"I don't believe that I have been wanted":

Processes of Overinclusion and Exclusion in Racialized and Gendered Organizations

Joya Misra[1], misra@umass.edu, University of Massachusetts, Amherst
Ember Skye Kane-Lee, ekanelee@umass.edu, University of Massachusetts, Amherst
Ethel Mickey, Ethel.Mickey@csusb.edu, California State University, San Bernardino
Laurel Smith-Doerr, lsmithdoerr@umass.edu, University of Massachusetts, Amherst

Suggested citation: Joya Misra, Ember Skye Kane-Lee, Ethel Mickey, Laurel Smith-Doerr, "I don't believe that I have been wanted": Processes of Overinclusion and Exclusion in Racialized and Gendered Organizations, *Social Problems*, 2024;
spae043, https://doi.org/10.1093/socpro/spae043

ABSTRACT

Many studies document that faculty of color, and particularly women of color, find the academy unwelcoming. Yet research that centers intersectional understanding of the mechanisms leading to these inequalities is underdeveloped. We identify three context-dependent mechanisms of racial and gender disadvantage among faculty: active exclusion, overinclusion, and passive exclusion. Taking an explicitly intersectional approach that builds on relational inequality theory, our study focuses on 32 faculty of color, including 18 women and 14 men, comparing their experiences to 30 same-rank white departmental colleagues. Comparing the experiences of faculty who share the same rank and department but differ by race and gender provides a deeper understanding of how race and gender inequalities intersect and are shaped by organizational processes. Active exclusion involves the devaluation of BIPOC faculty's research, as well barring access to resources and positions. Overinclusion is characterized by the overreliance of the university on the labor of faculty of color, particularly women of color, without appropriate compensation. Finally, we conceptualize a more passive kind of exclusion, where BIPOC faculty are left out of collaborations, mentoring, and decision-making relative to white colleagues. Moving beyond rhetoric to disrupting racism in the academy requires addressing overinclusion, and both active and passive forms of exclusion.

Keywords: faculty; higher education; intersectionality; race; gender; inclusion

[1] Contact Joya Misra, corresponding author at misra@umass.edu or Department of Sociology, 200 Hicks Way, Thompson Hall, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA, 01003, 413-545-5969. Kane-Lee and Smith-Doerr share the same address; Mickey's address is Department of Sociology, California State University, San Bernardino, 5500 University Parkway, San Bernardino, CA 92407, 909-537-5000.

Racial and gender domination is maintained through structures and systems, practices and policies, customs and cultures (Acker 2006; Avent-Holt and Tomaskovic-Devey 2019; Bonilla-Silva 2021; Ray 2019; Wingfield 2019). These systems may not appear to reinforce racism and sexism, even as they do. Indeed, as Victor Ray (2019a: 40) argues, "much racial inequality is produced through relatively passive participation in racialized organizations." These inequalities are striking in higher education, where diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) often serves as an empty mantra, emphasizing the goal of creating more diverse institutions, even as faculty, staff, and students of color experience exclusion.

Systemic racism and sexism reflect both explicit exclusion as well as more subtle forms of exclusion and overinclusion. These practices allow universities to express overt commitments to diversity, without simultaneously addressing racist and sexist organizational structures (Bonilla-Silva 2017, 2021; Embrick 2011; Wingfield 2020). Advantages and disadvantages accrue as resources and relationships are distributed within the organization via racial and gender schemas (Lewis 2004; Ray 2019; Valian 2004). Insofar as existing practices are understood as normative and neutral, white supremacy and patriarchy are invisible. Routinization is the organizational context that allows racism and sexism to proliferate (Avent-Holt and Tomaskovic-Devey 2019; Bonilla-Silva 2021; Ray 2019; Ridgeway 2014; Wingfield 2019).

We know a person's statuses— such as race, gender, class, and nationality—intersect to impact their experiences. Theoretically, intersectional frameworks recognize inequality, relationality, power, social context, complexity, and social justice (Collins and Bilge 2016). This focus is also central to relational inequality theory, which identifies how processes of exploitation, social closure, opportunity hoarding, and claims-making explain the maintenance of inequality within organizations (Avent-Holt and Tomaskovic-Devey 2019). We take an

explicitly intersectional approach to relational inequality, focusing on these processes from the standpoint of women of color.

Existing research illustrates that the experiences of faculty of color differ from white faculty (Lisnic, Zajicek, and Morimoto 2019; Settles et al. 2022; Settles, Buchanan, and Dotson 2019; Turner, González, and Wong (Lau) 2011). Yet few have applied an intersectional and organizational perspective to analyze the processes shaping faculty careers. Our research design allows us to analyze the experiences of faculty in the same local organizational settings and rank, sharing the same job in the same department while differing by race and gender, to identify the mechanisms of inequality within the organization. In analyzing intersectional inequalities, we center the experiences of women of color, rather than treating white men's experiences as "the norm," while carefully considering differences among men and women of color, as well as how their experiences map onto those of similarly placed white colleagues.

We identify three ways that the experiences of faculty of color differ from white departmental colleagues of the same rank. Women of color are mostly likely to express being, first, *actively excluded* from opportunities and resources, and secondly, *over-included* in devalued labor. Third, both men and women of color recount being *passively excluded* from collegial networks. We draw on sociological theories of relational inequality and racialized and gendered organizations to consider how all three mechanisms are embedded in the structure of academia. These organizational processes help explain how these workplaces, despite a mantra of diversity, equity, and inclusion, remain gendered and racialized. Our analyses contribute to understanding why efforts to diversify organizations are so rarely successful.

Racism and Sexism in Academia

Faculty of color, particularly Black, Latine, and Native American faculty members, are underrepresented in academic workplaces, with women of color especially underrepresented at senior ranks (Diggs et al. 2009; Lisnic et al. 2019; Settles et al. 2019; Stanley 2006; Tran 2014; Turner et al. 2011). Higher education institutions must do more to not only recruit, but also retain faculty of color, particularly women of color (Griffin and Reddick 2011; Hirshfield and Joseph 2012; Smith and Calasanti 2005; Turner et al. 2011; Zambrana 2018). Yet, academic workplaces have a history of exclusionary practices.

Black, Latine, and Indigenous faculty are less likely to be hired in tenure-line positions, in higher-paying fields, and in elite institutions (Fryberg and Martínez 2014; Lisnic et al. 2019; Stanley 2006; Turner et al. 2011). Those making hiring and promotion decisions "embody and uphold traditional standards of excellence as though they are time-tested evaluative tools rather than as products of a long social and historical process of exclusion" (Fryberg & Martínez, 2014: 11). Leaders and colleagues may stereotype people of color as less intellectually gifted or undeserving, implying that their inclusion reflects affirmative action rather than merit (Bonilla-Silva 2017; Ridgeway 2011; Settles et al. 2019; Turner et al. 2011). These faculty may be "redirected" into interdisciplinary programs or contingent jobs (Tran 2014; Turner et al. 2011).

Faculty of color are more likely to pursue work that addresses issues related to their communities, provides services, and engages in efforts for social change, all of which are often devalued by academic institutions (Settles et al. 2022; Stanley 2006). Gatekeepers for grants, fellowships, publications, and promotions tend to reflect narrow understandings of scholarship and rules for promotion, often rewarding "traditional" scholarship (Dade et al. 2015; Fryberg and Martínez 2014; Settles et al. 2019; Turner et al. 2011). Epistemic exclusion—the devaluation of particular research topics, methods, or types of knowledge production—affects career success for

many faculty of color (Bonilla-Silva 2017; Cech et al. 2017; Settles et al. 2022, 2019; Stanley 2006).

At the same time, leaders and colleagues often expect faculty of color to do more diversity, mentoring, and service work for the institution, with these effects compounded for women of color. Scholars refer to this as an "identity tax" or "cultural tax" (Griffin and Reddick 2011; Hirshfield and Joseph 2012; Melaku and Beeman 2022). Faculty of color may further be treated as "token representatives" (Diggs et al. 2009; Settles et al. 2019; Stanley 2006; Tran 2014). As Settles and colleagues (2019: 67) describe, "the university wants their status as racial minorities to be highly visible, while simultaneously devaluing them. . .[preferring] faculty of color to suppress parts of themselves that challenge White middle-class norms." Such processes spotlight faculty of color, while sidelining their success.

Faculty of color also often feel responsible for supporting students and communities of color (Castañeda and Hames-García 2014; Melaku and Beeman 2022; Stanley 2006). They may find this work meaningful, providing inspiration as well as opportunities to connect with other faculty of color and the larger community (Stanley 2006). Yet, this work is "neither compensated or recognized" (Melaku, 2022:1517), or as Wingfield (2019) theorizes, "racially outsourced." Service, mentoring, and diversity work are often unrewarded, unlike research (Dade et al. 2015; Diggs et al. 2009; Melaku and Beeman 2022).

Attaining community within the academy is difficult for faculty of color in predominantly white universities and less diverse fields. Many faculty of color are isolated and excluded from informal peer networks. Isolation has material effects on career success, including a lack of mentoring and fewer research collaborations and funding opportunities (Bonilla-Silva 2017; Diggs et al. 2009; Settles et al. 2019; Turner et al. 2011). Decision-making may reflect the voices

and perspectives of more senior, white faculty members. Even tenured faculty members of color may have less authority at work, making their work draining and dispiriting (Turner et al. 2011). This isolation may explain why, even when faculty of color are promoted, universities are less likely to retain them (Dade et al. 2015; Fryberg and Martínez 2014; Stanley 2006).

Relational Inequalities & Intersectional Theories

The inequalities discussed above reflect the gendered and racialized organization of academia. All organizations have racialized and gendered expectations for workers (Acker 2006; Melaku 2022; Ray 2019; Wingfield 2019). The basic operating principles of universities, developed around a model of upper-class white men with few care responsibilities, have not substantially changed over time. Thus, university leaders and faculty colleagues have an "ideal worker" in mind, reflecting gendered and racialized stereotypes (Acker 2006; Ridgeway 2011; Wooten and Branch 2012). Departmental policies, practices, and cultures thus often reproduce gendered and racialized inequalities.

Intersectional theory emphasizes that inequalities are multi-dimensional, and reflect relationality, in that one group's privilege is directly tied to another group's disadvantage (Collins 2000; Collins and Bilge 2016; Glenn 2009). Intersectional theorists directly analyze power and inequality, using a social justice lens to understand how inequalities are produced and maintained. Context and complexity are also central. Inequalities look different from place to place; they also differ based on the intersecting social locations an individual occupies (Collins 2000; Collins and Bilge 2016; Glenn 2009).

Relational inequality theory explains inequalities in organizations as reflecting mechanisms of exploitation, social closure, and claims-making, harnessed through making

categorical distinctions between groups of workers (Avent-Holt and Tomaskovic-Devey 2019; Tilly 1999). Exploitation occurs when more powerful actors in an organization benefit at the expense of less powerful actors, appropriating scarce organizational resources, including less powerful actors' unpaid labor (Avent-Holt and Tomaskovic-Devey 2019). Social closure reflects more powerful actors excluding less powerful actors from access to resources, through opportunity hoarding (reserving opportunities for in-group members) and exclusion (denying opportunities for out-group members) (Avent-Holt and Tomaskovic-Devey 2019). Claims-making reflects how actors make arguments about why they deserve greater access to resources, often using existing policies, practices, and cultures as justification (Avent-Holt and Tomaskovic-Devey 2019). Claims-making is a key mechanism through which exploitation and social closure occurs; all three generate inequalities. Critical to a relational inequality framework is the notion that inequality is produced in *social relationships* within the local *context* of organizations.

We bring together the justice-oriented epistemology of intersectional theory with the conceptual precision of relational inequality theory. Our analysis starts from an intersectional, relational inequality framework. We attend to how relational inequality mechanisms may play out differently for different intersectionally placed groups of actors; by focusing on the perspective of the subaltern, we capture forms of inequality that may not be as evident from the dominant group's standpoint. We focus on the subaltern's experiences with exploitation, social closure, and claims-making. We look within departments following bureaucratic policies and where actors are in relationships with colleagues, to understand how, despite institutional claims of commitments to diversity and inclusion, inequality is maintained. Avent-Holt and Tomaskovic-Devey (2019:46) argue that it is important to understand "where, when, and why

particular categories become salient and what cultural meanings they incorporate." We explore how intersectional identities shape how inequalities are experienced, cognizant of the simultaneous salience of both race and gender.

We consider how faculty of color experience exploitation, exclusion, and disconnection from claims-making opportunities. By analyzing the experiences of faculty who differ by race and gender, but share a similar structural position (job) and organizational location (department), we examine how cultural norms and policies are translated into practices that reinforce intersectional inequalities (Avent-Holt and Tomaskovic-Devey 2019; Smith-Doerr 2004; Smith-Doerr et al. 2019; Sturm 2006; Wingfield and Chavez 2020). As a result, we make new contributions to relational inequality theory, analyzing how these inequalities are experienced differently by men and women of color.

The existing literature suggests that faculty of color have *different* experiences than white faculty members. Yet, these accounts have not theorized the organizational mechanisms that reinforce racialized and gendered inequalities. We highlight the organizational processes driving racial and gender inequities for faculty of color, unpacking the implications of these intersectional mechanisms for how these groups experience their careers. We focus on the accounts of 18 women of color and 14 men of color at a predominantly white university, analyzing intersections of gender and race. We further draw from the accounts of 30 white faculty, matched by department and rank, to consider how the experiences of minoritized faculty compare to colleagues in the same jobs and organizational contexts. We extend research on inequalities by demonstrating how workers with different intersectional identities express or do not express experiencing exploitation, social closure, and claim-making in their workplace, to explain better the maintenance of organizational inequalities.

Methods

This paper is based on 62 interviews with STEM faculty (defined by math, and biological, physical, social, and computer sciences) at a research-intensive, predominantly (and historically) white public university in the Northeastern United States. We focus on STEM fields because previous research shows STEM faculty experience greater biases than faculty in more diverse fields (Cech et al. 2017; Lisnic et al. 2019; Wingfield 2020). Approximately 8% of STEM faculty at the university are from underrepresented groups, 35% are women, and 17% are Asian. The interviews were carried out by a U.S.-born woman of color social scientist, which created rapport with women of color. Contact information was collected from faculty lists on department websites; our interview acceptance rate was 61%.

The purposive sampling strategy targeted four faculty members at the same rank in fourteen departments. We initially interviewed women of color, prioritizing faculty from more junior ranks; then, we matched men of color, white women, and white men in the same department at the same rank and career age. Given the low representation of women of color in STEM, and our interest in understanding the intersectional experiences of faculty members, women of color were the foundation of our sample. We suggest that truly understanding inequality requires centering the voices of the most vulnerable groups.

Interviews were conducted between April 2019 through May 2020, and ranged between 40 and 75 minutes (the average was 60 minutes). The final two months of interviews (with all the white men, four white women, and two men of color) took place online due to the pandemic. Interviews with white men were more meandering than other interviews, which may reflect online modality or discomfort with discussing inequality (Bonilla-Silva 2014). We audiotaped

and transcribed all but three interviews; for those three, the interviewer took detailed notes and transcribed them the same day. The interviews covered questions about faculty experiences including mentoring, research collaboration, decision-making, and inclusion in their departments. During the six months when the authors transcribed and coded the interviews, we discussed emerging key themes in weekly meetings.

The sample is summarized in Table 1. Matching participants by department and rank creates both a targeted sample that allows for comparisons and a diverse sample; slightly more than half are women, non-white, and foreign-born respondents. Most participants were Assistant Professors or recently tenured Associate Professors, although we also included Professors and non-tenure-track Lecturers in permanent, benefitted positions. Occasionally, one member of a department would be a slightly different rank (e.g., recently promoted associate professor with advanced assistant professors). We quote from respondents using pseudonyms, providing their race, gender, and nativity for context, but exclude identifying details. We highlight the experiences of faculty of color but use data from white colleagues to shed light on organizational processes, and compare experiences among faculty of color, attentive to how gender intersects with race.

[Table 1 About Here]

Findings

Our findings emphasize three different institutional processes that disadvantage faculty of color in their workplaces, using theories of intersectionality and relational inequality. We begin with "active exclusion," how faculty of color feel actively devalued, discriminated against, and under-resourced, most often described by women of color. Next, we identify a less obvious form

of disadvantage – "overinclusion" in less valued work, also primarily experienced by women of color. Finally, we use our accounts to illustrate "passive exclusion," subtler forms of discrimination that have meaningful impacts on the success of both men and women of color.

Active Exclusion

In some cases, faculty of color describe being actively excluded due to their backgrounds, noting the disjuncture between the university's diversity rhetoric and feeling excluded from jobs, resources, and promotions. Colleagues also devalue their scholarship. Together, these forms of active exclusion reflect opportunity hoarding, silenced claims-making, and social closure – closed doors for faculty of color.

Emilia, a foreign-born Latina faculty member, describes how her husband was first hired for a tenure-stream job, and in negotiations, it seemed she would receive a similar appointment. She assumed this offer would come, given the diversity narrative at the institution. Yet,

> I was offered a possibility that then turned out to be many steps of negotiation . . . Eventually came here on one premise, and then the premise changed . . . what I was expecting to happen didn't happen. And so, I feel that that was sort of an inflection point . . . where things changed significantly.

After suggesting a possible tenure-stream position, due to her publication record, the university placed Emilia in a non-tenure stream position. This downgraded offer led her to feel devalued by college and university leaders, and to question its commitment to diversity. It may be that Emilia's record was not as strong as she thought, but bungled interactions with administrators surrounding her appointment have made her feel mistreated.

Diego (Latino, foreign-born), also in Emilia's department, feels accepted in his department, saying he never felt that his race "was affecting my possibilities at all." Yet Diego's

experience on a college-wide committee opened his eyes to how racism and sexism remain institutionalized:

> In certain departments, there is a white, completely crazy, completely predominant male part of their culture also. I can see that it is difficult for a woman to pass that filter, 90% men, and no women [full] professors, so that person could have trouble being promoted from assistant to associate. Exactly the same if you are the only person of color – color in a very broad way – Latino, African American or even from Asia.

Like Emilia, Diego sees a gap between the narrative of valuing diversity and how colleagues treat faculty. Diego believes that women and faculty of color have a better chance of being promoted in diverse departments, suggesting greater discrimination and more silenced claims-making in less diverse departments. On the college-level review committee, Diego identifies that in some departments, the advantages and status of central actors lead to inequalities in who can earn tenure and promotion, reflecting social closure that limits the opportunities for faculty of color and even white women (Avent-Holt and Tomaskovic-Devey 2019). Diego witnesses how inequalities operate in this committee.

Like other faculty of color, Mariana (Latinx, foreign-born) recognizes that her work tends to be more interdisciplinary: "That sort of in between. . . which is what I always found myself in, and then you can't fit into one or the other." This in-between position makes her feel vulnerable about how her research is judged (Settles et al. 2022). She described her experience when university-level standards changed just before she went up for tenure:

> So, my concern with that is seeing the grievances that were coming up, and how it was disproportionately affecting women of color that I knew. They were all gone or leaving

quickly. And so, I got really, really scared about that, like, what's going on? This is the people that are getting pushback . . . Like, I'm glad I made it through, but barely.

While Mariana fulfilled the expected record, administrative expectations changed, with women of color disproportionately filing union grievances. Mariana thinks of herself as having "made it through but barely," because of how the cases of women of color – perhaps more engaged in interdisciplinary work – received greater scrutiny. While Mariana's three departmental colleagues in the study agree that they went through tenure at a contentious time, none of them voiced concerns about their research being devalued as Mariana did. Women of color may be particularly burdened by epistemic exclusion.

In another department, Chang, a foreign-born Asian man, and Wyatt, a white U.S- born man, both do interdisciplinary work and feel pressure to publish in journals more central to the field. Yet Chang is less concerned these issues will affect his tenure case, arguing that his department does not have a clear "guiding principle" for where to publish. Still, he wonders whether he should publish in "more centrally located" journals. Wyatt does not worry: "I got the advice that it wouldn't be a bad idea to try and publish in a journal that was [field] focused. And you know I sort of said, 'Yes, that would be nice but again I'm going to publish the best place I can where it's the most appropriate.'" Wyatt felt comfortable discarding collegial pre-tenure advice, arguing "I think [interdisciplinarity] ultimately produces much better, more innovative research." Thus, while interdisciplinary work may be devalued, the combination of interdisciplinarity and being a man of color concerned Chang more and felt outright risky for a woman of color like Mariana, relative to a white man (Wyatt).

Other faculty of color describe how they must deal with active slights, which fits less clearly into a relational inequalities framework (Avent-Holt and Tomaskovic-Devey 2019).

When faculty colleagues say negative things about a colleague's race or nationality, even if indirectly in discussing a job candidate or ethnic food, it affects their sense of belonging. It is less obvious what their colleagues gain from drawing boundaries in these ways. For example, Yang (Asian, foreign-born woman), who is Chinese, describes how her department orders food from diverse local restaurants. This attempt to create inclusion has backfired. Yang recounts that one colleague loudly comments about Chinese food: "Look at all the yucky food today (*using a disgusted high-pitched tone*)." Yang describes these experiences as painful, noting that she is considering telling her chair: "I know this person didn't mean it, but it did make me feel not comfortable." Yang carefully appraises her colleague's comments, suggesting that they don't "mean it," although it makes her uncomfortable. Yet no one else has addressed these public comments. Lines can be drawn in ways that reinforce cultural boundaries and create less inclusive environments for faculty of color.

Yang's colleague Tracey, a white U.S.-born woman, also has concerns about race. She noted that the department hired a white faculty member and a Black faculty member at the same time, but the university-level leader involved in the hire provided less start-up money for the Black faculty member. Tracey argues, "I would say we have a lot of work to do there. . . I think this university has a long way to go. . . I was like, 'you're going to hire a Black person and then not give them anything?!'" Yet, Tracey and Yang's white colleague, Adam (U.S. born man), only says: "Well, I think in our discipline, traditionally, persons of color have been a smaller proportion. There's a recognition to that. I know that there are efforts in place to be more inclusive and have more diversity." For Adam, unlike for Tracey and Yang, there are "traditional" issues regarding a lack of diversity but, speaking in passive voice, he notes that

these issues are recognized and "there are efforts in place." Inclusion is less pressing in Adam's account.

Resource challenges also come up for Hiromi, a foreign-born Asian woman, who describes challenges with timely lab renovations:

> Sometimes I get some stereotype for 'Asian female'. . . So, my lab is under renovation. And at some point, I have a hard time communicating with [the contractors] because sometimes they didn't take me seriously. . . I'm sure that I may look . . . younger than other faculty, but I just feel like sometimes people just don't take me seriously.

Puzzled at why her renovations have taken longer than expected, Hiromi spoke to a white building manager, who talked to the contractor for her. DeLun, a foreign-born Asian man in the same department, has experienced fewer issues with space: "I haven't made any kind of too excessive requests. Whatever modest thing I have asked, I have been granted." Hiromi's lab may require more than DeLun's, or Hiromi's requests may appear "excessive." Yet slow lab renovations have material consequences for productivity and could mean the difference between a successful and unsuccessful tenure case.

Social closure and opportunity hoarding appear in these accounts. Women of color describe direct experiences of exclusion, such as when Emilia was stuck in a non-tenure-line job after relocating. Epistemic exclusion may be most powerfully felt by women of color, such as Mariana. Women of color also describe active slights that have material effects on their sense of inclusion (Yang) and research trajectory (Hiromi). Not only do women of color have less access to resources, but they also are more likely to voice concerns around belonging and connection. Men of color witness these processes (Diego) but provide fewer direct examples. White men

colleagues appear less concerned about how they will be judged (Wyatt), or assume the university is addressing diversity issues (Adam).

At the organizational level, routines act as cover for inequalities in hiring (Emilia) or tenure and promotion (Diego), including regarding what types of scholarship counts for faculty with different intersectional identities (Mariana, Wyatt, Chang). There is variation among subunits in the organization. Diego notes that more diverse departments may have fairer tenure and promotion standards. Variation in routines over time occurs, as when tenure standards changed right before Mariana went up for tenure. The organization does not have policies to ensure that resources like start-up-funds or lab renovations are distributed evenly (Tracey, Hiromi). Even Yang's experience hearing her culture denigrated reflects an organization with a lack of training for managers or co-workers to intervene in racism. Importantly, faculty of color have a variety of experiences with active exclusion; Diego feels very supported in his home department, although he has more concern about inequalities in the college more broadly. Yang feels only vague misgivings about colleagues' critiques of Chinese food. It is in comparing their narratives to those of white faculty colleagues that their experiences of exclusion stand out as distinct from experiences of inclusion and white privilege.

Overinclusion

The university at departmental and higher organizational levels relies on the labor of faculty of color in the less visible work of mentoring, service, and diversity work. We refer to the disproportionate loading of invisible and devalued tasks assigned to faculty of color as *overinclusion*. Women of faculty color most frequently report exploitation, as colleagues hoard

opportunities for research time by relying on their labor, while silencing their claims that this valuable work should be "counted."

Overinclusion reflects direct requests to faculty of color, as well as indirect acceptance of workload inequities. For example, Diego, who above noted concerns about racism and sexism in other departments, due to his work on the college-wide review committee, suggests that in his diverse department, he is treated as a whole person, rather than simply "the Latino." Yet, observing other departments, he recognizes "some people are asked all the time, in every committee, in search committees, because, well, you need to have that representation. This is also true for women in certain departments, the same." Thus, he suggests that faculty of color (and women) are recruited for additional service because they are underrepresented. Ava, a white U.S.-born woman in Diego's department, similarly recognizes this challenge, noting that "this drive for having . . . people of color on committees" burdens some faculty in ways that are "very self-defeating." In a different department, Rohan, an Asian foreign-born man says:

> [Faculty of color] were selected based on their merits not necessarily because they were faculty of color. But then they keep getting picked up for . . . representing our diversity and other things. I don't know, some I feel we send them the wrong message or . . . put too many things on them. I don't know if it's appropriate.

Diego, Ava, and Rohan all believe that departments ask faculty of color to do more than they should.

Mariana, a Latina foreign-born faculty member who above described how doing interdisciplinary work made her fearful that she would not receive tenure, has taken on multiple mentoring and service roles in her department and university since tenure. She emphasizes that she faces greater expectations for this work than her colleagues:

> I get over-included. And it's a burden. And it's the tax of . . . making it through tenure and being a woman of color. . . and then on top of it. . . I am an informal and formal advisor to more students than I can count. It's fantastic. It keeps me going. But it's unrecognized. . . it's like you're now on steroids, whatever unrecognized labor is like now.

As Mariana explains, she pays a tax as a woman of color (Hirshfield and Joseph 2012), when colleagues expect her to carry out increasing amounts of service and mentoring. Yet the work is unrecognized and undervalued. She further explains the experience of managing colleagues' difficult expectations to take on even more leadership roles:

> I said you know. . . 'I can't, it's hurting my career. And it's hurting my family life.' . . . But there is an unwillingness to fully understand the level of we can't take on any more work. Like we (*nodding at interviewer*) do it very competently, I'm glad we do it competently. But I have my career, I love the things I'm working on. . . And I feel like instead, what I'm going to get is a backlash for being a bad citizen.

For Mariana, tenure led to enormous growth in service and mentoring work, to the detriment of her research and family life. She underlines that *we*, referring to women of color, do leadership work at a cost. Even as Mariana tries to protect her time, she worries these attempts may lead others to perceive her as a "bad citizen" and inadvertently hurt her when she goes up for promotion to full.

Maurice, a Black U.S.-born man in Mariana's department, engages in leadership work but does significantly less than Mariana. While Maurice feels it is important to pitch in, he expresses no concern that protecting his research time might come back to haunt him: "I knew that my service was good enough and that this institution actually does not care about service."

Like Mariana, Maurice sees service is devalued, yet he feels less pressure to take on that work or manage expectations of colleagues. Their two white colleagues express little tension over service and mentoring. Mariana appears more weighed down by service and mentoring than either Maurice or their two white colleagues at the same career stage. We observe the intersection of race and gender squeezing out time for research for women of color.

As with Mariana, women of color frequently discuss mentoring students of color, both as something that matters, and as something that takes substantial time. Tiana, a Black foreign-born woman, describes the pressure she feels around mentoring diverse graduate students, even though she knows it's unfair for faculty of color to face higher expectations:

> We, as much as we know that we shouldn't be doing, or we should be more cognizant of this, we also made it here because people took the time to do that for us, right? (*Nodding at interviewer).* So, I'm not going to turn away, grad students of color . . . wanting to talk to me about how she feels. Because someone did it for me, that's how I got here. So, this vicious cycle of, I'm going to do it but, sure, I could be writing a paper at that time.

As Tiana explains, women faculty of color succeed because others took the time to support them, making her uncomfortable about turning down students. But it's a "vicious cycle"; the time she spends mentoring students might otherwise be spent writing papers. Tiana's colleague, Chang, who is foreign-born and Asian, does not feel the same burden, explaining he wishes he knew how to meet "graduate students [that] are super motivated and . . . have the right skill set." Their colleague Wyatt, a white US-born man, similarly emphasizes the time it takes to co-author with students. While Tiana spends time supporting students rather than working on research, her colleagues see mentoring as collaborating on research. Students may ask more emotional labor of

Tiana as a woman of color, and she may feel more pressure to provide emotional support to students.

Overinclusion is a form of gendered and racialized exploitation, or "predatory inclusion," because women of color are asked by students and colleagues to do more labor – mentoring, emotional, service, and diversity work – that is uncompensated and does not count in promotions. While it may be tempting to see this work as self-exploitation, Mariana's fear that she will be seen as a "bad citizen" when she goes up for promotion contrasts with Maurice's sense that the institution does "not care about service," and may reflect higher demands on women of color. At the same time, this work may be Mariana's response to the racialized and gendered nature of the organization, and her attempt to change the institution, its practices, and how it treats students, staff, and faculty of color. Similarly, while her colleagues Chang and Wyatt see mentoring as a means to publishing, for Tiana, mentoring means emotional labor supporting students. While some white faculty and men of color brought up the challenge of marginalized faculty being "over-included," women of color were much more likely to describe being over-included themselves. We argue overinclusion is exploitation *because* it is uncompensated, while it also allows dominant groups to appropriate a scarce resource – time for research (Avent-Holt and Tomaskovic-Devey 2019).

Overinclusion is also a sign of silenced claims-making within the organization in two ways. First, mentoring, service, and diversity work *could* be counted in evaluations. Faculty of color often find it to be meaningful work, as when Tiana notes that she is a faculty member because someone mentored her. Yet as Avent-Holt and Tomaskovic-Devey (2019: 170) argue, "the organizational context of inequality, what work counts or is counted, which jobs matter, and whose rules rule, are often made invisible within organizational routines . . . and not contested."

Women of color do *more* work, yet this work is not counted within organizational routines. Second, women of color do not feel able to say "no," another silenced claim. While women of color – and their colleagues – recognize this disjuncture, claims about overinclusion appear to be silenced.

Passive Exclusion

In the previous sections, faculty describe active exclusion in hiring, promotion, or access to key resources like lab renovations, or overinclusion in devalued service and mentoring work. In this section, faculty members describe more subtle challenges to accessing resources and forming collegial relationships. By focusing on the accounts of faculty of color, we show how processes that are less structural play critical roles in maintaining inequalities in academic departments. We might read these more passive forms of exclusion as relational inequality mechanisms of social closure, opportunity hoarding, or limiting the claims-making of faculty of color (Avent-Holt and Tomaskovic-Devey 2019). Yet these processes of passive exclusion might also appear invisible, and harder to measure compared to promotion rates or start-up funds. Our analyses, by centering women of color, allow for a deeper analysis of cultural, as well as structural, forms of exclusion (Blair-Loy and Cech 2022).

Most faculty of color are careful in describing these experiences, trying not to make assumptions about discrimination given limited evidence. Yang, who above discussed a colleague who denigrates Chinese food, describes the challenges she faces with the university's distribution of seed funding. While she takes responsibility for not *asking* for resources, which might be a silenced claim (Avent-Holt and Tomaskovic-Devey 2019), she also suggests the institution could distribute resources more evenly:

> I don't have that personality to try to get other resources I need. I think it's both because my gender, my nationality, and my race, I just feel I shouldn't ask for resources. . . sometimes I feel like there are certain supports [that] should be considered, like, equally, but I feel . . I'm not very good at arguing for my own support.

Yang may have internalized neoliberal ideals that faculty must "try to get other resources" they need, but like other women of color, she feels less comfortable advocating for resources to support her research. Research shows women of color often fear backlash for negotiating for what they need (Toosi et al. 2019). Indeed, Adam, a white man in the same department, explains he has received past seed funding support, but now, "A project has got to give me . . . at least a month of summer salary. . . and three years for a graduate student or postdoc. So, you know at least . . . a quarter million dollars or I don't bother with it." While Yang would appreciate university seed funding opportunities, Adam sees them as not worth his time.

DeLun, an Asian foreign-born man, feels his work is not always valued and his technical skills may be taken for granted. He explains that when he collaborates with someone who does not want to build on his insights, he will pull back: "Maybe they will think I'm a tool, right? And so, if they think I am a tool, then I will refuse to do more for them. So, yeah, some people will work with me with more respect. And then in that case, I'm willing to walk the extra mile." This sense that some colleagues might treat faculty colleagues of color as "tools," based on their technical skills, tended to emerge primarily in accounts from Asian men and women. These faculty describe being included in collaborations for their technical competence but seeing the team ignore their intellectual insights in ways that limit the project's potential (Mickey et al. 2024).

Managing relationships with disrespectful collaborators also came up for Delun's colleague Hiromi, who was not given proper credit for work she initiated. She suggests her cultural background might make it harder for her to stand her ground:

> I think it's rude to say things, so I wouldn't say anything. . . there is a very strong cultural thing that some race, some people from some particular culture may feel uncomfortable to argue. And majority of [white] people assume that people argue if there is a problem.

Hiromi blames herself and her culture for not arguing more when her intellectual work was not appropriately credited. Yet many women of color in our sample describe similar challenges. Foreign-born women were the most likely to identify their work literally uncredited by collaborators, either because collaborators purposefully cut them out of authorship or simply didn't remember or see their contributions (Mickey et al. 2024).

Lack of collegiality is also visible to women of color, who tried to understand why they are not invited to collaborate. Amita, a US-born Asian woman with a busy research program explains:

> I'm not the kind of person to still have enough self-confidence to say, "Here I am oh, I'm going to be great for this, I'm going to push myself on you." I need to be pulled up and asked. . . I will admit that I am not [collaborating with colleagues]. And the reason for that is *I don't believe that I have been wanted* (emphasis ours). That sounds more needy than it needs to be, but my input or my involvement has not been desired.

Amita is frustrated that she is not collaborating with colleagues in a department with many collaborative teams, which makes her feel that despite her expertise, she is not "wanted." This passive exclusion is something of a surprise to her, given how actively she was recruited to her department.

Amita's colleagues reflect on diversity in their department, suggesting gender may be the most important cut-point, given the many Asian faculty members. Zhang, a foreign-born Asian man, notes "some of the most successful faculty in the department are faculty of color (pause) – but . . . we don't have many outside of Asians," and further noting a lack of women in the department. Molly, a white U.S.-born woman argues that Asian faculty are viewed as "totally acceptable," but that she has been excluded, although she doesn't know how other women feel. Jerry, a white U.S.-born man, suggests the department "doesn't have any" faculty of color (perhaps meaning no members of underrepresented groups), but thinks that women feel "less included." Amita's lack of connection rings true with her colleagues – although they see that disconnect as stemming more from her gender than her race. Amita's Asian colleagues are all men, while her women colleagues are all white, suggesting that both gender and race have led to her unexpected isolation.

Yet faculty of color take care not to assume that the challenges they face regarding collegiality are because of their race or gender. Kerri (Black, foreign-born) sees her department as a "good" one, explaining: "[Y]ou learn to draw a line where, in my case, it's whether this is a Black thing, this is a Black and woman thing, [or] this is just science (*laughs*)." For example, she appreciates having mentors in the department, but describes being cautious about reaching out and takes responsibility for that, saying "that's more my issue more than people are not accessible, I don't really talk to a lot of people . . . I just know that I can go to anyone, I definitely know that no one will close their door to me." Her account, contrasts with Lucy, a white US-born woman newer to their department, also notes she has supportive mentors: "I guess I was very lucky in that. . . these mentors really seemed to foster me from the very beginning. . . I had these people that I knew I would be working with who made an effort to really check in on me a lot."

There may be many reasons why Kerri is less likely to reach out, including experiences before coming to the institution. Yet Kerri blames herself for not talking to her colleagues, recognizing that no one will "close their door" to her, while Lucy notes that her mentors "check in . . . a lot" on her. It appears that Kerri must put in more effort to connect.

Many faculty of color describe feeling left out of departmental decision-making. Lucas, a Latino foreign-born faculty member, says clearly that he does not have much say in hiring or personnel decisions: "Junior faculty in this department are not invited for this type of discussion. So, my voice was never heard because it was never invited to be heard." Lucia, a Latina foreign-born faculty woman in the same department, agrees: "our voices. . . might be not heard in the same way as other people." Courtney, a white U.S.-born woman, has experienced many challenges but thinks her voice is now more consistently heard. David, a white foreign-born man, however, says he feels regularly consulted and would quit if he felt his voice was not heard in the department. These dynamics of white faculty feeling more included in decisions were common.

In another department, Shan, an Asian foreign-born man who otherwise likes his department, describes his disappointment with a hiring decision, which led him to withdraw: "So, because of that the next time …the department was hiring, I just didn't participate at all, so I . . . wasn't in the conversation, but I knew . . . what I'm going to say, doesn't matter." Interestingly, Shan's colleague Jesse, a white U.S.-born faculty member, notes he couldn't imagine a situation where his voice *wouldn't* be heard: "I think that's almost impossible, in my opinion. . . I feel pretty included in that. . . it's so hard for me to picture that happening." At the same rank, in the same department, Shan and Jesse have very different experiences. Their colleague Judy, a white U.S.-born woman, describes weighing in on a decision in opposition to colleagues which was uncomfortable, but "I felt I could be heard even if I wouldn't necessarily

be agreed with." Mel, a foreign-born woman of color in the department, agrees with Judy and Jesse that there is open discussion in the department, but also notes the chair is most influential in making decisions. Consider: Jesse finds it hard to imagine not being included in decision-making, Judy feels heard, though less influential than she'd like, Mel thinks that conversation is open, but the chair is most influential, and Shan feels unheard. Within a racialized and gendered organization, the power to shape decisions reads differently to differently situated colleagues.

Man-Soo, a foreign-born Asian man, describes the challenges even tenured foreign-born faculty members experience in decision-making:

> Effectively members from certain backgrounds, tend to rather be silent or quiet, or less talkative . . . But for some important matters, I think, Department Head or some system should find ways, to find a way to hear their voices. . .To be absolutely very frank and honest, rank matters, but it's more about race. . . I can say that you know, certain ethnicity group of faculty do not participate in the active discussion. . . So then, is that the problem of the faculty who don't speak, maybe, but the culture, the atmosphere is not engaging and we cannot say that's their fault.

For Man-Soo, the fact that certain minoritized faculty members are silent in meetings is important, yet unaddressed. He argues that the department needs to identify strategies to engage all faculty. Man-Soo points to how passive exclusion of foreign-born faculty members may have long-term material effects on their careers, describing the experience of an Asian colleague who did not win tenure. Niu, an Asian foreign-born woman in the same department, also sees faculty of color and foreign-born faculty members as less included and wishes the department would conduct votes anonymously, so all faculty could weigh in. Neither of Man-Soo and Niu's two white colleagues at the same rank share these concerns about decision-making. Asians were most

likely to express these forms of passive exclusion, mirroring findings for the experiences of Asian-American corporate workers (Chin 2020).

Passive forms of exclusion may reflect social closure, as when faculty of color are left out of collaborations, or silenced claims, as when they disconnect from decision-making. As Avent-Holt and Tomaskovic-Devey (2019: 164) argue, claims can be silenced in a variety of ways, such as when people do not apply for a promotion, as well as when people "believe that they will not be taken seriously." By centering the experiences of faculty of color, we can see the power of passive exclusion. Faculty of color note the challenge of accessing research funds (Yang), finding research collaborations (Amita) and being treated respectfully by collaborators (DeLun and Hiromi). A substantial number of faculty of color also noted a lack of opportunity to make claims in decision-making processes, well beyond the illustrative cases (Lucas, Lucia, Shan, Mel, Man-Soo, Niu) mentioned here. Silenced claims-making is particularly important because if left out of these processes, faculty of color can do less to address exploitation, social closure, and opportunity hoarding. Thus, these more passive forms of exclusion play crucial roles in how inequalities are maintained at the university.

The organization is implicated in these passive forms of exclusion. While collaboration challenges may primarily reflect interpersonal relationships (Delun, Hiromi, Amita), organizational interventions around equitable collaboration could help address these issues. The organization could also disburse seed grants and provide mentoring guidelines in ways that reinforce equity (Chang, Kerri). Similarly, the organization could more effectively integrate all faculty voices in decision-making; as Man-Soo, says, "for some important matters, I think, Department Head or some system should … find a way to hear their voices."

Conclusions

Based on the accounts of thirty-two faculty of color, and thirty white faculty members matched to them by department and rank, we analyze how the intersection of race and gender shapes faculty experiences of exploitation and exclusion in a predominantly white university. Despite the university's rhetoric of progress, faculty of color report experiences that differ substantially from white colleagues. We draw on an intersectional relational inequality framework to illustrate institutional processes –active exclusion, overinclusion, and passive exclusion – that negatively impact the experiences of faculty of color.

Relational inequality theory suggests organizations maintain inequities through processes of exploitation, social closure, opportunity hoarding, and claims-making (Avent-Holt and Tomaskovic-Devey 2019). These processes are visible within the organization we analyze, contributing to what we conceptualize as active exclusion, overinclusion, and passive exclusion, as we further make visible what is less explicit in relational inequality theory. Even as scholars analyze, for example, social closure –they must look for both passive (e.g., not being included in research collaborations) as well as active forms (e.g., not being offered a tenure-track job). It is also important to identify how overinclusion may, itself, be a form of exploitation rather than a resource. Following the logic of these mechanisms via analyses of different perspectives in the same context, we emphasize key gendered and racialized distinctions in understanding of workplace exclusion.

Our intersectional framework brings to light that while women of color experience higher levels of exploitation through overinclusion and active exclusion through social closure and opportunity hoarding, both men and women of color suffer from more passive and invisible forms of social closure and opportunity hoarding, as well as silenced claims-making. We identify

more passive and less measurable processes that have substantial impacts on workers. Our analyses identify the critical role of silenced claims-making, which directly limits the ability of less powerful workers to address issues of exploitation, social closure, and opportunity-hoarding. Yet our analyses also show that faculty of color are active agents negotiating these organizational processes. Diego's efforts to question inequalities in the college promotion and tenure committee, Hiromi's requests to the white man building manager interceding in her lab renovations, Mariana's devotion to supporting students of color, Niu's suggestions that her department use anonymous voting – are all examples of how faculty of color work to mitigate organizational inequalities.

Our unique research design ensures we can compare faculty members in the same cohort and departmental context. While faculty inclusion further varies by department (Misra et al. 2024), here we focus on differences within departments, comparing faculty of color and their white colleagues at the same rank. An intersectional framework is key to identifying how experiences differ not only by race, but also by gender. Women of color were most likely to point to exclusion from resources and positions at the university. Epistemic exclusion, or devaluation of one's research, resonated more for women of color than for white faculty or men of color. Women of color were also the most likely to describe experiences of overinclusion—noting because they are evaluated based on research productivity that extra service, mentoring, and diversity work, have detrimental career implications. Yet, more passive forms of exclusion were consistently voiced by both men and women of color, including challenges in research collaboration and mentoring, and silenced claims in decision-making. White men experience a very different world at work; they do not experience overinclusion in service, mentoring, and diversity work; they do not describe active or passive exclusion from resources, collaborations,

or decision-making. White men were, in fact, surprised to be asked if they felt excluded; as Jesse, a white man assistant professor, noted about exclusion from decision-making, "I think that's almost impossible."

The differences we uncover show that universities remain racialized and gendered institutions, in which resources, including research time, are apportioned differentially along racial and gender lines. Because these differences appear to be neutral practices reflecting faculty choices, systems of white supremacy and patriarchy remain invisible. Higher education institutions may signal a commitment to equity and inclusion, but everyday practices and policies reinforce existing hierarchies that privilege whiteness and masculinity (Embrick 2011; Ray 2019; Wingfield 2020).

While universities have unique organizational logics, our framework could be applied to other industries and professional contexts. For example, Black women in law expend invisible labor not required of their white colleagues to negotiate their presence (Melaku 2022). Black health care workers are expected to do "equity work," even as white colleagues are given assignments with more lucrative opportunities (Wingfield 2019). These industries share with academia the troublesome paradox of touting a mantra of "diversity, equity, and inclusion," while continuing to reinforce inequities.

We suggest key approaches organizations can take to undo the racist and sexist practices that remain embedded in their cultures and policies. Institutions must recognize all forms of work, compensating additional workload, and valuing this work in promotions. Within universities, most administrators would not think it reasonable to assign a higher course load to faculty members of color, yet routinely expect faculty members of color to do more mentoring and service. Next, institutions must emphasize a wider understanding of how to evaluate work,

recognizing existing biases, to ensure more workers of color – and particularly women of color – are recruited and retained (Bonilla-Silva 2017; Settles et al. 2022). Finally, to truly address systemic inequality, managers and colleagues must address how workers of color are left out of collegial networks, collaborations, and departmental decision-making (Mickey et al. 2024; Misra et al. 2024). These practices exclude many workers from the life of the institution, making it substantially less likely that they will stay or succeed in their careers.

We have identified how workers are excluded and exploited by colleagues and organizations. Routinized processes reflect deeply rooted organizational cultures and structures that shore up white supremacy and patriarchy and have racialized and gendered outcomes. Rooting out exclusionary practices require not only identifying explicit forms of exclusion but also overinclusion and passive exclusion. All of these forms of discrimination are critical to understanding the experiences of workers of color, and especially how women of color experience gendered and racialized organizations. Only by better understanding their problems, can organizations make good on their intentions to be diverse and inclusive workplaces.

References

Acker, Joan. 2006. “Inequality Regimes: Gender, Class, and Race in Organizations.” *Gender & Society* 20(4):441–64. https://doi.org/10.1177/089124320628949

Avent-Holt, Dustin and Donald Tomaskovic-Devey. 2019. *Relational Inequalities: An Organizational Approach*. New York: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190624422.001.0001

Blair-Loy, Mary and Erin A. Cech. 2022. *Misconceiving Merit: Paradoxes of Excellence and Devotion in Academic Science and Engineering*. University of Chicago Press. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-023-00455-z

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2014. *Racism Without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in the United States*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2017. “What We Were, What We Are, and What We Should Be: The Racial Problem of American Sociology.” *Social Problems* 64(2):179–87. https://doi.org/10.1093/socpro/spx006

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2021. “What Makes Systemic Racism Systemic?” *Sociological Inquiry* 91(3):513–33. https://doi.org/10.1111/soin.12420

Castañeda, Mari and Michael Hames-García. 2014. “Breaking Through the Associate Professor Glass Ceiling.” Pp. 265–92 in *The Truly Diverse Faculty: New Dialogues in American Higher Education*, edited by S. A. Fryberg and E. J. Martínez. New York: Palgrave Macmillan US. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137456069_9

Cech, Erin A., Anneke Metz, Jessi L. Smith, and Karen DeVries. 2017. “Epistemological Dominance and Social Inequality: Experiences of Native American Science, Engineering, and Health Students.” *Science, Technology, & Human Values* 42(5):743–74.

https://doi.org/10.1177/0162243916687037

Chin, Margaret M. 2020. *Stuck: Why Asian Americans Don't Reach the Top of the Corporate Ladder*. New York: New York University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/soaa117

Collins, Patricia Hill. 2000. *Black Feminist Thought*. New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203900055

Collins, Patricia Hill and Sirma Bilge. 2016. *Intersectionality*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley. NO DOI

Dade, Karen, Carlie Tartakov, Connie Hargrave, and Patricia Leigh. 2015. "Assessing the Impact of Racism on Black Faculty in White Academe: A Collective Case Study of African American Female Faculty." *The Western Journal of Black Studies* 39(2):134-146. NO DOI but: https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A428998153/AONE?u=mlin_oweb&sid=googleScholar&xid=e361b017

Diggs, Gregory A., Dorothy F. Garrison-Wade, Diane Estrada, and Rene Galindo. 2009. "Smiling Faces and Colored Spaces: The Experiences of Faculty of Color Pursing Tenure in the Academy." *Urban Review* 41(4):312–33. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-008-0113-y

Embrick, David G. 2011. "The Diversity Ideology in the Business World: A New Oppression for a New Age." *Critical Sociology* 37(5):541–56. https://doi.org/10.1177/0896920510380076

Fryberg, Stephanie A. and Ernesto Javier Martínez. 2014. "Constructed Strugglers: The Impact of Diversity Narratives on Junior Faculty of Color." Pp. 3–34 in *The Truly Diverse Faculty: New Dialogues in American Higher Education*, edited by S. A. Fryberg and E. J. Martínez. New York: Palgrave Macmillan US. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137456069.0005

Glenn, Evelyn Nakano. 2009. *Unequal Freedoms: How Race and Gender Shaped American Citizenship and Labor*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

https://doi.org/10.4159/9780674037649

Griffin, Kimberly A. and Richard J. Reddick. 2011. "Surveillance and Sacrifice: Gender Differences in the Mentoring Patterns of Black Professors at Predominantly White Research Universities." *American Educational Research Journal* 48(5):1032–57. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831211405025

Hirshfield, Laura E. and Tiffany D. Joseph. 2012. "'We Need a Woman, We Need a Black Woman': Gender, Race, and Identity Taxation in the Academy." *Gender and Education* 24(2):213–27. https://doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2011.606208

Lewis, Amanda E. 2004. "'What Group?' Studying Whites and Whiteness in the Era of 'Color-Blindness.'" *Sociological Theory* 22(4):623–46. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0735-2751.2004.00237.x

Lisnic, Rodica, Anna Zajicek, and Shauna Morimoto. 2019. "Gender and Race Differences in Faculty Assessment of Tenure Clarity: The Influence of Departmental Relationships and Practices." *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity* 5(2):244–60. https://doi.org/10.1177/2332649218756137

Melaku, Tsedale M. 2022. "Black Women in White Institutional Spaces: The Invisible Labor Clause and The Inclusion Tax." *American Behavioral Scientist* 66(11):1512–1525. https://doi.org/10.1177/00027642211066037

Melaku, Tsedale M. and Angie Beeman. 2022. "Navigating White Academe during Crisis: The Impact of COVID-19 and Racial Violence on Women of Color Professionals." *Gender, Work and Organization* 30(2):1–19. https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12823

Mickey, Ethel, Joya Misra, Laurel Smith-Doerr, and Ember S. Kanelee. 2024. Forget Matthew: Cumulative Advantage Models of Collaboration without Intersectionality Obscure the Maya

Effect. Presented at the American Sociological Association Meetings, Montreal.

Misra, Joya, Ethel Mickey, Ember S. Kanelee, Laurel Smith-Doerr. 2024. "Creating Inclusive Department Climates in STEM Fields." *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education.* 17(2), 176–189. https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000402

Ray, Victor. 2019. "A Theory of Racialized Organizations." *American Sociological Review* 84(1):26–53. https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122418822335

Ridgeway, Cecilia L. 2011. *Framed By Gender*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199755776.001.0001

Ridgeway, Cecilia L. 2014. "Why Status Matters for Inequality." *American Sociological Review* 79(1):1–16. https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122413515997

Settles, Isis H., Ni Cole T. Buchanan, and Kristie Dotson. 2019. "Scrutinized but Not Recognized: (In)Visibility and Hypervisibility Experiences of Faculty of Color." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 113:62–74. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2018.06.003

Settles, Isis H., Martinque K. Jones, Ni Cole T. Buchanan, and Sheila T. Brassel. 2022. "Epistemic Exclusion of Women Faculty and Faculty of Color: Understanding Scholar(ly) Devaluation as a Predictor of Turnover Intentions." *Journal of Higher Education* 93(1):31–55. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2021.1914494

Smith-Doerr, Laurel. 2004. *Women's Work: Gender Equality vs. Hierarchy in the Life Sciences*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781588269768

Smith-Doerr, Laurel, Sharla Alegria, Kaye Husbands Fealing, Debra Fitzpatrick, and Donald Tomaskovic-Devey. 2019. "Gender Pay Gaps in U.S. Federal Science Agencies: An Organizational Approach." *American Journal of Sociology* 125(2):534–76. https://doi.org/10.1086/705514

Smith, Janice Witt and Toni Calasanti. 2005. "The Influences of Gender, Race and Ethnicity on Workplace Experiences of Institutional and Social Isolation: An Exploratory Study of University Faculty." *Sociological Spectrum* 25(3):307–34. https://doi.org/10.1080/027321790518735

Stanley, Christine A. 2006. "Coloring the Academic Landscape: Faculty of Color Breaking the Silence in Predominantly White Colleges and Universities." *American Educational Research Journal* 43(4):701–36. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312043004701

Sturm, Susan. 2006. "The Architecture of Inclusion: Advancing Workplace Equity in Higher Education." *Harvard Journal of Law & Gender* 29(2):248–334. NO DOI

Tilly, Charles. 1999. *Durable Inequality*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520924222

Toosi, Negin R., Shira Mor, Zhaleh Semnani-Azad, Katherine W. Phillips, and Emily T. Amanatullah. 2019. "Who Can Lean In? The Intersecting Role of Race and Gender in Negotiations." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 43(1):7–21. https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684318800492

Tran, Natalie A. 2014. "The Role of Mentoring in the Success of Women Leaders of Color in Higher Education." *Mentoring and Tutoring: Partnership in Learning* 22(4):302–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/13611267.2014.945740

Turner, Caroline Sotello Viernes, Juan Carlos González, and Kathleen Wong (Lau). 2011. "Faculty Women of Color: The Critical Nexus of Race and Gender." *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education* 4(4):199–211. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024630

Valian, Virginia. 2004. "Beyond Gender Schemas: Improving the Advancement of Women in Academia." *NWSA Journal* 16(1):207–20. https://doi.org/10.1353/nwsa.2004.0041

Wingfield, Adia Harvey. 2019. *Flatlining: Race, Work, and Health Care in the New Economy*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520971783

Wingfield, Adia Harvey. 2020. "Systemic Racism Persists in the Sciences." *Science* 369(6502):351–351. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abd8825

Wingfield, Adia Harvey and Koji Chavez. 2020. "Getting In, Getting Hired, Getting Sideways Looks: Organizational Hierarchy and Perceptions of Racial Discrimination." *American Sociological Review* 85(1):31–57. https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122419894335

Wooten, Melissa E. and Enobong H. Branch. 2012. "Defining Appropriate Labor: Race, Gender, and Idealization of Black Women in Domestic Service." *Race, Gender & Class* 19(3):292–308. NO DOI but https://www.jstor.org/stable/43497500

Zambrana, Ruth E. 2018. *Toxic Ivory Towers: The Consequences of Work Stress on Underrepresented Minority Faculty*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press. https://doi.org/10.36019/9780813593012

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Respondents (N=62)

Characteristic	Description	Number	Percentage
Gender	Women	33	53%
	Men	28	45%
	Non-binary	1	2%
Race	Black	6	10%
	Latinx	5	8%
	Asian	21	34%
	White	30	48%
Country of Birth	Foreign-born	33	53%
	U.S. born	29	47%
Rank	Lecturer/Sr Lecturer	8	13%
	Assistant	28	45%
	Associate	17	27%
	Full	9	15%