International minority ethnic academics at predominantly white institutions

Bhopal, Kalwant; Chapman, Thandeka K.

DOI:
10.1080/01425692.2018.1486698

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):
Bhopal, K & Chapman, TK 2019, 'International minority ethnic academics at predominantly white institutions', *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, vol. 40, no. 1, pp. 98-113.
https://doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2018.1486698

International Minority Ethnic Academics at Predominantly White Institutions

Abstract

Using Critical Race Theory (CRT) this paper examines the racial positioning of British international minority ethnic (IME) academics in predominantly White institutions (PWIs). Empirical data, in the form of 28 in-depth interviews with IME academics is used to analyze the complex raced and gendered positionalities of IME academics in institutions of higher education in the United States. We argue that the institutional contexts of predominantly White universities continue to re-affirm White privilege in ways that reflect the struggles in higher education to diversify faculty at PWIs. As scholars call for more diversity across higher education campuses, we suggest that it is important to understand the interconnections between policy and practice surrounding attempts to recruit and retain IME academics.

Keywords: CRT, IME academics, inclusion, Higher Education, faculty

Kalwant Bhopal, University of Birmingham K.Bhopal@bham.ac.uk

Thandeka K. Chapman, University of California San Diego tkchapman@ucsd.edu

International Minority Ethnic Academics at Predominantly White Institutions

Introduction

As the student enrollment of universities in the United States become more racially and culturally diverse, and as racially discriminatory incidents become more publicized on campuses, higher education administrations at predominantly White institutions (PWIs) have been criticized for their failure to hire racially and culturally diverse faculty (Watanabe 2018) Researchers have documented how recruiting and retaining racially diverse faculty benefits students' overall college experiences, the campus climate, and increases intellectual diversity (Jayakumar et al. 2009; Umbach 2006). International minority ethnic (IME) academics remain a significant sub-set of university recruitment efforts to diversify faculty in the USA. Yet, even as international scholars are being recruited to these campuses, recent research has found significant racial marginalization of IME academics (Jackson 2006). Echoing Leonardo's assertion that "race, and in particular whiteness, must be situated in the global context" (2002, 30), this article presents findings from a study of IME academics in the USA in order to better understand how race and racism shape institutions of higher education and the experiences racial minority actors within these institutions.

Using critical race theory (CRT) we examine how the interplay between university diversity policies and faculty actions create moments of empowerment and marginalization for IME academics. The tenets of racial realism, whiteness as property, and intersectionality in CRT are useful analytic tools for examining how university policies, professional relationships, and workloads at PWIs continue to marginalize IME academics in the USA. Empirical data, in the form of experiential knowledge of IME academics, is analyzed to explicate the complex positionalities of IME academics, and how their experiences disaffirm

university goals for increasing diversity among the professoriate. Given the CRT premise that racism is manifested and maintained through institutional and structural factors, we utilize CRT to argue that the binary created between university policies and faculty actions re-affirm White privilege and sustain the status quo of homogenous White departments.

We first describe our unique population and explain the methodology. An articulation of the CRT concepts used in the analysis is followed by the findings, which explore the experiences of IME faculty in PWIs and explain the difficulties of dismantling White privilege, or at least creating greater access for minority ethnic academics. The methodology section outlines the methods and data analysis, followed by an analysis of findings. The article concludes by sharing implications for inclusive policy making at PWIs.

Who Are the International Minority Ethnic Academics?

For this paper, we use the term IME to describe the respondents who participated in our study. All of our respondents were minority ethnic academics who originated from the UK and lived and worked in the UK all of their lives before moving to the USA. The respondents came to the USA to find work as international scholars, hence we use the term international minority ethnic academics to set the respondents apart from USA minority ethnic academics groups, for example African American, Asian American, Native American, and Latino scholars. There is evidence to suggest that minority ethnic academics in the UK experience racism, exclusion and marginalization, and are more likely to consider a move overseas compared to their White colleagues (Bhopal et al. 2015). The USA is considered the most desired destination for UK academics; yet, there is little research that has explored academic mobility for IME scholars in the USA. Hence, in this article we provide original research on the experiences of IME academics who have left the UK to work in USA higher education.

Documenting the Experiences of International Minority Ethnic Academics

Currently limited research exists documenting the lived experiences of IME academics in the USA. Given the limitations of the literature focused on IME academics, we use research recounting the experiences of minority racial academics in the USA to situate the perceptions and experiences of IME academics. Similar to minority ethnic academics in the USA, researchers have documented how IME academics are disadvantaged as they lack access to such networks that are part of the social and cultural capital needed to progress in universities (Bhopal 2016; Trix and Pskenka 2003). Turner and Myers (2000) argue that IME academics are often treated as 'guests' and felt 'out of place' in what is traditionally seen as the home of White academics. In this sense, White staff, '…project the underlying attitude that they are making 'others' feel welcome in 'their' space' (Turner and Myers 2000, 84). Research also suggests that such perceptions of 'being the only one' or being 'un-positioned' in universities can reinforce feelings of insecurity for minority ethnic academics, and consequently make them less likely to challenge the negative or racist experiences they encounter (Bhopal 2016).

Tokenism, a belief amongst White academics that IME academics are employed *because* of their ethnicity, rather than because they are qualified to do the job, has also been identified as a key factor in the disadvantages faced by IME academics (Turner and Myers 2000). Similar to minority ethnic academics in the USA, IME colleagues are often 'typecast' and expected to teach courses relating to diversity (Turner et al. 1999). Turner and Myers (2000) suggest that White colleagues assume that minority ethnic colleagues will be researching their own racial communities, which is often perceived as less rigorous forms of scholarship. At the same time, De la Ruz and Halcon (1988, 77) state that 'White on White' research is afforded legitimacy and worthiness, yet 'brown on brown' research is questioned and challenged and this attitude, "lends full credibility to Whites conducting research on White populations, but discredits minority academics' research on minority issues".

CRT Analysis of IME Experiences in PWIs in the USA

CRT frameworks have been used to analyze the experiences and outcomes of minority ethnic academics particular to the complex contexts of higher education in the USA (Hiraldo 2010; Savas 2014). Scholars utilize a CRT analysis to highlight the experiences of minority ethnic academics in PWIs (Delagdo et al. 2002; Espino 2012; Griffin et al. 2014); critique institution diversity policies (Aguirre 2000; Donahoo 2008); analyze intersections of race, class, and gender among faculty (Sulé 2014; Solorzano 1998) and document the racial climate in universities (Harper 2012; Orelus 2013; Pittman 2012). Using CRT, scholars challenge the meritocratic rhetoric that typically surrounds faculty hiring and promotions, particularly in relation to contesting systems of merit (Donohoo 2008).

A CRT analysis highlights how issues of race and racism impact the respondents' capacities to maintain successful careers and build positive work environments. The stories of IME academics, as racially marginalized subjects, reveal the participants' perceptions and interpretations of policies and practices, and provide a means to understand higher education processes and outcomes (Baxley 2012). Using CRT concepts of the material and idealist conditions, Whiteness as property, and intersectionality, as defined later in the paper, we explicate how the respondents' answers to questions about workplace climate, faculty workload, and implementations of diversity policies reflect the racialized realities of IME academics at PWIs in the USA and continue to professionally marginalize IME academics.

Racial Realism

Racial realism remains the central tenet of CRT (Perez and Solorzano 2015) and stands at the crux of the experiences of IME academics. Racial realism is the belief that race and racism

historically and presently influence the meanings and implementations of laws and policies in the USA. Regardless of the social justice intent of education policies, the implementations of these policies are prejudiced by people's perceptions and performances of race (Bell 1992). In CRT, the concept of racial realism helps to explain the influences of race and racism on IME academics daily interactions (Victorino et al. 2013) the construction of current institutional policies which shape the experiences of minority ethnic academics (Morfin et al. 2006), their career trajectories (Iverson 2007), and their opportunities for career success (Jackson 2008). Delgado (2001) articulates two concepts, racial materialism and racial idealism, as ways in which CRT scholars engage factors of race and racism within their analyses of events and present-day contexts. Racial materialism focuses on how issues of labor and economic imperatives are filtered throughout USA laws and policies, while racial idealism focuses on how people's "thinking, attitude, categorization, and discourse" (Delgado 2001, 2282) sustain racism. Delgado explains the two sets of factors associated with materialism and idealism,

> Ideal factors-thoughts, discourse, stereotypes, feelings, and mental categories-only partially explain how race and racism work. Material factors-socioeconomic competition, immigration pressures, the search for profits, changes in the labor pool, nativism-account for even more, especially today (2001, 2280).

The experiences of IME academics reflect the interplay between material and ideal conditions in the workplace. In higher education in the USA, idealism is manifested through the *actions* of White academics, which are based on their perceptions of "the other," while materialism is represented through the "tangible benefits" (Delgado 2001, 2283) that are associated with diversity policies and recruitment strategies to hire and retain IME academics. What our findings reveal is how the material policies, economic workforce imperatives posing as

equity initiatives, often conflict with the ideal realities of relationships, perceptions, and practices, which are ingrained in racism in university spaces. Thus, idealism, found in individual and collective actions, weakens or unravels the material policies that are supposed to create more racially diverse and equitable.

The concepts of 'Whiteness as property' and 'intersectionality' serve as manifestations of racial materialism and idealism; these concepts highlight the specific ways that higher education policies and faculty processes (i.e. individual and collective actions) minimize IME academics' avenues for success in Academia. Whiteness as property and intersectionality are theoretically intertwined with materialist policies and idealist faculty practices (Leonardo 2002). For example, IME academics' critiques of institutional policies are situated within intersections of gender and race, as well as instantiations of White privilege, while idealist concerns of racial climate, faculty mentoring, and work satisfaction are intertwined with gender expectations and unspoken aspects of White privilege.

Whiteness as Property and White Privilege

In his definition of Whiteness Leonardo states,

> Thus, it can be said that whiteness is also a racial perspective or a world-view. Furthermore, whiteness is supported by material practices and institutions… As a collection of everyday strategies, whiteness is characterized by the unwillingness to name the contours of racism, the avoidance of identifying with a racial experience or group, the minimization of racist legacy, and other similar evasions (Frankenberg, 1993) (2002, 32).

White privilege is the material expression of whiteness through the maintenance of power, resources, accolades, and systems of support through formal institutional structures and

procedures. The idealist expression of White privilege lies within whiteness as "an imagined racial collective" (Leonardo, 2002, 32) that asserts a superior stance over other racial groups. Whiteness as property becomes the ways in which Whites maintain White privilege through normative White university spaces, the exclusion of IME academics from particular spaces, and the marginalization IME academics by relegating them to low status positions and university service (Bhopal 2018). In this article we demonstrate how White privilege is preserved through faculty actions and existing structural procedures, which propagate unequal economic and social outcomes for minority ethnic groups (Leonardo 2002).

Intersectionality

Significantly, IME academics' racialized experiences become compounded by intersectional factors of gender, class, and sexuality in ways that further marginalize or grant privilege to individuals and groups (Baxley 2012; Griffin et al. 2014; Henry and Glenn 2009; Jackson 2008). Two types of intersectionality, structural and representational, are used to explore how different identity factors, such as race, gender, and class, intersect to support and hinder the success of IME academics in universities. Structural intersectionality focuses on the institutional subordination of men and women due to enforced gendered roles in schools and the workplace. Representational intersectionality focuses on stereotype constructions that impact men's and women's relationships with individuals and groups and their perceptions of themselves (Crenshaw 1991). Although Crenshaw's (1991) original intersectionality framework focused solely on the lives of women, the concept can be used to explain the experiences of both sexes. Research demonstrates how minority ethnic men experience different disadvantages than minority ethnic women due to idealist perceptions that stereotype minority ethnic men's behavior and sexuality (Griffin et al. 2014; Jackson 2008). These intersectional experiences can support or hinder IME academic career pathways.

Methods

We conducted 28 individual interviews with IME academics to explore their experiences of working in universities in the USA. Fifteen of the digitally recorded and transcribed interviews were conducted as face to face interviews, four were conducted over the telephone and nine were conducted via Skype (audio and video).

The individual interviews lasted from one to one and a half hours each and each respondent was interviewed once. The interviews enabled us to examine and interrogate critical concepts introduced by respondents in which we were able to capture rich, descriptive data to develop our themes. Individual interviews were chosen as the best method which would enable respondents to articulate their lived experiences of being a British IME academic in a PWI. A CRT analysis highlights the centrality of the participant's experience with the phenomenon, and emphasizes the integral role of story-telling as an analytic tool to interrogate issues of race and racism in CRT in higher education research (Espino 2012; Ramos 2013).

All of the respondents who participated in this study were working in public universities. The following tables provide background details on the respondents who participated in the study. The respondents, all of whom defined themselves as British, came from a variety of different ethnic backgrounds (Table 1) and were at different professorial grades on their career trajectory (Table 2).

Table 1 here

Table 2 here

Respondents also worked in different types of universities in a variety of areas in the USA (Table 3). Their academic backgrounds varied from the Humanities, Sciences and the Arts

and they had all been in the USA for a number of years. The majority of respondents had over five years' experience of working in higher education.

Table 3 here

Respondents discussed their reasons prior to moving to the USA. Push factors included being on short term contracts and seeking a first job in Academia, others already employed on permanent contracts mentioned having to work twice as hard as their White colleagues which prevented them from gaining promotion to full professor in the UK. Pull factors for leaving the UK included the offer of a permanent job with advantageous career opportunities and the existence of positive black role models in senior positions (such as Deans and Directors) which many felt did not exist in the UK.

Respondents were contacted through personal networks which led to a snowball sample of 28 participants. They had to have migrated to the USA to work in a university and identify as IME. The age range of respondents varied from 25-60 and the majority of respondents had worked for more than five years in universities, with the exception of two who had worked in universities for three and four years. After the initial contact with two respondents, the respondents recommended other IME academics who had also migrated to the USA to participate in the study. We are aware that our sample may represent a sub-group of academics who are interested in the topic, which may have created selection bias (Van Meter 1990). For example, it is possible that respondents may have recommended others who have similar views to themselves and those who enjoy talking about and sharing their experiences. In keeping with critical race theory, we seek to illuminate the multifaceted experiences of racial minorities, without claiming a homogenous racial experience. Therefore, our study provides original findings on the experiences of IME academics in the USA centering their complex raced and gendered positionalities in higher education.

Respondents were asked about their experiences of working in PWIs, this included the advantages and disadvantages associated with this; their views on diversity and inclusion policies in their universities; how they felt their identity affected how they were positioned in PWIs and the different strategies universities should be developing regarding inclusion. In addition to discussing their workplaces, the participants were questioned about their academic preparation, their early years working in universities, and their personal support systems. Firstly, we analyzed the data separately in relation to these different questions which helped to generate the themes and then compared the analysis to heighten cross-researcher validity. The findings are discussed in the section below.

Findings and Analysis

Navigating Whiteness and White Privilege

Whiteness, in the forms of privileging traditional White middle class cultural behaviors and promoting a meritocratic ideology regarding career success, is normalized and unexamined in the overall cultural context of PWIs. Jackson[1], a Black British Caribbean[2] Associate Professor expressed this as,

> *The university tends to be dominated by a liberal, White agenda and it is a place where Whiteness and White identity and privilege come to the fore. It is often marked out as White territory, which is unspeakable. White professors don't come out and say this is our territory; they just let you know it from a silence that remains unspoken.*

This idea of the 'unspoken White space' is one that many respondents referenced in their responses. Similar to the experiences of minority ethnic academics (Aguirre, 2010), the notion of 'unspoken White space' was both a real and virtual space that served as the

[1] All names are pseudonyms.
[2] Respondents were asked to self-define their identity.

property of White academics; it was a space that White academics occupied and *allowed* IME professors to enter - only if they met the criteria and standards set by their White peers. Andrew, a mixed heritage (Black/White) Associate Professor said,

> *There is a sense that the university is not a place where you can belong or where you are allowed to belong because you are not White – it is a White space for White scholars. This is seen in many ways in how that space is occupied and who is making the decisions. There is an assumption that Whiteness exists as the norm. And Black scholars sit outside of that.*

IME academics "sit outside" of white spaces because they are not perceived by White academics as sharing the same "norms." Leonardo asserts that, "whiteness can be demarcated and fenced off as a territory of white people which keeps Others out (2002, 38). The articulation of White boundaries and territorial racial stratifications serve as barriers that prevents IME academics from becoming fully engaged scholars in their departments and universities (Hiraldo 2010; Savas 2014). Moreover, the presence of non-White faculty challenged the normativity of Whiteness, and placed intellectual spaces, as epi-centers of White property, in jeopardy of being corrupted, and in need of protection.

White faculty struggle to preserve their workspaces as enclaves of White privilege by attaching merit and accolades to scholarship that reflects their sanctioned behaviors, intellectual traditions, and ideological frameworks (Harper 2009). Yet, even when non-White faculty attempted to comply with the norms of the intellectual space, they remained marginalized (Hiraldo, 2010; Hughes and Giles, 2010). Deborah a Black British Caribbean Assistant Professor said,

> *There is consistent pressure to be like everyone else, to have to fit in with what they want and behave in a certain way, to be a certain way. These are the sorts of things*

that you have to do to get promoted. But those things also may be exclusionary, where you are left out from some things because you don't really fit in.

As documented among minority academics, for IME scholars, idealist pressure to alter one's behavior to 'fit in' and ignore overt and subtle forms of racism from students and White academics becomes a significant factor in job satisfaction and retention (Orelus 2013; Pittman 2012).

Additionally, IME academics become further marginalized through material factors related to their workload expectations. Consistent with minority ethnic academics' experiences, many of the respondents believed that the factors that hindered their success were different than those encountered by their White colleagues (Henry and Glenn 2009; Baxley 2012). Deborah went on to say,

There are assumptions that everyone is contributing equally. But conversations and interactions always point to Black faculty taking on more administrative and student-centered roles that some of the White Professors simply don't do, or have to do. There is an assumption there is equality in the work we do, but this is not the case. Black faculty and Black scholars are assigned roles that are less valued than those assigned to White Professors.

Whiteness as property asserts itself when non-White academics are asked to assume roles and tasks that hold little value to the institution. Roles and relationships, which are understood to be significant, or the choice to not participate in particular roles without penalty, remain the property of White faculty. Due to the privileging of Whites regarding positions of influence and the right of refusal, which is denied to non-Whites, non-White faculty are seen as less valuable assets. Thus, the inability to dismantle White privilege by shifting White academics' perceptions of what counts as academically valuable, both in scholarship and human capital,

speaks to the realities of racial idealism as a major barrier for minority ethnic academics (Hiraldo 2010; Hughes and Giles 2010; Savas 2014).

Intersectionality: Experiences Impacted by Gender and Sexuality

In the case of minority ethnic women, the intersections of race, gender and class dictate that they can face multiple oppressions in the Academy (Griffin and Reddick 2011; Pittman 2012; Sulé 2014). For example, structural intersectionality operates due to the fact that African American women tend to be concentrated in the lowest levels of Academia in the USA (McGee and Kazembe 2016), which may result in their reported lower levels of job satisfaction than African American men (Fries-Britt et al. 2011; Victorino et al. 2013).

In this study, respondents indicated that even though race played a significant part in the positioning of academics of color, gender, social class, and sexuality were also crucial factors that impacted in their positioning by White academics and students. In some cases, IME men and women were able to benefit from policies and structures that supported mentoring IME faculty on campus. For Jacqui (a Black British African), "Being a IME woman can be seen as an advantage because there are not that many of us in powerful positions, so in some respects they [senior managers] will think that maybe they should promote you." The respondents experienced stratified expectations and opportunities based on different identity characteristics. These experiences played a significant role in respondents' job satisfaction, retention, and professional support. Keira, an Asian British Indian Associate Professor, explains that the traditional workplace gender roles within structural intersectionality often work to her advantage because she is not perceived as physically intimidating like IME men. Keira states,

> *An IME male would be treated differently in a university to a female. On the one hand, he would be seen as a threat, as highly masculine and also possibly as an*

aggressor, whereas an IME woman of color would not be seen this way. Rather, she would be seen as exotic, but still dangerous but in different ways.

Keira expresses how representational intersectionality positions her differently than IME men. Rather than being viewed physically intimidating, IME women are often viewed as foreign, sexualized beings who still pose a threat to White privileged spaces. For some respondents coming from upper middle class backgrounds was perceived to be beneficial. Keira explained how she felt the Academy worked on the basis of social class and gender.

You have to understand that here in the US, if you are an IME person of color but you are from a traditionally middle or upper class backgrounds this is a huge advantage that can work in your favor. It is as though even though you are a woman of color but you have that other social and cultural capital – that if you are from a high socioeconomic background - you will be more advantaged than another woman of color who is not.

Keira's representational intersectionality around both class and gender impacts how other academics perceive her as a minority ethnic faculty member. Because she relates to students and other academics as a middle class citizen, she does not satisfy the deficit stereotype of a low-income IME woman; therefore, her perceived closer assimilation to Whiteness, as well as her social and cultural capital work to her advantage.

Paul, a Black British African Associate Professor, also spoke about the benefits of his middle-class class status. He believed his ability to reflect middle class speech and behaviors deflected the representational stereotype of minority ethnic men as aggressive.

As an IME male I am seen as the other, I am seen in some sense as a threat. Sometimes my colleagues and my students do not know how to place me. I look

> *different and when I speak they see that I have an accent that could be defined as upper middle class and so they respect me. It is almost like a double jeopardy thing going on – they can't understand it and so can't position me.*

Paul recognizes that his upper middle class performance of identity makes him appear less intimidating. White academics' and his students' struggle to position him based on racialized and gendered representations of minority ethnic men as lower class that conflict with his apparent social status as signified in his middle class accent. Both Paul and Keira spoke about the ways in which their social class status enabled them to perform a certain kind of middle class identity; their middle class British accents were seen as attractive and exotic, as valued social and cultural capital, and lessening the impact of their racial identity in the traditional White space of the Academy in the USA – something that was less likely to happen in the UK. As Paul states, "You know the Americans love the [British] accent, and if your accent is middle class that puts you in a position where you are respected and in some ways seen as smart". Therefore, both Keira and Paul used this outsider status to their advantage.

Conversely, Jenny a Black British Caribbean Associate Professor had a different experience because of her identity as working-class.

> *The university was an unusual space for me and one that I was not familiar with so I had to learn some of the norms and behaviors that other academics would take for granted and be familiar with. I don't have that knowledge because it's not my traditional space.*

For Jenny, coming from a working-class background with less academic degree capital meant she had to learn the habitus of university settings; whereas, she felt that other IME academics did not have the same experiential learning curve. Once again, IME academic's perceptions of a "traditional space" with particular norms and behaviors becomes the property of Whiteness and a reification of White privilege.

Additionally, multiple "othering" identities further complicate IME academics' experiences with normative White privilege in Academia. John's representational intersectionality as an IME Black British Caribbean gay male affected his relationships with faculty and the value White academics placed on his scholarship and his relationships in the Academy.

> *My race and sexual orientation have certainly made people uncomfortable and when combined with an explicitly social justice and political perspective, I think it's been easier for some people who say that my research is 'too political' or 'too subjective' or 'not really research'.*

John felt that because he is an IME male researching racial inequalities in society his scholarship is not taken seriously compared to the work of his White colleagues**.** This was in part because many of his colleagues saw his research as 'personal research' which was related to lesser value given by his White colleagues to research which focused on race and inequality. The realities of race and racism, where minority ethnic academics, and their scholarship, are viewed as less valuable than White academics jeopardizes attempts to enact racial justice through laws and policies.

Materialist and Idealist Barriers Facing IME Academics

The research findings from the experiences of IME academics in PWIs point to a consistent set of problems that reflect both CRT materialist and idealist positions. Because materialist policies are subject to idealist interpretations of White academics, who cultivate and protect their White privilege both materially and ideologically, universities are often left with anemic

protocols and publicity fanfare often in the form of diversity policies that are unlikely to change significantly to shift the status quo (Chan 2005). Thus the struggle to maintain White privilege, and deny access for minority ethnic academics, is expressed through the marginalization of IME academics in their workspace, their assigned roles, their professional relationships, and the devaluing of their scholarship (Hiraldo 2010; Hughes and Giles 2010; Munoz 2010).

The conflict between the material policies and the idealist response to those policies is apparent in the (in) actions taken by faculty and administrators. For example, whilst some respondents felt that their institutions took inclusion seriously, particularly in relation to the existence of policies which focused on the recruitment and promotion of IME academics, others said that universities were simply not doing enough to further issues of inclusion among their faculties. Julian a Black British Caribbean Associate Professor said,

> *There are very few people of color in my institution and my department needs to make a concerted effort to recruit people of color…. It can be confusing because as an IME male I think they [Deans and Directors] do take these issues seriously, but they are not manifested in what the universities actually do. In my view, there is an underlying assumption in my faculty and in Academia more broadly that individuals from non-dominant backgrounds should conform to White norms and leave institutionalized racist acts unquestioned.*

Julian realized that administrative attempts to generate diversity did not translate into meaningful practical measures, such as more diverse faculty hiring. Julian's quote reflects many respondents' perceptions that university administrators were aware of the inequalities that existed in the university workplace and attempted to create policies, such as recruiting minority academics, to create more supportive work environments for IME academics. Yet,

the participants understood that recruitment policies were insufficient for addressing entrenched racism and systemic marginalization. For example, Adam, a mixed heritage (Asian/White) Associate Professor, felt that his university needed a more serious commitment to both the creation and enactment of diversity policies.

> *The institutions need a more diverse leadership strategy. They [Deans and Directors] say they are interested in equality and its impact on the staff and student body but this has to be translated into actions. We need inclusive decision making processes which involve the key stakeholders – the marginalized populations. We also need proactive policies and programming to account for diversity. This would then show how serious the university was in relation to their views on inclusion and equality. If we have I*ME *senior leaders they are better informed to make decisions that affect IME staff.*

The ability to translate policies into equitable practices through tangible actions becomes a primary critique of, and significant hurdle for diversity policies, given the limited numbers of IME academics in leadership positions. Both Adam and Julian, point out that the enactments of policy, such as faculty hiring, rests with White academics and administration (such as Deans and Directors) who are less invested in their institution's commitment to diversity than IME academics who struggle with these issues. Thus, White privilege and White property spaces are maintained because these initiatives fail to produce material results.

Other respondents recognized how the complications inherent in attending to required diversity policies, devoid of present and historical factors complicated university efforts to successfully enact policies toward racial justice. Martin, a Black British African full Professor, noted the complex nature of instituting diversity policies.

> *Yes the institution does take them [issues of diversity and inclusion] seriously, but at the same time I do not think the issues are complex enough – there is still not enough*

> *understanding. Even though we have the history here of slavery and what happened to African Americans – there still isn't the adequate commitment to change the status quo. Because the status quo is seen as ok, but* ***it could be better*** *[original emphasis].*

As Martin suggests, the university's level of commitment is insufficient because the policies do not account for White academics' desires to maintain normativity through racial homogeneity. Jake, an Associate Professor, and Samuel, a full Professor (both Black British Caribbean), noted how their universities' attempts to diversify departments were thwarted by the actions of faculty. Jake explained,

> *We have diversity action plans in place for the recruitment and support of [IME] faculty, but that does not seem to come through in the representation at higher levels. It means that certain issues around how inclusion is addressed doesn't happen. It has to happen at the policy level, but sometimes is not reflected at faculty level.*

As represented in Jake's quote, respondents understood the challenges of implementing racial diversity policies as a conflict between materialist university policies and idealist faculty practice. Samuel also articulates the dissonance between material enactments of policy and the actions of faculty.

> *These issues are taken seriously here, but I also think there are very narrow conceptualizations of equality and diversity used in some discussions in the Academy. I think the fact that my university is located in [area] explains partly the reason why some outdated notions of equality and diversity are still used. There is a contradiction between a liberal identity and a conservative view of diversity and equality that leaves White privilege intact and under examined.*

The liberal identity of the university, such as new policies towards diversity and inclusion of IME faculty, becomes derailed by idealist conservative views, such as the value White faculty place on racial diversity. Thus, while respondents acknowledged that their universities made changes to policies, they appeared to be more skeptical of the actual enactments and practices of these policies across their universities. Indeed, the suggestion by IME academics, that White academics are more likely to 'pay lip service' to university diversity policies, speaks to the bound nature of materialist and idealist CRT positions. These IME academics acknowledge the materialist university policies set in place to recruit and retain minority ethnic academics as a means to racially diversify the faculty. However, they also recognize how materialism interacts with idealism through the recalcitrant nature of White academics to implement diversity policies or demonstrate the value of minority ethnic academics through their actions.

Discussion: The Struggle to Recruit and Retain IME Academics

In order for the material project to enact successful diversity policies, the idealist project, which lies within the treatment of IME academics, must be addressed. Given the limited effects of material institutional and university-wide initiatives to diversify, when institutions become serious about racial diversity, they will have to in essence combat idealism in the forms of faculty action, perceptions, and dispositions toward diversity. To be clear, in the USA it is *faculty*, a set of privileged individuals, who have the most influence on faculty hiring and campus climate. Faculty structure the job positions, select the candidates, and make the hiring decisions before administration ever gets involved in the process (Alger 1998). Therefore, when faculty subvert the materialist project by the idealist actions, such as by devaluing the scholarship of minority ethnic academics through faculty hiring committee processes, the diversity policies remain ineffective.

Furthermore, diversity policies also are weakened by negative campus climates and hostile or tepid workspaces where IME faculty perceive themselves as less valued due to the greater value placed on the norms of Whiteness and the privileging of White male academics. In this study, respondents critiqued campus climates of exclusion and marginality, as a means to reinforce White privilege and conformity (Bhopal 2018). Moreover, respondents pointed to unequal teaching loads, course selection, and the availability of mentoring as criteria for job satisfaction. Thus, a lack of job satisfaction, at the hands of faculty actions, unravels recruitment and retention policies for IME academics.

Conclusions

This article has explored the experiences of IME academics working in universities in the USA. Similar to minority ethnic academic experiences the findings from the interviews with IME academics suggest that the positionalities of IME academics are complex and based on the unaccommodating and unwelcoming environment of universities (Trower and Chait 2002). Comparative to minority ethnic academics, IME identities are fraught with tensions of structures and practices in universities for increasing diversity amongst the professoriate (Jackson 2008). Furthermore, our findings suggest that institutional contexts of PWIs continue to re-appropriate White privilege and maintain the status quo for IME academics in the USA. Many of the respondents discussed their feelings of marginality and exclusion which contributed to how they were judged and valued in their faculties. Given the intractable nature of race and racism in USA higher education, we argue that university goals to diversify faculty often result in liminal changes that depend upon academics of color, including IME academics, carrying the weight of these reforms through their university service, their marginalized position in their departments, and their inability to influence substantive reform. Rather, IME scholars working in PWIs continue to experience

marginalization in which Whiteness and White privilege dominate as ideological and behavioral norms. The respondents recognized the value of materialist diversity policies, but at the same time emphasized that such policies relied on faculty actions to make a significant difference to how they were valued and treated in universities (Jackson 2008). It is clear that institutional change is untenable without both materialist equity policies and idealist practices targeting the perceptions and actions of White academics who wield privilege in academic departments.

Implications for Policies and Practice

Although respondents recognized the multiple complex dimensions of change, many felt inclusion was an achievable goal. We argue that rather than the ethos of inclusion being apparent in isolated spaces of the university, it should be embedded across all aspects of the university, including IME academics participating at *all* levels of the institution (not just as teachers, but also as decision makers). We suggest greater support in the form of mentoring and coaching for IME academics is needed to advance their career trajectories, this would demonstrate a clear valuing of inclusion and diversity via funding and investment for initiatives which encourage IME academics to progress their careers. Furthermore, universities must be open and provide greater transparent monitoring of the career progression of IME academics to senior posts (such as Deans, Directors and Principals). If universities are to represent the communities which they serve, they must show clear actions on how they address racial inequalities, particularly if they value a diverse faculty student body reflected in national and international department rankings. Lastly and more generally, a failure to acknowledge acts of racism and exclusion, results in a failure to act. Furthermore, our research suggests that it is crucial to examine how intersectional identities contribute to overall job satisfaction and professional success. It is only when universities are able to

acknowledge that racism, exclusion and marginalization exist, will they be able make changes for the inclusion of IME academics in PWIs.

Tables

Table 1: Ethnic background of respondents (self-definition)

	Male	Female
Black British Caribbean	7	8
Black British African	3	3
Asian British Indian	0	2
Asian British Pakistani	0	1
Mixed heritage (Black/White)	1	1
Mixed heritage (Asian/White)	1	1
Total	12	16

Table 2: Job titles/roles of respondents

	Full Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Total
Female	6	4	3	13
Male	7	4	4	15
Total	13	8	7	28

Table 3. Characteristics of Sample				
Years of Experience	***x<5*** **2**	***5-10*** **12**	***10<x*** **14**	**28**
Geographical Location	*South* 6	*West Coast* 7	*Midwest* 15	28
Discipline	*Education Studies/Sociology* 15	*Sciences* 8	*Arts* 5	28
Type of Institution	*Research* 15	*Teaching* 5	*Research and Teaching* 8	28
Years in the USA	*x<5* 10	*5-10* 8	*10<x* 10	28

References

Aguirre Jr., A. 2000. "Academic storytelling: a critical race theory story of affirmative action." *Sociological Perspectives*, 43 (2): 319-339.

Alger, J. 1998. "Minority faculty and measuring merit: Start by playing fair." *Academe*. 84: 71.

Baxley, T. P. 2012. "Navigating as an African American female scholar: Catalysts and barriers in predominantly White academia." *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy, 4* (1): 47-64.

Bhopal, K. 2016. *The experiences of black and minority ethnic academics: a comparative study of the unequal academy*. London and New York: Routledge.

Bhopal, K. 2018. *White Privilege: the myth of a post-racial society*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Bhopal, K., Brown, H. and Jackson, J. 2016. "BME academic flight from UK to overseas higher education: aspects of marginalisation and exclusion". *British Educational Research Journal.* 42 (2): 240-257.

Bell, D. A. 1992. *Faces at the bottom of the well: The Permanence of racism*. Basic Books.

Bonilla-Silvia, E. 2003. *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in the United States*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Chan, A. 2005. "Policy discourses and changing practice: Diversity and the university-college. *Higher Education." 50* (1): 129-157. Doi:10.1007/s10734-004-6351-3

Crenshaw, K. 1991. "Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics and violence against women of color." *Stanford Law Review* 43 (5): 1253-1351.

Creswell, K. 2014. *Research Design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods*. London: Sage.

De La Ruz, M. and Halcon, J. 1988. "Racism in Academia: The old Wolf revisited." *Harvard Educational Review* 58, 3: 299-315.

Delgado, R and Stefanic, J. 2001. *Critical race theory: An Introduction*. New York: New York University Press.

Delgado, R., Bernal, D., and Villalpando, O. 2002. "An apartheid of knowledge in academia: The Struggle over the" legitimate" knowledge of minority ethnic academics." *Equity & Excellence in Education*. *35* (2): 169-180.

Donahoo, S. 2008. "Reflections on Race: Affirmative Action Policies Influencing Higher Education in France and the United States." *Teachers College Record* 110 (2): 251-277.

Dovidio, J. and Gaertner, S. 2000. "Aversive racism and selective decisions." *Psychological Science.* 11 (4): 315-319.

Espino, M. M. 2012. “Seeking the "Truth" in the Stories We Tell: The Role of critical race epistemology in higher education research.” *Review of Higher Education 36* (1, Supp): 31-67.

Essed, P. 2000. “Dilemmas in leadership: Women of color in the academy.” *Ethnic and Racial Studies.* 23 (5): 888–94.

Fries-Britt, S. L., Rowan-Kenyon, H. T., Perna, L. W., Milem, J. F., and Howard, D. G. 2011. “Underrepresentation in the Academy and the Institutional Climate for Faculty Diversity.” *Journal of The Professoriate*. *5* (1): 1-34.

Grant, C. and Simmons, J. 2008. “Narratives on experiences of African-American women in the academy: Conceptualizing effective mentoring relationships of doctoral student and faculty.” *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*. 21 (5): 501-517.

Griffin, K and Reddick, R 2011. “Surveillance and Sacrifice: Differences in the mentoring patterns of Black professors at predominantly White institutions.” *American Educational Research Journal*. 48 (5): 1032-1057.

Griffin, R. A., Ward, L., and Phillips, A. R. 2014. “Still flies in buttermilk: Black male faculty, critical race theory, and composite counter storytelling.” *International Journal Of Qualitative Studies In Education*. *27* (10): 1354-1375.

Harper, S. R. 2012. “Race without racism: How higher education researchers minimize racist institutional norms.” *The Review of Higher Education*. *36* (1): 9-29.

Henry, W. J., and Glenn, N. M. 2009. „Black Women Employed in the Ivory Tower: Connecting for Success.” *Advancing Women In Leadership*. *29* (1): 1.

Hiraldo, P. 2010. “The Role of Critical Race Theory in Higher Education.” *Vermont Connection*. Vol. 31: 53

Hughes, R. and Giles, M. 2010. “CRiT walking in higher education: Activating critical race theory in the academy.” *Race Ethnicity and Education*. 13 (1): 41-57.

Iverson, S. V. 2007. “Camouflaging Power and Privilege: A Critical race analysis of university diversity policies.” *Educational Administration Quarterly*. *43* (5): 586-611.

Igwebuike, J. G. 2006. “Legal and policy implications for faculty diversification in higher education.” *Negro Educational Review*. *57* (3/4): 189-201.

Jackson, J. F. 2004. “Engaging, retaining, and advancing African Americans in executive-level positions: A Descriptive and trend analysis of academic administrators in higher and postsecondary education.” *Journal Of Negro Education*. *73* (1): 4-20.

Jackson, J. L. 2006. “Hiring practices of African American males in academic leadership positions at American colleges and universities: An employment trends and disparate impact analysis.” *Teachers College Record.* 108: 316-338.

Jackson, J. L. 2008. “Race Segregation Across the Academic Workforce: Exploring Factors That May Contribute to the Disparate Representation of African American Men.” *American*

Behavioral Scientist. *51* (7): 1004-1029.

Jayakumar, U. M., Howard, T. C., Allen, W. R., and Han, J. C. 2009. Racial Privilege in the Professoriate: An Exploration of Campus Climate, Retention, and Satisfaction." *Journal Of Higher Education*. *80* (5): 538-563.

Ladson-Billings, G., and Tate, W. 1995. "Toward a critical race theory of education." *Teachers College Record*. *97*: 47-68.

Leonardo, Z. (2002). The souls of white folk: Critical pedagogy, whiteness studies, and globalization discourse. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *5*(1), 29-50.

Mahtani, M. 2004. "Mapping race and gender in the academy: The experiences of women of color faculty and graduate students in Britain, the US and Canada." *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*. *28* (1): 91-99.

McGhee, E and Kazembe, L 2016. "Entertainers or education researchers? The challenges associated with presenting while black." *Race, Ethnicity and Education.* 19, (1): 96-120.

Morifn, O., Perez, V. and Parker, L 2006. "Hiding the politically obvious: A Critical race theory preview of diversity as racial neutrality in higher education." *Educational Policy* 20 (1): 249-270.

Munoz, F. 2009. "Critical race theory and the landscapes of higher education." *The Vermont Connection.* 30 (1): 53-62.

Orelus, P. W. 2013. "The Institutional cost of being a professor of color: Unveiling micro-aggression, racial [in]visibility, and racial profiling through the lens of critical race theory." *Current Issues In Education*. *16* (2): 1-10.

Patitu, C. L., and Hinton, K. G. 2003. "The Experiences of African American women faculty and administrators in higher education: Has anything changed?" *New Directions For Student Services*. 104: 79-93.

Perez, H. and Solorzano, D. 2015. "Racial macroaggressions as a tool for critical race research". *Race, Ethnicity and Education.* 18: 298-320.

Pittman, C. 2012. "Racial Micro aggressions: The Narratives of African American faculty at a predominantly White university." *Journal of Negro Education*. *81* (1): 82-92.

Ramos, T. 2013. "Critical race ethnography of higher education: racial risk and counter storytelling." *Learning and Teaching.* 1755-2273 6 (3): 64-78.

Savas, G. 2014. "Understanding critical race theory as a framework in higher educational research." *British Journal of Sociology of Education*. *35* (4): 506-522.

Solorzano, D. 1998. "Critical race theory, racial and gender micro aggressions, and the experiences of Chicana and Chicano scholars." *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 11: 121-136.

Sulé, V. T. 2014. "Enact, discard, and transform: A Critical race feminist perspective on professional socialization among tenured Black female faculty." *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 27* (4): 432-453.

Trix, F. and Psenka, C. 2003. "Exploring the color of glass: Letters of recommendation for female and male medical faculty." *Discourse & Society*, 14: 191-220.

Trower, C. A., and Chait, R. P. 2002. "Faculty diversity: Too little for too long." *Harvard Magazine*, March-April. http://www.harvardmagazine.com/on-line/030218.

Turner, C. and Myers, S. 2008. *Minority ethnic academics in academe: Bittersweet success*. Boston: Allyn and Unwin.

Turner, T., Myers, C., and Creswell, J. 1999. "Exploring underrepresentation: The Case of minority ethnic academics in the Midwest." *Journal of Higher Education*. 70: 27-59.

Umbach, P. D. 2006. The contribution of faculty of color to undergraduate education. *Research in Higher Education*, *47*(3): 317-345.

Van Meter, K. 1990. "Methodological and Design Issues: Techniques for assessing the representatives of snowball samples." *NIDA Research Monograph*, 31-43.

Victorino, C. C., Nylund-Gibson, K., and Conley, S. 2013. "Campus Racial Climate: A Litmus test for faculty satisfaction at four-year colleges and universities." *Journal of Higher Education, 84* (6): 769-803.

Watanabe, T. 2018. "California's public college campuses are so diverse, but their faculty and leaders aren't, a new study says." LATimes. http://www.latimes.com/local/education/la-essential-education-updates-southern-new-study-finds-drastic-disparity-in-1520364880-htmlstory.html#nt=card. Accessed May 2018