Examining Intersectionalities
Among Male Faculty of Color on the Tenure-track

Melissa A. Martinez, *Texas State University*
Juan Manuel Niño, *University of Texas San Antonio*
Isaac Torres, *Texas State University*

Abstract

This qualitative phenomenological study examined the lived experiences of 22 male assistant professors of color as they navigated the tenure-track process while working in various disciplines at four-year institutions nationwide. The notion of intersectionality provided a theoretical framework to unearth how participants' experiences were shaped. The guiding questions for the study included: 1) How do male tenure-track assistant professors of color describe their experiences in navigating academia? (2) How does intersectionality theory assist with better understanding their experiences? Findings revealed overarching themes related to how they negotiated and struggled with their various work and personal roles and responsibilities, understandings of their unique experiences within academia, and how they recreated their perceptions of self and how others viewed them given their personal and professional roles and multiple social identities. Findings reiterate that the experiences of male faculty of color cannot be unraveled from their intersecting social identities, nor from the contexts in which they live and work. Supportive environments that allowed for fluid understandings of what male faculty of color can and should be doing were appreciated and seen in varying instances, although less common.

Introduction

Faculty of color (FOC) remain underrepresented in higher education. As of fall of 2015, FOC accounted for only 22.5% of all full-time faculty working at degree-granting postsecondary institutions in the U.S. (Snyder, de Brey, & Dillow, 2018). The representation among full-time tenure-track FOC in particular has increased minimally over the years, with fewer FOC in the higher-ranking tenured positions of associate and full professor. As of fall 2015, only 17.5% of FOC were full professors, 23.2% were associate professors, and 25.9% were assistant professors. In comparison, in the fall of 2013, 16.4% of FOC were full professors, 21.8% were associate professors, and 25.3% were assistant professors; this is only a 0.6% to 1.4% increase at each rank within this time period (Snyder, de Brey, & Dillow, 2018).

To understand and improve the recruitment and retention of FOC, previous research has often focused on the shared experiences of FOC (see Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002; Diggs, Garrison-Wade, Estrada, & Galindo 2009; Johnsrud & Sadao, 1998; Sadao, 2003; Stanley, 2006; Thompson, 2008; Turner, Gonzáles, & Wood, 2008). Other research has considered the experiences of FOC in a particular field or discipline (see Dancy &

Brown, 2011; Martinez & Welton, 2015; Peters, 2011), as well as the unique experiences of female FOC (see Chang, Welton, Martinez, & Cortez, 2013; Gutiérrez y Muhs, Niemann, González & Harris, 2012), and male and/or female faculty from a particular racial/ethnic background (i.e. Latina/o, Black/African American, Asian, Pacific Islander) (see Warde, 2009; Williams & Williams, 2006). Overall, however, research has consistently found that the experiences of FOC are greatly shaped by social markers including gender, race, class, and sexual orientation, that given institutional and systemic inequities and forces can disadvantage and marginalize FOC. Consequently, some FOC experience feelings of isolation if they are the only or one of few FOC in their department (Stanley, 2006) and have dealt with such things as tokenism, racism, classism, sexism, and cultural taxation (Aguirre, 2000; Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002; Diggs et al., 2009; Padilla, 1994).

This qualitative phenomenological study (Creswell, 2013) focused on the experiences of male tenure-track FOC, specifically assistant professors, from varying racial and ethnic backgrounds, as there is a dearth of research in this area. Moreover, there is a need to consider how to recruit and retain more male FOC, when compared to their White male counterparts. Data from the fall of 2015 indicate the disparity in male FOC representation in degree-granting postsecondary institutions in the U.S., as there were only 19,032 full-time tenured and tenure-track Black faculty, 18,259 Hispanic male faculty, 45,095 Asian male faculty, 623 Pacific Islander male faculty, and 1,727 American Indian/Alaska Native male faculty at this time when compared to 312,185 White male faculty (Snyder, de Brey, & Dillow, 2018). Therefore, this study examined two overarching research questions: (1) How do male tenure-track assistant professors of color describe their experiences in navigating academia? (2) How does intersectionality theory assist with better understanding their experiences?

Supporting Literature

Previous research finds success and advancement for male FOC within the academy as wanting a palpable sense of collegial acceptance, accurate information and instruction from departmental colleagues, and from quality mentoring and networking experiences (Warde, 2009; Williams & Williams, 2006). A diverse student body, as well as increasing institutional diversity, can also empower a male FOC's sense of inclusion on campus, by providing channels for student-mentoring, community-building, and ultimately leading to an improved social climate (Antonio, 2003). Yet the paucity of male FOC at major universities reflects national, institutional, and departmental failures (Turner, Gonzalez, & Wood, 2008) to organize novel networks of mentoring and support—guiding scholars toward potential tenured, and full-professor statuses (Warde, 2009). While some male FOC would prefer a potential senior mentor to be of their same race or ethnicity, many do not see that quality as being so crucial (Williams & Williams, 2006). To reiterate, the unique experiences of a faculty member of color can be understood within departmental, institutional, and national contexts with emerging themes consistently being identified within, and bridging, these three contexts (Turner, Gonzalez, & Wood, 2008). An emerging theme within a departmental context would be an undervaluation of a male FOC's research interests; an institutional context would be a lack of student and faculty diversity; and a national context would be policy regarding affirmative action (Turner, Gonzalez, & Wood, 2008).

The journey from contract negotiation to tenure for a male FOC becomes a story that is priceless for future scholars of color and for higher education institutions – perhaps especially predominately white institutions (PWIs)– in the twenty-first century. These nuanced narratives of access and persistence within the academy provide new frameworks for future research to fight historic prejudice and academic exclusion (Stanley, 2006) and the perception that FOC are being controlled, through the fear that the tenure and

promotion process can induce (Urrieta, Méndez, & Rodríguez, 2015). The testimonies of male FOC reflect real, personal and professional anxieties – being both tokenized and quieted on campus – as they seek mentorship, and manage the merging of university culture with their own histories (Reddick & Saenz, 2012), while contending with vague and subjectively interpreted guidelines for tenure and promotion (Urrieta, Méndez, & Rodríguez, 2015). As the work of Reddick, Rochlen, Grasso, Reilly, and Spikes, (2012) indicates, for male FOC that are also fathers, there emerges an added struggle in the pursuit of tenure and attending to familial responsibilities, particularly for those that seek to be active fathers. The most useful strategies for dealing with such conflict include open communication, setting limits on work commitments, and drawing on family as a means to stay grounded amidst the stressors of the tenure-track. However, the culture of a department is key to providing the support an academic father of color needs, whether it be through offering paternity or parental leave, stopping the tenure clock if necessary, and fostering an open culture of communication and respect regarding work-life balance.

Similar quests for community, mentorship, and work-life balance among female FOC, across disciplines, tend to be ongoing (Blake-Beard, Bayne, Crosby, & Muller, 2011) and in some cases acutely ensembled with class difference, isolation, social exclusion, and communication problems (Kachchaf, Ko, Hodari, & Ong, 2015). Empowered women of color, equipped with critical frameworks and social capital, can also endure a doubling of criticism and doubt, often initiated by white male gatekeepers. Conversely, seasoned faculty members and departmental chairs are in opportune roles to support, empower, and help quiet the doubt in emerging scholars (Kezar & Lester, 2009). Merging old systems and new knowledges empowers both the institution and the FOC, constructing new capacities, including multiple cultures, and building upon relevant frameworks: societal, organizational, interpersonal, and individual (Sadao, 2003).

A male FOC, one perhaps most prepared for success in the academy, still may not endure the same scrutiny and pressure to change his research agenda, as often as do female FOC (Thomas & Hollenshead, 2001). Male FOC, pursuing tenure or not, are quite likely to encounter any number of racial microaggressions on campus, which can negatively affect their mental, physical, and social health—devaluing both the potential of the person, and the institution (Sue et al., 2011).

Theoretical Framework

 In this study, intersectionality is used as a framework to examine "the dynamics of difference and sameness [as it] has played a major role in facilitating consideration of gender, race, and other axes of power" (Cho, Crenshaw, & McCall, 2013, p. 787). Kimberlé Crenshaw (1989), a legal Critical Race Theory (CRT) and Black Feminist scholar, was the first to specifically coin the term, *intersectionality*, to examine discrimination and marginalization against Black women in anti-discrimination law, feminist and antiracist work. However, intersectionality has been increasingly utilized across multiple fields and international contexts, and is considered a major tenet of CRT (Cho, Crenshaw, & McCall, 2013).

In the field of education, CRT scholars Daniel Solorzano and Tara Yosso identify intersectionality as a part of the first theme of five "that form the basic perspectives, research methods, and pedagogy of a critical race theory in education" (2001, p. 472). They affirm "the centrality of race and racism and their intersectionality with other forms of subordination" within education; where "...class and racial oppression cannot account for gender oppression. It is at this intersection of race, gender, and class that some answers can be found to the theoretical, conceptual, methodological, and pedagogical questions" (p. 472). Other education scholars like Griffin and Reddick (2011) and Zambrana, Ray, Espino, Castro, Cohen, and Eliason (2015) have successfully applied an

intersectionality framework to examine the experiences of male and female FOC in academia—specifically, the mentoring experiences of Black faculty at PWIs and underrepresented minority faculty at research-extensive universities, respectively. Urrieta, Méndez, and Rodríguez (2015) also utilize intersectionality as an aspect of their CRT, Latino Critical (LatCrit) Race Theory, and Chicana Feminist framework when examining the perceptions, experiences, and reflections of the tenure and promotion process of 16 Latina/o tenure-track faculty.

As Griffin and Reddick (2011) note, "those employing intersectional analysis strive to distinguish the ways in which individuals engage their environments based on multiple identities" (p. 1034). Such multiple identities go beyond race, class, and gender, to include other social markers distinct to communities of color; Latinas/os, for instance, might contend with racial, gender, and class oppression along with "immigration, accent, sexuality, culture, language, phenotype, and surname-based oppression" (Urrieta, Méndez, & Rodríguez, 2015, p. 1152). However, a sole focus on individual differences, based on intersecting identities, can be a pitfall of utilizing intersectionality as a framework (Anthias, 2012; Núñez, 2014). Therefore, we examine the experiences of the male tenure-track FOC in this study while recognizing that "intersectionality is inextricably linked to an analysis of power", emphasizing "political and structural inequalities" (Cho, Crenshaw, & McCall, 2013, p. 797).

Núñez's (2014) multilevel model of intersectionality, which draws on the work of sociologist Floya Anthias (2012), assists in this process, as it can help explain how the "dynamics of identity, power, and history play out to shape educational experiences and outcomes" for individuals within three social arenas (p. 87). These include: 1) the first, micro-level where social categories and relations are defined, 2) the second, meso-level where multiple arenas of influence exist at the organizational, representational, intersubjective, and experiential levels, and 3) the third, macro-level of historicity, which "focuses on broader interlocking systems of economic, legal, political, media, and social power and classification that evolve over time in specific places, as well as social movements to challenge these systems" (p. 89).

Furthermore, as Urrieta, Méndez, and Rodríguez (2015) point out, inequalities in power are inherent in academia's culture and the tenure and promotion process in particular. They note:

> In the majoritarian narrative, tenure is said to be an individual meritocratic, gender-neutral, colorblind process, but it is a comparative and competitive process...Rationalist, white, masculinist knowledge and culture is the unspoken normative comparative standard for tenure and promotion. As a patriarchical [sic], heteronormative, racist regulatory process, tenure and promotion becomes the fiduciary of the knowledge production and cultural norms of academic life...Lack of faculty racial, gender, and class diversity serve to maintain and sustain these cultural norms and regulatory practices. (p. 1163)

It is with these various and expanded understandings of intersectionality and its application within higher education research in particular, that this study examines how the 22 male FOC navigated academia, focusing on how the inequitable social structures and power dynamics, particularly at the micro- and meso-levels, shaped their identities, opportunities, and progress towards tenure.

Methods and Data Sources

The dataset for this qualitative, phenomenological study (Creswell, 2013) was drawn from a larger research project examining the experiences of pre-tenure FOC at 4-year public and private universities nationwide. The larger project was guided

by two overarching questions: In what ways are tenure-track Assistant Professors of Color successful in navigating academia? What types of professional and personal challenges do tenure-track assistant professors of color face in navigating academia? The larger project included semi-structured audio-recorded interviews conducted both in person and via video call with a total of 55 tenure-track assistant professors that self-identified as being persons of color. Interviews were guided by a set of 12 main questions like the following: How does your life as an academic shape or impact your personal life? What would you say are some of the greatest successes and challenges you've had so far in navigating the academy as a professor of color? A team of five FOC working at various universities across the country collaborated to design and collect the data for the larger project; drawing on their own professional networks (i.e., listservs for professional associations, social media, professional academic conferences) and snowball sampling to recruit participants.

While various datasets from the larger project have been examined in previous publications, the interviews with the 22 male participants from the larger project (10 Black or African American, 7 Latino, 4 Asian or Pacific Islander, and 1 American Indian) have not yet been analyzed as a dataset. For this reason, along with the broad nature of the research questions posed in the larger study, the opportunity was taken to delve deeper into the exclusive experiences of the 22 male FOC, utilizing an intersectionality framework. When interviewed, male participants worked in the following states: Arizona, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Kentucky, Texas, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Mexico, North Carolina, Vermont, Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming. Male participants also worked in distinct programs of study, although a majority worked in the broader field of education. The research team for this study included the lead researcher on the larger project and two males of color navigating academia; one as an associate professor and the other as a doctoral student. Table 1 provides additional information for each participant; identified by their pseudonym.

Table 1. *Additional information for male faculty of color participants*

Name	Race/ Ethnicity	Discipline	Institution Type
Rodney	Black	Higher education and student affairs	Public, Research 1
Mark	Black	Higher education and student affairs	Public, Doctoral, High research
Lonnie	Black	Higher Education	Public, Doctoral, High research
Tim	Black	African American Studies	Public, Master's university
Orlando	Black	Curriculum & Instruction	Public, Research 1
Alton	Black	Higher education leadership	Public, Doctoral, Medium research
Fred	Black	Business-Marketing	Public, Doctoral, Medium research
Irwin	Black	Engineering	Public, Baccalaureate college
Walter	Black	Educational Leadership	Public, Research 1
Don	Black	Urban Education	Public, Research 1

Gus	Latino	Educational Leadership	Public, Doctoral, High research
Edgar	Latino	Educational Administration	Public, Research 1
Braulio	Latino	Higher education and student affairs	Public, Research 1
Saul	Latino	Biology	Public, Doctoral, High research
Nico	Latino	Education Policy Studies	Public, Research 1
Paulo	Latino	Mathematics	Public, Research 1
Jose	Latino	Education-Reading	Public, Doctoral, Medium research
Hakim	Asian	Communication Disorders	Public, Doctoral, High research
Ken	Asian	Educational Studies	Public, Doctoral, High research
Carl	Asian	Educational Leadership	Private, Research 1
Ulysses	Asian	Educational Administration	Public, Research 1
Quentin	American Indian	Education	Public, Baccalaureate college

Data Analysis

Analysis began with a review of all transcripts, followed by inductive, open coding by each author where commonalities in the experiences of male FOC as they navigated the tenure-track were identified. In phenomenological research, "themes may be understood as the structures of experience. So when we analyze a phenomenon, we are trying to determine what the themes are, the experiential structures that make up that experience" (Van Manen, 1990, p. 79). Initial codes were discussed and compared by the authors to identify preliminary themes that were common among participants, and to eliminate codes that were not common among participants. The authors agreed on three overarching themes that spoke to some of the most commonly shared and unique experiences among the male FOC participants, which related to issues of negotiation and struggle, understanding their unique experiences as male FOC, and their perceptions of self. At this point, intersectionality was identified as the theoretical perspective to further analyze the emergent themes.

At this stage, the second level of analysis began, which drew on aspects of Hatch's (2002) typological analysis strategy. In typological analysis, predetermined typologies, or categories, are "generated from theory, common sense, and/or the research objectives and initial data processing" (p. 152) and used to "find and mark those places in the data where evidence related to that particular typology is found" (p. 154). Once data related to a particular typology is gathered, summaries are created from the selected data and analyzed to identify patterns supported by data.

In this study, the first level of analysis that began with inductive, open coding generated three overarching themes that were considered typologies to further analyze data. However, we did not formulate summaries based on the typologies. Instead we reverted to the original transcripts to identify data that further elucidated the three typologies to unearth "something 'telling,' something 'meaningful,' something 'thematic' in the various experiential accounts" of participants (Van

Manen, 1990, p. 86). Quotes from participants served as rich, thick evidentiary support for the three themes discerned, with the notion of intersectionality in mind.

About the Authors

As qualitative researchers, the authors are forthcoming about their positionalities. The first author identifies as a Latina/Mexican American female who was born and raised along the U.S.-Mexico border of South Texas. She is a former teacher and school counselor, and is now an associate professor at a four-year, doctoral granting university that is also a designated Hispanic Serving Institution. Her personal and professional experiences as a student and scholar within P-20 educational settings shape her understandings of systematic oppression for communities of color, which inform her work. Her insider status as a FOC also particularly lent itself to examine the experiences of FOC on the tenure-track.

The second author was also born and raised in the borderlands of South Texas. Growing up as a Mexican American, he understood the complexities of identities at a very early age. As a public school student, he was labeled as a migrant, English language learner and honors student; yet, he was always perceived as an academically vulnerable student. He is a former public school teacher and administrator currently serving as an associate professor in a Hispanic Serving Institution. His experience as a practitioner influence his research and leadership preparation to better serve communities of color. Embracing the intersections of differences, as a single male he interprets masculinity as a cultural and fluid process, one that counters heteronormativity.

The third author identifies as a Chicano, multiracial male who was born in California and raised in Oregon. He is a former grant specialist and liaison between the university, local school districts, and underserved communities. His work developing creative curricula for students in juvenile detention has informed his doctoral research interests, which are based in equity and access, technology, and storytelling. The author acknowledges that his being a first-generation college graduate, a husband and a father, also help to form his intimate understanding of masculinity and academia.

Findings

The narratives of participants highlight three overarching themes related to how the male faculty negotiated and, at times, struggled in fulfilling their multiple personal and professional roles and responsibilities, how they came to understand their experiences as unique within the academy, and how they worked to recreate their perceptions of self. These themes arose in response to the first research question posed: How do male tenure-track assistant professors of color describe their experiences in navigating academia? The second research question related to the application of an intersectionality framework is further explored in the Discussion section.

Negotiate: Time, stress, and uncertainty of role commitments

While not all of the male faculty were fathers and/or had partners, all spoke to the importance of family as sources of strength in navigating the tenure-track—a finding that supports the work of previous scholars like Griffin, Pifer, Humphrey, and Hazelwood (2011) who concluded that "having social support from one's family and friends may offer faculty the support and motivation they need to continue to do good work or may be common among faculty across all racial and ethnic groups" (p. 518). Even when family was not always aware of what faculty life entailed,

participants spoke of the general support that family members provided. However, in some cases, the time demands of faculty life put a strain on familial relationships. This was often the case for those who were married with children, as there was constant negotiating of time and needs related to work and family responsibilities (Reddick, Rochlen, Grasso, Reilly, & Spikes, 2012), suggesting greater institutional support and understanding of the significant role of family for FOC in general, and the specific familial roles for male FOC in particular.

A number of participants expressed a desire to sacrifice with their partners as an equal, in their roles as fathers, but expectations for them as faculty did not always allow this. Such expectations were also often not understood by partners not in academia. This was evident for Mark, an African American professor, who shared how attempts to meet both work and personal family demands meant losing sleep. "I may get up a little earlier or I may go to bed a little later. I've learned that I have to do certain things to be successful. I think I do a good job with navigating that with my boys." However, he admitted, "I'm still figuring that process out with my wife." Rodney addressed the issue of prioritizing his children by sometimes limiting the time spent with his partner: "I'm obsessed about time, and it's also hard to sort of put up appropriate boundaries, but you know what? Kids force you to do that; kids force you, not marriage, kids, because you can totally blow off your spouse and be like *grrrrr* talk to you later." While Walter did not have children, he did "carve out...time with my wife or for time with friends." This strategy of "actually protecting that time on my calendar" helped him negotiate his roles, a strategy he had "gotten from faculty colleagues around the country in talking to them and [asking], 'how do you deal with these things?'"

Irwin, who had a three-month-old son during his first year as faculty, had warned his wife, "I told her, I said I'm going to be gone a lot, especially that first year [as a professor], and she said okay, cool, I understand, but she didn't really, really understand." The vague criteria offered by his institution regarding expectations contributed to his stress—a common critique of and experience with the tenure and promotion process among FOC (Urrieta, Méndez, & Rodríguez, 2015; Williams & Williams, 2006). "So they say do a good job at teaching; what does that mean? What do I have to do?" he inquired. Nonetheless, for Irwin, his family provided an opportunity to "bring things back into perspective." This "perspective" elucidates the nuanced aspects of each participant's experience as a male faculty member of color, one in which they simultaneously contend with academic expectations that are nebulous yet touted as meritocratic and objective, while family provides a culturally supportive environment in which one's role and responsibilities are more clearly delineated.

As the only male scholar of color in his department who was married with children, Tim spoke to the distinct way that he negotiated familial and professional roles and responsibilities when compared to his departmental peers: "I'm expected to be mother, father, brother, aunt, uncle, cousin, teacher, and all those other things and still do everything else and the kitchen sink, where I have colleagues that come in, teach their class, they go home." Because of his family responsibilities, Tim had to find a balance with his professional roles and recognized how the system favored certain lifestyles for the professoriate.

Yet others, like Quentin, found themselves negotiating culturally-bound expectations related to manhood and fatherhood that were placed upon them by extended family. As an American Indian professor, he shared how traditional family expectations began bumping up against the rigor and isolation of the researcher's life since he began working on his doctorate. "The PhD program is foreign to them [family] as well, and there are certain stereotypes that are associated with that. 'Oh,

when are you going to get a real job? You know you're married and raising a family, and you're fiddling around.'" It is difficult to ignore critical thoughts around male and family roles, and even those ideas are fraught with non-conscious, individual and collective intersections of experience.

As Nico and Paulo's wives were also academics, they believed this provided for a greater sense of understanding and an ability to negotiate work and family responsibilities. Nico shared how he and his wife "have a certain amount of understanding for how crazy our lives are… [O]ver the weekend, we were sort of, we call it tag-teaming, watching our two-year-old son because she needed to be out in the garden and I needed to finish some paper; it was just finding the balance between those two." Paulo and his wife worked within the same field, which meant they were "close enough to talk to each other [about their work], so that's nice." He felt they were "very lucky" to work at the same institution, so they would "never have to live apart," as might be the case with other partners in academia.

Lonnie and Carl, while cognizant of the responsibilities and stress that came with academia, were also appreciative of the flexibility that academia provided in comparison to other careers. "I've had a lot more time to spend with my family. I like the flexibility that it [academia] affords," Lonnie explained. He was able to pick up his daughter from school regularly, which was "valuable" to him. Carl, who was married and had a toddler, agreed with these sentiments, recognizing that academia is a "very flexible job and I've benefited from that." However, Carl also divulged, "I constantly have this sense of guilt and fear that I'm not doing enough" in both professional and personal realms of his life; he felt "caught up in that and trying to balance it all."

Gus also spoke to the stress that came with negotiating his roles "as a father, husband…as a professor, as a mentor, as an advisor," but relied on his "value system" and the support from his wife in this regard. He found solace in integrating his family in his academic life, "wanting to involve my girls more in seeing what I do…eventually being able to come to conferences, have my daughters see literally what I do, why I do it." Don also found strength in his wife's support, as she "understands what I am doing." His family structures allowed for "a pretty good balance." Don also referenced Robert Boice's book, *Advice for New Faculty*: *Nihil Nimus* He described how "the basic principle of the book is that everything that you do in academia should be done with constancy and moderation." It was an approach he began to adopt in his "life in general."

Understand: Experiences of male faculty of color are unique

In interviewing the FOC in the larger project, participants were asked to consider how, if at all, they felt their experiences in the academy varied when compared to their colleagues, both those that were White, as well as other male and female FOC. Most male participants expressed a keen understanding of how their own experiences were unique, with a few explicitly referring to the role of intersectionality as a key determinant impacting their experiences. In this respect, participants referenced institutional inequities and issues of power in more subtle ways as they focused on their multiple identities more explicitly. For instance, some identified their international, first-generation college student, and/or English language learner identities as particularly significant in shaping their experiences within academia. For others, race and gender worked in unison to be more determinant factors in their experiences. Yet, there were a handful of participants who did not see the intersectionality of their identities as necessarily impacting them much differently when compared to others given their programmatic, departmental,

or university context, and a couple of participants considered their racial/ethnic background as an advantage.

Quite a few participants spoke to particular distinctions they saw in navigating the academy as a male FOC when compared to other white colleagues. Alton, an African American professor, expanded on the notion of disproportionate expectations for FOC, or cultural taxation (Aguirre, 2000), but included an affirmation of agency: "You have to bring your A+ game at all times. We're just in a constant state in which we have to prove ourselves, [in the context of assumptions like] 'you know you're here because of affirmative action, you're here because the program needed more diversity' or something like that."

Rodney and Nico spoke to various aspects of being "hyper-visible" in their roles as male FOC on their particular campuses, a concept other male FOC have spoken to in previous research (Reddick & Saenz, 2012; Williams & Williams, 2006). For Rodney, this hypervisibility was in part due to his having been hired at the same time as another male FOC colleague, who were both undergraduate alumni of the institution in which they worked. "As men of color who went to school here we're hyper-visible; we're very… we came here with a lot of fanfare, [and] people knew who we were. 'I've heard about you': I hear that in circles," he explained. Yet he admitted, "sometimes you want to be invisible...sometimes as junior professors it's good not to be seen because you want to do your stuff." As a male FOC studying issues of race, Nico became hyper-visible on his campus as well, "It seems like every student of color wants to work with you in some way, shape, or form, or at least have you on their committee or [meet during] office hours." He described, "mentoring a student over in Sociology because the way they do sociology here tends to be family, gender, and sexuality studies. Nobody does race and racism and so they come over."

For those male FOC who had additional marginalized identities beyond race, class, and gender, the role of intersectionality became even more prominent in their understanding of their unique experiences within the confines of academia's policies and structures. This was the case for Orlando, who identified as a first-generation college student, who also did not "speak English as a first language" and who was an international faculty member "in a foreign land" in the U.S. "Those are the challenges for me; you have to work double in order to get something that other people may do … just once." Orlando expanded on his understanding of how intersectionality and hegemony impacted the experiences of all faculty, as well as students, within university settings: "I mean, at university as a straight male there are so many intersectionalities, [and there] are a lot of contradictions and complexities in that; you cannot just pick one and say, 'oh, this person is a White professor, and that's why he's….' The next time you see [that] there is a class issue, a question of seniority at universities; there are people who have been known more than others…. But we, as faculty, as people who work in these institutions, we do not interrogate how the university is structured and plays the gatekeeper for all people to come...I look at the hegemony of the university itself…How do we work? If we care about those things, then that's when we begin to talk about the issues of what education should be about."

Jose, a Latino living and working in a predominantly White community and university in the South, shared how the difficulties associated with being a male of color bled into his work as a faculty member who had to supervise pre-service teachers in schools. He acknowledged that to a certain extent being "light complected" and "male" afforded him some privileges, and so he "could assimilate enough as white," although "they [his colleagues] know I'm Mexican." He described an instance when he went to a school to supervise one of his White female

students, and he was asked to wait an unduly amount of time for clearance while his other colleagues were not. Jose felt that "It was about a deficit model rather than a racial model [being utilized], because this was actually non-dominant administrators doing this ignorance to me [sic]." For Jose, this experience points to the complexity of intersectionality. Jose felt unjustly treated by non-White educators who were, presumably, performing in a manner they would expect from White educators.

Hakim was well aware of the gender dynamic with students as well, and described the need to be cognizant of his interactions with his female students. However, Hakim did not necessarily acknowledge the role of his race/ethnicity in such contexts. In fact, Hakim first claimed, "I don't think I've seen anything, ethnic or race-wise that has been a difference" with regards to his experiences in academia. However, he later added, "I think there is a difference when you are a male and that is kind of made pretty clear to you.... I generally prefer to have my door open so people can hear my conversations [and] so there can be no accusations with the female student."

Most participants were also explicit about how female FOC must also navigate the academy in unique ways, and may confront misogyny, racial microaggressions, as well as other marginalization in their journeys. Edgar noted such distinctions from his own experience, "There is that female dynamic ...just the way folks talk in that area of Texas [speak to a woman]. You know, *What are you doing little lady? What are you doing in a meeting like this?* You know, those kinds of things. Those undertones can be really difficult." Ulysses, similarly shared how conversations with women FOC revealed some of the challenges they experienced in "being challenged in the classroom by students regarding the way that they do things, for example. Not to say that I've never been challenged. I have, but, it seems that it's not been as frequent as the women with whom I've spoken."

There were only a few participants that either did not see their identities as male FOC impacting them as differently when compared to other colleagues, or even saw their race or gender as an advantage within their field of study. Carl indicated, "I've never felt like it's [being a male FOC] been an issue for me." Admittedly, he felt "It's weird for each of us [in academia], just in different ways." He did not expand further on how the intersectionality of his own identities provided him with a unique experience, but reiterated how faculty's experiences varied on an "individual level."

Braulio was an undergraduate alumnus of the institution that hired him as a faculty member, and so when he was hired he was welcomed and touted as a "great example...of a young scholar of color." He admitted that, given this context, "I've been showed a lot of love, from just about everybody I've encountered here, support." He expanded on this, wondering whether some of his White colleagues had such a positive experience, and recognized that his experience as a male FOC could have been different at another institution:

> I feel like I'm greatly valued by this institution. I'm in a department that is majority Hispanic now in terms of its faculty, or just about. Now in fact I ... wonder if [my White colleagues] feel out of place... So it's been completely the opposite world, bizarro [sic] world…I feel like the fact that I'm Latino is an asset to this university somehow.

Much like Braulio, Saul saw his racial background as an advantage in his university context, as well as in his field of biology. As an international scholar originally from Mexico who was working at a Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI), he saw his racial and ethnic identity as "an advantage" that provided him the opportunity to apply for funding that was only available to faculty at HSIs and that provided him the opportunity to work with Hispanic students, and "make an impact

on the Hispanic population." The nuanced experiences for each participant contextualizes the category of "male faculty member of color" in various, real intersections.

Recreate: Perceptions of self and others

A majority of participants also discussed or implicitly revealed ways in which their roles in academia while on the tenure-track provided a means of reconceptualizing their own perceptions of self and the perceptions that others had of them, as male FOC. Similar to findings in previous literature, helping change previous deficit oriented or stereotypical notions held among students, faculty, and staff with regards to male FOC was also significant to most participants, which impacted how they navigated the academy and made sense of their professional identity (Reddick & Saenz, 2012; Williams & Williams, 2006). At the same time, most faculty were also cognizant of how the intersectionality of their own identities impacted others' perceptions of them, and thus their experiences within academia.

Lonnie spoke to the latter notion very explicitly, "I think when it comes to academia…, I see two parts. There's my perception and then the perception of others... How I have found myself with respect to students [is] that students many times dig further to see exactly what I am and gravitate towards me based on that." Lonnie provided an example of how his varying social identities, as Caribbean and Black, were at times simultaneously perceived differently by students, "So for instance, Caribbean students who we see here, once they find out that I was a Caribbean staff, sort of gravitate towards me. And that's interesting because I advise a Fraternity on campus as well, and they saw me as Black, but sometimes as an outsider because I wasn't one hundred percent, I guess, pure African American."

Mark actually spoke to how navigating as a male FOC in and outside of academia was "an intersectionality of multiple worlds" and this impacted his sense of self professionally and personally, and how we was viewed by others. He spoke to the power of the doctoral title, and how "when I deal with the majority culture and I feel like I'm not getting the kind of reception I should get…which is just being treated equitably…. It's funny how their demeanor changes when they find out that I am a faculty member at the university." He was often subsequently treated with respect, but he reiterated, "You should have done that when it was just '*Mr*. X'."

Other faculty like Ken, a Filipino faculty member, expanded on the positive impact they hoped to have on students, through their own roles as male FOC. Ken shared his hope that, "I've presented to my students, my undergraduate students, some successful models of a person of color teaching them, a PhD, knowing something and influencing them." This was important to him as, "sometimes some of my students will say … they haven't worked or been to school with or [been] taught by a person of color…." Thus, for Ken, "that's a success, being a positive role model."

Quentin, who worked at a PWI, spoke to his efforts "to challenge the popular understandings of what it means to be Indian, what that looks like, especially up against the headdress and all these stereotypes of what that means" through his teaching, research, and service. Yet Quentin also expressed how this prescriptive approach can leave many emerging scholars to think too narrowly about their work, and their place in the academy:

> I think one of the hard parts is to feel that your only contribution is to be a faculty of color and you have nothing else to offer. When I was introduced at the first faculty meeting, I was introduced as *This is Quentin. He does a lot of Cherokee work, and he's doing Cherokee outreach*, which mentions

nothing about my scholarship, nothing about my academic interests and that was pretty frustrating. And the fact that I didn't get to speak for myself, that was also frustrating. So, I remember early on, I tried not to do it and I kept being pushed back to it, so I think there was an expectation there...[that] I'm Native and I'm going to do Native stuff.

Finding the best means to speak up for himself as a male Native faculty where he had "a voice automatically" in his small department, he felt, "I think the hardest thing is just to see myself as a professor."

Nico provided an alternative perspective of how males of color within the academy, whether as graduate students or faculty, can also limit themselves if they rely on a very narrow, or even hyper-masculine view of themselves that draws on cultural notions of men of color needing to express bravado. In this way, Nico urged males of color in the academy to reconceptualize their identities, particularly when it came to being willing to seek mentorship and support:

All too often as men of color in the academy we resist opportunities for mentorship. We do not accept influence....We would prefer in class, even in social situations, to act like professors...Not realizing that some of the most successful people who I have met along this crazy journey are willing to admit publicly when they don't know. Admit that they are incomplete and they don't have all the answers...Because the way that we construct how it is to be a man is the opposite. 'I have to know, I have to be in control, I have to...'

Fred understood that his platform as a scholar of color could impact and provide for a new understanding of self. "I don't have to go to a big name institution. ...My title, my institution, my publications don't define me. I define myself," he explained. In this respect, Fred advised students of color seeking to join the professoriate to consider whether the profession, "make[s] sense for them personally, professionally, and when they go to bed at night, it has to sit right in their mind."

Similarly, Don revealed how he purposefully did not compare himself to others, whether colleagues of color or his White peers, in conceptualizing his own identity as male FOC. While he recognized there were distinctions in expectations between him and his white counterparts, "I realize that as a reality. But it isn't going to affect what I do and I don't compare myself to what they do."

Discussion

The narratives from the 22-male faculty of color participants highlight the complexities of navigating tenure in academia. More specifically, participants' experiences were associated with negotiating time, stress, and the uncertainty of role commitments within academia and family life, how male FOC interpret their uniqueness given their positionalities, and how they work to recreate their self-perceptions and those others form of them within academia. Applying an intersectionality framework to these findings can help further elucidate how the larger power structures of academia and the unique contextual politics of each participant's field, institution, and department or program shaped the experiences of the male FOC. This application is consistent with that of previous scholars examining FOC experiences in the academy (Griffin & Reddick, 2011; Urrieta, Méndez, & Rodríguez, 2015; Zambrana, Ray, Espino, Castro, Cohen, & Eliason, 2015).

The first theme, "Negotiate: Time, stress, and uncertainty of role commitments" was fraught with contradictions; most male FOC noted the negative impact of academia on their ability to negotiate and attend to their varying roles and responsibilities as fathers and/or husbands, while few recognized the advantages of a flexible faculty schedule to familial involvement. Yet it is reasonable to consider that some of the flexibility provided to participants at their work is largely due to the nature of the work that does not adhere to a traditional 8 am to 5 pm schedule. In this same vein, while time with family and friends was constrained because of academic demands, it was these social networks that often provided the most authentic support for participants, although some male FOC experienced tension with family because of their inability to devote sufficient time to the home or fulfill cultured and gendered expectations in their roles as academics. In sum, male FOC's experiences in negotiating varying expectations and roles in academia and with family reiterate the bicultural skills FOC often develop in order to switch between these two cultural contexts (Sadao, 2003).

Many of the examples and the language that the male FOC used to describe how they negotiated the road to tenure reflected inequitable, systemic power dynamics. For instance, references to "protecting" time on one's calendar in order to socialize with family and friends, as well as needing to decide between caring for one's children while "blow[ing] off your spouse" suggests an academic structure that is demanding, unforgiving, and lacking in the necessary supports for male FOC. Partners of the male FOC were often warned of needing, "to be gone a lot, especially that first year [as a professor]," and as a result, some male FOC found solace in the support that their partners provided while others recognized that their partners were less understanding. There was an unwritten expectation that academia had to be prioritized at the expense of familial relationships and responsibilities, leaving some male FOC to realize that such a work environment favored certain lifestyles. It could be argued that all tenure-track faculty might have similar experiences, but the negotiation of responsibilities that male FOC encounter becomes apparent when they begin to see differences in how they are treated and what they experience when compared to their peers. Male FOC often referred to how they held more roles and responsibilities than some of their White counterparts, who can "come in, teach their class, they go home," while FOC also deal with what they perceive as vague expectations for tenure (Urrieta, Méndez, & Rodríguez, 2015), greater advising and service commitments (Griffin & Reddick, 2011), often with fewer mentors to turn to in the process that look like them and can "provide the emotional, cultural, and personal support" desired (Tillman, 2001, p. 317). Thus, this theme highlights the polarity of lived experiences of male FOC given their own academic expectations and familial responsibilities.

In the second theme, "Understand: Experiences of male faculty of color are unique," the participants referenced how their positioning within academia was distinct when compared to their White male and female peers, as well as their female counterparts of color, as they navigated the tenure-track. As self-identified men who are negotiating a work-life balance, while carving out their own space within the academy, a myriad line of influence come to intersect: race, class, gender, economics, social progress, and institutional norms. This intersection is not based on the list approach, but rather trying to better understand how the complexity of each context helps influence an identity for each male FOC (Anthias, 2012).

As male FOC, many shared their experiences of being compared to other White colleagues and in doing so referenced the cultural taxation that FOC often face (Padilla, 1994), needing to "bring your A+ game at all times." This feeling of needing to "work double in order to get something that other people may do … just once" was intensified for those participants who experienced increased marginalization in being first-generation college students, non-native English speakers, or international faculty, for instance. Often

being the only or one of few male FOC in their programs or departments, some participants experienced pressures associated with hyper-visibility. This hyper-visibility acted as a double-edged sword, with some participants feeling greatly valued, yet overly sought out by students of color for mentorship or viewed as tokens on their campuses, while at the same time feeling overly surveilled in the process. These experiences parallel those noted by some of the Black male professors in Griffin and Reddick's (2011) study in which they found that some "sensed that they were being watched and how this translated into concerns about misperceptions of their relationships with female students—and worries about accusations of sexual impropriety" (p. 1048-1049). The experiences of Jose and Hakim speak to this need to approach "relationships with students with prudence and boundaries" (p. 1048).

For those male FOC that found value and additional support in their hyper-visibility, they shared how they harnessed the privileges associated with their positionality to assist them in reaching their academic goals and to further their commitment to uplifting communities of color. This was the case for Braulio, who felt that being Latino was "an asset to this university somehow," and for Saul who used his Latino image within his discipline of biology to "make an impact on the Latino population." Yet, these findings reiterate how the overall underrepresentation of male FOC on higher education campuses creates more demands for the few in academia, and as a result, creates unrealistic demands for FOC as they navigate the tenure process. This underrepresentation continues to be an area in need of further interrogation and attention, as Orlando suggested when he referred to the need to question "how the university is structured and plays the gatekeeper for all people to come."

In the final theme, "Recreate: Perceptions of self and others," participants shared how they have been able to redefine themselves within a higher education system and tenure-track process that fosters an inequitable distribution of power and roles. While most of the male FOC acknowledge contributing in some form to the ongoing bureaucratic oppression within the academy, they utilize their agency to reconceptualize the expectations and perceptions they have for themselves and those others have of them in academia. In this way, the conceptualization of one's identity goes beyond the physical characteristics of the self for many of the male FOC in this study. Yet concomitantly physical attributes, via gender and race, provide the basis to forge a space, formulate their identity, and resist hegemony within higher education.

For most participants, the work around teaching, research, and service centers on how to redefine their identity beyond their visible physical characteristics to counter gender, racial, and cultural stereotypes of males of color, knowing that revealing the complexity of their identities further shaped how others perceived and treated them. For instance, Lonnie, who is Caribbean Black, shared how his identity was most readily assigned to him by others based on his skin color. Perceived by his physical characteristics in being a Black man, this identity became more complicated when he revealed his Caribbean roots, providing him a means to connect with some Black Caribbean students more easily, but consequently shifting how some African American students viewed and treated him, as an outsider. This example highlights how intersectional aspects come to provide a sense of comfort, connectivity, and empowerment for some participants. Other male FOC shared similar shifts in perceptions by others, particularly when living and working within the community, based on being a faculty member and holding a PhD; this provided for them being treated with greater respect. Those male FOC who shared this experience scoffed at the need to reveal their professional identities in order to be respected in some spaces, although they harnessed this privilege when necessary.

In sum, male FOC's experiences with regards to how they negotiate their multiple personal and professional identities while working towards tenure reveal the continued

essentialization of FOC's racial and gender identities. It was this essentialism that some participants like Quentin, a Native American faculty member, and Fred, an African American faculty member, sought to combat so that they could redefine their own identities for themselves. Both male FOC understand that expectations of their work are generated by the blatant and hidden systemic culture of academia itself. However, said expectations become internalized, and help create a richer institutional context within which a male FOC comes to experience their own identity, and that of said institution.

Conclusion

Overall, findings reiterate that the experiences of male FOC on the tenure-track cannot be unraveled from their intersecting social identities, nor from the contexts in which they live and work. Although identities can be fluid, and constantly in flux given academic pressures and familial responsibilities, this was seen in varying instances with how faculty perceived themselves and how others perceived them differently depending on others' own social identities or group affiliations. Supportive environments that allowed for fluid understandings of what male FOC can and should be doing, were appreciated although less common. This finding aligns with previous research in which FOC note the significant role of welcoming and supportive departmental and institutional climates to assist them in finding work-life balance (Reddick, et al., 2012; Turner, González, & Wood, 2008).

It was also apparent from some participants, more than others, how there was often tension between cultural expectations and institutional understandings of their roles as male FOC that played out and shaped faculty's experiences. However, some faculty exhibited agency in forging their own identities as males, as fathers, as husbands, as mentors, and as colleagues, with most relying heavily on cultural support systems, especially from spouses. While a number of participants shared many common experiences with women FOC, there was not a collective theme of scholarship rejection from superiors, nor the subsequent self-doubt often reported by women of color working in academia (Gutiérrez y Muhs, Niemann, González, & Harris, 2012; Thomas & Hollenshead, 2001). This missing expression may further implicate the role of gender in operating as a means to dominant cultures and expectations.

Also, important to note is that none of the participants explicitly identified as transgender males or gay. Future research should consider purposefully examining the experiences of transgender or gay male FOC, as their experiences may be distinct, as well. Although the topic of masculinity as experienced by faculty members of color— regardless of gender—is too much to explore in this study, there is also a need for understanding this crucial intersection of gender, race, institutional norms, and expectations within the academy. This study embraces a growing body of research that highlights the need to better understand how intersectionalities influence the unique identity of male FOC in the tenure process. It is through continued scholarship that male FOC can provide institutions with heuristic ways to support their personal and professional advancement in academia.

References

Aguirre, A. (2000). Women and minority faculty in the academic workplace: Recruitment, retention, and academic culture. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, 27*(6).

Anthias, F. (2013). Intersectional what? Social divisions, intersectionality, and levels of analysis. *Ethnicities, 13*(1), 3–19.

Antonio, A. I. (2003). Diverse student bodies, diverse faculties: The success or failure of ambitions to diversify faculty can depend on the diversity of student bodies. *Academe*, 89.

Blake-Beard, S., Bayne, M. L., Crosby, F. C., & Muller, C. B. (2011). Matching by race and gender in mentoring relationships: Keeping the eyes on the prize. *Journal of Social Issues, 67,* 622–643.

Chang, A., Welton, A. D., Martinez, M. A., & Cortez, L. J. (2013). Becoming academicians: A critical ethnographic analysis of the figured worlds of underrepresented female faculty. *Negro Educational Review, 64*(1-4), 97-118.

Cho, S., Crenshaw, K. W., & McCall, L. (2013). Toward a field of intersectionality studies: Theory, applications, and praxis. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 38*(4), 785-810.

Crenshaw, K. W. (1989). *Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory, and Antiracist Politics.* University of Chicago Legal Forum, 139-167.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Dancy II, T. E., & Brown II, M. C. (2011). The mentoring and induction of educators of color: Addressing the impostor syndrome in academe. *Journal of School Leadership, 21*(4), 607-634.

Delgado Bernal, D., & Villalpando, O. (2002). An apartheid of knowledge in academia: The struggle over the 'legitimate' knowledge of faculty of color. *Equity & Excellence in   Education, 35*(2), 169-180.

Diggs, G. A., Garrison-Wade, D. F., Estrada, D., & Galindo, R. (2009). Smiling faces and colored spaces: The experiences of faculty of color pursuing tenure in the academy. *Urban Review, 41*(4), 312-333.

Griffin, K. A., Pifer, M. J., Humphrey, J. R., & Hazelwood, A. M. (2011). (Re)Defining Departure: Exploring Black Professors' Experiences with and Responses to Racism and Racial Climate. *American Journal of Education, 117*(4), 495-526.

Griffin, K. A., & Reddick, R. J. (2011). Surveillance and sacrifice: Gender differences in the mentoring patterns of Black professors at predominantly white research universities. *American Educational Research Journal, 48*(5), 1032-1057.

Gutiérrez y Muhs, G., Niemann, Y.F., González, C. G., & Harris, A. P. (2012). *Presumed incompetent: The intersections of race and class for women in academia*. Boulder, CO: Utah State University Press.

Hatch, J. A. (2002). *Doing Qualitative Research in Education Settings*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Johnsrud, L.K., Sadao, K.C. (1998) The common experience of otherness: Ethnic and racial minority faculty. *The Review of Higher Education, 21*(4), 315-342.

Kachchaf, R., Ko, L., Hodari, A., & Ong, M. (2015). Career-Life Balance for Women of Color: Experiences in Science and Engineering. *Academia Journal of Diversity in HigherEducation*, *8*(3), 175-191.

Kezar, A., & Lester, J. (2009). Supporting Faculty Grassroots Leadership. *Research in Higher Education*, *50*(7), 715-740.

Martinez, M. A. & Welton, A. D. (2015). Straddling cultures, identities, and inconsistencies: Voices of pre-tenure faculty of color in educational leadership. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education.* 1-21.

Núñez, A.-M. (2014). Employing multilevel intersectionality in educational research: Latino identities, contexts, and college access. *Educational Researcher, 43*(2), 85-92.

Padilla, A. M. (1994). Ethnic minority scholars, research, and mentoring: Current and future   issues. *Educational Researcher, 23*(4), 24-27.

Peters, A. (2011) Black women faculty in educational leadership: Unpacking their silence in research. *Diversity in Higher Education, 9*, 147-167.

Reddick, R., Rochlen, A. B., Grasso, J. R., Reilly, E. D., & Spikes, D. D. (2012). Academic fathers pursuing tenure: A qualitative study of work-family conflict, coping strategies, and departmental culture. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 13*(1), 1-15.

Reddick, R., & Saenz, V. (2012). *Coming Home: Hermanos Académicos Reflect on Past and Present Realities as Professors at Their Alma Mater. Harvard Educational Review,82*(3), 353-438.

Sadao, K.C., (2003). Living in Two Worlds: Success and the Bicultural Faculty of Color. *The Review of Higher Education, 26*(4), 397-418.

Snyder, T. D., de Brey, C., & Dillow, S. A. (2018). Digest of Education Statistics 2016 (NCES 2017-094). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

Solorzano, D., & Yosso, T. (2001). Critical race and LatCrit theory and method: Counter-storytelling. Chicana and Chicano graduate school experiences. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 14*(4), 471- 495.

Stanley, C. A. (2006). *Faculty of Color: Teaching in Predominately White colleges and universities.* Boston, MA: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.

Sue, D., Rivera, D., Watkins, N., Kim, R., Kim, S., & Williams, C. (2011). Racial Dialogues: Challenges Faculty of Color Face in the Classroom. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 17*(3), 331-340.

Thomas, G. D., & Hollenshead, C. (2001). Resisting from the margins: The coping strategies of Black women and other women of color faculty members at a research university. *The Journal of Negro Education, 70*, 166–175.

Thompson, Q. (2008). Recruitment, retention, and mentoring faculty of color: The chronicle continues. *New Directions for Higher Education, 143*, 47-54.

Tillman, L. C. (2001). Mentoring African American faculty in predominantly White institutions. *Research in Higher Education, 42*(3), 295-325.

Turner, C. S. V., González, J. C., & Wood, J. L. (2008). Faculty of color in academe: What 20 years of literature tells us. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education,* 1(3), 139-168.

Urrieta Jr., L. Méndez, L., & Rodríguez, E. (2015). "A moving target": a critical race analysis of Latina/o faculty experiences, perspectives, and reflections on the tenure and promotion process. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 28*(10), 1149-1168.

Van Manen, M. (1990). *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive   pedagogy*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Warde, B. (2009). The road to tenure: Narratives of African American male tenured professors. *Journal of African American Studies, 13*, 494-508.

Williams, B. N., & Williams, S. M. (2006). Perceptions of African American male junior faculty on promotion and tenure: Implications for community building and social capital. *Teachers College Record, 108*(2), 287-315.

Zambrana, R. E., Ray, R., Espino, M. M., Castro, C., Cohen, B. D., & Eliason, J. (2015). "Don't leave us behind": The importance of mentoring for underrepresented minority faculty. *American Educational Research Journal, 52*(1), 40-72.

Authors

Melissa A. Martinez is an Associate Professor in the Educational and Community Leadership master's and Ph.D. in School Improvement programs in the College of Education at Texas State University. Her research focuses on equity and access issues along the P-16 educational pipeline with regards to: college access and readiness issues for students of color, equity and social justice-oriented leaders and leadership preparation, and the experiences of faculty of color in academia. Some of her scholarship has been published in *The High School Journal, Race Ethnicity and Education, Journal of Latinos and Education, International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, Urban Review,* and the *Journal of School Leadership*.

Juan Manuel Niño is an Associate Professor in the College of Education and Human Development at the University of Texas at San Antonio. His research, which takes a critical perspective on the practice of education and leadership in multiple contexts, addresses issues of justice, equity and excellence in education for diverse communities. Centering on the importance of research and practice, he co-coordinates the Urban School Leaders Collaborative programs that prepare aspiring school leaders for social justice. Some of his work has been published in *International Journal of Leadership in Education, Association of Mexican American Educators Journal, National Forum of Applied Educational Research Journal, The Teacher Educator*, and *School Leadership Review*.

Isaac Torres is the Director of High School, College, and Career success at the E3 Alliance in Austin, TX. His work focuses on applying a collective impact framework, and facilitating cross-sector alignment to postsecondary success initiatives. He brings 15 years of experience in education, having worked as a college access mentor, a postsecondary tutor, a grant specialist, a research assistant, and an independent consultant. Isaac's research interests center on school dropout phenomena, technology, juvenile justice, and post-structural research methodologies. He is currently in candidacy for a Doctorate in School Improvement at Texas State University. Some of his work has been published in *Teachers College Record* (accepted-in press).