendix A: Executive Summary of the Henry Report

Background

On March 5, 2001, Suzanne Fortier, Vice-Principal (Academic) requested that the Senate Educational Equity Committee (SEEC) conduct a survey of all faculty to gather information regarding the experiences of visible minority and aboriginal faculty members at Queen's. The impetus for the study was a concern about poor retention of visible minority and aboriginal faculty members at Queen's.

SEEC formed the Faculty Survey Sub-Committee and developed a web survey that was sent to all members of the Queen's University Faculty Association. Focus groups and individual interviews were then conducted with those aboriginal and visible minority faculty members who self-identified and opted to take part in this exercise.

An expert on anti-racism, Dr. Frances Henry, professor emerita at York University, compiled and analyzed the data and the results of the focus group discussions. The final report, *Systemic Racism Towards Faculty of Colour and Aboriginal Faculty at Queen's University: Report on the 2003 Study, "Understanding the Experiences of Visible Minority and Aboriginal Faculty Members at Queen's University* ("The Henry Report"), was made available to SEEC in April 2004. The Henry Report (attached) provides a summary of the survey results and an assessment of the climate for visible minority and aboriginal faculty members at Queen's. Appendix A provides a history of SEEC's involvement in the study and the process followed in preparing a response to the Henry Report.

Introduction

In keeping with SEEC's mandate and in order to assist the University in implementing real change, the committee has prepared this response to the Henry Report. SEEC acknowledges that there are limitations to the Henry Report, for example, the size of the focus groups. However, in light of previous work done in the area of racism on campus, the Committee strongly believes that the Henry Report represents the realities of the current climate at Queen's. These issues are not unique to Queen's. Extensive literature on the experience of minority faculty supports the findings of the Henry Report (e.g. Aguirre 2000)[1].

A significant local contribution to the previous work in this area is the 1991 *"Final Report by the Principal's Advisory Committee on Race Relations"* ("PAC Report"). Because of its comprehensiveness and relevance to the current climate, SEEC chose to examine the PAC Report (attached) in detail to help overcome the limitations of the Henry Report. Although there was an initial thrust to implement some of the recommendations contained in the PAC Report (e.g. employment equity processes for the hiring of academic appointments and promotions, establishment of Human Rights Office, collection of equity and diversity data, etc) there has been little progress in addressing issues of climate over the past 15 years. The following

---

[1] Adalberto Aguirre, Jr. *Women and Minority Faculty in the Academic Workplace: Recruitment, Retention, and Academic Culture*, ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report Volume 27, Number 6, Adrianna J. Kezar,ed., Jossey-Bass, a Wiley Company, San Francisco 2000

recommendations are based on SEEC's analysis of both the Henry and the PAC Reports. They are categorized into the major themes that were emphasized in both reports: Leadership, Education, Recruitment/Hiring/Retention, Reward Systems and Strengthening Institutional Culture.

Major Themes
Leadership
The Senior Administration, including the Principal, Vice-Principals and Deans, has a key leadership role to play. They must show an unfailing commitment to the realization of an inclusive and diverse University.

- Include a clear statement that defines the University's commitment to equity and diversity in the Mission of Queen's.

- Develop a comprehensive plan with specific benchmarks in the area of anti-racism and equity to make people accountable for their actions. The plan should be a priority and must be reviewed on a regular basis.

- Establish a new portfolio at the Vice-Principal level that will be accountable for all academic and non-academic issues related to equity and diversity.

- Consistently incorporate equity and diversity values and objectives in internal and external decisions and actions. Particular responsibility for achieving this objective lies with every Senior Administrator.

Education
Every member of the Queen's Community has a vital role to play in achieving equity. It is important to provide the tools that will allow them to do so through University-wide educational programs.

- Rethink and redesign current equity and diversity awareness and training programs to ensure that they are inclusive and comprehensive.

  o This should be a collaborative process that involves all units and groups that have special responsibility in this area, for example, the AMS, Centre for Teaching and Learning, Equity Office, Human Resources, Human Rights Offices, Residence, and the SGPS.

  o Ensure that awareness and training programs recognize the need to value differences in the academic and broader learning and working environments.

  o Ensure that all members of the Queen's Community benefit from these programs, including the Governing Bodies, Administrators, Students, Staff and Faculty.

Recruitment/Hiring Retention

The University should strive to ensure that the composition of the student body and the faculty complement consistently reflect the proportion of racialized groups in the Canadian population. Therefore SEEC recommends the following:

- Create scholarships/bursaries that target students of designated groups in order to encourage them to come to Queen's. Engage in rigorous recruitment strategies in culturally diverse communities.

- Faculty members and students from racialized/Aboriginal groups need more support once they arrive at Queen's. The University needs to have structures in place that support a welcoming and inclusive workplace environment that takes into account individual differences and fosters smooth integration into the University Community. [See section on Strengthening Institutional Culture for specific responsibilities]

- Continue collection of data that provide a snapshot of the recruitment/hiring /retention of racialized/Aboriginal Faculty and develop efficient methods of tracking their career progression.

- Continue collection of data that provide a snapshot of the recruitment/admission/graduation of students from racialized/Aborginal groups and develop efficient methods of tracking students' academic progression.

Reward Systems
Strike a balance between enforcing requirements and motivating change by providing incentives and resources, specifically:

- Appoint to leadership/administrative positions (deans, directors, heads etc.) only candidates who clearly address how they would implement the University's equity and diversity goals and objectives.

- Reward leaders/administrators who achieve equity and diversity goals and objectives.

- Require Deans, Department Heads, and Directors to include in their annual reports progress made toward achieving the benchmarks set by the University (refer to the second bullet in the Leadership section)

Strengthening Institutional Culture
For Queen's to become a world leader, every member of the community needs to be a full participant in the life of the University. In order to achieve this, the current climate must be changed. Cultural change must be inclusive and recognize the interrelatedness of Faculty, Students, Staff, Alumni and the Governing Bodies.

- Provide a vehicle to foster interactions and networking amongst racialized/ Aboriginal groups across campus (for example: the development of an academic journal on equity/diversity issues that focuses on race; a defined physical space that provides people with the opportunity to interact in a supportive environment).

- Identify units that are successful in recruiting and retaining members of racialized/Aboriginal groups to promote best practices.

• Because pedagogical choices affect the culture of the University, more emphasis must be placed on diversifying the curriculum.

• Seek to become a leader in advancing a multicentric approach to scholarship. In order to achieve this, it is critical to value diversity of perspectives within the four types of scholarship: discovery, integration, application and teaching and learning.

Conclusion

It has been 15 years since the PAC report was tabled. If Queen's is to achieve the goal of changing the current climate and culture, described in both the Henry and the PAC Reports, the Administration must act quickly on these recommendations. Creating an inclusive environment will benefit everyone.

In order to encourage discussion and involvement in the climate change, SEEC recommends that this and all other reports on racism and equity issues be readily available and widely circulated.

Appendix B: Interview Questions

1. Do you believe that Queen's creates an inclusive and welcoming environment for racialized female faculty members?

Can you give examples to support your statement?

2. For you, what counts as racism and sexism? That is, how would you define racism and sexism?

3. Do you believe as a racialized woman at Queen's that you are treated the same as white or male faculty by:

     a. Your colleagues

     b. Heads of your department

     c. Administration

     d. Other Staff at Queen's

     e. Students

          -by undergraduates?

          -by graduate students?

     i.Can you give examples to support your statements?

     ii.If you believe you were treated differently, why do you think this is the case? Why were you treated this way?

4. Do you believe you have ever experienced racism and/or sexism at Queen's because you are a racialized female faculty member?

     i.please describe the situation.

     ii.was this racism/sexism manifest in an overt or covert way?

iii.what was done to solve this problem, if anything?

iv.was the problem dealt with to your satisfaction?

v.how did this experience make you feel? <Probe: Eg.marginalized, alienated, etc?>

vi.do instances of racism/sexism affect your everyday work experience?

5.Do you believe that the structures put in place to deal with racism/sexism as a racialized female faculty member are effective?

<Probe: For example, structures like the human rights office, etc?>

If not, what kind of structures do you think would be more effective?

<Probe: Do you believe that employment equity is the right way to go about creating this sort of environment? Can you explain why or why not? Can you give examples to support your statement?>

6. Do you think that racialized female faculty members are adequately represented at Queen's?

If not, why do you think this is the case?

7. Do you think that Queen's has difficulties retaining racialized female faculty members?

<Probe: if yes, how did you come to this conclusion? For example, did you read reports or newspaper articles that stated this, do you know of racialized female faculty members who have left the University, etc?>

<Probe: if no, the Henry Report was a response to the difficulties the University has retaining racialized female faculty members. Are you aware of this? How do you feel about this?>

i.if yes, why do you think the University has problems of retention?

ii.do you find this to be problematic? Please explain why.

8. What do you believe would make Queen's a more inclusive and welcoming environment for racialized female faculty members?

9. Can you recommend any other racialized female faculty members at Queen's that may want to participate in this study?

10. Would you like to view the transcript from this interview when it is completed to ensure that you are comfortable with the information you provided during interview?

If yes, I will contact you via email when the transcript is completed and we can arrange a time and place for you to view the completed transcript.