

The University of San Francisco
**USF Scholarship: a digital repository @ Gleeson Library |
Geschke Center**

Doctoral Dissertations

Theses, Dissertations, Capstones and Projects

2013

Counter-Narratives of La Raza Voices: An Exploration of the Personal and Professional Lived Experiences of Mexican-American/Chicana/O Faculty at California Catholic Institutions of Higher Education

Frank Vincent Serrano
fvseirano@usfca.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://repository.usfca.edu/diss>

 Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Serrano, Frank Vincent, "Counter-Narratives of La Raza Voices: An Exploration of the Personal and Professional Lived Experiences of Mexican-American/Chicana/O Faculty at California Catholic Institutions of Higher Education" (2013). *Doctoral Dissertations*. 60.
<https://repository.usfca.edu/diss/60>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, Capstones and Projects at USF Scholarship: a digital repository @ Gleeson Library | Geschke Center. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctoral Dissertations by an authorized administrator of USF Scholarship: a digital repository @ Gleeson Library | Geschke Center. For more information, please contact repository@usfca.edu.

University of San Francisco

COUNTER-NARRATIVES OF LA RAZA VOCES:
AN EXPLORATION OF THE PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL
LIVED EXPERIENCES OF MEXICAN-AMERICAN/CHICANA/O FACULTY AT
CALIFORNIA CATHOLIC INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

A Dissertation Presented
to
The Faculty of the School of Education
Department of Leadership Studies
Organization and Leadership

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

by
Frank V. Serrano
San Francisco
May 2013

THE UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Dissertation Abstract

Counter-Narratives of La Raza Voices:
An Exploration of the Personal and Professional
Lived Experiences of Mexican-American/Chicana/o Faculty at
California Catholic Institutions of Higher Education

Faculty members of color time and again encounter the greatest number of challenges and barriers (e.g., discrimination, isolation, marginalization, tokenism, inundated with workloads and service commitments, devalued research, and delayed promotion and tenure) in both entering academia and succeeding within academia.

The purpose of this study was to explore the personal and professional lived experiences of eight self-identified native-born Mexican-American and Chicana/o tenured and tenure-track faculty members employed at four California Catholic institutions of higher education.

This study utilized a qualitative narrative methodology employing the critical race tenets of counter-storytelling and the permanence of racism. Through use of this methodology, La Raza counter-story narratives shed light on various degrees of racism pertaining to their social and cultural climate, tenure and promotion process, and level of job satisfaction as ethnic minority faculty members in Catholic higher education.

Themes elicited from La Raza faculty narratives were compared against the associated master narratives. Although La Raza participants' lived experiences marginally substantiated previous findings related to faculty of color, their narratives enhanced limited findings with more depth and detail specific to Mexican-American and Chicana/o faculty in Catholic higher education. In addition, La Raza faculty provided

numerous recommendations to assist Mexican-American and Chicana/o scholars in their pursuit of academic careers in Catholic higher education; current Mexican-American and Chicana/o faculty toward tenure and promotion; and academic administrators in their recruitment, promotion, and retention of Mexican-American and Chicana/o faculty in Catholic higher education. Apparent in their counter-story narratives, each La Raza participant has made personal and professional commitments and contributions to sustain the cultures of both their self-identified ethnicity and of their university.

This dissertation, written under the direction of the candidate's dissertation committee and approved by the members of the committee, has been presented to and accepted by the Faculty of the School of Education in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education. The content and research methodologies presented in this work represent the work of the candidate alone.

<u>Frank Vincent Serrano</u> Candidate	<u>May 8, 2013</u> Date
---	----------------------------

Dissertation Committee

<u>Dr. Patricia Mitchell, Chairperson</u> Chairperson	<u>May 8, 2013</u> Date
--	----------------------------

<u>Dr. Betty Taylor, Second Reader</u>	<u>May 8, 2013</u> Date
--	----------------------------

<u>Dr. Brian Gerrard, Third Reader</u>	<u>May 8, 2013</u> Date
--	----------------------------

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The decision and commitment to undertake the research involved in writing a dissertation was influenced by many people who inspired and motivated me to pursue and complete this project. With the completion of this dissertation, I am immensely grateful to the many professors and family members who assisted, nurtured, and encouraged me throughout this academic journey.

First, I would like to thank the Mexican-American/Chicana/o professors from the University of San Francisco, Santa Clara University, Loyola Marymount University, and the University of San Diego who participated in this study. Each graciously took time from their busy lives as professors to share their personal and professional lived experiences that enabled them to secure faculty membership at a Catholic institution of higher education. Without their participation and willingness to share their lived experiences, this study would not have been possible.

I would especially like to thank Blanca, my wife and loving friend, for encouraging me through the many chaotic and exciting years of this project. Thank you and I love you so very much. I am more grateful than you will ever know. To my children—Sebastian, Alegria, Francisco, and Mariposa—I know I have missed out on many opportunities with all of you throughout these years while I have been in school; fortunately I will now have much more time for all of you.

I am also very grateful to those professors who taught and mentored me at the University of San Francisco. In particular, I am profoundly grateful to my dissertation committee: Dr. Patricia Mitchell, Dr. Betty Taylor, and Dr. Brian Gerard. To my dissertation chair, Dr. Mitchell, I am deeply grateful for your scholarly advice; your

insight and warm-hearted guidance throughout these years has been extremely valuable to me. You challenged me to grow professionally and personally. I would also like to thank Dr. Benjamin Baab and Dr. Doreen Jones for their continued guidance and encouragement throughout this dissertation journey.

And finally, but not least, I would like to thank and acknowledge my parents, Frank Luciano Serrano and Georgia Lucy Serrano. Dad (R.I.P., December 17, 1980), I wish you could be here to enjoy this occasion. I know that somewhere you are smiling and saying “That’s my *Mijo!*” To my mother, Georgia Lucy Serrano, even though you may not have understood my continued desire to pursue my academic endeavors, you continued to encourage me in my academic pursuits. Thank you for all of your prayers. Also, thank you so much for taking care of the children when I needed time for school studies. I know you have postponed many of your own plans and dreams so that I could fulfill my own and for this I am forever grateful to you. You can relax now; this phase is complete.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	xi
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	1
Background and Need for Study.....	3
Purpose of the Study.....	6
Theoretical Framework of Critical Race Theory in Education.....	7
Critical Race Theory.....	7
Critical Race Theory in Education.....	8
Research Questions.....	10
Definition of Terms.....	11
Summary.....	15
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	17
Restatement of the Problem.....	17
Historical Overview of La Raza in the United States.....	19
Current U.S. Population Demographics of La Raza.....	27
Current Status of La Raza in Higher Education.....	29
Undergraduate.....	29
Graduate.....	29
Doctorate.....	30
Gender Disparities in Higher Education.....	32
Faculty Diversity in Higher Education.....	32
Faculty Recruitment.....	36
Recruiting Foreign-Born Faculty versus Native-Born Faculty.....	41
Tokenism.....	43
Faculty Retention.....	44
Job Satisfaction.....	44
Campus Climate.....	47
Mentors.....	48
Collegiality.....	49
Tenure and Promotion.....	50
Critical Race Theory (CRT).....	54
Critical Race Theory in Education.....	56
Critical Race Theory Methodologies.....	58
Criticisms of Critical Race Theory.....	60
Summary.....	61
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY.....	65
Restatement of the Purpose.....	65

Research Questions	65
Qualitative Research Design	66
Sample Procedure and Setting	69
University of San Francisco	73
Santa Clara University	72
Loyola Marymount University	73
University of San Diego	74
Data Collection	77
Data Analysis of Narratives	82
Procedures and Ethical Considerations	83
Limitations	85
Summary	85
CHAPTER IV: FINDINGS: LA RAZA FACULTY COUNTER-NARRATIVES	88
Introduction	88
Demographic Analysis	89
La Raza Primary/Secondary and Undergraduate/Graduate Experiences	91
Professor Uno	91
Professor Dos	93
Professor Tres	96
Professor Cuatro	97
Professor Cinco	99
Professor Seis	100
Professor Siete	101
Professor Ocho	102
Career Progression of La Raza Faculty in Catholic Higher Education	105
Realization of Interest in an Academic Career	105
Graduate School Preparation	108
Mentoring	111
Attraction to Academic Career in Catholic Higher Education	114
Supports in Catholic Higher Education	116
Challenges in Catholic Higher Education	119
Experiences of Discrimination and Racism	122
Social and Cultural Climate for La Raza Faculty in Catholic Higher Education	126
Level of Association with Self-Identified Ethnic Group and Ethnic-Related Involvement	127
Ethnic and Cultural Composition of Faculty and Level of Collegiality	130
Socialization in Department and Institution	135
Feeling Accepted	137
Feeling Isolated	138
Ethnicity Limited Progress for Tenure or Promotion	139
Worked Harder to Be Perceived as a Legitimate Scholar	140
Conflict of Culture with Others and Suppression of Culture for Acceptance	143
A “Voice” Respected by Others	149
Level of Satisfaction of La Raza Faculty in Catholic Higher Education	150

Catholic Institution’s Mission, Vision, and Values	150
Cultural Climate of Department and Institution	152
Most and Least Rewarding Aspects for Faculty	153
La Raza Recommendations for Mexican-American/Chicana/o Scholars.....	156
Seeing the Connection between Catholic Mexicans and Catholic Higher Education	157
Understanding the Expectations and Culture of the Department and Institution	158
Being Assertive and Self-Promoting and Connecting with a Scholar in Your Field with a Similar Ethnicity.....	159
La Raza Recommendations for Mexican-American/Chicana/o Faculty	159
Clearly Understand the Tenure Requirements and Exceed the Requirements	160
Do Not Isolate Yourself and Get a Mentor.....	161
Protect Your Time and Set Limits	162
La Raza Recommendations for Academic Administrators.....	163
Diversity Must Be a Top-Down Decision and Priority	163
Offer Incentives and Grow Your Own.....	164
Awareness of Diversity and Cultural Differences	165
Summary	167

CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	168
Introduction.....	168
Purpose of the Study	169
Themes Elicited from La Raza Faculty Counter-Story Narratives.....	170
Graduate School Experiences and Preparation for the Professoriate.....	171
Master Narrative of Graduate School Experiences and Preparation for the Professoriate.....	171
La Raza Counter-Story Narrative of Graduate School Experiences and Preparation for the Professoriate.....	171
Counter-Narrative of Graduate School Experiences and Preparation for the Professoriate.....	173
Campus Climate Issues	173
Master Narrative of Diversity and Cultural Climate.....	173
La Raza Counter-Story Narrative of Diversity and Cultural Climate.....	175
Counter-Narrative of Diversity and Cultural Climate	176
Master Narrative of Collegiality	176
La Raza Counter-Story Narrative of Collegiality	177
Counter-Narrative of Collegiality	178
Mentoring.....	178
Master Narrative of Mentoring	178
La Raza Counter-Story Narrative of Mentoring	179
Counter-Narrative of Mentoring	181
Tenure and Promotion.....	182
Master Narrative of Tenure and Promotion	182

La Raza Counter-Story Narrative of Tenure and Promotion	185
Counter-Narrative of Tenure and Promotion	186
Experiences of Discrimination and Racism	187
Master Narrative of Experiences of Discrimination and Racism	187
La Raza Counter-Story Narrative of Experiences of Discrimination and Racism	189
Counter-Narrative of Experiences of Discrimination and Racism	191
Conclusion	191
Implications for Catholic Higher Education	193
Recommendtions	195
La Raza Recommendations	195
Recommendations for Future Research	198
Concluding Thoughts	199
REFERENCES	201
APPENDICES	209
APPENDIX A: UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO IRBPHS APPROVAL	210
APPENDIX B: SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY IRBPHS APPROVAL	211
APPENDIX C: SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY HUMAN SUBJECTS RESEARCH CURRICULUM COMPLETION REPORT	212
APPENDIX D: LOYOLA MARYMOUNT UNIVERSITY IRBPHS APPROVAL	213
APPENDIX E: UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO IRBPHS APPROVAL	214
APPENDIX F: INFORMED CONSENT LETTER UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO CONSENT TO BE A RESEARCH SUBJECT	215
APPENDIX G: UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO CONSENT TO BE A RESEARCH SUBJECT, RESEARCH SUBJECTS' BILL OF RIGHTS	217
APPENDIX H: LA RAZA FACULTY INTERVIEW PROTOCOL	219
APPENDIX I: LA RAZA DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE	221

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 U.S. Population, by Race and Ethnicity, 2011 and 2000.....	28
Table 2 Full-Time Instructional Faculty in Degree-Granting Institutions, by Race/Ethnicity and Academic Rank: Fall 2007, Fall 2009, Fall 2011.....	34
Table 3 University of San Francisco Full-Time Faculty by Race/Ethnicity, and Tenure Status for Academic Year 2009–2010	72
Table 4 Santa Clara University Full-Time Faculty by Race/Ethnicity, and Tenure Status for Academic Year 2009–2010	73
Table 5 Loyola Marymount University Full-Time Faculty by Race/Ethnicity, and Tenure Status for Academic Year 2009–2010.....	74
Table 6 University of San Diego Full-Time Faculty by Race/Ethnicity, and Tenure Status for Academic Year 2009–2010	76
Table 7 Catholic Institutions Combined Full-Time Hispanic Faculty by Gender, and Tenure Status for Academic Year 2009–2010.....	77
Table 8 California Catholic Institution La Raza Participants	85

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

According to government demographic data on racial/ethnic populations, the general Hispanic population has slowly evolved into the largest minority group in the United States, outpacing Hispanic college-student enrollment and faculty employment in higher education. According to the U.S. Census Bureau (2011/May), as of April 2010, there were an estimated 50.5 million (16%) Hispanics in the United States (not including Puerto Rico), with a growth of 43% from April 1, 2000 to April 1, 2010, making Hispanics the fastest-growing population group in the United States. Subsequently, by 2015, Hispanics are projected to represent 55.4 million (17.2 %) of the population residing in the United States (U.S. Census Bureau, 2008), and according to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES, 2010), by 2025, Hispanics are projected to represent 21% of the U.S. population. According to Carnevale and Fry (2000, as cited in Castellanos & Jones, 2003),

It is projected that the numbers of Latino college students will rise from 1.4 million in 1995 to 2.5 million in 2015; this increase of approximately 73% will make Hispanics the nation's largest college-going minority: One in every six undergraduates by 2015 (p. ix).

In contrast, "It is also projected that by 2015, Hispanic students in the 18 to 24 year old undergraduate population will be underrepresented by more than 500,000 students" (Carnevale & Fry, 2000, as cited in Castellanos & Jones, 2003, p. x).

This underrepresentation appears to coincide with the continued challenges and obstacles encountered by Hispanic and Latino students in the educational system. A study

by Leon and Nevarez (2007) identified the following sequence of challenges and obstacles experienced by Hispanic and Latino students in education:

- low-caliber schools (often large schools with high student-to-teacher ratios with impoverished families)
- low high school graduation rates (less likely to complete high school with an estimate of 53% completion compared to a 74.9% completion rate for whites)
- less effective college preparation (often unaware of financial-aid resources and less likely to afford SAT and ACT preparation courses)
- channeling to two-year institutions (enroll disproportionately in community colleges and fail to transfer to four-year universities)
- low college-graduation rates (in 2005, 12% of Latinos age 25 years and older received a bachelor's degree or higher compared to nearly 18% of blacks and more than 30% of comparable whites)
- reduced presence in graduate school (Latinos gaining a bachelor's degree seldom attend graduate school, which is a vital stepping stone to a career in college administration) (pp. 360–361)

Many Hispanics and Latinos characteristically are financially disenfranchised and live in areas with equally poorly performing schools with low rates of high school graduation and college entrance.

Considering current population status and population projections for Hispanics in the United States, particularly Mexican Americans, this racial/ethnic group is likely to have an increasingly negative impact on the economic direction and stability of this country, partly due to the fact that Hispanics have increasingly become the least educated of all racial/ethnic groups in the United States (Gandara & Contreras, 2009).

Furthermore,

The health of the United States economy ... is growing more dependent on the knowledge and skill of Hispanic workers ... although in a global economy requiring a level of knowledge and skill attainable only through a college

education, the educational disparity among Hispanics is of national concern (Pino & Ovando, 2005, p. 3).

A cause contributing to this dilemma is related to the increasing influx of Mexican immigrants arriving in the United States with lower levels of education. This is a continuing issue that negatively influences the accuracy of educational statistical progress of native-born Hispanics in the United States (Crissey, 2009). Thus, it is reasonably difficult to accurately confirm the educational progress and attainment of native-born Hispanics, particularly Mexican Americans.

Background and Need for Study

According to Washington and Harvey (1989), “prior to World War II, Hispanics and African Americans were virtually invisible in higher education” (p. 1). The “reason for the racial segregation of faculty was not due to the lack of qualified minority faculty,” but rather due to “the American college and university hiring processes and preferences” (Washington & Harvey, 1989, p. 2). Not until 1972, “the year affirmative action in higher education was initiated to increase the numbers of minorities in education, was African-American faculty represented by 2.9% of all faculty,” ... whereas “other minority groups represented 2.8% of the total faculty” at American colleges and universities (Washington & Harvey, 1989, p. 2). The same year, an estimated “1,500 faculty could be identified as Mexican-American or Chicano, with less than half (600) employed at community colleges” (Washington & Harvey, 1989, p. 6). According to McDonald and Garcia (cited in Castellanos & Jones, 2003), “Affirmative action initiatives among many institutions of higher education in the 1970s brought Latinos into colleges, many of whom are now faculty members” (p. 32).

Although the number of Hispanic and other minority faculty increased until 1976, “a decline occurred between 1977 and 1984 ... for Hispanics from 1.7% to 1.4%” (Washington & Harvey, 1989, p. 3). Researchers attempting to understand this phenomenon suggested the following causes for the decline of Hispanic faculty:

Declining numbers of Ph.D.s among Hispanics; underrepresentation of minorities in the disciplines of science and engineering; concentration of doctorates in the fields of education, humanities, and social sciences; and a trend toward nonacademic careers among doctoral degree holders (Washington & Harvey, 1989, p. 2).

Racial segregation was “declared discrimination, which violated the Fourteenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution; thereafter contracting to eradicate the injustices occurring throughout the United States, especially in relation to the selection of students and professionals of color in higher education” (Jackson, 2008, p. 1004). Although jointly the 1954 U.S. Supreme Court decision in *Brown v. Board of Education* and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 improved hiring practices and work conditions for women and minority faculty, discrimination was still apparent to many students, women, and professionals of color (Jackson, 2008).

In 1999, Latino faculty comprised less than 3% of all full-time professors and roughly 3% of all full-time administrators (Stanley, 2006). Furthermore, Leon and Nevarez (2007) reported that in “A study of Title IV universities, Latinos were 3.1% of full-time tenured U.S. faculty; whereas 84% were White, 4.5% Black, and 6.5% Asian” (p. 359).

Hispanic and Latino faculty continue to remain at the bottom of the faculty spectrum among their colleagues of color in higher education. Further “analysis reveals that there are more Latino instructors, lecturers, and non-tenure line faculty (6,187) than

tenure-track assistant (4,237), associate (3,161), or full-time (2,913) professors” (Leon & Nevarez, 2007, p. 359). In addition to the continued upheavals encountered among faculty membership,

Latino faculty are disproportionately concentrated in the humanities, foreign language departments, Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSI), and two-year colleges ... and find themselves in relatively low-status, non-tenure-track positions with minimal hope of advancement or entry into the power structure of academia (Delgado-Romero, Manlove, Manlove, & Hernandez, 2007, p. 37).

Despite the invaluable contributions of Latino faculty, “Latinos account for 1.4% of full-time professors in higher education” (Leon & Nevarez, 2007, p. 359).

Furthermore, analysis of 30 years of national trends data of the persistent stratification of faculty of color (e.g., institution type, academic department, and academic rank) concluded that “faculty of color are most underrepresented at private four-year institutions and at select institutions, while concurrently overrepresented in the lower academic ranks and less prestigious academic fields” (Jayakumar, Howard, Allen, & Han, 2009, pp. 542–543). Regardless of these significant demographic profiles and social and institutional trends, American higher education has apparently not adequately addressed the increasing needs of student diversity, partly due to the limited representation of faculty of color.

Despite *Brown v. Board of Education* and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, faculty of color continue to frequently encounter challenges and obstacles upon entering academia that are increasingly apparent among retention and promotion rates for Hispanics and Latinos (Moody, 2004). By contrast, immigrant minority (nonnative-born) faculty who have voluntarily come to this country often discover a far more favorable cultural and political context to inhabit and are more highly regarded by the European

American majority (Moody, 2004). In addition, a literature review by Saenz and Ponjuan (2009) proposed that Hispanic and Latino men fall short of their female peers moving through the higher education hierarchy, although minimal research is available on Latino men and their education pathways in higher education. The various challenges serving as obstacles hindering recruitment and retention for Hispanic and Latino faculty as well as other faculty of color will be thoroughly addressed in the literature review in chapter II.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to explore the personal and professional lived experiences of the few self-identified native-born La Raza (Mexican Americans and Chicanas/os) that have been successful in achieving the level of faculty membership at institutions of Catholic higher education and to explore their experiences as an underrepresented minority in academia. A qualitative narrative research design was utilized in conjunction with tenets of critical race theory (CRT) as a theoretical framework to guide the literature review and methodology of this study, and to gain an in-depth understanding of the lived experiences of this Hispanic sub-group of the professoriate.

Due to the scarcity of literature on the personal and professional lived experiences of Hispanic and Latino faculty, among other minority faculty (e.g., black, Asian, and Native American/Alaskan Native) at American Catholic colleges and universities, I conducted a qualitative narrative study with a sample of self-identified native-born Mexican-American and Chicano/a tenured and tenure-track faculty at four traditional four-year Catholic colleges and universities in California. The information developed to identify the aforementioned population at California Catholic colleges and universities

was generated by the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities and Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System of the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) by institution, race/ethnicity, gender, and tenure status for the year 2009–2010.

Theoretical Framework of Critical Race Theory in Education

Critical race theory (CRT) provided a theoretical framework to explore the personal and professional lived experiences and self-perceived challenges and supports of La Raza (Mexican-American and Chicana/o) faculty as an underrepresented minority employed in academia.

Critical Race Theory

Bell and Freeman initiated CRT in the mid-1970s as an outgrowth of critical legal studies, which included race as an element to critique mainstream legal ideology (Ladson-Billings, 1998). CRT was deliberately created to enhance the awareness of sustained racism with the purpose of eradicating racism and additional forms of subordination, which include gender, class, immigrations status, and sexual orientation (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002).

Solórzano, Ceja, and Yosso (2000) defined CRT as concentrating “on the racialized, gendered, and classed experiences of communities of color and offers a liberatory and transformative method for examining racial/ethnic, gender, and class discrimination” (p. 63). CRT is grounded on five prominent tenets: “(a) counter-storytelling, (b) the permanence of racism, (c) whiteness as property, (d) interest convergence, and (e) the critique of liberalism” (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004, p. 27).

According to Yosso and Solórzano (2005), the five tenets of CRT can serve as “a guiding lens to inform researchers in the process of conducting studies with people of color” and

can be further utilized to “address research questions, teaching approaches, and our policy recommendations regarding social inequality” (p. 127). In addition, the use of CRT as an “analytical lens” fosters our “research with a critical eye to identify, analyze, and challenge distorted notions of people of color as we build on the cultural wealth already present in these communities” (Yosso & Solórzano, 2005, p. 127).

Critical Race Theory in Education

Application of CRT was first introduced to the field of education by Ladson-Billings and Tate in 1995 as a response to the 1991 findings of Jonathan Kozol’s article, “Savage Inequalities,” which “delineated the great inequalities that exist between the schooling experiences of White middle-class students and those of poor African-American and Latino students” (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995, p. 47). Other scholars instrumental in the work of Ladson-Billings & Tate were Woodson and Du Bois for their use of “race as a theoretical lens for assessing social inequality” (as cited in Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995, p. 50). To theorize on the subject of race and property and use the theory as an analytical tool for understanding school inequality, Ladson-Billings and Tate set forward the following three paradigms:

1. Race continues to be a significant factor in determining inequality in the United States.
2. U.S. society is based on property rights.
3. The intersection of race and property creates an analytical tool through which we can understand social (and consequently, school) inequality (p. 48).

As the issue of race remains a restraining obstacle towards the quest for equality, “thinking of race strictly as an ideological construct denies the reality of a racialized society and its impact on ‘raced’ people in their everyday lives,” and in contrast,

“thinking of race solely as an objective condition denies the problematic aspect of race—how do we decide who fits into which racial classifications” (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995, pp. 48–49). Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995) argued that race can be used “as a tool for explaining social inequality, although the intellectual salience of this theorizing has not been systematically employed in the analysis of educational inequality” (p. 50).

According to Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995), “the ability to define, possess, and own property has been a central feature of power in America” whereas “in the simplest equations, those with ‘better’ property are entitled to ‘better’ schools” (pp. 53–54). Another property difference is represented by “school curriculum as a form of ‘intellectual property’ because quality and quantity of the curriculum varies with the ‘property values’ of the school” (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995, p. 54).

Those studying the intersection of race and property postulated that the idea of being white is considered a form of property in the context of education. Referencing the work of legal scholar Harris in 1993, “property functions of whiteness include 1) rights of disposition; 2) rights to use and enjoyment; 3) reputation and status property; and 4) the absolute right to exclude” (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995, p. 59). For example, “When students are rewarded only for conformity to perceived ‘white norms’ or sanctioned for cultural practices (e.g., dress, speech patterns, unauthorized conceptions of knowledge), white property is being rendered alienable” (p. 59).

Prevalent methodologies of CRT include “counter-storytelling, parables, narrative analysis, and a conceptualization of ‘majoritarian storytelling,’ or ‘master narrative,’ all aimed at coming to a better understanding of the role of race and racism in American life” (Love, 2004, p. 228). By using the method of counter-storytelling, participants of

color are given the opportunity to share their experiences by “voice” (Ladson-Billings, 1998, p.14). According to Yosso and Solórzano (2005), critical race counter-stories serve several pedagogical functions, for example,

1. they can build community among those at the margins of society;
2. they can challenge the perceived wisdom of those at society’s center;
3. they can open new windows into the reality of those at the margins by showing the possibilities beyond the ones they live and by showing that they are not alone in their position;
4. they can teach others that by combining elements from both the story and the current reality, one can construct another world that is richer than either the story or the reality alone; and
5. they can provide a context to understand and transform established belief systems (p.124).

Research Questions

To explore the personal and professional lived experiences of self-identified native-born La Raza (Mexican-American and Chicana/o) tenured and tenure-track faculty (assistant, associate, and full professors) employed at Catholic institutions of higher education, the following research questions guided this study:

1. How do native-born Mexican-American/Chicana/o faculty perceive their personal lived experiences pertaining to their attendance and participation in the educational system in America?
2. How do native-born Mexican-American/Chicana/o faculty perceive their personal and professional lived experiences pertaining to their academic career paths and self-perceived supports and challenges in Catholic higher education?

3. How do native-born Mexican-American/Chicana/o faculty perceive their personal and professional lived experiences pertaining to their social and cultural climate and level of satisfaction in Catholic higher education?
4. What applicable recommendations do native-born Mexican-American/Chicana/o faculty have to assist a) Mexican-American/Chicana/o scholars in their pursuit of academic careers in Catholic higher education; b) current Mexican-American/Chicana/o faculty toward tenure and promotion; and c) academic administrators in their recruitment, promotion, and retention of Mexican-American/Chicana/o faculty in Catholic higher education?

Definition of Terms

The following terms have been operationalized for this study. The terms will be used to provide a common language with which to consider and comprehend this study. Although the terms may be consistently found throughout research, the precise meanings rendered here are specific to this research study.

Chicana/o: A term for Mexican Americans reflecting their dual heritages and mixed culture. Some Mexican Americans use the term to emphasize their equality as American citizens, while others use the term to relate their cultural and political struggles (Santana & Gonzalez, 2001, cited in Castellanos & Jones, 2003, p. xx).

Counter-Narrative: “Challenge the dominant white and predominately male culture that is considered normative and authoritative,” and by acting to “deconstruct the master narratives, they offer alternatives to the dominant discourse in educational research.” Counter-narratives in higher education by women and people of color

employed as faculty imply “that differences exist for them in their academic experiences that are distinct from those of the majority white faculty” (Stanley, 2007, p. 14).

Counter-Storytelling: Writing that challenges the validity of accepted premises or myths, particularly those held by the majority (Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J., 2012, p. 159). Counter-storytelling involves “naming one’s own reality” through the “use of narrative to illuminate and explore experiences of racial oppression” (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Critical_race_Theory, 2012).

Critical Race Theory (CRT): Critical race theory offers a critical analysis of race and racism from a legal point of view. It is also a “radical movement consisting of a group of interdisciplinary scholars and activists concerned with studying and changing the relationship between race, racism, and power” (Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J., 2012, p. 159).

Diversity: Important and intersecting dimensions of human identity such as race, ethnicity, national origin, religion, gender, sexual orientation, class, age, and ability within a community and also in the individuals that comprise that community (Smith et al., 1997, p. 7).

Faculty: Individuals whose routine assignments are to provide teaching, research, and/or public service in the academic rank titles of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructor, or lecturer (Knapp, Kelly-Reid, & Ginder, 2010).

Faculty of Color: Includes faculty members whose racial/ethnic background is African American, Hispanic, Latino/a, Asian American, or American Indian/Alaska Native (Moreno, Smith, Clayton-Pedersen, Parker, Teraguchi, 2006).

Hispanic: A term created by the Office of Budget and Management in 1978 as an ethnic category for persons of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central American, South American, or some other Spanish origin (Trevino, 1987). This label “refers to various populations that are bound by a common ancestral language and cultural characteristics, but that vastly differ in immigrant history and settlement in the United States” (Castellanos & Jones, 2003, p. xx).

La Raza: The term was coined by Mexican scholar José Vasconcelos in his 1925 book, *La Raza Cósmica (The Cosmic Race)*, to reflect that the people of Latin America are a mixture of many of the world’s races, cultures, and religions (Vigil, 1998, p. 9; The Campus Alliance De La Raza, 2013). Vasconcelo’s reference to Mexicans was an early assessment of how cultural diversity can lead to strength and vitality (Vigil, 1998, p. 9). According to the National Council of La Raza, “the term *La Raza* has its origins in early 20th-century Latin American literature and translates into English most closely as the people, or, according to some scholars, the Latino people of the New World,” although “some people have mistranslated *La Raza* to mean ‘the Race,’ implying that it is a term meant to exclude others, while in fact, the term is an inclusive concept, meaning that Latinos share with all other peoples of the world a common heritage and destiny” (The Campus Alliance De La Raza, 2013).

Latino/a: People residing in the United States whose ancestors are from Latin American countries. This term is more inclusive than Hispanic, as it includes people from Latin America (e.g., Peruvians, Argentineans, Nicaraguans, and Guatemalans) who do not necessarily speak Spanish, such as Brazilians (Castellanos & Jones, 2003, p. xx).

Master Narrative: Narrative knowledge is knowledge expressed through storytelling. Master narratives embody our expectations about how things work. They are “scripts that specify, legitimize, and control how certain social processes are carried out” (Stanley, 2007, p. 14).

Microaggression: Routine intentional or unintentional verbal or behavioral aggression that communicates hostile, derogatory, or negative racial slights or insults (Gildersleeve, R. E.; Croom, N. N.; Vasquez, P. L.; 2011). Microaggression may be a small encounter with racism, usually unnoticed by members of the majority (Delgado, R. & Stefancic, J., 2012, p. 167). It is based on assumptions about racial matters absorbed from one’s cultural heritage” (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Critical_race_theory, 2012).

Origin: According to Delgado-Romero et al. (2007), *origin* is defined by the U.S. Census Bureau as “the heritage, nationality, group, lineage, or country of birth of the person or the person’s parents or ancestors before their arrival in the United States” (p. 36).

Private not-for-profit institution: A private institution that is not for profit and may be affiliated with a religious organization (Knapp et al., 2010).

Race: A socially and historically defined human grouping assigned according to heredity, but not biologically defined. Race refers to very large human groups containing diverse populations and ethnic groups (Castellanos & Jones, 2003, p. xix).

Racism: According to Lorde (1992, as cited in Solórzano & Yosso, 2002), racism is “the belief in the inherent superiority of one race over all others and thereby the right to dominance” (p. 24). In addition, Marable (1992, as cited in Solórzano & Yosso, 2002) argued that racism is “a system of ignorance, exploitation, and power used to oppress

African Americans, Latinos, Asians, Pacific Americans, American Indians and other people on the basis of ethnicity, culture, mannerisms, and color” (p. 24).

Recruitment: The process of identifying and informing African-American, Asian/Pacific American, Chicano/Latino, and Native American populations to provide them with support systems that will facilitate improved and enhanced access to the university, with the expectation of increasing enrollment of multicultural students and faculty (Castellanos & Jones, 2003, p. xix).

Retention: The continuous process of creating, maintaining, and supporting ongoing strategies for meeting personal, academic, social, and financial needs of multicultural students to ensure academic success and graduation (Castellanos & Jones, 2003, p. xix).

Summary

This chapter provided a brief summary of Hispanic and Latino population demographics and projections. The general Hispanic and Latino population has slowly evolved into the largest minority group in the United States, with Mexican Americans representing the largest and least educated sub-group (Gandara & Contreras, 2009). In contrast, the population increase of Hispanics and Latinos/as in the United States has not coincided with an increase in college-student enrollment and/or faculty employment in higher education.

There are many aspects in the context of this study that are significant to the development of literature on this issue. Given the underrepresentation of Hispanic and Latino faculty, specifically Mexican Americans in higher education, it is imperative to identify prevalent institutional supports and challenges contributing to their journey

toward careers in academia. Various challenges serving as obstacles negatively affecting Hispanic and Latino faculty, as well as other faculty of color, will be thoroughly examined in the literature review in chapter II. For the purpose of this study, the critical race theory tenets of counter-storytelling and permanence of racism will be integrated to explore and thoroughly describe a shared phenomenon experienced by La Raza faculty employed in higher education.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

There persists a critical need to recruit and retain faculty that represent and reflect the culture and diversity of the United States throughout all levels of education. One of the foremost challenges for historians and researchers has been accuracy in documenting the enrollment and educational attainment of Mexican Americans in higher education, largely due to identity issues and census classification prior to 1980 (McDonald & Garcia, as cited in Castellanos & Jones, 2003). Therefore, in this study, prevalent terms such as *Hispanic*, *Latino/a*, *Mexican American*, and *Chicano/a* are used interchangeably, and in accord with the research findings, to signify a people with origins and/or heritage in Mexico and Latin American countries. In the United States, “the term *La Raza* is sometimes used to refer to people of Chicano and mestizo descent as well as other Latin American mestizos who share Native American ancestry” (Wikipedia.org, 2013). For the purpose of this study, the term *La Raza* will be used synonymously throughout this study to identify native-born Mexican-American and Chicano/a students and faculty in the United States.

Restatement of the Problem

Currently, Hispanics are the largest minority population in the United States. However as faculty, Hispanics remain the least represented racial/ethnic group in higher education, an issue that poses as a major problem to the success of current and future Hispanic students nationally (Leon & Nevarez, 2006). According to Verdugo (1995), “Hispanic faculty are not exempt from the negative effects racial stratification has on the status of minority faculty” (p. 671) and often encounter numerous challenges and

obstacles in higher education pertaining to recruitment, tokenism, retention, job satisfaction, campus climate, mentors/role models, collegiality, promotion/tenure, isolation, and discrimination. Moreover, repeatedly Latino faculty are “disproportionally concentrated in the humanities, foreign language departments, Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs), and two-year colleges ... in relatively low-status, non-tenure-track positions with minimal hope of advancement or entry into the power structure of academia” (Delgado-Romero et al., 2007, p. 37) in comparison to other faculty of color.

Latinos/as have made substantial contributions to the field of higher education relative to the recruitment and retention of faculty of color in the last 20 years (Turner, Gonzalez, & Wood, 2008); in contrast, there remains a scarcity of documented contributions to the field of higher education associated with Hispanic and Latino faculty by American Catholic institutions of higher education. Due to this scarcity of literature, this chapter will exclusively review literature associated with issues encountered by faculty of color, specifically Hispanic and Latino faculty at public institutions of higher education; subsequently, I will include thoughts on Catholic higher education in the summary.

This literature review provides information depicting the historical experiences and current status of La Raza students and faculty at public institutions of higher education. The first section, “Historical Overview of La Raza in the United States,” provides a brief overview of the historical issues leading to the civil rights and human rights movement by La Raza for educational equity. The second section, “Current U.S. Population Demographics of La Raza,” highlights recent national demographics and trends for Hispanics and Latino/as in comparison to other ethnic/racial groups. The third

section, “Current Status of La Raza in Higher Education,” is a depiction of Hispanic and Latino undergraduate and graduate students by statistics and trends. In the fourth section, “Faculty Diversity in Higher Education,” I examine literature associated with issues about faculty diversity in higher education. A brief definition of diversity in higher education will be provided to assist in understanding the relevance of the subject addressed in the literature. In the fifth section, “Faculty Recruitment,” I examine recruiting procedures and issues, as well as foreign-born faculty in comparison to native-born faculty and tokenism. In the sixth section, “Faculty Retention,” I examine identified challenges for faculty of color in higher education, such as retention, job satisfaction, institutional/work climate, mentors/role models, collegiality, tenure, and promotion. The last section will provide a brief description of critical race theory (CRT) as a theory and methodology. Specifically, CRT was used as a lens throughout the literature review to support and construct the methodology for this research study to further examine the personal and professional lived experiences of La Raza faculty in academia.

Historical Overview of La Raza in the United States

La Raza, specifically the Mexican subpopulation, has inhabited the United States for more than 500 years, yet they are continually perceived as second-class citizens and/or immigrants. La Raza have encountered many challenging obstacles in attempting to achieve equity in civil and human rights, in particular, educational equity in the United States. According to R. Rodriguez (1996), there are differing beliefs as to when the Chicano resistant movement began:

1. When Columbus was met by a fusillade of arrows in his first attempt to land in the Americas;

2. The defense of Tenochtitlan in 1521 (now Mexico City), pitting the Cuauhtémoc-led forces against the Spanish invaders; or
3. The end of the Mexican American War in 1848, when Mexico lost half of its territory to the United States and its Mexican residents became “*strangers in their own lands*” (p. 1).

However, many believe the “modern Chicano political movement began in the mid-1960s” and was a movement that directly resulted in the establishment of Chicano studies programs in higher education and numerous La Raza advocacy groups and organizations (R. Rodriguez, 1996, p. 1).

Prior to the Chicano movement of the mid 1960s, numerous historical events fueled the current discrimination and marginalization encountered by many Mexican Americans in the United States. MacDonald and Garcia (as cited in Castellanos & Jones, 2003) provided an examination of five major eras contributing to the history of Latinos in American higher education. The first era, “Southwestern Class Exceptionalism, 1848–1920,” began with the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848, an agreement to end the war between Texas and Mexico. As a result, “the United States acquired modern-day Arizona, Colorado, California, New Mexico, and Texas” (p. 19). Although the agreement promised specific provisions, such as “citizenship, preservation of former land grants, and Spanish language rights” (Castellanos & Jones, 2003, p. 19), all entitlements were disregarded by the United States. Providing a clearer delineation of the sense of betrayal experienced among Mexicans residing in the states they once called their own, Hernandez (1997) offered the following account:

The failure to fully explain how America acquired its Southwest and how it subsequently dishonored its obligations has a great deal to do with the way in which Americans have regarded Mexicans. Few treaties have had a more lasting influence on one nation’s perception of another’s peoples than the Treaty of

Hidalgo, which formally ended the war and sealed the annexation of the territories to the United States.

Mexicans like sheep were largely shorn of their property and dignity. They may have been *Hidalgos* under Mexican rule, but they were awarded by their conquerors a lower-class status. Lynchings and murders kept them in their place and they became aliens in their own country. A racist regime put them in their place. The land of liberty had numerous embarrassments in store for those who were not Anglo-Saxon. These cultural codicils included what could kindly be called an imperfect suffrage system and rampant Jim Crowism extended to Mexicans. It was a society of violence, power, and profit. It was racist and discriminatory (p. 969).

The second era, “Imperial Conquest: The Case of Puerto Rico, 1898–1950,” began with the Spanish War of 1898 in which the United States acquired Puerto Rico, thereafter establishing American schools with emphasis on the English language in an effort to Americanize the populace. MacDonald and Garcia (as cited in Castellanos & Jones, 2003) noted that in 1903, the University of Puerto Rico was established to emphasize “teacher training for American assimilation, and agricultural and mechanical arts rather than classical studies” (p. 22). To further Americanize Puerto Rican youth, the United States offers them the ability to attend colleges in the United States, although with limited academic opportunities until the Commissioner of Education in Puerto Rico discovered a “loophole in the legislation enabling . . . students to attend institutions with broader academic missions than Tuskegee and Hampton Institutes,” and by “1905, almost 500 Puerto Ricans were attending American institutions, such as Rutgers, MIT, University of Michigan, and Cornell” (p. 23). During the 1940s and 1950s, an influx of Puerto Ricans migrated, generally to New York and Chicago, although limited employment opportunities were available to migrant Puerto Ricans due to their limited fluency in the English language (MacDonald and Garcia as cited in Castellanos & Jones, 2003).

In the third era, “Slipping in the College Gates, 1920s–1950s,” MacDonald and Garcia (as cited in Castellanos & Jones, 2003) acknowledged limited availability of research documenting Latinos attending public higher education in the mid-20th century, although what is known are the barriers encountered by Mexican Americans such as “being segregated into either separate schools or classrooms based upon their accents, skin color, or surname,” and “few Mexican American children reached the eighth grade due to lack of enforcement of school attendance laws, language difficulties, immigration, classroom harassment, and racism” (p. 25). Regardless of obstacles encountered by Mexican Americans toward college participation prior to the 1960s, MacDonald and Garcia (as cited in Castellanos & Jones, 2003) proposed that the following four factors contributed to an increase of Mexican-American participation in higher education:

1. Community and charitable organizations;
2. Active support of teachers, clergy, or social workers that were sympathetic and in a position to identify youth with exceptional intelligence;
3. Passage of the Servicemen’s Readjustment Act of 1944 (GI Bill); and
4. The League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC), founded in 1929 (pp. 25–26).

In the fourth era, MacDonald and Garcia (as cited in Castellanos & Jones, 2003) described “El Movimiento in Higher Education, 1960–1980,” as “the watershed of the entrance of Latinos into higher education” (p. 27). This was an era that reflected an increase in Latino students, as well as the first generation of Latino faculty appearing on college and university campuses. Latino students and Latino faculty became less isolated on campus and Latinos embraced their identity rather than pathways to assimilation. At the time, fewer than 100 scholars of Mexican descent held doctorates in the United States, primarily in education. As a means to address the disparity of Mexican students

and faculty on campus, student youth movements and organizations became increasingly visible and active on college and university campuses (MacDonald and Garcia, as cited in Castellanos & Jones, 2003):

The first Latino protest on a college campus occurred at San Jose State College in 1968, as graduating students walked out during a commencement exercise to protest the underrepresentation of Chicano students and lack of bilingual and cultural training for professionals (MacDonald & Garcia, cited in Castellanos & Jones, 2003, p. 29).

Shortly afterward, additional student walkouts and strikes on college and university campuses followed, due to unmet demands to increase Latino representation on campuses. As a response to student movements, “Affirmative action initiatives during 1970 brought Latinos into colleges, many of whom are now faculty members” (p. 32).

For the fifth era, “The Federal Government Steps In, 1980s and 1990s,” MacDonald and Garcia (as cited in Castellanos & Jones, 2003) discussed “that the surge of the Latino population between the 1980s and 1990s with projections of becoming the largest minority group in the United States, yet the least educated, caught the attention of the federal government” (p. 34). As a response to Latino population growth, “the creation of the term ‘Hispanic’ in 1973 by the [Office of Management and Budget], Statistical Directive 15 was implemented as a method of documenting the status of all Hispanics” (p. 34). Hispanics identified with the definition, according to the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (1994). Shortly after the “federal recognition of Hispanics as a separate minority group” (p. 34), the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities was formed to improve the access and quality of college education for Hispanics (p. 34), which soon brought “the establishment of Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs) based on the definition of the Department of Education as postsecondary institutions with at least

25% Hispanic full-time equivalent enrollment and also 50% or more low-income students” (MacDonald & Garcia, as cited in Castellanos & Jones, 2003; pp. 36–37). “The reauthorizing of the Higher Education Act of 1998 included HSIs with tribal and [Historically Black Colleges and Universities] under Title V, allowing them a larger slice of the federal pie” (MacDonald & Garcia, as cited in Castellanos & Jones, 2003, p. 37).

Overwhelmingly, literature associated with La Raza in education places a negative prominence of their presence and progress in American institutions of education. Prior to 1910, “little attention was given to the education, health, economic, or political status of Mexican Americans” (Pino & Ovando, 2005, p. 5). Valencia (2008) noted that the “Mexican-American community’s overall struggle for the right to an equal education . . . spurred Mexican Americans to pursue legal battles on issues such as school segregation, special education, bilingual education, school closures, undocumented students, higher education financing, and high-stakes testing” (p. 1). Aware of the educational system’s negative attitude toward their children, “Mexican-American parents voiced their opinions and challenged oppressing school districts and school boards by using the legal system to gain equal education for their children” (Valencia, 2008, p. 1). The next section will highlight four historical court cases involving the plight of Mexican Americans toward educational equality in elementary and middle schools, and subsequently examines additional historical obstacles and legal cases that have directly influenced higher education.

The first known legal suit involving the education of Mexican-American children was in 1925 by “Adolfo ‘Babe’ Romo, a Mexican American rancher in Tempe, Arizona; Sr. Romo filed suit against his Laird school district on behalf of his four young children,

who were forced to attend a markedly low-quality segregated school, and won” (Valencia, 2008, p. 1). This court case led the way for similar court cases involving the segregation of Mexican- American children. Shortly after *Romo v Laird*, Texas conducted the first study in 1928 examining the education of Mexican-American children, which revealed the following issues of inequality:

School segregation and unequal access, barriers to the full utilization of educational experiences, lack of financial resources, low quality of teachers, misconceptions of Mexican Americans’ intellectual ability, and instruction in a non-comprehensible language (Pino & Ovando, 2005, p. 5).

The second court case, *Jesus Salvatierra v. Independent School District* in Del Rio, Texas in 1930, “involved the plaintiff and other parents accusing the Del Rio School Board of depriving Mexican American students of equal resources provided to White students” (Godina-Martinez, 2010, p. 24). Obtaining the assistance of the League of United Latino American Citizens,

parents petitioned for an injunction prohibiting the use of bond monies by the Del Rio School District ... to construct new facilities that would only progress segregation among Mexican American children ... parents complained that this deliberate act of segregation was based on race and hence unconstitutional (Godina-Martinez, 2010, p. 24).

The district judge ruled in favor of *Salvatierra*, although “the ruling was overturned by the San Antonio Court in favor of the Del Rio School District, finding that separation of Mexican American students was not based on race, but on instruction” (Godina-Martinez, 2010, p. 24).

The third court case occurred approximately one year later, *Alvarez v. the Board of Trustees of the Lemon Grove School District* in San Diego, California, and involved Mexican Americans organizing and filing suit after “the local elementary school principal prevented 75 Mexican American children from enrolling in an all-white school. ... The

court ruled in favor of Alvarez because a separate facility would dissuade the goal of Americanization” (Godina-Martinez, 2010, p. 25).

The fourth court case occurred six years prior to the historic *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka* decision in 1954, a national landmark court case recognized for ending legal segregation of children in schools based on race. In 1944, the case of “*Mendez v. Westminster* took place in California when an 8-year-old Mexican American girl, Sylvia Mendez, and her siblings were denied attendance at a segregated all-white elementary school near their Orange County home because they were too dark” (Godina-Martinez, 2010, p. 25). Subsequent to the protest of the Mendez family and numerous community members alleging the policy of segregating students by the school district was discriminatory and a violation of the Fourteenth Amendment,

the U.S. Federal Court in San Diego, California ruled in favor of *Mendez v. Westminster*, concurring that such segregation was clearly a violation of California education laws that prohibited segregation and a violation of the Fourteenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution (Godina-Martinez, 2010, p. 26).

Two months later, the legislature of California passed Assembly Bill 1375, signed into law by Governor Warren in 1947, eliminating all segregation in California schools of Indian, Chinese, Japanese, and children of Mongolian ancestry (Godina-Martinez, 2010).

The impact of *Mendez* was furthermore evident in the favorable ruling to end segregation in the 1948 case of *Delgado v. Bastrop Independent School District* in Texas and the 1951 case of *Gonzalez v. Sheely* in Arizona (Godina-Martinez, 2010). Godina-Martinez (2010) argued that although the case of *Mendez v. Westminster* is not well known by many, “the victory of *Mendez* set the precedent against segregation in the United States and for future civil rights cases” (p. 25) notably,

the Mendez case set the legal precedent that enabled *Brown* attorneys to win their arguments before the Supreme Court ... in 1954 which eventually ended the legal segregation in schools in the United States (Godina-Martinez, 2010, p. 27).

Current U.S. Population Demographics of La Raza

In 2010, Hispanics accounted for 16% (50.5 million) of the total population in the United States (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011/May). According to Ennis, Rio-Vargas, and Albert (2011), Mexican Americans comprised 63% (31.8 million) of the U.S. Hispanic population and 10% of the total U.S. population in 2010. In recent findings by the Pew Hispanic Center, the U.S. 2011 census for Hispanics accounted for 51.9 million of the U.S. population (see Table 1), which was a 47.5% (16,722,678) population change from the year 2000 (Motel & Patten, 2013). These statistics and population projections clearly indicate that Hispanics are the fastest-growing racial/ethnic population in the United States. For example, by 2015, Hispanics are projected to represent 55.4 million (17.2%) of the population residing in the United States (U.S. Census Bureau, 2008b), and according to the NCES (2010), by 2025, Hispanics are projected to represent 21% of the U.S. population. National population studies have suggested Mexican Americans are the largest subpopulation of all Hispanics.

Table 1

U.S. Population, by Race and Ethnicity, 2011 and 2000

U.S Population	2011	2000
Hispanic	51,927,158	35,204,480
Native born	33,138,858	35,204,480
Foreign born	51,927,158	35,204,480
White alone, not Hispanic	197,098,663	194,527,123
Black alone, not Hispanic	38,203,000	33,706,554
Asian alone, not Hispanic	14,858,375	10,088,521
Total	311,591,919	281,421,906

Note. “Other, not Hispanic” includes persons reporting single races not listed separately and persons reporting more than one race. Source: *Statistical Portrait of Hispanics in the United States, 2011* by Motel, S. & Patten, E., 2013, retrieved from <http://www.pewhispanic.org/2013/02/15/statistical-portrait-of-hispanics-in-the-united-states-2011/#1-2010-census>. Permission granted to use the material from Pew Research Center.

Considering the current population status and population projections for Hispanics in the United States, particularly Mexican Americans, it is anticipated that this racial/ethnic group will have an increasingly negative impact on the economic direction and stability of this country, primarily due to the fact that Hispanics are the least educated of all racial/ethnic groups in the United States (Gandara & Contreras, 2009). According to Pino and Ovando (2005), “the health of the United States economy ... is growing more dependent on the knowledge and skills of Hispanic workers ... although educational disparity among Hispanics is a national concern” (p. 3).

One cause contributing to this dilemma is related to the increasing influx of Mexican immigrants arriving in the United States with lower levels of education, a continuing issue that negatively influences the accuracy of educational progress and attainment of native Hispanics in the United States (Crissey, 2009). Thus, it is difficult to accurately confirm the educational progress and attainment of native Hispanics,

particularly Mexican Americans, a factor supporting this study, emphasizing only self-identified native-born La Raza faculty employed at Catholic institutions of higher education. The next section will provide a brief overview of the educational status of Hispanic and Latino students in higher education.

Current Status of La Raza in Higher Education

Undergraduate

According to the NCES (2011a), in the fall of 2009, Hispanics represented 12% of undergraduate students in higher education, which is a 9% increase from 1976. By 2020, enrollment for Hispanic students is projected to increase 46%, compared to 1% for whites, 25% for blacks, 25% for Asian/Pacific Islanders, and 1% for American Indian/Alaska Native (NCES, 2011b). Apparent in these projections, Hispanics will represent a significant increase of undergraduate students of color enrolled by the year 2020. The greatest numbers of bachelor's degrees conferred in 2009 were in the fields of business (348,000), social sciences and history (169,000), health sciences (120,000), and education (102,000, NCES, 2011).

Graduate

According to master's degrees conferred by race/ethnicity for selected years, 1976–1977 through 2008–2009 of the NCES (2010a), Hispanics in 1976 earned 1.9% (6,071) of master's degrees in comparison to blacks at 6.6% (21,037), whites at 84.0% (266,061), Asian/Pacific Islanders at 1.6% (5,122), and American Indian/Alaska Natives at 0.3% (967). With a significant increase in 2009, Hispanics earned 6.0% (39,439) of master's degrees in comparison to blacks at 10.7% (70,010), whites at 64.6% (424,188), Asian/Pacific Islanders at 6.1% (39,944), and American Indian/Alaska Natives at 3,759

(0.6%). Comparing numbers of master's degrees earned by gender among Hispanics from years 1976 through 2009, men increased 3.5% and women 4.5% (NCES, 2010a). In addition, the greatest numbers of master's degrees conferred in 2009 were in the fields of education (179,000) and business (168,000, NCES, 2011).

Doctorate

Validating the underrepresentation of Hispanics obtaining postsecondary degrees in the United States, Valverde and Rodriguez (2002) argued there have been “no major changes in Hispanic graduation enrollments or degrees awarded since 1976” and “the severity of underrepresentation is most evident at the doctoral level, where 2% of all doctoral degrees attained in 1996 were awarded to Hispanics” (p. 51). In addition, the authors suggested, due to prior studies not disaggregating data to reflect Hispanic subpopulations, “it is difficult to establish the proportion of postsecondary degrees awarded nationwide to Mexican Americans” (pp. 51–52).

According to doctoral degrees conferred by race/ethnicity for selected years, 1976–1977 through 2008–2009 of NCES (2010b), Hispanics in 1976 earned 1.6% (522) of doctoral degrees in comparison to blacks at 3.8% (1,253), whites at 81.1% (26,851), Asian/Pacific Islanders at 2.0% (658), and American Indian/Alaska Natives at 0.3% (95). With a slight increase in 2009, Hispanics earned 3.8% (2,540) of doctoral degrees in comparison to blacks at 6.5% (4,434), whites at 58.6% (39,648), Asian/Pacific Islanders at 5.7% (3,875), and American Indian/Alaska Natives at 332 (0.5%). Examining the comparison of doctoral degrees conferred by gender among Hispanics from years 1976 through 2009, men increased 1.9%, whereas women increased 2.4% (NCES, 2010a). At the doctoral degree level, the greatest number of degrees conferred to Hispanics were “in

the fields of health professions and related clinical sciences (12,100), education (9,000), engineering (7,900), biological and biomedical sciences (7,000), psychology (5,500), and physical sciences (5,000)” (NCES, 2011a).

Gender Disparities in Higher Education

Historically, an assumption of the educational system has been its male domination as well as favoritism for males, validated by extensive research related to the inequality among male and female college enrollment, participation, and degree conferral in higher education. Contrary to former research, recent scholars have observed a continuous increase of Hispanic females enrolling at higher rates as full-time freshman at four-year colleges and universities in comparison to Hispanic males, which has steadily declined over the past three decades (Branch-Brioso, 2008; T. Rodriguez, 2009; Saenz & Ponjuan, 2009). According to Branch-Brioso (2008) findings of a report on Hispanic college freshman by the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) of the University of California, Los Angeles Graduate School of Education & Information Studies, the gender gap between Hispanic male and female college students has never been greater over the last three decades of freshman survey responses.

Branch-Brioso (2008) asserted, “While women are outperforming men across all ethnic and racial groups, the gap between male and female Hispanics is the most pronounced” (p. 1), and is intensely “pronounced among Mexican-American males who were 37.1 % of the Mexican-American freshman, compared to 62.9 percent for females” (p. 2). Saenz and Ponjuan (2009) supported these findings as they suggested “the most pronounced gender disparity exists within Mexican Americans/Chicanos where females outnumber males by a factor approaching 2 to 1 as of 2006” (p. 68). Puerto Rican

freshman at four-year institutions had the least gender gap. In addition, T. Rodriguez (2009) argued despite Hispanics' increase in postsecondary enrollment between 1976 and 2004,

disparities in undergraduate enrollment among Hispanics are already noticeable in 1990, with a 10 percentage point difference in favor of women; that difference increases to 17 percentage points by 2004 and graduate level gender disparities in enrollment among Hispanics are noticeable in 1990 at 13 percentage points of difference and rather significant in 2004 at 27 percentage points difference (p. 2).

The aforementioned findings are counter to the belief that Latinas are constrained by traditional gender-based roles, although an explanation for this phenomenon can be related to the proximity of institutions of higher education allowing Latinas to remain home or close to home (Branch-Brioso, 2008).

Faculty Diversity in Higher Education

Diversifying faculty representation at institutions of higher education has posed as a continued challenge on a nation level “since the 1960s, which was ignited by the consciousness of the Civil Rights Movement in efforts to diversify higher education at all levels, from the student body to the faculty ranks” (Antonio, 2002, p. 582). Considering steady growth has occurred for undergraduate students of color in higher education, unfortunately representation of faculty of color has not proportionately coincided (Antonio, 2002; Jayakumar et al., 2009). According to Jayakumar et al. (2009), “Despite antidiscrimination legislation and affirmative action, faculty of color remain significantly underrepresented in higher education ... and approximately 5.3% of full professors in the United States are African American, Hispanic, or Native American” (p. 538). Additionally, a 30-year analysis of national trends on the persistent stratification of faculty of color by institution type, found that “faculty of color are most underrepresented

at private four-year institutions and at select institutions, while concurrently overrepresented in the lower academic ranks and less prestigious academic fields” (Jayakumar et al., 2009, pp. 542–543).

Examining the trend of full-time instructional faculty in degree-granting institutions for the fall of 2007, 2009, and 2011 (see Table 2), according to the NCES (2012), in the fall 2010–2011, Hispanics represented 31,331 full-time instructional faculty in degree-granting institutions, which is a slight increase of 3,291 from 2009 (28,040) and 6,356 from 2007 (24,975). Considering the gradual increase of represented full-time Hispanic faculty, a majority of these faculty members do not self-identify as native-born Mexican Americans or Chicanas/os.

Table 2

Full-Time Instructional Faculty in Degree-Granting Institutions, by Race/Ethnicity and Academic Rank: Fall 2007, Fall 2009, Fall 2011.

Academic rank	Total	Selected racial/ethnic groups				
		White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Pacific Islander	American Indian/ Alaska Native
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2007						
Total	703,463	540,460	37,930	24,975	53,661	3,340
Professors	173,395	147,867	5,839	4,128	12,239	528
Associate professors	143,692	115,274	7,855	4,714	11,082	604
Assistant professors	168,508	117,618	10,642	6,329	17,290	679
Instructors	101,429	77,609	7,480	5,800	5,225	965
Lecturers	31,264	23,470	1,602	1,492	2,081	151
Other faculty	85,175	58,622	4,512	2,512	5,744	413
2009						
Total	728,977	551,271	39,715	28,040	59,691	3,457
Professors	177,581	149,568	6,086	4,683	13,284	580
Associate professors	148,981	117,270	8,163	5,383	12,632	601
Assistant professors	171,639	117,892	10,979	6,789	18,712	719
Instructors	104,521	78,329	7,806	6,577	5,566	1,002
Lecturers	33,332	24,895	1,812	1,583	2,318	138
Other faculty	92,923	63,317	4,869	3,025	7,179	417
2011						
Total	761,619	563,689	41,649	31,331	66,887	3,529
Professors	181,508	150,334	6,517	5,180	14,646	589
Associate professors	155,200	119,371	8,695	6,143	14,409	597
Assistant professors	174,045	118,014	10,994	7,428	19,822	701
Instructors	109,054	80,703	8,600	6,906	5,808	981
Lecturers	34,477	25,823	1,688	1,773	2,456	135
Other faculty	107,335	69,444	5,155	3,901	9,746	526

Note. Source: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data Statistics (IPEDS), Winter 2007–2008, Winter 2008–2009, and Winter 2010–2011, Human Resources component, Fall Staff section, by U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, table prepared July 2012, retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d12/tables/dt12_264.asp. Permission to reproduce granted.

Sustaining the premise associated with the underrepresentation of faculty of color, Turner and Taylor (2008) conducted a 20-year literature review and synthesis of 252 publications to inform scholars and practitioners on the current status of the field. Findings concluded that “faculty of color remain underrepresented, making up only 17% of the total full-time faculty at all institutions of higher education” within the literature review (p. 139).

Trower and Chait (2002) argued that faculty diversification has proceeded slowly because institutions of higher education maintain the myth that there are a limited number of qualified women and minority candidates. The authors add that the problem is not only in the pipeline, although more so if the following obstacles are experienced by women and minority faculty: “(a) hierarchy of disciplines, (b) gender or race-based stereotypes, (c) single-minded devotion to professional pursuits, (d) relative value assigned to various elements of faculty work (for example, teaching versus research), (e) various forms of research (pure versus applied, quantitative versus qualitative), and (f) various outlets for research (refereed versus non-refereed, print versus electronic)” (p. 36). Additional issues suggested by Antonio (2002) impeding the growth of faculty of color in higher education included the following:

- A small and decreasing pool of minority Ph.D.s and disproportionate tenure rates and rates of pre-tenure departure;
- The persistence of racist perceptions on institutional and individual levels that restrict access and impede the professional progress of faculty of color;
- The devaluation of the qualifications of minority Ph.D.s not trained in the most elite, prestigious colleges; and
- The difficulties of surviving in a predominately white academy due to poor mentoring, disproportionate advising and service loads stemming

from frequently being the only faculty of color in a department, an isolating work environment, and the lack of scholarly recognition given to research focusing on ethnic minority populations (pp. 583–584).

Further addressing the issue of diversity, Brayboy (2003) suggested, “to advance the agenda of diversity, institutions ... must move toward considering ‘wholesale’ changes in their underlying structures and day-to-day activities ... to refocusing the historical legacies of institutional and societal racism that pervades colleges and universities” (p. 74). It is apparent from the literature that there is a need for change in the historical mindset of “business as usual” and merely operating on “status quo,” which appears to encompass the institutional culture at most American colleges and universities, by and large due to the hierarchy of representatives that continue to serve as the “gate keepers” and “shot callers” responsible for the admissions of La Raza students and the recruitment and retention of La Raza faculty. The next section will examine recruitment proceedings and issues on behalf of prospective faculty of color in higher education.

Faculty Recruitment

The premise of recruitment is dependent on institutions of higher education identifying the need for hiring particularly faculty of color to enhance the overall learning environment for all students, but especially for students of color, which are the true stakeholders of the institution. According to a research brief, *The American College Teacher: National Norms for the 2007–08 Survey*, DeAngelo et al. (2009) concluded that, similar to the 2004–2005 Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) Faculty Survey, the majority of faculty (93.6%) “believed that a racially/ethnically diverse student body enhances the educational experiences of all students,” and a “majority of the faculty (73.2%) believe that strides still need to be made by their institutions to hire more faculty

of color” (pp. 2–3). Tierney and Sallee (2008) proposed that the challenge in recruiting faculty of color is often within the “pipeline problem,” which means that limited numbers of minorities are graduating from doctoral programs, thus recruiting faculty of color is limited (p. 161). Correspondingly, Quezada and Louque (2004) argued that “leaks in the pipeline complicate recruitment of faculty of color ... therefore the problem was one of supply, and the solution is to increase the number of doctoral recipients of color” (p. 3). According to Moody (2004), “if recruiting is to be successful, it has to occur all the time, not just when an actual job vacancy is at hand and job announcements are distributed” (p. 92).

In addition to the challenges in recruitment, Tierney and Sallee (2008) suggested that departments differ in their need to recruit faculty of color, and the determining factor is often related to “curriculum” and a need to “teach particular courses” (p. 161). On the other hand, Verdugo (1995) asserted that the stigma associated with the presence of Latino faculty in higher education is related to affirmative action policy, rather than their academic accomplishments. To further examine the probable reasons related to the limited number of faculty of color, the next section will address circulated myths utilized by various colleges and universities to postpone diversifying their departments and institutions.

Smith, D. G. (2000) addressed the myths impeding colleges and universities from diversifying their faculties. In an attempt to debunk sustaining myths or excuses by academia to hire faculty of color, the author conducted a study of 299 former Ph.D. recipients of the prestigious Ford, Mellon, and Spencer Fellowships between the years of 1989 to 1995. The ethnic demographic of the scholars consisted of African American

(26%), Asian/Pacific (4%), European Americans (35%), Latinos (32%), and Native Americans (3%). The majority of the participants received their doctorates from research institutions and Ivy League schools, and a majority of the participants (70%) held faculty appointments. Prevalent myths and realities emerging from the study included the following:

1. Myth: The scarcity of faculty of color in the pipeline means that many institutions must compete against one another to seek out and hire minority candidates.

- Reality: Only 11% of the participants of color were recruited for faculty positions, 3% being Puerto Rican. One participant, a Latina, commented, “I would say that I find it a little surprising that I do not regularly get phone calls with regard to recruitment. We are so few, it’s amazing that most universities will say [they] can’t find anybody, yet persons like myself are not recruited. I think I should be getting phone calls and I don’t get phone calls.” An African-American women reported on efforts at her institution to hire persons of color: “Out of eleven faculty hires, there was one person of color ... One of the excuses is that black people won’t come here ... I have been lucky personally, but the notion that it is easy to get a job if you are a person of color is not true.”

2. Myth: The scarcity of faculty of color in the sciences means that those who are available are in high demand.

- Reality: Most of the scientists in our sample, all of whom were persons of color, were pursuing postdoctoral study. Only 16% held a faculty position and none of the postdoctoral scholars were sought out by colleges or universities. After spending four years in postdoctoral positions, one Chicano astrophysicist took a job in industry after unsuccessful academic searches. A Latino geophysicist additionally pursued employment in industry after receiving no academic offers. He commented, “I thought that everything was based on merit. From what I have seen, compared to business, academia is more politically driven, especially in hires and funding. It’s a much more competitive and dog-eat-dog world than I ever imagined.”

3. Myth: Faculty of color are leaving academia altogether for more lucrative positions in government and industry.

- Reality: Most of the scientists in our sample who took nonacademic posts discussed the need to establish a career before age 40; they did not want to continue with multiple post-docs. Others spoke of inhumane search processes that left them feeling unappreciated. Still others note the difficult job market. Thus the

decision to leave academia often reflected problems in academia, not irresistible temptations outside.

4. Myth: The kind of scholars represented in this study, both because of their competitive positioning in the market and their elite education, consider only prestigious institutions in their job searches, making it virtually impossible for other institutions to recruit them.

- Reality: The participants in our study expressed interest in different positions, regions, and institutional types. Limited mobility explained some but not all of these preferences. The candidates based their choices on the environment in which they wished to live, a desire to teach a diverse student body, an interest in institutions with missions related to their professional goals, or other factors. Some participants regretted not having been recruited by a regional institution with which they had some affinity.

5. Myth: Wealth and prestigious institutions draw established faculty of color away from non-elite institutions with fewer resources, creating a revolving door that limits progress for any single institution in diversifying its faculty.

- Reality: Outside offers do lure some faculty members away from their institutions. But most of our participants indicated an unwillingness to move frequently solely because of monetary incentives, especially difficult for participants with families. The participants who had moved did so because of dual-career choices, questions of fit or unresolved problems with their institutions, such as having to deal with multiple demands as a result of being one of just a few faculty of color in a department or an institution. A Chicano participant said, for many faculty, the institution was a revolving door, not only because you get recruited, but also because of issues. It is a battlefield; you are constantly struggling.

6. Myth: Campuses focus so heavily on diversifying the faculty that heterosexual white men have no chance.

- Reality: The white male and female participants in the study allowed us to address this argument. Most of the European American men in the study were highly successful, especially those who had expertise in diversity issues. The few white participants experiencing difficulty securing faculty appointment specialized in fields having virtually no openings. The pattern for white women was similar. White faculty members in the study reported they had not been hurt by affirmative action and suggested that efforts to diversify faculty at their institutions could have gone further. One white woman in a faculty position at an elite liberal arts colleges stated, "When I look at whom we hired, of the twelve jobs available, we hired one minority and we got special funding for her." A white male professor of classics said, "A lot of people in my demographic group talk about the lost-white-male syndrome and say that all the jobs are going to women. I really don't think that is true. The field is still largely dominated by white men."

The inherent bias in the field is so strong that others are not taken as seriously from the interview stage onward. Similarly, a white male faculty member in art history reported, “There is a lot of talk about diversifying, but when push comes to shove, there is still a lot of white males, and I am a white male” (Smith, 2000, pp. 48–49).

To better understand the primary issues of concern that continue to exist for people of color in higher education, as well as strategies that can be implemented by administrators, Jackson (2008) highlighted six themes from the literature used to characterize the faculty of color experience:

1. *Lack of support*—is associated with the organizational culture within institutions of higher education that continue to perpetuate an unequal opportunity for faculty of color, especially in relation to low retention rates. Commonly cited areas for lack of support include (a) not receiving adequate financial support; (b) being subjected to differential evaluation; (c) qualitative review processes; (d) undue regulation; (e) inappropriate questioning related to non-scholarly matter; and (f) receiving inadequate information.
2. *Revolving door syndrome*—refers to the issue of retaining faculty of color at institutions of higher education. Issues relative to retaining faculty of color, such as discrimination and racism, can be alleviated by administrators within academic departments and/or institutional departments allotted the responsibility for corrective action.
3. *Tokenism*—perpetuates a negative effect for many faculty of color as they strive to continually prove themselves to convince skeptical non-minority colleagues that faculty of color are creditable scholars and researchers. Tokenism also contributes to a feeling of isolation for many faculty of color, often by being the “one” in the department. It is common for tokenism to manifest itself in a myriad of forms (e.g., committee overload, marginality, and professional isolation).
4. *Typecasting syndrome*—is the mindset that faculty of color can be better suited to conduct research or teach courses about ethnic minorities, discrimination, racism, and diversity issues. Conversely, faculty of color may prefer alternative areas of research and teaching due to a preconceived notion that ethnic-related research and teaching are not valued or viewed as scholarly contributions by their department, especially by their non-minority colleagues.
5. *One minority per pot*—is the unwritten quota system in which departments hire one minority per department, a condition formerly viewed as the “no

minorities allowed rule,” which was enforced usually through violence. The sixth theme, the “brown-on-brown” taboo, implies that research interests of many faculty of color focus on their ethnicity and other persons of color; consequently, this type of research interest is considered by white colleagues as unimportant and not valid. Ironically “white-on-white” research is considered legitimate; at the same time, many white social scientists establish their professional careers as experts on minority issues.

6. “*Brown-on-brown*” taboo—implies that research interests of many faculty of color focus on their ethnicity and other persons of color. White colleagues often see research by faculty of color on people of color as unimportant and not valid. It is ironic that “white-on-white” research is afforded legitimacy, but “brown-on-brown” research is questionable and challenged at the same time that white social scientists are establishing their professional careers as experts on minority issues. The quality of research by faculty of color is also challenged when it is published on diversity issues in ethnic-specific journals. This fact supports the contention that faculty of color have not only undergone the rigors of tenure and promotion, but also deal with racism on many different levels (Jackson, 2008, pp. 1013–1015).

Verdugo (1995) further argued that obstacles encountered by Hispanic faculty in higher education “are rooted in the racial prejudices and attitudes held by other faculty and school administrators” (p. 672). As the literature has established, various challenges and obstacles related to presence and advancement in higher education have been acknowledged by faculty of color. Two additional obstacles cited by Garza (1988, as cited in Verdugo, 1995) included “the ‘barrioization’ of Hispanic faculty in departments that are not taken seriously by other faculty and administrators, and the perceptions by other faculty that Hispanic faculty lack skills as scholars” (p. 672).

Recruiting Foreign-Born Faculty versus Native-Born Faculty

Another issue attributed to the recruitment of La Raza faculty is related to the practice of colleges and universities hiring foreign-born La Raza faculty in lieu of native-born La Raza faculty. Verdugo (2003, cited in Castellanos & Jones, 2003) argued there

are two issues associated with the validity of reported numbers of Hispanic faculty in higher education. First, colleges and universities use Spanish surnames to identify faculty who are evidently not Hispanic, which produces an overestimate of actual Hispanic faculty. Second, colleges and universities recruit and hire foreign-born Hispanic faculty in lieu of U.S.-born Hispanics. Verdugo (2003, as cited in Castellanos & Jones, 2003) argued this is an “egregious practice” for two reasons:

1. It assumes that competent U.S.-born Hispanics who are potential faculty members are rare; and
2. It is invalid to include foreign-born Hispanics in aggregate data (they are currently so included) because it does not adequately characterize race-based inequality in higher education (p. 245).

Sustaining the aforementioned argument, Moody (2004) agreed that the practice of colleges and universities of hiring international faculty to diversify their departments “is not a substitute for hiring domestic African-American, Hispanic-American, and Native American faculty ... and to truly reflect American society in higher education ... we must recruit and retain our own native-born scholars whose families have been in this country for decades and centuries” (p. 95). Even though foreign-born scholars may provide a global component to the institution of higher education, the hiring of foreign-born scholars presents a disservice to native-born scholars seeking careers in academia because this practice conveys the message that foreign-born scholars are more qualified to fill faculty positions in higher education than native-born scholars. Delgado et al. (2007) reported that statistics on Latino/a faculty “do not currently reflect national origin or ethnicity; therefore, it is difficult to accurately estimate Chicano/a faculty representation in higher education ... although it is estimated that 49% of Latino/a faculty are immigrants” (p. 41).

Tokenism

According to McKinley and Brayboy (2003), the term *token hire* refers to “a sole faculty member of color in a department that has had other opportunities to hire or retain faculty of color but has failed to act on the opportunity” (p. 80). Token hires are “representatives of the ‘colored’ view, serving as the conscience of the department” (McKinley & Brayboy, 2003, p. 80) and “often become ‘problem fixers’ in their department regarding issues of race and diversity” (p. 81). Teaching diversity courses frequently becomes an expectation of faculty of color. These courses are often considered unnecessary and minimized by non-minority faculty members (p. 82). In an interview conducted by McKinley and Brayboy (2003), one Latino faculty member provided the following comments:

You sit in these classes and listen to the students talk about “the Mexican” and what they are taking, how they commit crimes, and ruin our society, but students never realize that they are talking about me. Somehow, they don’t see me as a “problem” in the way that they might see my brothers as problems (p. 84).

Beutel and Nelson (2006) argued that the paucity of women and faculty of color has the potential to cause tokenism, which frequently causes these individuals to be “treated as representatives or symbols of their entire racial/ethnic group,” rather than being valued for their own individualism ... and a method to “prevent tokenism is the presence of a gender or race-ethnicity ‘critical mass’ of at least 15% within the larger group” (p. 111).

In addition, levels of job satisfaction also differ between men and women (August & Waltman, 2004). Therefore, administrators must remain conscientious when implementing recruitment and retention strategies in relation to gender differences for faculty of color when considering satisfaction and/or attrition.

Faculty Retention

Job Satisfaction

Recruiting faculty of color is merely a portion of the process toward diversification in higher education. Several studies have examined job satisfaction of faculty of color at four-year colleges and universities (Ali, 2009; Ambrose, Huston, & Norman, 2005; August & Waltman, 2004; Hagdorn & Sax, 2004; Johnsrud & Rosser, 2002; Ponjuan, 2005; Reybold, 2005; Rosser, 2004, 2005; Sabharwal, & Corley; 2009). For the purposes of this study, “job satisfaction can be defined as the positive emotional feeling resulting from attaining what one wants or values from a job” (Ali, 2009, p. 289).

Apparent in previous studies is an increasing necessity for colleges and universities to examine faculty job satisfaction, especially if these institutions truly aspire to diversify faculty membership by retaining faculty of color to proportionately reflect the diverse population of America, and more importantly, the diverse student population on campus. The purpose of this section is to provide an overview of the prevailing issues contributing to job satisfaction among faculty of color: institution/work climate, mentors/role models, collegiality, and tenure/promotion. Each subsection will subsequently address literature specifically related to job satisfaction among La Raza faculty in higher education.

Ali (2009) investigated the job satisfaction characteristics of faculty from five different races (Hispanic white or Hispanic black; African American; Asian or Pacific Islander; American Indian/Alaska Native; and white non-Hispanic) in higher education by utilizing secondary data from the 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF). Applying Herzberg’s job satisfaction theory to examine faculty job

satisfaction, this two-factor theory suggested that “faculty may experience both job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction at the same time” (Ali, 2009, p. 290). To conduct this study, Ali used “intrinsic job satisfaction variables (achievement, recognition, work itself, advancement, responsibility, and reward) and extrinsic job satisfaction variables (policy, work climate or condition, and benefits)” (pp. 290–291) to examine faculty job satisfaction. Findings indicated that faculty of different races were dissatisfied with their workload, which focused primarily on undergraduate teaching rather than other scholarly pursuits. Rank of full professor was prevalent among white faculty, whereas African-American and Hispanic faculty retained the lowest percentage among rank of full professors. In addition, 90% of faculty of all races indicated satisfaction with their academic career and would again choose a career in academia. A majority of faculty were satisfied with salary and benefits (Ali, 2009).

Marston and Brunetti (2009) conducted a study with experienced professors teaching in higher education for at least 15 years, to examine the level, sources, and nature of career satisfaction using “The Experienced Teacher Survey” at a small liberal arts college located on the West Coast of the United States (p. 323). The survey was distributed to 170 tenure-track professors, with a return rate of 74 (43.5%). Twenty-five professors teaching in higher education for at least 15 years were selected for interviews from four schools of the college: liberal arts, sciences, economics and business administration, and education. Findings of the study identified “professional satisfaction factors (e.g., working with students and seeing them learn, joy in teaching one’s subject, and freedom and flexibility in the classroom),” scholarship, and relations with colleagues as prevalent motivators to remain in the profession (p. 335). Service to the institution,

salary and benefits, summer breaks (p. 335), and having a good administrator (p. 338) were rated lowest among factors of satisfaction and/or to remain in the profession.

Ambrose et al. (2005) argued that the process of turnover and the recruitment of new faculty are costly; therefore, to study faculty retention, Ambrose et al. collected detailed personal narratives from faculty by utilizing the principal strengths of qualitative research identified by Maxwell for its capacity to examine the following:

1. The *meaning* for participants (in this case, faculty members) of the events, situations, and actions in which they are involved;
2. The particular *context* within which participants act and how the context influences their actions;
3. The *unanticipated* phenomenon and influences that emerge spontaneously in open-ended interviews in ways they cannot in structured surveys;
4. The *process* by which events and actions take place; and
5. Complex *casual* relationships, the varying and interacting causes of faculty satisfaction (p. 807).

Conducting a qualitative study at a small private research university over a period of two years (2002–2003), Ambrose et al. (2005) interviewed 123 current and former faculty members (tenured and tenure-track) to investigate reasons for satisfaction and dissatisfaction and to remain at or leave their institution. The authors' adaption of Matier's work was utilized to establish a framework for predicting faculty decisions to leave an institution. As a result, the following seven general categories were identified as sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction: "salaries, collegiality, mentoring, reappointment, the promotion and tenure process, and department heads" (p. 811). The other two categories "involved regional issues and the university's interdisciplinary focus" (p. 811).

Campus Climate

The campus climate in higher education is the source of conflicting issues for many faculty, although implications for faculty of color have been and continue to be additionally troublesome. Harvey (1991, as cited in Leon & Nevarez, 2006) described the campus climate as one of “culture, habits, decisions, practices, and policies that make up campus life” (p. 128). According to Turner and Myers (2000), faculty of color described their work environment as “one fostering feelings and experiences of exclusion, isolation, alienation, and devaluation,” all of which are experiences that decrease levels of job satisfaction due to an “unwelcoming environment” (p. 83). In addition to these institutional/work climate issues, Torres, J. et al. (2004) concluded that “racism or perceived racism” served as a barrier for many faculty of color, but particularly for Latino faculty. Therefore, issues pertaining to “race or perceived racism” remain at the premise of the problem perpetuating challenges of foreseen obstacles toward job satisfaction for faculty of color, but especially for La Raza faculty with aspirations of a career in academia.

To address the aforementioned issues in the campus climate, hiring more faculty of color within a department may provide a strategy to diminish feelings of exclusion and devaluation, among many other negative feelings experienced by La Raza faculty. To support this notion, Strunk and Robinson (2006) argued increasing the diversity among faculty can be helpful because “teachers will be more likely to remain employed in a college or university where there are relatively more faculty members of their own race” (p. 80). Another strategy for hiring faculty of color proposed by Moody (2004) is “cluster hiring” because it “will prevent the solo phenomenon” and project the idea that the

institution is making a conscious effort to decrease obstacles often encountered by faculty of color such as isolation (p. 102).

In the article, “Women and Minority Faculty in the Academic Workplace: Recruitment, Retention, and Academic Culture,” Aguirre (2000) proposed that institutions of higher education have progressed in their efforts to diversify faculty presence by recruitment, so a greater need to understand socialization among women and minority faculty in the workplace is needed. DeAngelo et al. (2009) emphasized the importance of institutional climate and diversity of race, ethnicity, and gender at colleges and universities. Their findings concluded that job satisfaction was reported higher for male faculty than female faculty. Among full professors “very satisfied with their salaries, 47.2 % of women at public institutions were more likely to consider leaving in the past two years than 20.2% of men at public institutions, 21.0% of men at private institutions, and 21.5 % of women at private institutions” (p. 3). Ponjuan (2005) suggested that tenured faculty below the rank of full professor were less satisfied and Latino faculty were more likely to leave academia than white faculty due to overall job duties and perceiving an unfair institutional climate for faculties of color.

Mentors

The presence of mentors in higher education provides guidance to junior faculty, especially in relation to maneuvering the pathway toward tenure and promotion. Quezada and Louque (2004) asserted that there is “minimal support in the form of mentoring for junior faculty of color after they have been hired, in turn, impairing their odds for success in the tenure process” (p. 4). Leon and Navarez (2006) referenced a prior study conducted by Reyes and Halcon in 1998 proposing that “Chicano faculty, like other faculty of color,

develop strategies to cope with hostile institutions of higher education” (p. 3). Verdugo (1995) suggested that “the presence of Hispanics in positions of status and power serves as a role model on campus for students and other faculty of color (p. 669). In addition, Leon and Navarez (2006) argued that “mentoring newer faculty can increase the number and retention of Latino faculty by providing a successful academic environment” (p. 3)

Offering La Raza students visibility and access to La Raza faculty may increase academic achievement and decrease feelings of isolation. In a literature review of prior interviews conducted to examine the experiences of faculty of color in higher education, Turner (2003) proposed that “mentoring is an important intervention that minority faculty use towards succeeding in higher education” (p. 119). Unfortunately, not all colleges and universities offer a formal mentoring program within their departments, so mentoring then becomes the sole responsibility of the faculty of color.

Collegiality

The notion of collegiality is the interconnectedness faculty members encompass as scholars in higher education, although this notion often persists as an obstacle for faculty of color, especially for La Raza faculty. Prior studies have argued that the presence or absence of collegiality contributes to the retention of new faculty (Ambrose et al., 2005; Quezada, & Louque, 2004; Zhou & Volkwein, 2004). Rather than experiencing collegiality, many faculty of color feel isolated and identify racial and ethnic bias as a major challenge in the academic workplace (Turner, Myers & Creswell, 1999). In addition to the aforementioned obstacles, Rosser (2004) addressed the issue of professional development as a factor contributing to new faculty’s decision to remain in academia:

Providing adequate funding to support faculty members' professional activities and development can be equally important to their retention ... [this] often includes travel support to attend research meetings or professional development seminars ... and provision of funds to participate in those efforts that enable faculty members to maintain a current and relevant research agenda in their area of expertise. Faculty members thrive on the intellectual and collegial stimulation from their peers when they attend professional activities and national research meetings (p. 287).

In addition, Quezada and Louque (2004) implied that the term "*collegiality* can be a code word for favoring candidates with backgrounds and political and social perspectives similar to one's own," in turn, sustaining a trend of "hiring people who look like the majority of the faculty who are already there" (p. 3). Until this trend is quashed, La Raza faculty will continue to experience unwelcoming and unsupportive work environments, rather than collegiality or even acceptance. In a study conducted by Hagedorn circa 1996 (as cited in Martson & Brunetti, 2009), he posed the question, "What makes you most satisfied or most dissatisfied with your job pertaining to the social aspects of the profession?, the most common and consistent response was colleague relationships," which he argued "may be even more important for college faculty because unlike many other professions, the competence of colleagues has personal implications" (p. 337). As addressed earlier in this review, the absence of collegiality can perpetuate feelings of exclusion and devaluation for La Raza faculty, especially if they are the sole faculty of color within a department.

Tenure and Promotion

The achievement of tenure is considered the pinnacle of higher education for those in pursuit of this quest. Nevertheless, this is a pinnacle rarely achieved by La Raza faculty, apparent in disproportionate numbers as faculty members at colleges and universities nationwide. According to the November 2010 "Employees of Postsecondary

Institutions” report from the National Center for Educational Statistics, 5% of African-American and 4% of Hispanic professors were tenured at degree-granting institutions (Knapp et al., 2010). This is a phenomenon that warrants increased attention by administrators in higher education responsible for assessing and implementing strategies toward retention and promotion of faculty of color, especially considering that La Raza are currently the largest Hispanic subpopulation in the United States and will eventually occupy more colleges and universities nationwide.

Jackson (2008) noted that faculty evaluations in higher education are “used for contract renewal for new faculty, tenure decisions, promotion in rank (i.e., assistant, associate, and full professor), and merit pay” (p. 1008). Critical to job satisfaction, faculty of color are less likely to be tenured and often occupy lower academic ranks than their white coworkers. Racism and prejudice, as well as experiencing feelings of isolation, also negatively affect the level of job satisfaction for faculty of color (Brewer & McMahan-Landers, 2003). Guanipa, Santa-Cruz, and Chao (2003) argued that some universities are failing in the area of faculty diversity, especially for Hispanic faculty seeking tenure and promotion at U.S. colleges and universities.

Quezada and Louque (2004) argued that “sometimes the criteria for promotion and tenure has subtle discrimination built into it” and for those faculty of color pursuing service-oriented assignments, “they are the only voices supporting issues of diversity, social justice, and equity in community forums and school board meetings” (p. 4). Cooper and Stevens (2002) suggested that minority faculty often feel “unwelcome, unappreciated and unwanted” while continually attempting “to prove that they deserve their positions” (p. 6). Cooper and Stevens argued that the presence of both structural and

personal barriers to academic success is reflective of tenure and promotion. The authors provided the following list as potential barriers for minority faculty:

- Minority faculty continue to be underrepresented in academia, holding a higher percentage of part-time and non-tenure track positions;
- Minority faculty remain disproportionately located in less prestigious community and four-year colleges;
- In the face of discrimination, minority faculty tend to leave the academy before they obtain tenure in significantly larger numbers;
- Research on minority-related topics is attacked as nonacademic or inappropriate because of a focus on social change and minority issues;
- Minority faculty hold more split or joint appointments, which can serve as a barrier during the tenure review process;
- Minority faculty often feel isolated, lack mentors, experience higher rates of occupational stress, and have to deal with institutional sexism and racism;
- Teaching is undervalued if it involves minority-related subjects or courses;
- When minorities are hired, they may face disproportionate advising and services loads because they are often the only minorities in a department;
- Minority faculty tends to spend more time on teaching and service, leaving them vulnerable to attack at the point of tenure and promotion (pp. 6–8).

In conclusion, “minority faculty continue to be perceived as the ‘other’ and suffer from institutionalized racist attitudes that perceive their difference as inferior according to dominant white Western values and norms” (Cooper & Stevens, 2002, p. 7).

According to Springer (2004), institutions of higher education typically expect faculty to focus on teaching and research, rather than service, which is often valued the least when evaluated for tenure. Nevertheless, minority faculty often encounter disproportionate advising and service responsibilities because they are often the only faculty of color in their department. Aguirre (2000) argued, “Due to often being the only

‘one’ in their academic department or college, women and minority faculty often perform more service activities (e.g., advising or serving on committees) ... than white male faculty” (p. 70). Further examining traditional academic roles of faculty in higher education, Rosser (2004) specifically addressed the aspect of service by reporting:

There is no other aspect of academic work than the service and committee work component that can draw the life and time away from a faculty member. Although it is critically important to serve all aspects of academic life, the amount of time allocated to service and committee work can have positive and negative implications on faculty members’ work, satisfaction, and whether they pursue other career alternatives, particularly for women and ethnic minorities (p. 302).

At times, faculties of color are penalized for contributing too much time to service when evaluated for tenure (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995). Examining differences relative to the tenure and promotion process among public and private institutions of higher education is somewhat difficult due to the scarcity of literature available on this process at private institutions, particularly Catholic institutions of higher education. Conversely, in a qualitative study of 16 faculty of color at a private research university, Baez (2000) argued that “the construct of ‘service’ ... may set the stage for a critical agency that resists and redefines academic structures that hinder faculty success ... and ... faculty of color ... may engage in service to promote the success of racial minorities in the academy and elsewhere” (p. 363).

As a method to counter the negative implication of service and committee work, Mooney and Reder (2007) proposed an alternative type of faculty service: “Creating model programs that include and draw on the experiences of senior faculty to support mid-career faculty is one area where small colleges can make significant contributions” (pp. 168–169). This type of program suggested a type of mentoring component

performed by distinguished faculty to assist mid-career faculty in navigating through the professoriate, an especially needed component to assisting toward tenure and promotion.

There appears to be a simultaneous conflict experienced by faculty of color in higher education. Foremost, faculty of color are encouraged to pursue service-oriented assignments, participate in race/ethnic-related committees, and teach ethnic courses, because white faculty are reluctant to do the same type of work and white administrators pressure faculty of color into service assignments. On the other hand, due to the belief that service assignment work is valued less than teaching (certain types of courses) and research (publishing in certain types of journals), especially in the evaluation process toward promotion and tenure, it appears that faculty of color are deliberately being set up to fail. This practice appears to validate the sentiments thus far expressed throughout the literature review of prior research studies—feeling unwelcome, unappreciated, and unwanted. Perhaps departments hire one or a few faculty members to serve a hidden agenda, to procure an environment of isolation. If the preference of some faculty of color is the pursuit of service-oriented assignments or race-related service, perhaps the faculty of color can inquire upon their search for employment which particular colleges or universities merit service work. This method may bring about a better fit for both faculty of color and institution.

Critical Race Theory (CRT)

CRT began in the mid-1970s with the work of Derrick Bell and Alan Freeman as an outgrowth from the field of critical legal studies to include race as an element to critique mainstream legal ideology (Ladson-Billings, 1998). At the core, CRT is utilized to enhance the awareness of sustained racism with the purpose of eradicating racism and

additional forms of subordination, which include gender, class, immigration status, and sexual orientation (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002).

CRT “focuses on the racialized, gendered, and classed experiences of communities of color and offers a liberatory and transformative method for examining racial/ethnic, gender and class discrimination” (Solórzano et al., 2000, p. 63). CRT is based on five prominent tenets: (a) counter-storytelling, (b) the permanence of racism, (c) whiteness as property, (d) interest convergence, and (e) the critique of liberalism (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004, p. 27). According to Yosso and Solórzano (2005), the five tenants of CRT can serve as “a guiding lens to inform researchers in the process of conducting studies with people of color, and can be further utilized to address research questions, teaching approaches, and our policy recommendations regarding social inequality” (p. 127). In addition, “using CRT as an analytical lens helps us approach research with a critical eye to identify, analyze, and challenge distorted notions of people of color as we build on the cultural wealth already present in these communities” (Yosso & Solórzano, 2005, p. 127).

To assist with understanding the context of racism, Audre Lorde (1992, as cited in Solórzano & Yosso, 2002) defined *racism* as “the belief in the inherent superiority of one race over all others and thereby the right to dominance” (p. 24). Another definition of *racism* proposed by Marble (1992, as cited in Solórzano & Yosso, 2002) “defined racism as ‘a system of ignorance, exploitation, and power’ used to oppress African Americans, Latinos, Asians, Pacific Americans, American Indians, and other people on the basis of ethnicity, culture, mannerisms, and color” (p. 24). Solórzano and Yosso (2002) noted that Manning “Marble’s definition of *racism* is important because it shifts the discussion of

race and racism from a black-white discourse to one that includes multiple faces, voices, and experiences” (p. 24) and embedded in these definitions of *racism* are at least three important points: “(1) one group deems itself superior to all others, (2) the group that is superior has the power to carry out the racist behavior, and (3) racism benefits the superior group while it negatively impacts the subordinate racial/ethnic groups” (p. 24). As suggested by Solórzano & Yosso (2002), “Lorde’s and Marable’s definitions posited that racism is about institutional power ... a form of power that people of color in the United States have never possessed” (p. 24).

Critical Race Theory in Education

The application of CRT was first introduced to the field of education by Ladson-Billings and Tate in 1995 as a response to the 1991 findings of Kozol’s book, *Savage Inequalities*, which “delineated the great inequalities that exist between the schooling experiences of white middle-class students and those of poor African-American and Latino students” (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995, p. 47). Other scholars instrumental in the work of Ladson-Billings and Tate were both Woodson and Du Bois for their “use of race as a theoretical lens for assessing social inequality” (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995, p. 50). “To theorize race and use it as an analytical tool for understanding school inequality (p. 48),” Ladson-Billings and Tate put forward the following three central propositions to understand race and property:

1. Race continues to be a significant factor in determining inequality in the United States.
2. U.S. society is based on property rights.
3. The intersection of race and property creates an analytical tool with which we can understand social (and consequently, school) inequality (p. 48).

As the issue of race remains a restraining obstacle towards the quest for equality, “thinking of race strictly as an ideological construct denies the reality of a racialized society and its impact on ‘raced’ people in their everyday lives;” conversely, “thinking of race solely as an objective condition denies the problematic aspect of race—how do we decide who fits into which racial classifications?” (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995, pp. 48–49). Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995) argued that “race can be used as a tool for explaining social inequality, although the intellectual salience of this theorizing has not been systematically employed in the analysis of educational inequality” (p. 50).

According to Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995), “the ability to define, possess, and own property has been a central feature of power in America” while “in the simplest equations, those with ‘better’ property are entitled to ‘better’ schools” (pp. 53–54). Another property difference is represented by school curriculum as a form of “intellectual property” because “quality and quantity of the curriculum varies with the property values of the school” (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995, p. 54).

The intersection of race and property postulates the idea that being white is considered a form of property in the context of education. Referencing the work of legal scholar, Harris in 1993, “property functions of whiteness” include “1) rights of disposition; 2) rights to use and enjoyment; 3) reputation and status property; and 4) the absolute right to exclude” (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995, p. 59). For example, “when students are rewarded only for conformity to perceived ‘white norms’ or sanctioned for cultural practices (e.g., dress, speech patterns, unauthorized conceptions of knowledge), white property is being rendered alienable” (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995, p. 59).

According to Solórzano (1998), critical race theory in education “challenges the dominant discourse on race and racism by examining how educational theory, policy, and practice are used to subordinate certain racial and ethnic groups” (p. 122). Five themes form the basic perspectives, research methods, and pedagogy of CRT in education: “(a) centrality and intersection of race and racism, (b) challenge to dominate ideology, (c) commitment to social justice, (d) centrality of experiential knowledge, and (e) interdisciplinary perspective” (Solórzano, 1998, p. 122).

Critical Race Theory Methodologies

Prevalent methodologies of CRT include “counter-storytelling, parables, narrative analysis, and a conceptualization of ‘majoritarian storytelling,’ or ‘master narrative,’ all aimed at coming to a better understanding of the role of race and racism in American life” (Love, 2004, p. 228). By utilizing the method of counter-storytelling, participants of color are allowed the opportunity to share their experiences by “voice” (Ladson-Billings, 1998, p. 14). According to Yosso and Solórzano (2005), critical race counter-stories can serve several pedagogical functions:

1. they can build community among those at the margins of society;
2. they can challenge the perceived wisdom of those at society’s center;
3. they can open new windows into the reality of those at the margins by showing the possibilities beyond the ones they live and by showing that they are not alone in their position;
4. they can teach others that by combining elements from both the story or the current reality, one can construct another world that is richer than either the story or the reality alone; and
5. they can provide a context to understand and transform established belief systems (p. 124).

Counter-storytelling is a technique used to “analyze the role of race and racism through the experiences of people of color” and is “both a method of telling the story of those experiences that have not been told and a tool for analyzing and challenging the stories of those in power and whose story is a natural part of the dominant discourse—the majoritarian story” (Yosso & Solórzano, 2005, p. 124). As proposed by Love (2004), the use of counter-storytelling serves several purposes:

1. It changes the form and content of research and conversations about events, situations, and societal participation.
2. It situates and centers race as a filter for the examination of prevailing stories and constructions of reality.
3. It can serve as a tool for exposing, analyzing, and challenging the majoritarian stories of racial privilege.
4. It can make the assumptions made by the dominant culture more visible and explicit and therefore available for examination.
5. It enables the discourse to move beyond the broad label of racism, which can cover a wide range of behaviors at the individual, system, institutional, and societal levels, to reveal specific experiences and circumstances that limit and subordinate.
6. It helps to undo ethnocentrism and unconsciously viewing the world in one way.
7. By listening to the counter-stories of people of color, white people can gain access to a view of the world denied to them by white privilege and white domination.
8. Telling their own story provides people of color psychic and emotional barriers against the damage caused by majoritarian stories.
9. Counter-storytelling provides a means for members of subordinate groups to address those circumstances where the prevailing conception of justice provides no language or means by which the marginalized person can express how he or she has been injured or wronged in terms that the system will understand (pp. 232–233).

Criticisms of Critical Race Theory

Critical race theory (CRT) has also encountered numerous criticisms in an effort to transform the existing paradigm of civil rights thought. Concerns have been raised by critics “questioning whether minority scholars of CRT have any particular claim to expertise simply by virtue of who they are” (Delgado and Stefancic, 2012, p. 99). In addition, critical race theorists have been accused of “radical multiculturalism” and of “hiding behind personal accounts and narratives to advance their points of view, as well as a lack of respect for truth and traditional notions of merit” (Delgado and Stefancic, 2012, pp. 101–102). To explore further into the criticisms of CRT, Delgado and Stefancic (2012) identified the following criticisms particular to storytelling, a tenet of CRT:

1. It is a distortion of public discourse ... because the stories may not be representative of the experiences of the groups of which they are members.
2. It stifles discussion and debate when the storyteller claims to be in a better position to understand the issues at hand because of his or her background.
3. Stories told may not be representative of the experiences of the groups of which they are members ... [alleging] stories are intentionally atypical because they seek to attract the attention and arouse the sympathy of the audience.
4. “Voice of color” seems to imply that critical race theorists have a deeper understanding of certain issues than their white counterparts do.
5. It accuses the movement of straying from its materialist roots and dwelling overly on matters of concern to middle-class minorities such as microaggression, racial insults, unconscious discrimination, and affirmative action in higher education.
6. It has become excessively preoccupied with issues of identity, as opposed to hard-nosed social analysis.
7. It lacks analytical rigor ... because the point of the story is open to interpretation, public debate can go in many directions (pp. 103–107).

The authors noted, considering the numerous criticisms of CRT, “the internal critiques go only to the movement’s emphasis and allocation of resources, and do not threaten its solidarity, vitality, or ability to generate vital insights into America’s racial predicament” (Delgado and Stefancic, 2012, p. 108).

Summary

It is apparent that our current American educational system has historically failed in its efforts to adequately educate the majority of minority students, most conspicuously among La Raza students, from one generation to the next generation and so on. Hence, change is imperative, but when, how, and by whom? Both public and private educational systems need to address the crisis in education. It is evident that a national strategic plan to educate all Americans, including Americans of color, is in the best interest of our nation, especially considering the fact that minority populations are growing at a rapid pace, which will in turn influence the future economic stability and status of America.

In addition, teachers and school administrators need to consistently encourage all students to attend college as far back as elementary school, thereby directing the students, and especially students of color, toward a pathway or pipeline to higher education attendance and success. As stated earlier in the literature review, the presence of teachers (K–12) or faculty (higher education) of color serves as inspiration and role models for students of color, thus providing these students with the notion that a profession as a teacher or college professor is an attainable goal.

Apparent in this literature review, numerous research studies and scholarly articles have thoroughly addressed the scarcity of faculty of color and obstacles they encounter in the public sector of higher education. Equally important as the scarcity of La

Raza faculty employed at Catholic institutions of higher education is the scarcity of literature that exists concerning La Raza faculty, specifically Mexican Americans, which represent both the largest and least educated Hispanic sub-group in the United States. Traditionally, the mission of Catholic education generally includes access, moral teaching, social justice, and diversity. There is a long tradition of upholding the value of racial/ethnic diversity in Catholic schools.

Profile reviews of numerous American Catholic colleges and universities have revealed a commonality of a racially and ethnically diverse faculty membership among their departments and institutions at large. However, I would hypothesize that many of the identified Hispanic faculty members are foreign born as suggested in this literature review (Moody, 2004; Verdugo, 2003). Colleges and universities, particularly Catholic colleges and universities, emphasize a “global perspective,” which is evident in their faculty and mission. I understand the importance of offering students an education that includes a global perspective, rather than one limited to the perspective of just the United States, though I fail to see the equity correlated with diversity by employing numerous foreign-born faculty of color, but less native-born faculty of color, who can offer perspectives other than that of the dominant culture in the United States. Employing more native-born people of color as faculty will deepen and broaden the students’ perspectives as they will be exposed to counter-narratives of the American experience. Considering the aforementioned literature review that has addressed and debunked prior myths concerning the deficiency of qualified scholars of color, particularly La Raza scholars, there is no excuse for the low representation of native-born people of color in higher education. There are growing numbers of native-born people of color who have obtained

doctorate degrees that are available and interested in the pursuit of careers in higher education, potentially Catholic higher education.

Despite extensive research on La Raza faculty in Catholic higher education, this researcher has found a scarcity of information on this Hispanic sub-group or any Hispanic group for that matter. Various Catholic colleges and universities have conducted internal research studies (e.g., job satisfaction, campus climate, etc.) reflecting perceptions and attitudes of various ethnic/racial groups, although studies relatable to faculty are usually unavailable to others outside of the institution. In addition, contacting numerous self-identified Hispanic and Latino scholars employed at Catholic colleges and universities nationwide in the fall of 2010, inquiring about this matter, I anticipated finding at least one publication addressing Hispanic or Latino faculty in higher education, but unfortunately found none. Therefore, it is imperative to pursue and thoroughly describe the shared phenomenon experienced by La Raza (Mexican American and Chicana/o) employed as tenured and tenure-track faculty in Catholic institutions of higher education, so that this information becomes known and forms the basis for changes in higher education, especially as it pertains to La Raza.

A brief history of critical race theory (CRT) was provided in the literature review to support the theoretical framework of this research. As stated earlier, CRT provides a complementary framework for communicating the experiences and realities of the oppressed (Ladson-Billings, 1998) by challenging traditional research paradigms and theories. Prevalent methodologies of CRT include “counter-storytelling, parables, narrative analysis, and a conceptualization of ‘majoritarian storytelling,’ or ‘master

narrative,' all aimed at coming to a better understanding of the role of race and racism in American life” (Love, 2004, p. 228).

As stated earlier, CRT has also encountered numerous criticisms in an effort to transform the existing paradigm of civil rights thought. Opponents of CRT have “questioned whether minority scholars of CRT have any particular claim to expertise simply by virtue of who they are” (Delgado and Stefancic, 2012, p. 99). In addition, opponents postulated that CRT, primarily storytelling, promotes a “lack of respect for truth and threatens notions of merit” (Delgado and Stefancic, 2012, p. 102), as well as “lacks analytical rigor because the point of the story is open to interpretation” (Delgado and Stefancic, 2012, p. 103).

Remaining attentive to the criticisms of CRT, as well as the benefits, this methodology can provide a counter-story paradigm by use of narratives to gain an in-depth understanding of the personal and professional lived experiences of self-identified native-born Mexican-American and Chicana/o tenured and tenure-track faculty employed at Catholic institutions of higher education. By utilizing the method of counter-storytelling through use of narratives, La Raza participants are given the opportunity to share experiences through their “voice” (Ladson-Billings, 1998, p. 14).

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Restatement of the Purpose

More important than the scarcity of literature is the scarcity of Hispanic and Latino faculty, specifically Mexican Americans and Chicana/os, employed at Catholic institutions of higher education. Therefore, it was imperative to explore and thoroughly describe a shared phenomenon experienced by these underrepresented ethnic minority faculty members. The purpose of this study was to explore the personal and professional lived experiences of the few self-identified native-born La Raza (Mexican-American and Chicana/o) tenured and tenure-track faculty members that have been successful in achieving the level of faculty membership at Catholic institutions of higher education, and to further explore their experiences as an underrepresented minority within academia. A qualitative narrative methodology was selected to gain an in-depth understanding of the lived experiences of this particular Hispanic sub-group of the professoriate through counter-storytelling, understanding racism, and understanding the tenets of critical race theory (CRT). To convey the research methodology and procedures of this study, I will thoroughly address the use of critical race methodology and counter-story narratives, the sampling procedures and settings, and the data collection and analysis methods.

Research Questions

To explore the personal and professional lived experiences of self-identified native-born La Raza (Mexican-American and Chicana/o) tenured and tenure-track faculty (assistant, associate, full professors) employed at Catholic institutions of higher education in California, the following research questions guided this study:

1. How do native-born Mexican-American/Chicana/o faculty perceive their personal lived experiences pertaining to their attendance and participation in the educational system in America?
2. How do native-born Mexican-American/Chicana/o faculty perceive their personal and professional lived experiences pertaining to their academic career paths and self-perceived supports and challenges in Catholic higher education?
3. How do native-born Mexican-American/Chicana/o faculty perceive their personal and professional lived experiences pertaining to their social and cultural climate and level of satisfaction in Catholic higher education?
4. What applicable recommendations do native-born Mexican-American/Chicana/o faculty have to assist a) Mexican-American/Chicana/o scholars in their pursuit of academic careers in Catholic higher education; b) current Mexican-American/Chicana/o faculty toward tenure and promotion; and c) academic administrators in their recruitment, promotion, and retention of Mexican-American/Chicana/o faculty in Catholic higher education?

Qualitative Research Design

According to Creswell (2007), introductory books on qualitative research frequently do not contain an easily located definition. However, the evolving definition by Denzin and Lincoln (2005, cited in Creswell, 2007) conveyed the ever-changing nature of qualitative inquiry as follows:

Qualitative research is a situated activity that locates the observer in the world. It consists of a set of interpretive material practices that make the world visible. These practices transform the world. They turn the world into a series of representations, including field notes, interviews, conversations, photographs,

recordings, and memos to the self. At this level, qualitative research involves an interpretive, naturalistic approach to the world. This means that qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomenon in terms of the meanings people bring to them (Creswell, 2007, p. 36).

Creswell (2007) identified five qualitative approaches to inquiry that include “narrative study, phenomenology, grounded theory, an ethnography, and case study” (p. 53). For the purpose of this research study, qualitative narrative inquiry was selected because “it begins with experiences as expressed in lived and told stories of individuals” and “is understood as a spoken or written text giving an account of an event/action or series of events/actions, chronologically connected” (Creswell, 2007, p. 54). There are various forms of narrative research conducted that primarily include “autobiographies, biographies, life histories, and oral histories” (Creswell, 2007, p. 55). The narrative form selected for this study was a combination of oral history with personal accounts to explore multiple episodes throughout the personal and professional lived experiences of La Raza faculty employed at California Catholic institutions of higher education.

Creswell and Plano Clark (2011) suggested “a theoretical perspective provides a framework for the need to gather qualitative and quantitative data” (p. 10). In accord with gathering qualitative data in this study and in order to embody a “voice” from the lived experiences of La Raza faculty, I incorporated critical race methodology. Adhering to the suggestion of Solórzano and Yosso (2002), “critical race methodology in education challenges white privilege, rejects notions of ‘neutral’ research or ‘objective’ researchers, and exposes deficit-informed research that silences and distorts epistemologies of people of color” (p. 26). Furthermore:

Critical race theory (CRT) recognizes that the experiential knowledge of people of color is legitimate, appropriate, and critical to understanding, analyzing, and

teaching about racial subordination. In fact, critical race theorists view this knowledge as a strength and draw explicitly on the lived experiences of people of color by including such methods as storytelling, family histories, biographies, scenarios, parables, *cuentos*, *testimonios*, chronicles, and narratives (Solórzano et al., 2000, p. 26).

CRT provides a complementary framework for communicating the experiences and realities of the oppressed (Ladson-Billings, 1998) by challenging traditional research paradigms and theories. CRT provided a counter-story paradigm to gain an in-depth understanding of the personal and professional lived experiences of self-identified native-born Mexican American and Chicana/o tenured and tenure-track faculty employed at Catholic institutions of higher education.

To present La Raza participants' counter-stories, I used a narrative research design to highlight situations of professional and institutional discrimination, as well as experiences of bias related to recruitment, collegiality, workloads, social and cultural climate, tenure, and promotion. To accurately conduct narrative research, Creswell (2008) provided several common characteristics shared in conducting narrative inquiry:

- Seeks to understand and represent experiences through the stories individual(s) live and tell;
- Seeks to minimize the use of literature and focus on the experience of the individual(s);
- Seeks to explore the meaning of the individual's experiences as told through a story or stories;
- Seeks to collect field texts that document the individual's story in his or her own words;
- Seeks to analyze the stories by retelling the individual's story;
- Seeks to analyze the stories by identifying themes or categories of information;
- Seeks to situate the story within its place and setting;

- Seeks to analyze the story for chronological information about the individual's past, present, and future;
- Seeks to collaborate with the participant when writing the research study;
- Seeks to write the study in a flexible storytelling mode; and
- Seeks to evaluate the study based on the depth, accuracy, persuasiveness, and realism of the account (p. 516).

Uniting the critical race tenet of counter-storytelling and a narrative research design allowed this researcher to increasingly ascertain and apprehend the lived experiences concerning a shared phenomenon of inequities from the perspective of La Raza faculty. Moreover, considering the scarcity of existing data on this phenomenon, the objective of this study was to compare the personal and professional lived experiences of La Raza faculty and then identify and extract commonalities useful in developing strategies toward successful careers in Catholic higher education.

Sample Procedure and Setting

To conduct this qualitative research study, the procedure of purposeful sampling was selected. Rather than selecting a great number of individuals or settings, purposeful sampling in qualitative research “identifies and recruits a small number that will provide in-depth information about the central phenomenon or concept being explored in the study” (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011, p. 174). According to Creswell (2007), the strategy of criterion sampling “works well when individuals studied represent people who have experienced the phenomenon” (p. 128). In addition, the purpose of criterion sampling is that “all cases meet some type of criterion useful for quality assurance” (Creswell, 2007, p 127) and to adequately study the experienced phenomenon, “the

process of collecting information involves primarily in-depth interviews with as many as 10 individuals” (p. 131).

Adhering to the aforementioned recommendations, the criterion sample consisted of eight faculty members, seven males and one female, selected based on the following criteria: (a) self-identified Mexican American or Chicana/o, (b) born in the United States, who (c) are currently employed full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty at the ranks of assistant, associate, and full professor at the four California Catholic institutions selected for this study. Participants were selected based on meeting the aforementioned criteria and were invited to provide their personal and professional lived experiences sought to address the purpose and research questions of this study.

The eight participants of mixed gender in this study were selected among self-identified native-born Mexican-American and Chicano/a full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty from the University of San Francisco, Santa Clara University, Loyola Marymount University, and the University of San Diego during the fall 2012 academic year. All four institutions are located in California. The University of San Francisco is located on a 50-acre setting between the Golden Gate Bridge and Golden Gate Park with a city population of approximately 812,826 inhabitants. Santa Clara University is situated in Santa Clara (118,263 population) adjacent to the city of San Jose in Santa Clara County at the southern part of the San Francisco Bay Area. Loyola Marymount is in the Westchester area of Los Angeles (3,819,702 population) and sits atop the bluffs overlooking Marina Del Rey and Playa Del Rey. The University of San Diego is located approximately two miles north of downtown San Diego (1,326,179 population), on the north crest of Mission Valley in the community of Linda Vista and is approximately 15

miles north of the United States border with Mexico. The following provides a brief description of each participating university's history, student and faculty population, and racial/ethnic demographics.

University of San Francisco

The University of San Francisco (USF) promotes learning in the Jesuit Catholic tradition. It was founded in 1855 by the Society of Jesus (Jesuits) and first accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) in 1950. The campus setting is considered large, and it participates in Title IV federal financial aid programs.

Undergraduate and graduate instruction is provided in five colleges: College of Arts and Sciences, School of Education, School of Law, School of Management, and the School of Nursing and Health Professions. Degrees awarded at the university range from baccalaureate degrees to doctorate degrees in research/scholarship and professional practice.

A total of 7,871 students were enrolled at USF as undergraduate (4,745) and graduate (3,126) students during the 2009–2010 academic year. The combined 12-month student population for 2010 by race/ethnicity represented white: $n = 4,136$; Asian/Pacific Islander: $n = 1,870$; African American/black: $n = 577$; and Hispanic: $n = 1,258$. In the fall of 2009, full-time faculty represented a total of 300 faculty (tenured: $n = 225$ and tenure-track: $n = 75$) employed at the institution that identified as white, Asian/Pacific Islander, African American/black, and Hispanic. Full-time faculty by race/ethnicity with tenure status for the academic year 2009–2010 is represented in Table 3.

Table 3

University of San Francisco Full-Time Faculty by Race/Ethnicity, and Tenure Status for Academic Year 2009–2010

Catholic institution	Tenured faculty				Tenure-track faculty				
	Race/ethnicity	White	Asian/Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic	White	Asian/Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic
University of San Francisco		183	15	13	14	50	13	5	7

Santa Clara University

Santa Clara University (SCU) is a private, not-for-profit four-year or above institution located in the Silicon Valley of California, in the city of Santa Clara. It was founded in 1851 by the Society of Jesus Order (Jesuits) and first accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges in 1949. The campus setting is considered midsize, and it participates in Title IV federal financial aid programs. Santa Clara University identifies as being the first Catholic institution of higher education in California. Undergraduate and graduate instruction is provided in six colleges: College of Arts & Sciences, Education and Counseling Psychology, Leavey School of Business, School of Engineering, Jesuit School of Theology, and the School of Law. Degrees awarded at the university range from baccalaureate degrees to doctorate degrees in research/scholarship and professional practice.

A total of 7,243 students were enrolled at SCU as undergraduate (4,249) and graduate (2,994) students during the 2009–2010 academic year. The combined 12-month student population for 2010 by race/ethnicity represented white: $n = 3,833$; Asian/Pacific

Islander: $n = 2,033$; African American/black: $n = 309$; and Hispanic: $n = 1,068$. In the fall of 2009, full-time faculty represented a total of 340 faculty (tenured: $n = 268$ and tenure-track: $n = 72$) employed at the institution that identified as white, Asian/Pacific Islander, African American/black, and Hispanic. Full-time faculty by race/ethnicity with tenure status for the academic year 2009–2010 is represented in Table 4.

Table 4

Santa Clara University Full-Time Faculty by Race/Ethnicity, and Tenure Status for Academic Year 2009–2010

Catholic institution	Tenured faculty				Tenure-track faculty			
	Race/ethnicity	White	Asian/Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic	White	Asian/Pacific Islander	Black
Santa Clara University	217	25	6	20	47	18	2	5

Loyola Marymount University

Loyola Marymount University (LMU) emphasizes the liberal arts in the educational traditions of the Society of Jesus (Jesuits) and the Religious of the Sacred Heart of Mary (Madams). LMU traces its founding to the 1973 merger of Loyola University (founded in 1911 as Loyola College) and Marymount College (founded in 1924). LMU, accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges in 1949, participates in Title IV federal financial aid programs and is the second largest Catholic institution of higher education in California. Undergraduate and graduate instruction is provided in seven colleges: Bellarmine College of Liberal Arts, College of Business Administration, College of Communication and Fine Arts, Frank R. Seaver College of Science and Engineering, Loyola Law School, School of Education, and the School of

Film and Television. Degrees awarded at the university range from baccalaureate degrees to doctorate degrees in research/scholarship and professional practice.

A total of 9,156 students enrolled at LMU as undergraduate (5,836) and graduate (3,320) students during the 2009–2010 academic year. The combined 12-month student population for 2010 by race/ethnicity represented white: $n = 5,172$; Asian/Pacific Islander: $n = 1,369$; African American/black: $n = 730$; and Hispanic: $n = 1,875$. In the fall of 2009, full-time faculty represented a total of 413 faculty (tenured: $n = 100$ and tenure-track: $n = 313$) employed at the institution. Full-time faculty by race/ethnicity with tenure status for the academic year 2009–2010 is represented in Table 5.

Table 5

Loyola Marymount University Full-Time Faculty by Race/Ethnicity, and Tenure Status for Academic Year 2009–2010

Catholic institution	Tenured faculty				Tenure-track faculty				
	Race/ethnicity	White	Asian/Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic	White	Asian/Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic
Loyola Marymount University		240	27	17	29	71	14	4	11

University of San Diego

University of San Diego (USD) is “committed to advancing academic excellence, expanding liberal and professional knowledge, creating a diverse and inclusive community, and preparing leaders dedicated to ethical conduct and compassionate service” (http://www.sandiego.edu/about/mission_and_vision.php). Similar to LMU, USD was founded by a joined merger of two Catholic institutions of higher education

(San Diego College for Women and the College of Men and the School of Law) in 1972 and is governed by an independent board of trustees dedicated to the values originally articulated by its Catholic founders, Mother Rosaline Hill, R.S.C.J., and Bishop Charles Francis Buddy, D.D. The university was first accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges in 1956. The campus also participates in Title IV federal financial aid programs. Undergraduate and graduate instruction is provided in eight colleges: Arts and Sciences, Business, Law, Leadership and Education, Nursing/Health, Peace Studies, Continuing Education, and Engineering. Degrees awarded at the university also range from baccalaureate degrees to doctorate degrees in research/scholarship and professional practice.

A total of 7,390 students were enrolled at USD as undergraduate (4,683) and graduate (2,707) students during the 2009–2010 academic year. The combined 12-month student population for 2010 by race/ethnicity represented white: $n = 5,007$; Asian/Pacific Islander: $n = 930$; African American/black: $n = 264$; and Hispanic: $n = 1,189$. In the fall of 2009, full-time faculty represented a total of 327 faculty (tenured: $n = 229$ and tenure-track: $n = 98$) employed at the institution that identified as white, Asian/Pacific Islander, African American/black, and Hispanic. Full-time faculty by race/ethnicity with tenure status for the academic year 2009–2010 is represented in Table 6.

Table 6

University of San Diego Full-Time Faculty by Race/Ethnicity, and Tenure Status for Academic Year 2009–2010

Catholic institution	Tenured faculty				Tenure-track faculty				
	Race/ethnicity	White	Asian/Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic	White	Asian/Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic
University of San Diego		187	17	6	19	80	7	5	6

Considering the prominence of this study is relative to self-identified native-born Mexican-American and Chicana/o faculty, Table 7 illustrates the combined full-time Hispanic faculty by gender and tenure status for the academic year 2009–2010 employed at the four California Catholic institutions selected for this study. The total sample size consisted of 111 prospective participants. Of the four institutions, Loyola Marymount University employed the greatest number of full-time Hispanic faculty and the University of San Francisco employed the least. In the course of reviewing institutional websites and contacting each institution via telephone and/or email, each Hispanic faculty member within the sample size ($n = 111$) was contacted via email per this researcher or per the assistance of an institutional sponsor at both the University of San Diego and Santa Clara University. Findings concluded that a majority of tenured and tenure-track Hispanic or Latino faculty reflected in Table 7 did not meet the criteria for this study due to either self-identifying as foreign-born or self-identifying with a Hispanic sub-group other than Mexican American or Chicana/o. The four institutions provided a combined number of 15 prospective subjects: University of San Francisco ($n = 2$); Santa Clara ($n = 3$); Loyola

Marymount University ($n = 6$); and University of San Diego ($n = 4$). Considering one of the prospective subjects employed at the University of San Francisco participated in the pilot study for this research, there were a remaining total of 14 prospective research subjects.

Of the 14 prospective research subjects (men = 11; women = 3), eight (8) agreed to participate in this study (men = 7; women = 1). Two subjects from the University of San Diego expressed an interest in participating, although due to time constraints, these interviews did not occur. The four remaining faculty either expressed interest, although were unable to coordinate an agreeable interview date due to time constraints, or did not appear interested in participating in this study.

Table 7

Catholic Institutions Combined Full-Time Hispanic Faculty by Gender, and Tenure Status for Academic Year 2009–2010

Catholic Institution	Tenured			Tenure-track		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
University of San Francisco	7	7	14	4	3	7
Santa Clara University	14	6	20	3	2	5
Loyola Marymount University	14	15	29	5	6	11
University of San Diego	10	9	19	2	4	6

Data Collection

This research study utilized a combination of semi-structured and open-ended in-depth interview questions. The researcher developed a 49-item questionnaire for this

study titled La Raza Faculty Interview Protocol (Appendix H), which was constructed from review of the literature on faculty of color with a critical race theory lens. The organization of the interview protocol consisted of the following five sections: (a) Academic Background, (b) Career Progression (Self-Perceived Supports and Challenges), (c) Social and Cultural Climate, (d) Level of Satisfaction, and (e) Recommendations (see Appendix H). In addition, a questionnaire titled La Raza Demographic Questionnaire (see Appendix I) allowed participants to provide information regarding self-identified race/ethnicity, gender, age, citizenship status, generational status in U.S., Spanish speaking, marital status, religious affiliation, country of parents' birth, and generational status.

The instrument titled La Raza Faculty Interview Protocol was self-developed for the purpose of this study. As a method to enhance the validity and credibility of the research instruments intended to be utilized in this research study, a pilot study was conducted at the University of San Francisco on April 4, 2012, with a faculty member meeting the participant criteria for the intended full study. The pilot study was estimated at a duration of approximately 60 to 90 minutes, although due to the length of the research instruments, the interview was approximately three and half hours long. Throughout the interview, the interviewee provided numerous suggestions to enhance the credibility and validity of the research instruments. Analyses of the digital audio-recorded interviews, field notes, and suggested revisions per the recommendations of the faculty interviewee, La Raza Interview Protocol (see Appendix H) was revised and reduced from 49 to 29 questions to adequately obtain pertinent information from the intended participants of the full study. In addition, La Raza Demographic Questionnaire (see

Appendix I) was also revised. The pilot study assisted in determining flaws, limitations, and structural weakness within the initial constructed interview protocol and demographic questionnaire. The pilot study also allowed this researcher to better determine the duration of interview(s) with participants.

Prospective interview subjects were identified via networking through professional and personal contacts, institutional websites, and various institutional offices (e.g., institutional research, human resources, and various departments) at the following California Catholic institutions: University of San Francisco, Santa Clara University, Loyola Marymount University, and University of San Diego. Upon identification of self-identified native-born Mexican-American and Chicana/o tenured and tenure-track faculty employed at the four aforementioned Catholic institutions, personal email invitations were sent containing an informed consent outlining participant criteria and goals and objectives of the audio-recorded research study (see Appendix F).

Once a list of interested subjects was confirmed, selected participants were briefed regarding confidentiality and provided a copy of the Research Subjects' Bill of Rights (see Appendix G) and La Raza Demographic Questionnaire (see Appendix I). An email or phone call was then placed to respondents to formally schedule face-to-face interviews at a mutually agreeable time and location during the fall of 2012. An email or phone call preceded the scheduled interview reiterating the purpose of the research study, informed consent, and confirmation of the time and location of the scheduled interview. Unanswered email requests were followed up with additional email requests and/or personal phone calls in an effort to build support for the study.

Additionally, prospective participants were informed of the interview timeframes (approximately 60–90 minutes). The demographic questionnaire, La Raza Demographic Questionnaire (see Appendix I), was sent via email to all interview participants for completion one week prior to the date of the scheduled interviews and gathered by the researcher at the time of the interview. Participants were also informed of their option to withdraw from the interview process at any time. Participants did not receive a copy of the interview protocol prior to the scheduled interview.

Counter-storytelling was incorporated during this qualitative study to gain an in-depth understanding of the personal and professional lived experiences of self-identified native-born Mexican-American and/or Chicana/o tenured and tenure-track faculty. In an attempt to highlight a shared phenomenon experienced by these underrepresented faculty members, narrative analysis was the strategy used to create, describe, identify, interpret, and present their counter-stories narratives (Creswell, 2007, p. 156).

Again, counter-storytelling is a technique used to “analyze the role of race and racism through the experiences of people of color” and is “both a method of telling the story of those experiences that have not been told and a tool for analyzing and challenging the stories of those in power and whose story is a natural part of the dominant discourse— the majoritarian story” (Yosso & Solórzano, 2005, p. 124). As proposed by Love (2004), the use of counter-storytelling serves several purposes:

1. Changes the form and content of research and conversations about events, situations, and societal participation.
2. Situates and centers race as a filter for the examination of prevailing stories and constructions of reality.
3. Can serve as a tool for exposing, analyzing, and challenging the majoritarian stories of racial privilege.

4. Can make the assumptions made by the dominant culture more visible and explicit and therefore available for examination.
5. Enable the discourse to move beyond the broad label of racism, which can cover a wide range of behaviors at the individual, system, institutional, and societal levels to reveal specific experiences and circumstances that limit and subordinate.
6. Helps to undo ethnocentrism and the unconscious conviction of viewing the world in one way.
7. By listening to the counter-stories of people of color, white people can gain access to a view of the world denied to them by white privilege and white domination.
8. Telling their own story provides people of color psychic and emotional barriers against the damage caused by majoritarian stories.
9. Provides a means for members of subordinate groups to address those circumstances where the prevailing conception of justice provides no language or means by which the marginalized person can express how he or she has been injured or wronged in terms that the system will understand (pp. 232–233).

An important value of Latino culture is *personalismo*, which is defined as “the Latino tendency to prefer personal relationships over impersonal relationships” (Anthsel, 2002, p. 440). This cultural value supported my rationale to engage in face-to-face interviews rather than telephone interviews with La Raza faculty. It has also been suggested that researchers of the same ethnicity have an increased ability to build rapport on a personal and cultural level with their research subjects:

Same-ethnicity data collectors should be employed in research projects where personal contact is involved. Researchers of the same ethnicity as the respondents can enhance rapport, willingness to disclose, and the validity and reliability of the research team and, in this fashion, motivate them not only to complete the research process but also to provide accurate information ... Being ethnically similar to the interviewer can help the participants feel that they can share experiences ... This can be of particular importance in methodologies where the collection of information is heavily dependent on establishing good rapport between researcher and participants, as is the case in studies utilizing participant observations or open-ended questions (Marin & Marin, 1991, p. 53).

Data Analysis of Narratives

The interviews were conducted utilizing the La Raza Faculty Interview Protocol (see Appendix H). According to Creswell (2007), analysis of narratives consists of a process of “reorganizing the stories into some general type of framework” (p. 56) of “chronological unfolding events and turning points or epiphanies” (p.155). After the interviews were conducted and the data from each interview was then transcribed, analyses of the transcripts proceeded by using methods described by Creswell (2008), who suggested:

The first step in data analysis is to explore the data ... by reading the transcripts in their entirety several times ... immerse yourself in the details, trying to get a sense of the interview as a whole before breaking it into parts (p. 250).

All interviews were digitally audio-recorded and folders were visibly coded to conceal personal identifying information. Audio folders obtained from the interviews were then transcribed verbatim and compared with field text and notes obtained during each interview. This researcher analyzed the data and used a deduction process to gain significant information to combine the statements into themes. These themes were filtered into textural descriptions to “convey an overall essence of the [personal and professional lived] experiences” of La Raza participants (Creswell, 2007, p. 60).

Establishing credibility in qualitative design is based on instrumental utility and trustworthiness rather than through traditional validity and reliability measures. The uniqueness of the qualitative study within a specific context precludes or prevents exact replication in another context (Creswell, 2003). To determine the accuracy of the findings and credibility of the information, Creswell (2008) provided three primary procedures to ensure the accuracy of data, analysis, and interpretation:

To ensure the accuracy of data collection and analysis ... validating the findings occurs in the course of ... three primary forms typically used by qualitative researchers: triangulation, member checking, and auditing (p. 266).

To augment an accurate analysis of the data collected, this study used a combination of triangulation, member checking, and auditing. First, triangulation was performed by substantiating data obtained from the interviews. Second, member checking was performed by requesting each participant in the study to review and confirm the accuracy of their documented, transcribed, and interpreted interviews. Third, auditing was performed by the dissertation committee members and an independent editor.

To ensure the accuracy of the qualitative data through member checking, each participant was provided a verbatim copy via email of the transcribed interview for their review to ensure the accuracy of the transcripts, categories, and themes (Creswell, 2003). Participants provided feedback related to typos and statements requiring corrections.

Procedures and Ethical Considerations

The researcher, in an attempt to ensure the protection of the eight participants who served as the human subjects investigated in this study, adhered to the ethical standards of the American Psychological Association. Prior to initiating this study, the researcher obtained Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval from the University of San Francisco, the researcher's degree-granting institution on May 22, 2012 (see Appendix A). Additional permission to engage in research with human subjects was obtained from each of the participating institutions on the corresponding dates: Santa Clara University on March 14, 2012 (see Appendix B); Loyola Marymount University on February 15,

2012 (see Appendix D); and the University of San Diego on September 7, 2012 (see Appendix E).

Each participant was informed of the general nature of the study and its basic educational application. Participants were asked to review and sign a consent form prior to each interview (see Appendix F). Participants were also informed that each institution in the study would be identified in the study. Participation in this study was voluntary, and in addition to a guarantee of confidentiality through the use of pseudonyms, each participant was provided the opportunity to review the interview transcripts to assure for accuracy and revisions as needed. Lastly, a thank-you letter was sent to each participant expressing the utmost appreciation for their participation in this research study. All data and information obtained from interviews (e.g., field notes, digital recordings, and transcripts) was properly safeguarded and stored in a locked file at the researcher's home office.

Due to the concern expressed by various participants regarding confidentiality, names and personal information obtained in La Raza Demographic Questionnaire and La Raza Interview Protocol, which may identify participants, was omitted in this dissertation (e.g., degree, discipline, department of current appointment, courses taught, and marital status). Due to identifying each of the participating Catholic institutions and to ensure participants' confidentiality in this study, pseudonyms were provided. Table 8 provides a brief description of La Raza participants.

Table 8

California Catholic Institution La Raza Participants

Name	Institution	Gender	Age group	Generational status in U.S.	Tenure status	Rank
Professor Uno	University of San Diego	Male	50–64	1st	Tenured	Full Professor
Professor Dos	University of San Diego	Female	50–64	2nd	Tenured	Associate Professor
Professor Tres	Loyola Marymount	Male	50–64	2nd	Tenured	Full Professor
Professor Cuatro	Loyola Marymount	Male	35–49	2nd	Tenured	Associate Professor
Professor Cinco	Loyola Marymount	Male	Younger than 35	3rd	Tenure-Track	Assistant Professor
Professor Seis	Santa Clara University	Male	50–64	1st	Tenured	Associate Professor
Professor Siete	University of San Francisco	Male	35–49	3rd	Tenured	Associate Professor
Professor Ocho	Santa Clara University	Male	50–64	3rd	Tenured	Full Professor

Limitations

Although numerous considerations were explored in the development of this research study, various factors contributed to the limitations of the study. The first limitation of this study was geographical location, because only four four-year Catholic institutions of higher education in California were selected. Second, of the four Catholic institutions of higher education selected in this study, the number of participants meeting the criteria of this study was limited to a total of 15, of which eight faculty members agreed to participate. I anticipate the number of participants would have been higher if I included faculty members at the ranks of adjunct and lecturers, as well as foreign-born faculty members identifying as Mexican American and Chicana/o. Third, considering the limited number of participants in this qualitative research study, findings may not be

generalized to other faculty members (assistant, associate, full professor) meeting the criteria of this study employed at other Catholic institutions of higher education. The fourth limitation of this study was the composition of the participants, comparatively due to the fact that seven of the participants were men with one female participant, as well as all, except for one participant, identified as tenured faculty members. Findings may have been increasingly diverse if additional women and tenure-track faculty members participated in the study. Finally, although face-to-face interviews were conducted by a self-identifying Mexican-American/Chicano researcher, self-disclosure by participants may have been hindered due to level of trust and concerns for confidentiality. Furthermore, considering the sensitive nature of the questions presented to the participants, Marin and VanOss Marin (1991) proposed the following:

Potential problems may occur in the data collection and interpretation of responses by Hispanic participants because “Hispanics may often provide inaccurate and socially desirable responses, may produce larger proportions of missing data, may prefer extreme and acquiescent responses, and may show low self-disclosure to strangers” (p. 101). Hispanics exhibit a tendency to provide the “correct” answer, at least as perceived by the respondents, independent of the content of the question or of their actual experiences (p. 105).

The aforementioned limitations appeared evident in a few of the participant responses, particularly relative to disclosing their experiences of discrimination and racism throughout their educational journey toward securing employment as a faculty member at their institution. It is my assumption that participants had encountered a greater number of experiences pertaining to discrimination and racism due to contradicting responses by some, although they either elected not to disclose these experiences or were unable to clearly recall additional experiences of discrimination or racism through the duration of the interview. In conclusion, Marin and VanOss Marin (1991) suggested Hispanics’

tendency through “providing socially desirable answers could be a way to promote positive, smooth relationships between researcher and participants” (p. 106).

Summary

In this chapter, I provided a description of the research methodology, sample and setting, and data collection and analysis methods, and a brief description of the study’s participants from the four selected California Catholic institutions. The research design utilized a qualitative narrative methodology. Tenets of critical race theory (CRT) were discussed, particularly counter-storytelling and the permanence of racism. Counter-storytelling was integrated into the methodology and in the development of the interview protocol to achieve a greater understanding of the personal and professional lived experiences of the self-identified native-born Mexican-American and Chicana/o faculty employed at Catholic institutions of higher education. The findings from this study, detailed in Chapter IV, provide narratives of the La Raza participants pertaining to their academic progression toward graduate school, self-perceived supports and challenges, social and cultural climate, and level of satisfaction as faculty in Catholic higher education throughout their tenure. In addition, the following chapter provides applicable recommendations by the participants to assist (a) Mexican-American/Chicana/o scholars in their pursuit of academic careers in Catholic higher education; (b) current Mexican-American/Chicana/o faculty toward tenure and promotion; and (c) academic administrators in their recruitment, promotion, and retention of Mexican-American/Chicana/o faculty in Catholic higher education.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS: LA RAZA FACULTY COUNTER-NARRATIVES

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to explore the personal and professional lived experiences of self-identified native-born La Raza (Mexican Americans and/or Chicana/os) who have been successful in achieving tenured and tenure-track faculty membership (assistant, associate, full professors) at Catholic institutions of higher education.

This chapter provides the narratives of each of the eight participants interviewed who are employed at the University of San Francisco, Santa Clara University, Loyola Marymount University in Los Angeles, and the University of San Diego. First, a demographic analysis of the participants is presented. Second, La Raza participants' primary/secondary and undergraduate/graduate academic experiences are described. Third, La Raza participants' career progression is delineated with self-perceived supports and challenges in Catholic higher education. Fourth, La Raza participants' perceptions of the social and cultural climate in Catholic higher education are revealed. Fifth, La Raza participants' perceptions of their level of satisfaction in Catholic higher education are disclosed. Finally, suggested recommendations are provided by La Raza participants to assist a) scholars in pursuit of academic careers in Catholic higher education; b) current Mexican-American faculty toward tenure and promotion in Catholic higher education; and c) academic administrators in the recruitment, promotion, and retention of Mexican-American and Chicana/o scholars and faculty in higher education.

Demographic Analysis

The demographic questionnaire (see Appendix I) was constructed from the review of literature pertaining to the targeted population of this study. The demographic questionnaire was sent to Hispanic faculty self-identifying as either Mexican American or Chicana/o tenured and tenure-track at five different Catholic institutions of higher education in California. There were a total of 15 respondents that confirmed meeting the criteria to participate in this study. Of those 15 respondents, eight confirmed interest in participating in the interview. The demographic questionnaire contained 21 questions that included self-identified race/ethnicity, gender, age, citizenship status, generational status in the United States, Spanish speaking, marital status, religious affiliation, country of parents' birth, and generational status.

La Raza participants included seven males and one female. Five of the participants' ages ranged between 50 and 64, two ranged between the ages of 35 and 49, and one participant was younger than 35 years old. Generational status in the United States included two participants identifying as first generation, three identifying as second generation, and three identifying as third generation. All participants identified as Mexican, Mexican American, Chicana/o, and/or Mestizo. Two participants were raised in predominately Anglo communities, and the remaining participants, except for one participant born in the United States but raised in Mexico, were raised in predominately Mexican/Mexican-American communities in California and Texas. Four of the participants affirmed that Spanish was their first language. The participants represented a broad range of disciplines from the arts and sciences to professional fields. All participants were in full-time positions, although there were differences in tenured and

tenure-track titles: Seven faculty members were tenured and one was tenure-track. Three were full professors, four were associate professors, and one was an assistant professor.

As stated previously, the purpose of this research study was to explore the personal and professional lived experiences of native-born self-identified Mexican-American and Chicana/o faculty employed at Catholic institutions of higher education in California. This study established four guiding research questions that evolved into an increasingly focused and detailed set of 29 interview sub-questions that were divided into the following five sections: (1) Academic Background; (2) Career Progression (Self-Perceived Supports and Challenges) in Catholic Higher Education; (3) Social and Cultural Climate in Catholic Higher Education; (4) Level of Satisfaction in Catholic Higher Education; and (5) Recommendations in Catholic Higher Education. The questions were developed during the course of the literature review, during the review of additional scholarly publications, and from recommendations provided by the interviewee of the pilot study on April 4, 2012, from the University of San Francisco. These questions make up what became the interview instrument titled La Raza Faculty Interview Protocol (see Appendix H). To protect the confidentiality of each of the eight participants, the following narratives contain the pseudonym of “Professor” followed by numbers one through eight in the Spanish language. The pseudonyms are represented as the following throughout this dissertation: Professor Uno, Professor Dos, Professor Tres, Professor Cuatro, Professor Cinco, Professor Seis, Professor Siete, and Professor Ocho. What follows are the research questions, sections, and sub-questions in chronological order that correspond with each of the eight participants’ narratives.

La Raza Primary/Secondary and Undergraduate/Graduate Experiences

In the first section of La Raza Faculty Interview Protocol titled “Academic Background,” participants were asked to recount their experiences in primary and secondary education, as well as their experiences in undergraduate and graduate education as an ethnic minority student. The purpose of this section was to initially obtain information concerning recounted positive and negative experiences in education prior to their path toward a career in academia as faculty members. The responses of each La Raza participant are recounted in the narratives below.

Professor Uno

Primary and secondary experiences. I think they were pretty good because I was in elementary education during the height of the '60s and it seemed, at least, the teacher I had in sixth grade ... I found him to be a progressive white guy supporting so many of the issues of the civil rights during that time. When I go back and think about it, I think of him a lot as someone who really sparked an interest in all of us ... he made you think and treated you like an adult, which I thought was important when I was in the sixth grade. So after that, when I think about what we called back then “junior high,” they call it “middle school” now ... I had a good cohort of Chicano friends ... we hung out a lot and we all turned out to become aspiring musicians; it really kept us out of trouble. And you know we were doing the music of the time, like Santana and others and we were into it. To this day, I still have those friends and we still hang out and try to act like we know what we're doing when it comes to music.

You know where I think things really changed radically for me was high school, because a lot of those friends ended up going to a new high school. What had happened is a new high school had been built ... and most of my Mexicano and Chicano friends ended up going to the new school, which was south of where I lived. So there was a major drop in terms of diversity and it became pretty much an all-white school. So the few friends that remained I can count on my hand, about four or five that I really hung out with.

It wasn't a really good experience ... I remember I really wanted to get out ... I didn't want to be there. So that would be my general response. But I think a major event was the loss of those friends during that high school period.

You know I think ... it really comes down to one thing. A lot of it had to do with my mom ... we were raised with the value of education and of course it meant education in the sense of being Mexicano and Chicano, which meant that it was a

very holistic point of view. So this was drilled into us since the time we were kids. So my older brother and my older sister had already started the track to college because my mother was not going to let anything slide ... it was a classic case of a real hardcore mom that was going to kick your ass if you didn't go to college. And she worked really hard and my dad was there, but my dad was really more of the enforcer ... So that was a big part of it. This issue that I spend a lot of time talking about and thinking about, I think is very important. In Spanish when they say "*Para ser una persona de la comunidad,*" ("to be a person from the community"), it means so much more. No matter how much we achieve and how far we go in our careers as Mexican Americans/Chicanas/os, we are still people of the community from which we come. And I've always felt that we lose that when we get into institutional education. What happens is that our parents give everything to the teachers and they don't have the agency that they had in the community.

Undergraduate and graduate experiences. The assumption was that we were all going to do this, there were no other options. But what I did do, and I don't really talk about this, I actually went to [community college] and it's now an HSI [Hispanic Serving Institution] ... It's over 50 percent Latino ... it's such a different world now from when I was there. I had a really bad first semester; I didn't do well at all. I remember taking a Spanish class and I was on probation ... the Spanish class was taught by some guy from Latin America and didn't know what the hell I was doing. Then I found another Spanish teacher that was a Chicano ... he really understood our issues and he took more time. So I made up that grade by re-taking that class. And you know what ... I think things just kind of clicked and I just got into it. Before you knew it, I was working ... I was in school ... I was still this aspiring musician and I stayed there for two years.

Unbeknownst to me there were counselors [from various universities] coming to [community colleges] and I happened to be at the right place at the right time ... I met the counselor and she reviewed my scores and all that stuff and she said, "You should come to [the University of California] ... you can do this," ... but I didn't know that. So it was one of those things ... "Hey you can come [here], apply, and I can guarantee that you'll get accepted." But those were the days of EOP and affirmative action, which were so much more aggressive than they are now. Then I applied and I remember before the official notifications were going to go out, I was accepted and that changed my life in the sense that I went to [the University of California], which was a different animal than any other place. It was a science school and it was very intense and it was very difficult, it was a very cold place—there was support, but it was a very odd support. I was part of a campus by the name of "Third College"; Third College doesn't exist anymore—now they call it the "Thurgood Marshall program." I didn't know a lot about this at the time, but it made sense. I met a lot of people, a lot of Chicano students from Los Angeles, Imperial Valley, and from here ... we just came together and we

supported each other and graduated. But we lived in the same neighborhood, because in those days there was apartment housing offered because we were all in that college ... so that was a very important change.

Again, when I was an undergraduate at [the University of California], our resident advisor, Eric ... a pretty progressive Jewish guy ... he was into civil rights and all that stuff. He took me aside and told me that I should go into counseling. So he really encouraged me to apply to the program at [California State University] ... this was like December of 1980. I think it was about February of 1981 and I was going to be graduating at the end of that year ... I got a letter from them and they told me that I had been put on a waiting list ... so I was disappointed and it was going to really change my career path. And I started to say, "What else can I do"; I wanted to continue doing stuff around Chicano studies and ethnic studies. I had had a conversation with a guy named Ricardo Griswold—he's a well-known historian of Chicano history that taught for one year at [the University of California]—and he said to me, "Why don't you look at the program at a Catholic university, there's a guy by the name of Julian Samora, he's got money and you can apply." So I did and it was pretty late ... it was February. I wrote Julian Samora a letter and he contacted me right away and he called me a week after and said, "We would be very interested if you apply ... we have money and we can get you in ... no problem." I represent one of 59 students that went through this program and they basically provided support to get a Ph.D. ... some people got JD's and some people went on to become doctors and judges. So basically what I'm trying to share is that other opportunities shut down and [the Catholic university thing] just appeared. So I got accepted and what happened during my first semester ... my mother called and told me a faculty member was looking for me from [California State University]. So the long and short of it ... I had been accepted to that program, but what had happened is that they sent me the wrong letter. So whoever got an acceptance letter wasn't accepted and I had gotten accepted. It's just kind of interesting because on so many levels ... it changed my own perspective by leaving California. And again, I say this as truthfully as possible ... that I really owe my career to Julian because it wouldn't have happened otherwise ... he paved the way for so many of us. I think there are 57 of us out there in the country that would say the same thing.

Professor Dos

Primary and secondary education experiences. Well, I'm biracial; my parents separated when I was four, and then my mother married a Chicano from California. There was difficulty about what to do with us children ... my father was a Mexican immigrant ... so my white grandparents took us and they didn't know what to do with us. But they helped me a lot. I went to school in Southern California ... there were only about three other Mexican-American kids in the elementary school and I really got a lot of racism ... my brother and me. One teacher in third grade refused to teach me ... so she put me and this other little girl in the corner and refused to teach us ... this went on for many weeks until my

family found out ... then they intervened. So I had this very odd upbringing of getting intense “racialization” because we couldn’t pass ... and not being raised in the culture that I had to find later on my own. I think a lot of children of biracial families ... the white side of the family is overtly racist ... like my grandfather called us racial turnips because we were very dark. They [my grandparents] felt like they were doing us a big favor by deracinating us ... “they could just fit in.” So pretty much, I gained respect because I could really fight. My grandfather taught me how to box and one day I just went out and beat the crap out of this girl. I was smart and a really good fighter ... I was chill. So there’s that.

My grandparents sent me to a girl’s school in seventh, eighth, and ninth grades and I really thrived there because it had a lot of boundaries. I did really well there for a lot of reasons ... but I wanted to leave there because there were no boys and I missed my social life and all that stuff ... but I have to thank my grandparents for their support until they died ... they were both dead by the time I was 15.

High school was very difficult for me because of my parents ... my mother was divorcing my Chicano stepfather and the family was falling apart. I think I was just falling apart ... I found a reference group of working-class kids where I lived ... it was more racially mixed and they were chill. But I was just sort of disintegrating and sort of flunking out of high school. My mother had a little money left over from my grandparents, so they put me in a private school my senior year so I would pass high school and graduate.

Raised by mother after age 15 ... things were really falling apart ... my brother left home and my little sister left home at age 13 because they couldn’t handle the family dysfunction. So I hung in there and then tried to go to college and take care of my mother ... everyone else had left ... really traumatic.

Undergraduate and graduate experiences. So there was always that split [biracial] in my life. So in college I would explore things on my own and nobody really went to college except my stepfather who went to college on the GI Bill. So I just picked the major where people encouraged me. So I was like that scholarship boy that Richard Hodgert talks about ... that mechanically does. It didn’t dawn on me that my education should be about what I cared about ... it was about proving that I was as good as the white kids ... so I just did it ... I just mechanically forced myself to learn the curriculum and on the side I would explore what I wanted to do. So that lasted all the way through grad school ... where I was studying [academic subjects] because it was canonical and smart and on the other side I had all these books I would read like American Indian studies

and African American studies ... I was crazy. So I think being split was the theme of my early life.

In college I had a real hard time ... I went to [a nearby] college first and that lasted about a month and then I needed to come home because my mother was really ill and I was just too burnt out with all that. I had an ill mother and all the kids were gone and that was stressful. So I just came home to stabilize. I didn't really know how to apply to college and [a Catholic university] was in the phone book ... so I just made an appointment. I needed those boundaries because I came from such chaos, so I think it really healed me [at the Catholic university]. I noticed that some of the other students of color say they would have flunked out if they had gone to [state] ... because there was too much stimulus ... too much trouble to get into. So it really helped me ... it was really grounding.

After I graduated from [the Catholic university] ... getting myself disciplined but the split continued ... I really liked urban studies ... so I took a course in that. It was very sad because I didn't have any mentoring ... I should have gone right into urban studies but whatever, a lot of kids make mistakes. Then I took some graduate courses [at the Catholic university] and I worked at some really crummy jobs for a while ... just really bad. So I was floundering ... I didn't know what to do.

One of my friends went to Wyoming for grad school and he was getting married. So we drove to Wyoming for his wedding and I met the folks at the [Wyoming grad school] and they said, "You should come to graduate school here" ... and I said okay. So I turned up in three weeks in Wyoming ... this is crazy ... this is a person that had no networks and no idea how it goes. Another friend was in Michigan—he said, "You should come to Michigan, it's a better school." ... So I drove to Michigan to finish grad school there. No clue, but I did fine in Michigan and I got my Masters (laughing).

I wanted to go to [a private school in California] ... so I applied to one grad school [a private school in California] ... and I got in. At [the private school in California] the split continued ... they were patient with me ... I passed all my orals. Then the split did me in finally. I said, oh hell no ... I'm not going to write my dissertation on this crap. So I totally reinvented myself ... I wrote about D.H. Lawrence and the war between fascism and socialism ... I wrote a whole chapter on his time in Mexico. I wrote this real political dissertation on fascism and socialist thought in the Third World ... they were going to throw [me] out ... and I said, I'm not leaving here without my degree. Then I got picked up by these

amazing people [professors] ... I was hired to teach full-time as a lecturer in their radical program, which was this incredible multicultural freshman required course. That was my graduate education. So I had to learn all of this stuff during the weekend and run these classes and my life came to together ... end of split ... it's healed. Cesar Chavez came to speak and I was on my way. But it took way too long ... this should have happened in high school. I should have had mentors in high school. I won the Department Dissertation Award and I was self-taught. I got an incredible education I still use today.

Professor Tres

Primary and secondary education experiences. There wasn't a lot of self-consciousness. I went to elementary, junior high, and high school, where the majority of the student body was Latino, about 60 to 70 percent ... and by the time I graduated high school, it was about 20 percent Latino. Clearly I can still remember elementary school ... where there was not a single Latino elementary teacher and a majority of us were Latino ... but I certainly remember the teachers being very responsive and I don't remember feeling anything negative about them. Also ... sometimes I like to joke because I was bilingual education at my elementary school ... every time a kid from Mexico would show up they would sit him next to me so that I could translate ... I think my sisters had the same experience. So the integration process was obviously different than it is today. You know, I don't think that there was anything unique, anything special that happened per se. I was just given the opportunity and plugging along. And doing well ... that means being able to apply to college.

It really didn't happen until high school ... I remember a lot of teachers, but none of them that I related to. But in high school I played basketball as a freshman throughout and immediately we related to the basketball coach who was Latino and my social studies teacher who was Latino ... these guys who I looked up to were Latino and strong and educated and well respected within the school. Because of basketball and other things with them, my self-confidence grew ... I could see myself in them. From the day I got to high school, they would say ... "You're going to go to college" ... it was just a given with them, along with my dad ... it was never a question from the moment I arrived at high school, when the Latino coach, from then on, said, "Hey, where you going to college ... you got to do this" ... that's the way he spoke to me and the other guys on the team. He just spoke to us that way ... That person right there, really, really helped.

Undergraduate and graduate experiences. Again very positive because I went to [a private university] just when Latinos were starting to go and there was a critical mass of Latinos, but we were still way underrepresented. There were not many dorms and in order for me to get housing, I joined what they called the Latino floor ... so as a freshman I lived on the floor where there were all Latino males ... there were 30 of us. So immediately, here was a cohort that self-identified as Latino and helped each other out ... they felt that they needed to be there and we all helped each other. So I think that was an incredible experience that was helpful to me. In addition, there was the Mexican-American alumni association that gave scholarships and there was also a Chicano student services center, which later on became Chicano/Latino services offering programs to get people together that I identified with ... I still know people today that I met 30 some years ago that I still have contact with today ... people that became very successful. I think that at that particular time ... it was a time in the mid to late 1970s where there was an initial major recruitment of Latino students into college ... minor from today, but there was this concerted effort ... then the building of support programs ... I just happened to get to [a private university] when these programs were getting off the ground and were well funded. The fact that they had a Mexican-American alumni association that gave you money and that they had a Chicano student services center that was very proactive ... that they had this residential community of Latinos ... that created the base that was very helpful in my transition to college. I could imagine had I shown up at a college or private university where there were only ... you know ... 10 Latinos, as opposed to five, six, or seven hundred ... where there was no supportive student services or any of that, it would have been a very different experience I think.

Professor Cuatro

Primary and secondary education experiences. So this is going to get more complicated, well maybe it's complicated for everybody, but because I'm mixed race, white and Mexican, and I was blond-haired when I was a kid and my mom in order to ... well the way she said it—'cause my grandfather named me after his father—my mom put [English first name] because she didn't think [Spanish first name] sounded good with [last name]. I'm curious because a lot of my experiences that would explicitly connect race to my younger childhood educational experiences are really retrospective ... for instance, my older brother [learned] Spanish first ... my Spanish was really broken ... and in second grade I remember he failed every Spanish class because he would have my mom help him. I don't know if they had ESL in the early seventies in [Southern California] ... but if they did, they would have never identified him ... he was a white-looking kid called [English first name with a Spanish surname] and it would have

never processed that those issues were ESL and he was held back a year. He was like that stereotype, but nobody recognized him as Mexican and one of the real effects I know it had for me ... I never asked for help. I didn't get help from anyone in my family for my studies. There's a lot that I can't remember explicitly within the educational system attached to race because I didn't learn the words for it until later in life.

Being of mixed race in [Southern California] ... you know ... basically was working class ... it was like lower-middle-class white folks and a lot of undocumented working-class Latinos. My white family wasn't around in my upbringing ... I was pretty much with my Mexican family ... except for my dad and a lot of that had to do with race and religion. So I felt really comfortable and at ease in a more or less middle-class Mexican type of culture. But when I went out of the home ... there was nothing middle-class Mexican ... middle class was white and Mexican was working class. I didn't have a lot of friends growing up ... when I got accepted at [the University of California] ... I left fast and when I was on academic probation at the university ... I remember going through my head ... they could kick me out but I'm not going back [home] because I had found here at college ... educated or college-oriented people of color and that was so comforting ... oh my God ... I could breathe.

Undergraduate and graduate experiences. So I got to the [University of California] and my GPA wasn't probably as competitive as others ... I had a low GPA but I did pretty well on test scores and that might be the story of my primary education. So I got to [the University of California], but I was required to do this Summer Bridge Program and I was required to get tutoring ... I was in the last year in which they did this provisional acceptance where I had to have a C average the whole first year or I'd get kicked out. So like I said, getting accepted at [the University of California] and finding people that I kind of could just be comfortable with ... just meant everything to me ... I mean it was an absolute release of my heart ... it was just amazing. I couldn't say at that point I always described myself as Mexican American ... because as a half-breed ... I would sort of say I was Mexican *and* American. Then I took Chicano classes ... I studied abroad my first year and when I came back ... I was just floored by how I could see this sort of latent Mexicaness of my upbringing become so clear and so evident ... it was bizarre to me that we would describe it as anything else ... but in my family it's not the way we talked about it. So I began taking Chicano studies classes and then my grades took off and then my interest level took off and everything else just shot through the ceiling. So from that point on, it almost feels like I had two lives ... this one that led me up to [the University of

California] and then this kind of ... at least the first year ... maybe two years of this kind of uncertain area that created enthusiasm. Then after that it was really kind of on the path that I am probably still on ... a real curiosity, not just about Chicano or Chicana studies, but about the ways race, ethnicity, and the sociological factors influenced experience, knowledge ... all of these things.

Professor Cinco

Primary and secondary education experiences. I grew up with my mother and I would see my father a few times a year. From preschool to the seventh grade, I went to public school in Boil Heights, which was 99 percent Mexican. I never had good grades in school; I always had C's and D's. The first time I ever had a Chicano teacher was actually in the eighth grade. I was a troublemaker and I would always get detention and everything. One time he [the Chicano teacher] pulled me aside and told me, "Your mom works hard to send you here man and she pays tuition ... you have to do this, you have to do better, you have to go to college, because people don't expect it" ... I always thought that was kind of weird, because nobody ever talked to me like that.

When I was in high school ... it was an all-boys [Catholic] school ... but it was basically worse than public school, because it was the school where all the drop-outs and gang members went. I remember my junior year, me and five guys got called out by the school counselor and we were told that we had B grade averages and could apply to college, but he said, "Because you can't afford to go to college, you could go to a junior college."

Undergraduate and graduate education experiences. I went to junior college for a year. Then when I got to (a Catholic university), I had never seen so many white people in my life. I thought only Mexican people went to church.

I remember my first year in the dorms, my roommate, he was Asian, but I never saw him ... he would come sometimes to the dorm but he didn't live there. Later when we graduated, I saw him and he told me that his parents didn't want him to stay with me because I had some pictures of me and my friends and his parents thought I was a gang member and they told him I would steal his stuff. We later became friends and I still talk to him.

Another time, when I was at the school moving in, this white girl asked me loudly, "Do you know where the trash is? Can you throw this away for me?" I

told her, “I’m moving in here.” She said, “Oh, you’re a student here.” She later became one of my friends too.

Also, it was my first political science class and I remember being in class and one white student was talking about Mexicans ... “If they didn’t have so many children, they wouldn’t be so poor.” But because I didn’t know how to speak up, and because my roommate and this other guy had told me I had an accent ... like Cheech and Chong and knew I wasn’t as smart as everybody else ... I just remember having this ugly feeling in my throat and it reminded me of the time when I would go with my grandma to the doctor and they would scold her when I was a little kid because they couldn’t understand what she was saying [in Spanish] ... it was an ugly feeling and I didn’t have that feeling until I came to [a Catholic university] on the first day of class. I remember toward the end of that first year in class, again the same student said something about Mexicans and I had to say something. These comments got me to the point where I would just get so angry but I couldn’t speak up in class, but I had to say something because this was degrading for me to hear this stuff. I spoke up and said something in class to correct the teacher and the student that made the comment and they were both quite; at that point I realized the power of knowledge: I had to defend my beliefs and that’s the power of Chicano studies.

[When applying to doctoral programs], I got accepted by 13 schools and I narrowed it down to two universities [Ivy League and private] because there were Latino professors [specializing in the same discipline of interest]. I remember one professor on campus automatically assumed that I couldn’t write ... this famous professor ... before he ever read anything I had written ... the first thing he told me in class was, “You’re probably going to have to work on your English.” And honestly after he told me that, it was hard for me to write anything for his class. And it’s funny because throughout my graduate program, he’d forget that English was my dominant language and he would say, “Wow, your English is getting so good, you’re such a good writer” ... and I would say every time, English is my main language. I’m the first Chicano to get a Ph.D. at [an Ivy League university] in a [specified discipline]. The experiences I had at [a Catholic university] and a [specified discipline] shaped my identity and my commitment to what I wanted to do.

Professor Seis

Primary and secondary education experiences. Okay, so I did all my education through the [bachelor’s degree] in Mexico. I attended Catholic primary school at the La Salle Brothers School. I did my secondary school, the equivalent of a middle school, at a public middle school. I attended a Jesuit high school: All of these were in [a city in Mexico]. Then from there, I went to Mexico City to study at another Jesuit university ... I got my BA there. I stayed in Mexico City one

year working, and then I came to [a private university in California] for the Ph.D. program.

Undergraduate and graduate experiences. Well in my case it doesn't apply ... because in the [schools] I attended, I was not a minority. If I had been in this country it would apply, but growing up in Mexico, no.

At [a private university in California] ... pretty intense, but ethnicity really [did not apply] at the Ph.D. level ... my classes were small ... I think we were eight. So we didn't really think about it [race/ethnicity], it wasn't an issue. At [a private university in California] ... at that time at least ... it was not an issue.

Professor Siete

Primary and secondary education experiences. You know I was in Catholic school from first grade through my bachelors. I like to say I survived 16 years of Catholic education, right. You know my elementary school was fairly diverse and in terms of my own ethnic identity ... I hadn't evolved yet at that age. So I wasn't really aware of my ethnic identity as a Mexican American because I come from a mixed family ... my mother's mostly Western European ... German and Polish. At the time I think my own racial identity was white and I hadn't identified as much yet as a Latino until later as I grew up and I actually went to Mexico as an undergraduate to study Spanish. I never grew up speaking Spanish. High school again was a private Catholic high school, and at the time it was fairly diverse, we didn't have a lot of African-American kids there, but we had a good amount of Latino kids, but mostly white kids. But to answer your question ... I really wasn't aware of racial and ethnic issues at the time during elementary and high school.

It was kind of bicultural ... my mother I guess was who dictated the cultural. I had my grandmother who was Mexican American ... she was the first generation in the family. So about Christmas time is when we would have more of the Mexican tradition at my grandmother's house ... the meal would be chicken and mole and tamales ... and you had the family and the extended family crammed into this little bungalow. We still get together ... but we buy the tamales, we don't make them, but we still make the mole.

Undergraduate and graduate experiences. I went to [a Catholic university] as an undergraduate ... it was fairly white there and again I think this was about the time when I started to have a shift in my ethnic identity. I was aware of being Mexican American, but I think I was more aware about being the first in my family going to college and it wasn't until my junior year when I went down to Mexico City to study Spanish did I begin to have a shift in my identity. It was

fairly white there [the Catholic university] ... wasn't much diversity there ... it was run by the Holy Cross Order, which was fairly conservative and I didn't realize how conservative it was at the time compared to the Jesuits ... that seem to be more liberal.

So that was hard ... it was hard for me to go off ... even though I'm the youngest of five, I was the first to go off to college. It was a great experience, but it was kind of challenging to go away to a Midwest traditional and well-known university. I remember getting this recruitment poster and thinking it was strange because it said ... What does it mean to be a minority at [Catholic university]? Not really having that identity yet and not really feeling like a minority in the sense from an ethnic background yet, except more in terms of my family background and their education. It was a whole different world for me, but I would say that it wasn't until my junior year in college when my own ethnic identity began to emerge.

When I went to Mexico, I immersed myself in learning the language [Spanish], because I didn't grow up speaking Spanish, and there I started to make more connections in terms of my Latino roots. I remember one influential event ... I got a letter from my grandmother, before it would be superficial conversations ... but I remember she had written me this letter and I was really impressed that she wrote me this letter in Spanish and I was able to read it while I was down there [Mexico]. It was so articulate and beautiful and I was seeing a different side of her. Then I realized, okay this is a woman that I know doesn't have a lot of education when she immigrated to the U.S., but she's very wise and very intelligent ... I hadn't seen that side yet because it was always in English. So that was, I don't know if you would call it a critical incident, but it was one of those moments or events when I was studying abroad that really struck me ... she was sending me blessings, and there was more to this woman, my grandmother, than I had realized.

Professor Ocho

Primary and secondary education experiences. I went to a parochial grade school ... it was run by a community of religious sisters and the high school was run by the Christian brothers ... so I attended both Catholic grade school and high school in Texas. It was just amazing ... it was only five minutes from the border.

You know what made it [school] a lot easier for me was that I had 10 siblings ... I am the seventh of 11 children ... three girls and eight boys. So because I'm the seventh, there were already older brothers and sisters at home speaking both languages. Just about everybody in the class was Mexican American ... there

were a few Mexicans who would cross the border since it was so close. I would say the only challenge was that sometimes I felt some of the teachers didn't understand us ... we had a lot of first-year teachers and because Fort Bliss is nearby ... some of the soldiers' wives would teach but they didn't know Spanish and they didn't know our culture. Now that I look back and every now and then ... you kind of got the message that to be bilingual was a disadvantage. As one teacher told me, she said, "Well because what happens is that your vocabulary is a lot less ... because if you don't know the word in one language ... you switch to another." It's true, but as a kid I couldn't hear that, but it's also an asset because you can switch to another language and your capacity to learn another language is going to be greater because you grow up bilingual. So to counter that effect, we did have Mexican and Mexican-American sisters and priests that were very much the opposite. I remember one used the image of the bird—he said, "If you just know Spanish ... you're like this [gesturing with his hand sideways] and if you just know English or like this [again gesturing with his hand sideways], but if you know both you can fly [gesturing with his hand flat]." So he really insisted that we have both [languages]. And he got me to start reading in Spanish, which I never thought I could do ... he was a very important presence. I think because they had suffered by people who had put them in certain categories he really learned the hard way and he didn't want us to suffer like he did. There was also this Mexican sister ... a great woman ... she had a real campaign for education and to never be embarrassed by who you are. They were very positive influences.

Undergraduate and graduate experiences. Undergraduate ... it first was a real shock ... I went to [a Catholic university] in New Orleans ... so I went from [home city in Texas] to New Orleans. I wanted to join the Jesuits, but they wanted me to wait, because they said I was too young at 18. But the real reason they told me later ... they found that if they got Mexican-American boys from [home city in Texas] they would not stay because they would get so homesick. He said the best advice he got was ... have them make the break from home first ... it was a great idea because first you go through culture shock. I remember people telling me ... "When are you going back to Mexico?" I'm not from Mexico ... "But you speak Spanish and you sign your name with an accent." New Orleans, now that I look back ... it's a very diverse city, but for me at the time it seemed very Anglo or black and I didn't realize it was a much more complex city racially and so forth. A big advantage was that I was studying sociology, and sociology gave me great categories to put my experiences into ... great categories to know myself. It also helped me to understand things like internal colonization. There were some very good categories and they were sociological. Also the Jesuit community had

known people that were in the [home city in Texas] Jesuit community. So I felt like I was part of a bigger family.

So by the time I got to graduate school, I had a lot of self-knowledge. I ended up really liking Latin American studies, which I ended up getting a Masters in. I ended up joining the Jesuits, and again there was a lot of affirmation. One thing I saw was that there was a real need for people like me ... a need for bilingual Mexican Americans. So right after the Bachelors in sociology ... it was two years of novitiate ... two years of philosophy and then the Masters in Latino American studies. I worked for three years, and then I studied theology and then the doctorate: It was a few years of school.

* * *

The aforementioned narratives of the eight La Raza participants provided first-hand accounts of their educational and personal lived experiences in primary and secondary education, as well as their experiences in undergraduate and graduate education as an ethnic minority student. A few themes became apparent from their counter-stories, including the importance of their parents and other supportive people throughout their schooling (e.g., grandparents, teachers, other students, a coach, and a counselor), positive messages about education, the role of Catholic schooling, and supportive programs targeting and assisting Mexican-American students offered by the university or college. In addition, shared counter-stories by Professors Dos, Cuatro, and Siete recounted some level of difficulty related to ethnic self-identity and their attempt to reconnect with their Mexican origins, culture, and language. Some of the participants expressed experiences of either racism or discrimination associated with their ethnicity. Professor Dos revealed the level of racism she encountered from her grandfather. Professor Cinco revealed experiencing discrimination and racism as an undergraduate and graduate student. Professor Ocho said how he experienced racism in the form of an

assumption made by a fellow white student. Lastly, five of the participants reported attending either a Catholic elementary or middle school or a Catholic college or university as an undergraduate or doctoral student. La Raza participants further discuss later in this chapter the connection they perceived between being Mexican American and/or Chicana/o and Catholic higher education. Only Professor Siete attended Catholic institutions from elementary school through undergraduate studies.

Career Progression of La Raza Faculty in Catholic Higher Education

This second section of La Raza Interview Protocol, “Career Progression (Self-Perceived Supports and Challenges)” in Catholic higher education, addresses the second research question of this study and examines participants’ revealing recollections and motivations toward becoming faculty members in higher education. Some of the participants did not initially pursue employment at Catholic institutions of higher of education upon completion of graduate school, although some expressed various reasons for their decision, which included their experiences prior to and after graduate school. In addition, participants revealed self-perceived supports and challenges encountered throughout and toward obtaining faculty membership. To gain the essence of the personal and professional lived experiences this section was intended to accomplish, several sub-questions were presented to thoroughly address the research question in narratives.

Realization of Interest in an Academic Career

When posing the question, “When did you realize you were interested in an academic career?” responses varied from as early as childhood to the completion of the doctorate program. To present La Raza responses, I provide a chronology of when participants realized they had an interest in an academic career. Professor Ocho, a full

professor at Santa Clara University, responded, “I think as a kid ... I liked the idea of teaching, but I wanted to be a priest and I couldn’t see myself as a teaching priest necessarily... I knew I wanted to get a good education and I liked school.” Professor Ocho goes on to further discuss how he was influenced to reconsider becoming a faculty member of a Catholic college or university: “A good friend told me, ‘if you’re going to really make a difference, you have to be a part of a faculty and not just a parish and teach a course here and there’.” Perhaps he initially felt some level of resistance in initiating the leap toward teaching in higher education, as supported in his following statement:

That’s how I saw myself ... doing a lot of retreat work and different advocacy work, but I never thought I would be tenure track ... climbing the ladder and publishing and it just started happening ... and again, it was just about the need (Professor Ocho).

Nevertheless, Professor Ocho appeared pleased with his path and career choice in academia. Professor Dos, an associate professor at the University of San Diego, also shared that she became interested in an academic career as early as childhood and replied,

I would say really young. I would say 12 because it was all I knew because my family was so isolated in some ways and school was all I knew. Like the kids in the neighborhood wanted to be cops and border patrol ... it’s all they know ... it’s the only institution they had contact with. So being smart, I always knew it was my ticket...but I wasn’t really smart because I was split [biracial] but I could really do school well (Professor Dos).

Professor Cuatro, an associate professor at Loyola Marymount University, shared that his parents were public high school teachers ... “so they really kind of introduced it to me.” While completing his undergraduate degree in California, he shared that “It just felt like I had a lot more that I wanted to learn, so I kept going.” It was while attending

graduate school that he realized, “I really fell in love with the idea of being a professor and the life that that could offer.”

Three of the participants reported that they became interested in an academic career as undergraduate students. Professor Tres, a full professor at Loyola Marymount University, shared as a freshman he was unclear of his career direction until “There I thought ... looking at my professors ... this would be a pretty cool job you know.” While discussing his plan with his roommate at the time, Professor Tres replied, “When we were freshman we were talking about what professors do and we looked at each other and said ... hey, let’s be professors. It was the lifestyle that was very appealing.”

Professor Cinco, an assistant professor at Loyola Marymount University and the youngest participant of this study, replied,

By my sophomore year ... it was a combination of realizing how powerful knowledge was and talking with [a professor] who told me why he chose to be a professor and that resonated with me and I definitely didn’t want to work construction with my dad ... I’d rather teach two days a week about the stuff I like (Professor Cinco).

Professor Siete, an associate professor at the University of San Francisco, said he liked the flexibility of being allowed to pursue a “private practice,” as well as “to be an academic.” Professor Siete furthermore replied,

But I think what sold it the most was the teaching because I had been a high school teacher before I went to graduate school. I think a lot of it had to do with my experiences of doing research and teaching ... and I really liked teaching and wanted to do teaching at the next level ... It’s nice to have that combination of the two at the USF where it’s not such hardcore research like Research 1 institutions ... I think that was what was attractive (Professor Siete).

The remaining two participants corresponded that the proceeding phase after obtaining their doctoral degrees was teaching at a college or university. Professor Uno

stated, “It was just ingrained in my brain ... it was all about getting educated and I got to the ultimate experience, which was to go to graduate school, and then I sat there one day and said, “Okay ... what am I going to do with this ... and obviously you’re going to teach.” Professor Seis also articulated his interest and initial process toward a career in higher education:

Well when I finished the Ph.D., it was clear that that was the choice [teaching] ... that is what the program was intended to prepare me for ... an academic career. I interviewed for a staff position at Penn and for a variety of reasons I chose Penn. I was allowed to teach a course as an adjunct. I wanted to have some teaching experience in case I applied for an academic job. The fact that I didn’t continue in academia when I moved back to California was partly a reflection of what was available ... so I went into consulting and industry [prior to tenure at Santa Clara University] (Professor Seis).

As revealed by the participants, each identified their own reasons for pursuing careers in academia, which varied from being aware of their desire to teach at an early age to developing an interest near the end of their doctoral program. One reason for pursuing a teaching career often correlates with a desire to assist in the development of students’ learning and preparing students for the world outside of higher education, although this was not clearly revealed by the participants in responding to this interview question.

Graduate School Preparation

When posing the question, “Did graduate school prepare you for your role as a faculty member in higher education?”, the emerging response was that their doctoral program did not specifically prepare them for *teaching*, and principally prepared them for *research*.

Professor Uno: You know I have to say yes ... I know a lot of people would probably say no and I have a lot of colleagues in higher education. Let me explain to you what I mean. Julian Samora got his doctorate degree in 1953, he's the first Mexican-American sociologist in this country and he struggled, he didn't just go right in ... he had a family and a real challenging life. So being from that generation he had to navigate mainly in an Anglo world and beat them at their own game ... that's what it came down to. He got hired at Notre Dame in 1959 until the end of his career in 1986 ... so the guy knew the place very well. The reason I feel that graduate school helped me do this work was because he was a very good mentor. The man was like the Godfather ... if you had any problems with other teachers ... problems gone ... he had a lot of status and he was very forceful in a gentle way. You need to have an ally ... make sure you're going to a program where you have faculty that are going to support you or you won't finish. It's all about politics. That's why I feel like I was prepared for doing this work. To this day I get frustrated and tired, but I just continue to remember what this is all about.

Professor Dos: No, because I picked the wrong thing to study. Teaching [as a doctoral student] prepared me to be a faculty member and that took me one step further than my dissertation. So the course took me into the literature of people of color ... so that saved my life ... that was everything ... So teaching that [course] prepared me for teaching.

Professor Tres: No, I think it prepared me to do research, it didn't prepare me to teach ... but I think it prepared me in terms of understanding the academic environment in graduate school and it transitions you to interact with faculty. It certainly prepared me for conducting research, but in terms of teaching, absolutely not.

Professor Cuatro: Barely ... you know grad school teaches you how to do research ... usually not very well. It doesn't teach you how to be a human being interacting with other human beings ... it didn't teach me how to teach ... didn't teach me how to serve on committees ... didn't teach me how to balance my time ... didn't teach me how to submit essays for publication ... didn't teach me how to develop a career and strategize where to publish or how to publish, with whom to speak ... didn't teach me how to share my work with other colleagues, which everybody does.

Professor Cinco: Yes and no, it didn't prepare me to be a teacher at all. I think one of the weakest parts of the Ph.D. system is that they don't teach you how to

be a good teacher. I think it prepared me to be a good researcher, but not a good teacher. Honestly I got my teaching experience at a [Catholic university] and I remember all of my teachers knew me and I just remember the attention all my teachers gave me with my writing or just talking me through an idea—that one-on-one attention. At an [Ivy League university] I had a professor that didn't care; I realized that some of the most brilliant scholars that have written the most amazing books are just horrible teachers. So I know how important having good teachers in college was for me and I wanted to be a good teacher too.

Professor Seis: It did. The main thing it taught me was how to think like an academic, academic writing and research skills, the whole culture of writing papers and submitting them for conferences and revising them for publication. You know that's what it was intended to do. But it didn't turn out like that initially—it was one of those God plans or you plan God laughs. I was very young when I started the Ph.D. program, I was 23 and I finished when I was 27. In retrospect, I didn't benefit from the program as much as I could have if I had more experience and maturity ... but all in all, it served me well. That's what happens when you don't know what you're doing, you just fall into things.

Professor Siete: I think it did to some extent, it prepared me for research, but it didn't prepare me for the teaching, but that happens a lot in graduate school. It didn't prepare me as a mentor or to do the service work.

Professor Ocho: I would say yes and no. As a doctorate student, I was teaching and you got feedback on your teaching ... it gives you a lot of confidence. As far as the teaching ... no ... not really.

Many of the participants expressed that their doctoral program primarily prepared them to conduct research, with responses among participants varying from “Well” to “Barely.” The majority of the participants said their doctoral program did not prepare them for the teaching facet in academia; however, this is typical of most doctoral programs. As a required component of their doctoral program, Professors Dos, Cinco, and Ocho were fortunate to have gained teaching experience. Professors Uno and Tres expressed other learned facets pertinent to faculty responsibilities in academia. Professor Uno reported that having an ally in the doctoral program assisted him toward navigating

the politics through the program toward completion of his doctoral degree. Professor Tres stated that the doctoral program assisted him with “understanding the academic environment in graduate school” and that “it transitions you to interact with faculty.” Professor Siete reported that the doctoral program did not prepare him to “mentor or to do service work.”

Mentoring

In accordance with the literature review, for faculty of color, in this case Mexican-American and Chicana/o faculty, there is “minimal support in the form of mentoring for junior faculty of color after they have been hired, in turn, impairing their odds for success in the tenure process” (Quezada & Louque, 2004, p. 4). When posing the question, “Are you currently receiving or did you formally receive mentoring as a junior faculty member?” the response of nearly all La Raza participants was that they received “informal mentoring” at their institution.

Sharing their mentorship experiences as junior faculty members at their institutions, Professor Uno informed me that he received mentoring, although it was not within his assigned department. “You know who did it ... it was other Latino faculty at other institutions ... those guys really took me under their wing ... I really owe them a lot.” Professor Dos also said she did not receive mentoring within her department and expressed the assigned mentor “didn’t really understand my perspective,” so she searched for mentors outside of her department that “were of like opinion.” She stressed the importance of seeking mentors that “mirror your reality and your perspective.” Professor Tres informed me he received mentoring from non-Latino colleagues within the department because at the time, “They [Latino colleagues] just weren’t around.” The

dean of his department provided him mentoring, although it was informal, because, at the time, there was no “formal or systematic or sustaining” type of mentoring established at his institution.

Professor Cuatro said that when he initially arrived at his institution, “They had nothing in writing for what it took to get tenure”; thereafter, he received a mentor “officially through the university.” He shared that having really good mentorship, although it was not within his department, was crucial. In addition, Professor Cuatro said he gained mentoring through Fellowships, which “were primarily at the time for people of color.” Professor Cinco, a tenure-track faculty member, informed me he currently has an assigned mentor at his institution. He shared, when he arrived at his institution, his mentor within the department approached the president of the university to advocate on his behalf:

Look, this kid is one of the top race scholars coming out of grad school right now, he has an Ivy league Ph.D., and he could probably get a job at any other school, but he’s willing to come back because this is his alma mater and because he knows that Loyola Marymount University is a family-based school and he wants to be close to his family (Professor Cinco).

Professor Seis informed me he received informal mentoring at his current institution through conversations with various department chairs throughout the years within his department regarding the progress of his research, preparing manuscripts for publishing, and tenure process and requirements. He asserted the “real mentoring” he received was through an Ignatius institution group for faculty members meeting once a month to assist in building opportunities for “shared discernment on professional and personal issues”:

More experienced faculty brings to the table specific tactics or strategies to help you address problems. There's nothing like it at any other place in the world, only Santa Clara University has it, it's where it was designed and first implemented and it's been absolutely invaluable; that's what saved my life. I myself did not receive any kind of formal mentoring from colleagues; I collaborated with some research projects but had no formal mentoring (Professor Seis).

Professor Siete informed me he received informal mentoring at a previous public institution prior to arriving at his current institution, at which time he was assigned a mentor. He shared initially, "I wasn't so excited about the choice because there were other faculty of color that I felt I really connected with," although he continued to say, "My mentor's fantastic. I have a formal mentor that really looks out for me and I can go to her for support." Professor Siete went on to share the assistance and support he has received from his mentor:

You think only in the business world but in academia there are all kinds of politics. My formal mentor is not shy about protecting me from getting pulled into too much service and I think that that is one of the roles of a good mentor. She always says, "Always thank the person for the invitation ... say that's a very interesting offer ... let me talk to my mentor about it." If there's a power differential ... let's say it's a dean or an associate dean that's asking me to do something, she says, "Don't say no to the dean or the provost or the president, but you can say no to the chair or a chair from another department (Professor Siete).

Professor Ocho commented that he received "a lot of good mentoring," although did not believe it was "officially part of the system." He attributes the mentoring he received to the Jesuit community. "The people I lived with ... I would ask them questions or they would advise me ... I felt like there were a lot of good people looking out for me." Professor Ocho's experiences, like those of most other La Raza participants, echo the inability to obtain formal mentoring for Mexican-American and Chicana/o junior

faculty within their institutions. Fortunately for Professor Ocho, he was able to obtain guidance, support, and mentoring within his religious-affiliated community.

Most La Raza participants expressed that their mentoring experiences were obtained from outside of their department. They shared obtaining mentoring from colleagues with similar ethnicities and senior faculty outside their department and at other colleges and universities due to the limited numbers of Mexican-American and Chicana/o faculty either employed within their department or at their college or university. These participants searched for colleagues and senior faculty with similar ethnicities with the purpose of assisting them in navigating and succeeding toward the process of tenure and promotion at their institutions as minority faculty.

Attraction to Academic Career in Catholic Higher Education

With a larger number of Mexican-American and Chicana/o scholars employed at public colleges and universities, La Raza participants were asked to elaborate on what attracted them to a career in Catholic higher education. Emergent themes discussed by Professors Uno, Dos, Cuarto, and Seis revealed they did not initially or primarily seek employment at a Catholic college or university, and their decision was primarily contingent on “being close to family,” nearby their institution, “working with students interested in diversity and inclusion issues,” or the “opportunity presented itself.” Another theme that emerged was that they were attracted to the social justice mission of their Catholic institution because it “fit” their own personal beliefs and values.

Professor Tres stated he was attracted to the “value system” and his ability to “conduct research not only to inform but also to mobilize” and that he has been encouraged at his Catholic institution compared to Research 1 institutions. Professor

Cinco said, “I grew up Catholic and the Jesuits here on campus were very important for me as an undergraduate student.” He expressed seeking employment at his institution because it introduced him to “liberation theology” and “Catholic social teaching” involved a commitment to the poor ... “to bridge my faith and politics.”

I feel like it’s a family-based school. I know people here have families and the pressures of academia don’t take over that, not like the Research 1 schools; don’t get me wrong, I like them and I like my research, but I see that at those institutions it’s all about the research. This is a family school; I could teach my faith and politics here, it’s a perfect fit for what I do (Professor Cinco).

Professor Siete informed me he did not recall wanting to teach in a Catholic school, although stated, “I was really drawn to the Jesuit mission of social justice ... and it really fit well with my values as a researcher.” He commented further on his attraction to Catholic higher education:

To me, it was a really good fit in both my values and my research with a social justice mission. What I really like about the mission here is helping underserved populations. It feels like home and it feels comfortable for me, but I don’t think I ever had that goal of teaching at a Catholic institution (Professor Siete).

Professor Ocho reported teaching at a public university for one semester prior to being assigned a position in Catholic higher education. He expressed a “calling” to work with “Latino students” in his discipline because “there are so few of us [Mexican Americans].” He is currently advising doctoral students from various Catholic institutions and reflects, “I think to myself, how I was mentored, what worked for me, and how can I pass that on.”

Most La Raza participants informed me they were not primarily attracted to employment in Catholic higher education, although others expressed an interest in Catholic higher education because of their interest in the Jesuit mission of education that

includes a faith-based value system and a social justice element. They believed the social justice element in Catholic higher education supported their research interests that entailed conducting research that emphasized informing and mobilizing others.

Supports in Catholic Higher Education

Supports for faculty members in higher education are invaluable toward their success in navigating the tenure and promotion process at their institution. La Raza participants were asked to elaborate on the types of supports they have or have received throughout their career in Catholic higher education. Emergent themes included “mentors,” “positive relationships with colleagues, senior faculty, and administrators,” and “professional evaluations.”

Professor Uno informed me he could not generalize for all Catholic institutions of higher education, although believed “there are some really genuinely good faculty” at his institution.

He shared having friends, beyond teaching, have been supports at his institution, which have been a majority of faculty of color. He also shared his support group of faculty of color was larger, although “We’ve lost a lot of those faculty.”

Professor Dos said being a faculty member at a Catholic institution has been supportive, especially for Mexican Americans because “it’s not as hard here because it’s so much a part of our reality.” She thought being at a Catholic institution may be increasingly difficult because for “other ethnicities that don’t have those ties it can be a lot harsher.” For Professor Dos, being active within the community outside of her Catholic institution has allowed her to “learn more about the culture, and more about Chicano spirituality, even if you revolt against it, but that’s part of us too.”

Professor Tres reported having received a “tremendous amount of support at Loyola Marymount University and a lot of it, again, was not formal.” Clarifying the type of support he received from his institution, he stated,

I think the support came from the fact that they weren't rigid and they were flexible ... so that when you came up with ideas or when you came up with research topics or when you came up with certain curricular activities, it wasn't no, it was ... “Oh that's interesting, let's try it”(Professor Tres).

Professor Cuatro said the greatest support he has received thus far has been the mentorship. He shared a few colleagues he considers friends have also been a support for him. Exploring other supports, he concluded with the following statement:

I don't look for support in my job, I have my family, and part of the reason why I wanted a job in [Southern California] is because my life is here and my job supports my life, not the other way around (Professor Cuatro).

Professor Cinco said a senior colleague at his institution has been supportive with instructing him on how to interact with other colleagues and who to contact for resources. He shared the dean of his school, who is an administrator of color, has been supportive. He said the dean understands “all the extra burdens” faculty of color endures because of his own extensive research related to faculty of color in higher education. Professor Cinco continued to say how the dean has been a support not only for faculty of color but for all faculty at his school:

He instituted that first-year faculty members, not just faculty members of color, but all first-year faculty members, don't have to do any service their first two years. So having him here ... having someone who is conscious of these issues in an administrative position has really been helpful here. So it helps to have people of color in administration (Professor Cinco).

Professor Seis reported that the “faculty office” at his institution has served as a support and over the years it has grown to become “more active and better able to support faculty in all stages of faculty development.”

Professor Siete believes the “senior faculty mentors have been everything—they’ve been really key” with his department. He said senior faculty is aware of the various issues experienced by faculty of color. He elaborated how senior faculty have been supportive: “Everything from microaggression to issues around doing the kind of research you think is valuable to service and protecting you from being pulled into too much service.”

Professor Ocho reported he has received support from professional organizations. He said student evaluations and professional evaluations have helped him in understanding proficiencies and deficiencies as a faculty member. He also stated that colleagues can be a support, especially when complimenting you on your work, such as “I’m hearing really good things about your classes.” To conclude, Professor Ocho pointed out that senior faculty have provided support with advice:

I think they [senior faculty] were very upfront that there were a very few of us and that we had to be really good because there was a real sense for our reputation. It meant that you had to work extra hard and it might not always show. One Provincial actually told me, “We have to work harder because we can. We have to master Cervantes and we have to master Shakespeare; so no more poor victim” (Professor Ocho).

Supports in Catholic higher education were found to vary among the eight La Raza participant s interviewed for the study. Most participants expressed that the majority of their supports had been from the few staff and faculty with similar ethnicity employed at their institution, while a few participants included other ethnic groups as supports.

Some participants attributed their success to supportive senior faculty and administrators at their institution. These supports included mentoring in the form of supporting their research interests and protecting them from being inundated with committee assignments and service work. One La Raza participant said that administrators have been supportive by allowing first-year tenure-track faculty members at his institution to focus their time on teaching, research, and publishing without any service work commitments for their first two years.

Challenges in Catholic Higher Education

Challenges for faculty members in higher education can be the determining factor whether they remain in or leave their institution. La Raza participants were asked to elaborate on the challenges they have experienced throughout their career in Catholic higher education. Emergent themes discussed by the participants include “lack of process,” “increased difficulty for women of color,” “inundated with service responsibilities,” “managing workload,” and “lack of resources.”

Professor Uno stressed that “The problem for me with Catholic higher education is that it lacks process.” He explained that decisions at his institution are at times made without a formal process and said, “It’s all about face-time, who you know, who you hang out with, and I hate to say it man, but it reminds me of the Mafia.” He expressed his frustration with what he called continuous “inter-sanctum decisions” and said, “So you need to have the power or you need to be involved in all of those discussions, but you can’t be at every place and time.” Professor Uno provided an example of his challenge with the process at his institution:

What I mean is that you and I are sitting here in this room and let’s say you’re on the faculty and I’m on the faculty and [there’s] an opening for a position and my

administration says, “Hey come on over you have the job.” And before I know it, you know it, [and] you’re the person [who gets] the position. What the hell, wasn’t there a process, wasn’t there like a search, wasn’t there like an open invitation (Professor Uno).

Professor Dos informed me that being a woman has been a challenge at her institution. She elaborated further:

The workload was so big and with all the excess stuff we did around a Hispanic-affiliated student group, creating [a department] and then teaching new courses—I was a mad woman ... I had no life. I’ve got to say the downside was no life, it was all about work. So I was unable to achieve that balance and I think for men it’s a little easier; they had wives ... I needed a wife. I hadn’t achieved balance till now (Professor Dos).

Another challenge Professor Dos has experienced at her institution is the practice of “internalization,” explaining that

Internationalization is always preferring foreign-born people to people of color and our school is absolutely entrenched in that. Internationalization is a priority, it’s an agenda, it’s funded, and they’re not interested in funding anything about people of color. So there are very few Chicanos and I think it’s very intentional because we’re trouble (Professor Dos).

Professor Tres said the greatest challenge is the “lack of resources” at most Catholic institutions of higher education, with the exceptions of “Georgetown, Boston College, and Notre Dame, which have significant graduate programs.” In regard to “lack of resources,” he said the following about smaller Catholic colleges and universities such as San Diego, San Francisco, Santa Clara, and LMU:

We don’t have a significant graduate student culture; therefore, you don’t have those colleagues or students to help you with your research to that same degree that all Research 1 universities have ... So I think that’s been a challenge. (Professor Tres).

Professor Cuatro informed me that his greatest challenge has been “falling into the trap of service as a faculty of color” and said he believed service work was increasing especially “for women faculty of color.” He continued to say how service responsibilities as a faculty of color affected his promotion:

Faculty of color are inundated with service requests. Every committee wants a person of color on their committee so that they can look as though they’re making an effort for diversity representation. And as you know, there’s not that many of us. It’s just unmanageable, you have to learn how to say no and I haven’t done it very well. Last year I hit a breaking point, I was doing a lot of service and I didn’t get the highest merit increase that I usually do and I had everything (Professor Cuatro).

Professor Cinco reported that his greatest challenge has been “making the transition” as a new faculty member. Currently, he said his “biggest challenge” is designing a new course, although that’s “a good challenge.” Another challenge for Professor Cinco has been “trying to balance the teaching with the research” as a tenure-track faculty member.

Professor Seis shared his greatest challenges have been “unstable leadership” and “isolation” within his department. He said when he initially arrived at his department, the first few years he experienced a series of “ups and downs” due to the “unstable leadership.” Another challenge for him has been being “a team of one to lead a master’s program.” He said being alone in his program, he did not have others to consult with and stated, “At times I felt a little isolated ... it has been a bit of a challenge to establish a reputation of someone who has something to contribute.”

Professor Siete informed me his greatest challenge of has been “being able to manage the time for research” with other expectations for teaching and service. He said the teaching load is manageable and “I’ve seen worse.” He further elaborated saying:

I think one of the biggest challenges has been keeping my scholarship going on a regular basis because it can so easily take a backseat to the other things you have to do (Professor Siete).

For Professor Ocho, his greatest challenge has been “the work demand.” He shared managing the work demand is increasingly difficult when you are a new faculty member within the department “in terms of coming up with courses and readings and so forth.” In addition, he said the challenge is greater if you are a person of color in terms of time because the “institution wants that face on the committee, again representation, student demands, and church demands.” Another challenge for Professor Ocho has been continuing with his writing, although he said the institution offers sabbaticals, which have allowed him to pursue research and writing.

Among the challenges faced by La Raza participants—lack of process, increased difficulty for women, inundated with service responsibilities, managing workload, and lack of resources—the greatest challenge has been managing their workload. The participants in the study expressed difficulty managing their time for teaching, service, and research, which they partly attributed to being inundated with service requests as a faculty member of color. It was suggested by these participants that departments in their institutions actively pursued faculty of color to join committees for the purpose of diversifying committees, which at times served as a detriment to their own pursuit of tenure and promotion at their institutions.

Experiences of Discrimination and Racism

Thoughts of being perceived by colleagues, administrators, and others as different particularly based on race and/or ethnicity can increase feelings of isolation within the department and institution. La Raza participants were asked whether they experienced

racism, prejudice, or discrimination in their career in Catholic higher education, and if so, to elaborate on it. Themes that emerged from the interviews include “lack of respect and recognition,” “being categorized by ethnicity first,” “microaggression,” “silencing,” “marginalization,” “questioning of credentials,” and “subtle comments of racism.”

Professor Uno reported, “Here at the university, I think it’s microaggression.” He said there are “ways of silencing people or keeping them out of the discussion. It happens a lot; you just have to confront it.” He said that he is currently working on a project and has recently submitted his ideas to the administration, although he has received a lack of support for his ideas with no rationale for the denial. He then stated, “I am a person of color and instead of having a dialogue with me ... giving me my respect ... they’re just not going to respond to me; they’ve chosen to ignore me.” He suggests this is a form of “microaggression because there’s no process, just NO, it’s not going to happen,” although he asserts the issue is important to him and he will be patient and continue “working at it.”

Professor Dos reported finding “marginalization, silencing, exclusion, and microaggression” as faculty of color at her institution. She said that she has studied racism in higher education extensively and asserts racism is “systemic and comes from the top” and that “all scholars say unless the president’s office, the mission statement, and the administration set the tone, not much will change.” She stressed that “you just try to fit in,” seeing her experience in terms of “an assimilation philosophy—it’s our way or the highway and it’s a lot of window dressing around diversity.” Professor Dos recalled an experience of prejudice about a month after she was hired at her institution about 20 years ago:

I was up late at night in the library, about nine o'clock at night doing stuff, and a faculty member came in and he said, "You were an affirmative action candidate shoved down our throats; some of us were really against you ... You just need to know how some of us felt." I was like, "Whoa, I can't believe you're saying this." So I go home and he called me later and he says ... "I know what I said you can repeat and you can use it against me." I said, "No, I'm not going to use it, I'm going to save it, and you know what I have" (Professor Dos).

Professor Tres informed me that he was originally hired at his institution without having finished his dissertation, although he said, "That was not unusual back then for Latinos or for any faculty per se," whereas white males were required to finish their dissertation prior to being hired. He said he has held many positions at his institution and he thinks that other faculty members believe those positions came not because of merit but because of solely being Mexican American or Chicano. "So there's always that having to prove yourself a little bit more in terms as why you got that position." Professor Tres provided an example of how he was perceived by a colleague:

I remember when I was appointed associate dean, someone said, "Oh yeah, I think they need a Latino in that position," instead of saying, "Oh yeah they need someone with your skill set" or what have you ... she wasn't trying to be negative, but she didn't realize [the implications of what she said] (Professor Tres).

Professor Cuatro informed me he has not experienced racism, prejudice, or discrimination directly or overtly, although shared he has a Latino colleague in his department with more pronounced Latino features and "I showed up for a meeting once and he wasn't at the meeting and one of my colleagues said, 'Where is your twin?' We don't look anything alike." Professor Cuatro provided another example of how he is perceived by his colleagues:

Another time I was at a meeting and somebody called him by my name and we weren't even sitting next to each other. So you understand how people see you. You understand that they don't see you first; they see an ethnic category first. So,

I can't say that explicitly or directly, but it's there, you can feel that it's in their imagination (Professor Cuatro).

Professor Cinco informed me his only experience with any type of racism, prejudice, or discrimination thus far in his department was an encounter with a former professor who made a comment to him when he accepted employment at his institution earlier this year. "She said, 'Oh we need a token Spanish last name on the doors or the walls,' something like that."

Professor Siete said he has not personally observed any type of racism, prejudice, or discrimination directed toward himself. He shared witnessing subtle instances, although he believes there is a "lack of recognition about what faculty of color do to some degree." He also believes there is "a problem with a lack of representation of faculty of color in administrative positions versus faculty positions," and he did not believe it was racism, but "it's ... something that's systemic that marginalizes."

Professor Ocho said he has observed subtle instances of racism, prejudice, or discrimination within his department among colleagues and stated, "Sometimes people believe we are where we are because of our race." Recalling an instance while at a party, he said, "I remember one faculty member told me, 'They let you in the back door,' and I just found that so offensive." He also recalled previous struggles with non-ethnic colleagues:

I found myself really struggling to get good marks from the white boys and again it wasn't until a good superior pointed this out to me ... "Don't be so worried about the white boys, because again, you're trying to anticipate their critique, especially if you're trying to make a case for Latinos." I learned also that it works both ways: that we have to be careful saying a colleague or a policy is racist (Professor Ocho).

Professor Ocho also provided an instance with another colleague regarding international students:

I think another challenge is for anyone doing a heavy cultural project, and we have a large number of international students. So some of the faculty would guide them to me—“You should work with them on this project”—but were all committed to the dialogue of faith and culture. And I thought to myself, you just don’t want to do the work it takes to get someone who’s struggling with the language and the concepts so they succeed. In having a conversation with them, they said, “Well that person shouldn’t be here; they can’t cut it at the institution.” So obviously, I think there’s racism in the academy and I’m very concerned about this (Professor Ocho).

Most La Raza participants voiced an experience of discrimination or racism through forms of microaggression at their current institution. This microaggression included being ignored and silenced by administrators when questioning current policies and offering ideas for improvement, as well as experiencing prejudice and discrimination by non-ethnic faculty colleagues. One participant initially said he had not experienced racism, prejudice, or discrimination at his institution, and then later related two specific experiences of microaggression in the form of racism. Even though La Raza participants did not say they had pervasive experiences of discrimination and racism within their institutions, their collective experiences support prior research concluding the reality of continued discrimination and racism experienced by faculty of color in higher education.

Social and Cultural Climate for La Raza Faculty in Catholic Higher Education

The third research question of this study was addressed within the third section of La Raza Interview Protocol. The third section explored the social and cultural climate experienced by La Raza participants within their department and institution. This section

also explored their values, beliefs, and socialization relationships. La Raza participants' responses in the third section are presented in the following narratives.

Level of Association with Self-Identified Ethnic Group and Ethnic-Related Involvement

In the third section of La Raza Interview Protocol, the first two questions explored La Raza participants' level of association with their self-identified ethnic group and their involvement in ethnic-related committees or groups within their department or university. All participants showed pride in their self-identified ethnicity, whether they identified as Mexican American or Chicana/o.

Professor Uno said he felt "very much comfortable with the identification of being a Chicano," although he discussed living with "the contradictions of being part of a middle-class society while at the same time wanting to hold on to ethnic values and always having to deal with those contradictions." As a means of remaining connected to his Chicano values, he further commented, "You're resolving it by continuing to provide services in the community and meeting people that are like-minded that tend to be more liberal and progressive in their politics." Bridging his Chicano identity with service work, he reported current involvement at his institution as an advisor to a Hispanic-affiliated student organization and current connection with "community orbs," although nothing else at his institution because "there really isn't anything else available." He also added, "I think there's a real connection with what we do and Catholic education ... I believe our work is nothing more than work about social justice and that's at the core of Catholic teaching."

Professor Dos, who identifies as biracial, shared her association with her self-identified ethnicity. “Well because I was deracinated as a young child, I am a born-again Chicana.” She continued by stating, “I got religion like you wouldn’t believe and that’s where we deracinated folks can really be useful, because we’re so hungry to know ... we’re like evangelicals for La Causa.” Professor Dos said that she was instrumental in developing an ethnic-related department at her institution and has been involved in various other ethnic-related committees, some of which have been discontinued throughout the course of her tenure. She also reported, at the present time, there are no support organizations for faculty of color at her institution.

Professor Tres commented that he has been fortunate at his institution to practice what he teaches and to be engaged and involved with various social events related to his self-identified ethnicity within his department and institution. He stated, “The benefit is that I get to practice all the cultural aspects. I am so incredibly fortunate that I am in a position that I get paid to be Latino.” Professor Tres did not divulge his involvement with any specific ethnic-related committees, groups, or organizations outside of his institution, although he reported, “I’m involved every time Mexicans, Latinos, and Hispanics get together at the university. I’m involved, which for me is not a burden.”

Professor Cuatro said that he is biracial and stays connected with his self-identified ethnic group by currently residing in a predominately Latino area with his partner whom he identifies as biracial. Although he is not Catholic, he reported he “can feel some spirituality in making the sign of the cross” and attends Catholic church with his partner and children because “I like the idea of praying together and being together

like a family for that.” Professor Cuatro said he is currently involved with self-identified ethnic-related committees within his department or institution.

Professor Cinco stated that he continues to reside in a self-identified ethnic neighborhood. He commented, “I don’t hang out with academics; I still hang out with my friends from high school. I’m constantly going to cultural events: Chicano poetry readings and bands from where I live.” He said he continues to reside in his neighborhood because he wanted to remain close to his family. Professor Cinco also said he is currently involved with a self-identified ethnic-related committee to assist students on campus.

Professor Seis informed me that he currently serves on a Hispanic-affiliated advisory board outside of his institution to remain connected with his self-identified ethnic group. He related a recent attempt to volunteer at a local organization assisting Latino students with completing high school, although “they never called me back.” He expressed he would like to be more involved within the community, although this desire has not yet been fulfilled. Within his department, he is solely involved with a Latino faculty group and has limited his involvement among other ethnic-related groups at his institution at this time because “within the school it feels like there’s no overwhelming need to do something right now” because he believes that his “university [already] does a lot for the Hispanic community in general.”

Professor Siete shared, “My background was kind of split between a white mother and a Mexican-American dad.” He credits his wife, who is from a Latin American country, for engaging and immersing him more in the values and practices of Latino culture. “That’s probably the thing that connects me most to Latino culture, although it’s

not necessarily my Mexican-American culture.” Professor Siete said this about his current involvement with ethnic-related events at his institution:

There are faculty of color retreats that I go to that I just love. These are writing retreats that are focused just around faculty of color. I also do the admission callout. It’s the multicultural student callout: Faculty call out students who’ve been accepted to try to encourage them to come to the open house and attend the university (Professor Siete).

Professor Ocho said, “I definitely make it a point to stay in touch with the community, and as a priest, there’s often a need to help out in parishes or give talks.” He emphasized that his involvement with his self-identified ethnic group is “very high.” He continued by saying, “For me, it’s kind of expected because this is what I teach. So I just think the way my life is structured ... it’s built in.” Professor Ocho said that he is currently involved at his institution with assisting Latino doctoral students, which was recently organized by the students to gain support in their program.

All La Raza participants identified as either Mexican American or Chicana/o, with three of the participants identifying as biracial. All La Raza participants voiced a connection and commitment to their self-identified ethnicity through their involvement in teaching, research, and service work at their institution, as well as outside of their institution within their community. The three participants identifying as biracial expressed their unique and continued personal and professional struggles as faculty members at their institution. They also expressed their continued commitment to Hispanics and Latinos through teaching, research, and services at their institutions.

Ethnic and Cultural Composition of Faculty and Level of Collegiality

In the third section of La Raza Interview Protocol, the next questions explored the ethnic and cultural composition of the faculty at the participants’ college or university

and the level of collegiality within their department. In addition, La Raza participants were asked if socialization within their department or institution was primarily with faculty or staff of the same self-identified ethnicity.

Exploring the ethnic and cultural composition of faculty within their departments, a majority of La Raza participants informed me that their departments are predominately white, although four of the participants said that faculty of color are predominant within their departments.

Professor Uno described the ethnic and cultural composition of the faculty in his department, which is ethnic related, as the “most diverse” at the university, although he continues to believe that “we’re doing very poorly I think in terms of faculty of color” because “we hire a lot of white progressive faculty to teach courses that diverse faculty could be teaching.” He also expressed his frustrations related to the lack of faculty of color at his institution:

In our university we have zero full-time tenured African-American faculty... zero. What do you do? I’ve brought this up with the dean ... they’re not going to do anything. This is what I mean by process ... They don’t think about this ... And they’re nice people and they’re well-meaning, but it doesn’t click with them (Professor Uno).

Addressing the level of collegiality within his department, Professor Uno stated, “We’ve been lucky to hire some incredible faculty and our department has pretty much worked well. We work very well together.”

In describing the ethnic and cultural composition of the faculty within her department, Professor Dos said, “It’s great.” She also told me that within another department, “we had two amazing faculty of color,” although they are no longer employed with the institution, because “my guess is that people of color check out when

they find out they're not going to be heard, so they just check out." Addressing the level of collegiality within her department, Professor Dos said, "It's wonderful and supportive, although in [another department], there are some very good people that I like, but for me there's no collegiality."

Describing the composition of the faculty within his department, Professor Tres said, "We're all Mexican American—that's who we are." He said that when he initially began his academic career at the institution, nearly 30 years ago in another department, most of the faculty were white with one female, [but] since then, the college has hired several African-American faculty, but never more than one in the department. He also said that tension among faculty increases within departments with larger numbers of faculty, especially "when faculty don't know each other." He concluded that it's much different when you're a faculty member at the "Cal States and UC's that have departments of 50 and 60 people ... big difference." In response to the question about the level of collegiality within his department, Professor Tres replied, "Oh strong—there are five of us Latinos and it's just a strong cohesive unit, we get along professionally, personally, and socially," which he attributed to the size of the department and culture of the faculty, as well as to being a liberal arts college and the culture of the Jesuit university.

When he arrived at his department, Professor Cuatro said he was one of two male faculty of color, and his department remained this way throughout his first six years as a junior faculty member. He informed me that during this time as a junior faculty member, there was one senior faculty member of color studying abroad three consecutive years. "He was divested ... and I think a lot of it had to do with race." In conclusion, he said that

“his primary department is predominantly white and that some perceive themselves as liberal, which makes it almost impossible to talk to them about poor racial dynamics.”

Regarding the level of collegiality within his department, Professor Cuatro stated,

It’s fine. You know one thing I learned in graduate school and I think that somebody actually gave it to me as advice or at least it was after the fact. If you can meet one or two friends in grad school, don’t try to make 10 friends out of the whole cohort; one is amazing; two is like wow what happened there. It’s the same thing with colleagues. We have 24 faculty and I have one really close friend (Professor Cuatro).

Professor Cinco described the composition of the faculty within his ethnic-related department as follows: “Now there are three minorities in the department: three out of 12 or 13—it’s not bad.” In terms of the level of collegiality within his department, Professor Cinco stated, “I think it’s amazing. It’s really good. I’m lucky, I know I’m an anomaly, I know that for sure. Other colleagues say they hate even walking into their departments.”

Regarding the composition of the faculty in his department, Professor Seis said it was okay. “Including me, there are two faculty of Mexican origin. There is another adjunct faculty that is African American, but the vast majority is white.” Regarding the level of collegiality within his department, Professor Seis said collegiality among faculty members has evolved “over the last two years,” although this was accomplished with rebuilding communication and restoring a sense of trust among faculty members within the department by a “series of amazing conversations about our practices and our goals. It wouldn’t have happened if it wasn’t for the communication and trust.”

Describing the composition of the faculty within his department, Professor Siete said, “It’s very good. We have, if you count the administrators, two African-American faculty, two full-time Asian faculty, and one Latino.” He said he did not believe his department maintained a diverse faculty membership, although “they really value issues

of multiculturalism ... [reflected in] what they teach and impart to students.” Addressing the level of collegiality within his department, Professor Siete stated:

It’s very good. It’s very strong. People are very collegial and supportive. You know, there’s some politics around issues, but usually they come from the outside. I feel very supported here. You have some colleagues involved in politics and they get under your skin, but I think they’re all good people here and they’re really committed to doing a real good job. So I’m lucky; I know it’s not the same in all the departments here (Professor Siete).

Professor Ocho described the ethnic and cultural composition of faculty within his department, saying “Well, the majority is white Anglo Saxon, but that’s quickly changing. We now have three Asian Americans and one Latino. So, there is a growing shift.” He said that he did not think the university was as diverse as it could be and believed that money could be part of the reason. He shared the reason for limited numbers of Latino faculty in higher education was related to Latinos not having “the educational levels to be accepted at a school like this, but it’s encouraging to me that there’s an awareness that we need to move in that direction.” Regarding the level of collegiality within his department, Professor Ocho replied, “I would say really, really good.” He expressed liking colleagues that are really his friends because they “are always trying to bring out the best in me even when I don’t see it myself.” He continued with concerns about teachers and deans that are unable to find the good in others and bring it out.

All La Raza participants informed me that their departments are composed of primarily white faculty members, with the exception of specialized disciplines within their departments that consist of a majority of faculty of color. A few participants shared there have been attempts to hire faculty of color within their departments, although some

of these faculty have left the institution because “they find out they’re not going to be heard, so they just check out” (Professor Dos). Another contributing factor to the limited numbers of faculty of color has been related to hiring “white progressive faculty to teach courses that diverse faculty could be teaching” (Professor Uno). One participant informed me that his college has hired several African-American faculty, but never more than one in his department (Professor Tres). Participants voiced the shortcomings of their departments and institutions in retaining faculty of color and believed that a greater effort could be made in recruiting and retaining faculty of color to increasingly diversify their departments and institutions.

Socialization in Department and Institution

All participants reported that their departments had predominately white faculty members, which appears to coincide with the literature review in reference to limited numbers of tenured and tenure-track faculty of color. Conversely, specialized disciplines appeared to employ the majority of faculty of color within a larger department. When inquiring if La Raza participants mainly socialized within their department and/or institution among faculty and/or staff of the same ethnicity, Professor Uno replied, “We have a multiethnic community and I think we all come together to provide a transformative education ... That’s what brings us together.” Professor Uno went on to say,

It’s with more people of color I have to say. I have white friends from my childhood and in the community, but I don’t have any white colleagues. There’re all faculty of color I have to say (Professor Uno).

Further exploring socialization within the department, Professor Siete stated:

Sure, yeah I think so. I do feel some connection and similarity with people of similar backgrounds. And I think I've felt a connection with even my Asian and African-American colleagues and it may just be around shared experiences of diversity and values (Professor Siete).

Confirming the majority of white faculty within his department, Professor Cinco replied, "In the department here, no, the majority are white." Professor Ocho concurred by responding, "No, not at this university." Seeking socialization with fellow self-identified Hispanic or Latino faculty outside of the departments, Professor Tres replied,

Oh yeah, I mean, there's the Latino faculty association and Chicano studies ... there's constant opportunities just with the faculty at large where Latinos get together socially. Although, interesting enough, the more of us [Mexican American and/or Chicana/o faculty] that there are, the more difficult it is to get all of us together (Professor Tres).

Professor Cuatro provided an alternate perception of socialization within his department and institution:

You know the problem may be the premise there ... I don't really socialize. Well, I guess it's probably half and half. You know, there's a danger too. We had a colleague that didn't get tenure who was Chicano who was hired the same time I was. I think one of the things he suffered from because he was in [an ethnic-related department] is a lack of visibility at the university ... by virtue of that, he was somewhat invisible (Professor Cuatro).

Professor Cuatro continued to say that socializing is important and can be accomplished through service work, although you must be selective about the types of service work because "you don't want to fall into the trap of doing too much service." He also stated that service work should not be specifically focused on people of color and not just about race and ethnicity ... those are always slightly devalued ... that's my impression."

The next sequence of questions in this section explored whether La Raza participants felt accepted or isolated among non-ethnic faculty within their department. These questions were posed to reveal participants' previous and current perceptions associated with acceptance or isolation among staff, faculty, and administrators within their department and/or institutions. I first present La Raza participant responses to the question of feeling accepted followed by the question of feeling isolated among non-ethnic faculty within their department.

Feeling Accepted

All La Raza participants shared a feeling of being accepted among their colleagues within their department, although this may well be attributed to the type of department most of them are in. Professor Uno said feeling accepted within his department was not an issue “because we’re a coalition of interethnic faculty and we support each other,” although he believed faculty in his department were perceived by others outside the department as “asking questions that are unpopular.” Professor Dos concurred. “Yeah, but they don’t like my views,” she said. Professor Tres said he felt “Absolutely” accepted within his department and attributed it to the length of time he has been employed at the institution, although he said, “There has always been a sense of support and acceptance, even in the beginning.” Professor Cuatro was initially apprehensive in his response about feeling accepted within his department, as he stated, “Some—yeah, they all accept me,” and shared that he feels the greatest comfort and ease among faculty of color. He concluded, “The rest of them, I never forget the relationship, even when they’re nice.” Professor Cinco said he “Definitely” felt accepted and continued saying he had to attend an “Ivy League school” to be hired in comparison to

“everybody else here.” Professor Seis stated, “Yes, they talk to me” even when there are differences of opinion and further commented, “It’s a tricky question, you know it when you’re living it and you know it when you’re not.” Professor Siete said, “Oh yeah” and shared he has not had anyone not accept him because of his background or self-identified ethnicity. Professor Ocho also said that he “definitely” feels accepted within his department and confirmed this through consultation requests and invitations to speak in colleagues’ classes.

Feeling Isolated

In addition, all La Raza participants reported they did not currently feel isolated within their departments, and again this may be attributed to their department. Some La Raza participants reported the hiring of recent faculty of color has decreased their personal level of isolation within their department. While others shared they would feel isolated if they were within another department at their institution. Professor Uno said that he did not feel isolated in his department, “but I would feel isolated in other departments and right now I’m feeling that because there’s a lot of B.S. coming down and I get tired.” He continued to express his frustrations:

When I lay my head down at night and I wake up in the morning, I wish things would be different ... I wish people would be treated in a different way (Professor Uno).

Professor Dos reported she initially felt isolated when she began her career at her institution nearly 20 years ago until not long ago. “That’s why we created a new department to belong to.” Her solution to the isolation experienced by Mexican-American and Chicana/o faculty was to create a new program and hire their own colleagues.

Professor Cuatro reported feeling less isolated since the department hired two junior

faculty of color, although said “some heated and tense moments” ensued among faculty and administrators at times involving “qualifications versus the need to diversify.” Professor Seis shared having a Spanish-speaking faculty member he can relate to in his department has been “comforting and feels good.” He further stressed, “It’s one of those things you don’t realize until someone who is non-Mexican or non-Hispanic converses.” Professors Tres, Cinco, Siete, and Ocho did not express any feelings of isolation within their departments.

The next sequence of questions in this section explored whether La Raza participants believed their self-identified ethnicity or gender limited their progress for tenure or promotion in academia and if they believed they had to work harder than their non-ethnic colleagues to be perceived as a legitimate scholar.

Ethnicity Limited Progress for Tenure or Promotion

Professor Uno did not believe his self-identified ethnicity or gender limited his progress for tenure or promotion in academia. He makes reference to what he learned from Julian Samora (his former mentor) while at a [Catholic university]. “You had to learn the game of the dominant society and learn it so well that you could challenge them or beat them at their own game; that’s strategy.” Professor Dos said she did not believe her ethnicity or gender limited her progress for tenure or promotion at her institution and thought she was well treated. She elaborated, “I was the ‘token’ girl and I think they really wanted me to succeed.” Professor Tres disclosed feeling no limitations toward tenure or promotion, although stated, “But I see where it impacts people.” Professor Cuatro shared a different experience from the other responses thus far regarding his tenure review. He stated, “When I was going up for tenure, there was one woman who

really did not like me,” although he had enough people in the department that favored granting him tenure. Professor Cinco said he is “definitely careful” with his choice of words among others within his department and institution. “So just the fact that I have to think about it and I have these nice Guevara shirts I don’t know if I can wear is culturally isolating.” Professor Seis did not displace blame onto anyone else and accepted responsibility. “I blame me. It’s been my work and my procrastination and my laziness if anything.” Professor Siete also did not believe that his progress toward tenure or promotion had been limited by his ethnicity or gender and stated, “The only way it’s impacted is by trying to figure out the service that’s right.” Professor Ocho stressed connecting with Latino communities to recruit faculty that “can move in both worlds” and expressed that Latino faculty, especially being bilingual, are “that much more valuable.”

Worked Harder to Be Perceived as a Legitimate Scholar

The next subject of inquiry was whether La Raza participants believed they had to work harder than their non-ethnic colleagues to be perceived as a legitimate scholar. Other issues touched on in this section had to do with conducting research in marginal areas, being inundated with work, low pay but stability, token hire in need of exceeding expectations, limited experience related to discipline, bicultural issues affecting self-perception, and lack of family support and experience in higher education.

Professor Uno stressed, “We have to work harder because we’re doing work that other people have not done, and we need to seek inaccessible resources because these are marginal areas of research.” He continued by providing an example:

What I want to clarify is working harder doesn’t mean that there’s a deficiency. I think there’s a real authenticity in someone who wants to document something

that nobody knows about, so it requires a very special skill. I imagine your dissertation is going to take a lot more work for you to get done than for somebody else that's going to just visit a classroom or develop a curriculum, but in the end this is going to be very valuable and I think that needs to get out there (Professor Uno).

Professor Dos contends faculty of color worked harder because they are often inundated with additional tasks. "I think the hard work comes with faculty of color doing more in terms of mentoring and service." She said she has done "more than other faculty in terms of mentoring and service" as well as "working with students of color."

Professor Tres said that he has worked harder not because of his ethnicity but because of his area of research:

Yeah, I think so, but not just because of my self-identified ethnicity. The type of research I am doing is on Latino and Latina communities, so here people make comments like "Why are you focusing on that sub-group?" Proving that a study is worthy of study like any other is sometimes a challenge. But that is seen as okay here. At a Catholic university, if you want to study an underrepresented group and try to understand the exclusion of politics and the attempted efforts of inclusion, it is seen as a legitimate concept (Professor Tres).

Professor Cuatro emphasized he has "absolutely" had to work harder to be perceived as a legitimate scholar among his colleagues, although he did not specify the reason(s). He continued to say "I don't want to scare you off—the life that this job allows for is really great." He admitted he would "never be rich" working at his institution, although his employment there provides "stability" and the "ability to create" the life he wanted.

Professor Cinco said that he believes he was a "targeted minority hire" at his institution, and because of this belief, he needs to "meet certain standards" that his

colleagues do not have to meet. Professor Cinco said he continues to work diligently to exceed expectations of being a token hire and the requirements of tenure:

So whether it's direct or indirect, they let me know you got the token hire and you better not waste our time. I feel like I'm exceeding their expectations. One of them told me, "Hey you're working too hard; you need to space these things out." You know, one of the things here is that you have to publish a book or four articles. So by the end of my first year teaching I should have double what I need for tenure (Professor Cinco).

Professor Seis also confirmed he has had to work harder than his non-ethnic colleagues to be perceived as a legitimate scholar because of his limited experiences in teaching, research, and writing related to the discipline of his department. He believes he is doing a "good job" teaching his courses, although recognizes "it is better to have people that have lived the life" related to the discipline of his department. He continued by acknowledging in the not too distant future, "I may just write myself out of a job in the program and let somebody with specific experiences take over this role."

Professor Siete shared the tensions related to his self-perceived biracial ethnicity that has been a continuing issue for him dating back to the time when he was applying to college and asked himself, "What does it mean to be a minority at a [Catholic university]?" He believes he has "had a lot of white privilege relative to other Mexican Americans who had [two] Mexican parents." He pointed out, however, that they might have had other privileges, such as "growing up speaking Spanish, whereas I had to learn it the hard way." Professor Siete further elaborated personal struggles with his biracial identity that have caused him to work harder in a different area of his life than the majority of La Raza participants:

For me personally, it's sort of the imposter syndrome, am I really white getting the advantages of being a minority without having those experiences. I want to be

seen on equal footing with everyone else. So there's always been a tension for me in my own identity and emerging identity. I do wonder about what am I and is it really how I perceive myself or is it how others perceive me (Professor Siete).

Professor Ocho attributes having to work harder to limited family resources. He shared that attending college was "a new world" for him. He said that his father was a mechanic and was unable to relate to his desire for a college education and career in the "world of academia."

A few La Raza participants believed they had to work harder to be perceived as a legitimate scholar not because of their self-identified ethnicity but because of their research interests that reflected their self-identified ethnicity. They pointed out, however, being a faculty member conducting ethnic-related research at a Catholic college, as opposed to a public institution, is encouraged. At the same time, the legitimacy of the research conducted by some of these participants has been diminished by some non-ethnic colleagues who did not regard it as scholarly work.

Conflict of Culture with Others and Suppression of Culture for Acceptance

The next sequence of questions in this section explored whether La Raza participants believed the cultural values of their self-identified ethnicity or gender conflicted with the cultural values of other faculty members in their department and if they had to suppress their cultural values to be accepted within their department. Most La Raza participants did not believe the cultural values of their self-identified ethnicity or gender conflicted with the cultural values of other faculty members in their department, and three La Raza participants believed they had to suppress their cultural values, to some extent, to be accepted within their department.

Professor Uno believes his cultural values conflicted with those of other faculty members, not necessarily within his department, but with faculty of other departments at his institution. He said he entered academia “from a different space to transform people’s lives” and help them think creatively, which he believes Catholic education does “with our students.” He said what he has witnessed “over and over” is the pressure some faculty members and administrators put on students to conform. He stressed that within his department, the objective is to teach students how to “think critically” because “we want them to think outside the box, we want them to take their education and apply it to their world and that gets administration a little bit nervous.” He continued to say that ethnic minority students are often “wresting with conforming versus being creative” and the courses within his department allow students to explore and be creative and he believes “that’s what education is about.”

Addressing the issue of suppressing cultural values to be accepted within his department and institution, Professor Uno replied, “You do that every day of your life” and he attributed this to “becoming someone that can live in more than just one world.” He shared, “You’re always vigilant” about your interactions and socialization with others, especially unfamiliar faculty members and administrators. He said in order to “let your hair down,” this can only occur in a “safe place” among trusted friends within his department and institution. “For me to do that ... I can count them on my hand and they’re all faculty of color; I could never do that with white faculty.”

Professor Dos said she is aware that her cultural values conflict with those of faculty members and administrators outside of her department. She shared being excited about her work within the community, although said, “You simply can’t bring that in here

because no one understands or [they are] totally indifferent to what you're talking about." She went on to say that the "split continues" because she is unable to completely share her knowledge and experiences from community work at her job because "there's no interest."

Whether she suppressed cultural values to be accepted within her department and institution, Professor Dos said she did not believe she did in her department, although outside the department, she said, "Definitely, but you're strategic by suppressing certain things to get the goodies." She compared her strategy to a "chess game" of when to "open your mouth." Rather than argue about teaching other courses, it was more important for her to teach courses about people of color and said, "Now I can be myself in my department."

Professor Tres did not believe his cultural values conflicted with those of other faculty members within his department. He said he was being advised by others not to devote so much attention to the service component of his work, "so there's a little bit of tension in terms of that, but not much." He concluded that other colleagues across the university in different departments have also experienced this.

Whether he suppressed cultural values to be accepted within his department and institution, Professor Tres said, "The expectation was just the opposite, and I think that expressing my cultural values helped me advance my career in this context." Nevertheless, he said he understood the need for other faculty to suppress their cultural values to be accepted. Concluding, he said, "Again, [it was] a very opportunist situation for me."

Professor Cuatro believes, for the most part, that his cultural values have not conflicted with those of other faculty members within his department. He said there is a faculty consensus within his department regarding concern about social justice and cultural diversity, although a problem arises sometimes among faculty when they are defined and practiced within the curriculum. He explained, “For some it’s that they taught *The House on Mango Street* in one of their classes and for others of us it’s structural transformation and egalitarian sorts of policies about how people are treated.”

Regarding the issue of suppressing cultural values to be accepted within his department and institution, Professor Cuatro stated, “No, to whatever degree, they’ve accepted me as I am.” He attributed his acceptance by others to his institution in comparison to employment at a Research 1 institution. He concluded, “I think Research 1 institutions accomplish that through so-called ‘intellectual battles,’ and we just don’t have that as much.”

Professor Cinco did not believe his cultural values conflicted with those of other faculty members within his department, although he said he is conscious of his cultural values in comparison to other faculty outside of his department and how they may have the tendency to conflict. He stated, “Yeah, I feel [cultural values] affect how I interact with colleagues, because of tenure,” although he shared that he was not going to change his “East LA accent” because “it’s important” and “it’s a political stance.” What has made a lasting impression on Professor Cinco is the notion that “people with Spanish accents are perceived as kind of dumb but people with British accents are perceived as smart.”

In terms of suppressing cultural values to be accepted within his department and institution, Professor Cinco said that as a teacher, “I lecture the way I speak and I make sure I speak with my accent; I don’t try to hide it.” He shared the importance of “not hiding” his accent because he believes it is important for other students that can identify with his culture to say “Oh he sounds like me” and for the white kids in class to say, “Oh someone can say some really smart things or knows a lot with an accent.” He also said being at his institution has affected “how I dress” among faculty members and administrators, so he admits to making some concessions in this area.

Professor Seis believes his cultural values do not conflict with those of other faculty members within his department and said, “No. I think that one of the beauties of it is that I don’t perceive that there is any tension among my peers in relation to our ethnicity.” Whether he suppressed cultural values to be accepted within his department and institution, Professor Seis stated, “Short answer for me, no. I don’t really think of myself in very ethnic terms.” He shared he did not perceive “any need to behave or say things that may be inappropriate in the Mexican context to be honest.”

Professor Siete did not believe his cultural values conflicted with those of other faculty members within his department, saying, “I don’t think they conflict; I think there’s a difference sometimes.” Elaborating on differences that arise among faculty, Professor Siete said he has witnessed a conflict of opinions when recruiting new faculty members and faculty priorities have been split between selecting a scholar that can add to the diversity of the department or selecting one because of the type of research the scholar has conducted.

In response to the question whether he suppressed cultural values to be accepted within his department and institution, Professor Siete stated, “No, I don’t think I’ve suppressed them at all. If anything, I’ve been searching for them. I don’t think I’m in an environment where I have to suppress them.” He said there is an appreciation of having a Latino scholar in the department to conduct research with the same population. Professor Siete reiterated, he has not suppressed the values of his culture and is still “trying to identify what it [his culture] is.”

Whether his cultural values conflicted with those of other faculty members in his department, Professor Ocho said, “I don’t think so anymore.” He attributed this change to increasingly opening oneself up to sharing and acceptance of others, no matter the cultural values or beliefs. He also said, “I think sometimes as Latinos there’s a lot of self-affirmation going on because we have these insecurities and fears because this is the way we’ve been brought up” and concluded that “we’ve been socialized to think we’re less.”

Addressing the subject of suppressing cultural values to be accepted within his department and institution, Professor Ocho believes he suppressed cultural values at certain times throughout his life and stated, “I think that shame is what we deal with, and then I think that we’re ashamed for being ashamed, that’s a lot of shame.” He recalls a time when he was referred to as a “Gringo” by another Jesuit. “I felt bad, because it was like, to my grandmother, the worst thing you could be.” He shared the advice he was given by a friend: “You had to become a Gringo, because that’s the only way you were going to make it, but that doesn’t mean you’re not Latino.” Professor Ocho did not provide specific experiences of suppressing cultural values to be accepted in higher

education, although his experience(s) related to the struggles of living in a bicultural world for many Mexican Americans and Chicanas/os.

A “Voice” Respected by Others

The premise of this dissertation was to provide La Raza faculty employed at Catholic institutions of higher education a “voice” to share their personal and professional lived experiences. A tenet of critical race theory, counter-storytelling is the “voice” people of color have, giving them the opportunity to relate their experiences through narratives (Ladson-Billings, 1998, p14). The last question in this section explored if La Raza participants believed they had a voice that was respected by colleagues within their department. All La Raza faculty participants clearly believed they had a voice within their department, as well as outside of the department for some, as portrayed in the following narrative excerpts:

Professor Uno: I have a voice and I’ve come to see it more and more. I feel that I had to work really hard to get it, it wasn’t given to me. But I think that people with privilege and with power or with status get it without working for it. In our case, across the board, we had to work our ass for it ... we worked hard ... that’s clear.

Professor Dos: Yes I do, even in [another department]. They won’t do what I suggest, but they listen because of the fear thing from the *Bronx Tale*.

Professor Tres: Yeah, absolutely. Again having to do with number one ... just being here so long, and then number two, feeling strongly that I represented my community that needs to have a voice, and in expressing that, and number three, the culture of the place allowing for that.

Professor Cuatro: I think to be honest, yeah. I think fairly so, especially now that I’ve chaired a department. But it would probably be pulled away real quickly at some point.

Professor Cinco: I think so, yeah, definitely. They see me within these elite circles and they see me with these famous professors, and because I know these professors in the profession and because they know I won the National

Dissertation Award, it's kind of weird ... like the tables have changed ... now they want to associate with me more now.

Professor Seis: Yes, especially in this job—they have to hear me, but even before. I think that my colleagues appreciate that I have instituted certain types of practices. Making sure that everyone has a voice.

Professor Siete: Yeah, I do. I speak out ... it's sometimes different when you have junior versus senior faculty, but I feel like my voice is respected.

Professor Ocho: I see that in terms of the way I am consulted. For example, a search committee was created for the dean ... people can submit votes to the dean and the dean says ... “You know, your college really values your opinion” and when he asks you to be on the committee ... say yes.

As stated earlier, all La Raza participants believed they had a “voice” within their departments, and for some, outside of their departments as well. Some participants believed they have gained the respect of their colleagues due to the many years they have been employed with their institution, which has also included serving as a department chair for most of the participants.

Level of Satisfaction of La Raza Faculty in Catholic Higher Education

Concluding this portion concerning the third research question of this dissertation, the fourth section of La Raza Interview Protocol asked participants to elaborate on their level of satisfaction with their institution's mission, vision, and values; the cultural climate of their department and institution; as well as the most rewarding and least rewarding aspects of being a faculty member in Catholic higher education.

Catholic Institution's Mission, Vision, and Values

La Raza participants were asked to elaborate on their level of satisfaction with their institution's mission, vision, and values as a Catholic institution of higher education. The themes that emerged included “we don't live up to,” “weak,” “don't always walk the walk,” “good fit,” and “commitment to social justice.”

Professor Uno believes his institution has a great mission statement that “we don’t live up to.” He believes the values of inclusion and diversity at his campus “have never been fully realized” and cited that the last WASC (Western Association of Schools and Colleges) letter of commendation was very critical in the areas of diversity at his institution. He concluded by stating, “It just means that the right hand doesn’t know what the left hand is doing.”

Professor Dos considers her institution’s mission, commitment to diversity, and articulation of Catholic values of social justice to be “weak” in comparison to other Catholic institutions of higher education. “It’s just window dressing,” she said.

Professor Tres considers his level of satisfaction to be “very high” with his institution’s mission, vision, and values for the reason that they are inclusive of Latinos and the treatment of Latinos, which sustains his work and the reason he has remained at his institution.

Professor Cautro stated, “As a Catholic institution, it is fine, but we seem to be getting into a phase where they’re anxious about their Catholic identity and that worries me.” He was unsure if the reason for the institution’s anxiety was related to issues of growth, finances, or lack of leadership.

Professor Cinco said, as a Jesuit institution with a commitment to social justice, it has “fit perfectly” with his identity and personal beliefs in the courses he teaches.

Professor Seis said he is satisfied with how his institution “identifies what it could do and what it can do as a Catholic Jesuit university as opposed to a public institution.” He also said that his institution is “not shy” about proclaiming its interest in making sure

everyone is aware of their values of promoting social justice, caring for those in the greatest need, and treating students with respect and interest.

Professor Siete stated, “Oh, I’m highly satisfied with the mission and values, sometimes they don’t always walk the walk, but overall I’m very satisfied.” He said he was drawn to the Jesuit values of social justice and serving underserved populations at his institution.

Professor Ocho believes his institution is moving in the direction of increasing diversity, although he was not pleased with their current status. He felt that Catholic education initially played a strong role in “helping the immigrant, and now we Catholics in this country are as American as apple pie, so I worry.”

Cultural Climate of Department and Institution

La Raza participants were asked to elaborate on their level of satisfaction with the cultural climate of their department and institution. Most of the participants expressed being satisfied with the cultural climate of their department, although shared differing thoughts about their institutions in general. Emergent themes discussed by the participants included “could do better,” “want to see more but it takes time,” and “not culturally competent.”

Professor Uno stated, as an institution, “I feel that we’re misdirected and I feel that we could do so much better.” He alluded to the exhaustion he has felt with continuously addressing issues of inclusion and diversity with administrators. He said, “You get tired . . . you don’t always want to lead the charge,” and doing so has increased his frequency of being approached by administrators.

Professor Tres believes the cultural climate within his department is very good, and had this to say about his institution: “You always want to see it [the institution] do more, but I see there’s no resistance to the incorporation of Latino individuals, values, or culture, so it, you know, takes time.”

Professor Siete contends the cultural climate in his department and at his institution is “good, but I think it could be better.” He said the faculty of color seems “very comfortable” and went on to say it could be better if more people of color were in administrative positions.

Professor Cinco believes his institution recognizes the importance of cultural diversity and inclusion, although it has not been fully implemented there. Although he has some criticisms of the cultural climate at his institution, he stated, “I wouldn’t say it’s culturally competent, but I wouldn’t say it’s hostile or racist [either].”

Most and Least Rewarding Aspects for Faculty

La Raza participants were asked to elaborate on the most and least rewarding aspects of being a faculty member in Catholic higher education. Emergent themes of most rewarding aspects included “teaching and developing relationships with their students,” “flexibility of time,” “comfort in teaching social justice issues,” and “tradition of Catholic education.” Emergent themes of least rewarding aspects included “lack of administration’s communication with rank-and-file faculty,” “lack of student and faculty diversity,” and “feeling undervalued and underappreciated.”

Professor Uno stressed the most rewarding aspects of being a faculty member at his institution have been working with “some incredible students,” and he further said, “The small classrooms have helped us to get to know the students one-on-one.” The least

rewarding aspects for him have been struggling with issues that people do not understand and always having to draw people's attention to things they don't understand and "always having the unpopular perspective on things." In addition, he believes that administrators "often make decisions without a great deal of consultation from their rank-and-file faculty" and "they have not been very open to suggestions."

Professor Dos shared the most rewarding aspect for her as a faculty member has also been the students because "we can develop really amazing close relationships with our students at the university; that's been very rewarding." The least rewarding aspects for Professor Dos have included "the hypocrisy of the Catholic Church, [which is] really wearing." She also said, "Having a perspective of liberation theology and to come to this totally materialistic school that's always about money and the lack of diversity within the Catholic experience itself" was troublesome to her.

Professor Tres expressed the most rewarding aspect for him has been teaching students to be "agents for social change." You have the opportunity "to mold these individuals to change the world and make it better—how rewarding is that!" The least rewarding aspect for Professor Tres has been the administrative component, "the increasing need to meet certain requirements by accrediting institutions and legal things and all that."

Professor Cuatro echoed the most rewarding aspects of the other La Raza participants: "working with the students." Additional rewarding aspects for him have been "the flexibility of time to do my own writing and trying to create my life according to the way I want it to be." The least rewarding aspects for him have been "feeling undervalued and underappreciated." He shared that people's opinions of him have caused

personal concerns, although he is learning how to disregard those opinions. He expressed that academia has a way of ingraining how others perceive you, especially related to “the way we get published is by having people like your writing.” He continued by saying “The way to move up and get tenure is to have people like you; they don’t want to say that— but it’s a big part of it.”

Professor Cinco reported the most rewarding aspect for him has been his area of research, which he believes is a “perfect fit” with his Catholic institution. He stated, “So it makes it really easy to talk about issues of social justice, issues of poverty, issues of immigration, so in that sense, it’s really comforting.” The least rewarding aspects for him have been “less pay” at his institution than he would receive at a Research 1 institution. Also, the issue with departments because they “only hire one minority; they don’t double up—that’s how it goes.”

Professor Seis said the most rewarding aspect for him has been that “you are not constrained by legal or any other types of issues in terms of addressing questions around social issues that should be discussed in an academic context.” The least rewarding aspect for him has been that the job responsibilities of a faculty member “are never done.” He stressed, “If you’re not preparing to teach, you’re thinking about your research, and if you’re not doing either of those two, then you need to be thinking about your service commitments.”

Professor Siete stated the most rewarding aspect for him has been “my colleagues in the department. We all have a similar mission in mind in terms of educating our students.” He expressed the job is hard, especially because of service demands, although said, “I really feel supported by my colleagues; we’re all rallied around a similar goal.”

The least rewarding aspects for him have been “the service, if the service is not connected to your core goals or mission,” and being overly involved with committees and meetings that can result in overwhelming service requirements, which are not unique to Catholic education.

For Professor Ocho, the most rewarding aspect is the realization that he is “part of something much bigger.” He believes that the Catholic tradition has something to offer and has “not shunned education” and has rather “been open to the development that’s our tradition, and Catholic education embraces that and wants to offer it to more people, and that for me is very exciting.” The least rewarding aspect for Professor Ocho has been the “elitism” associated with Catholic education. He stated, “When you think of Catholic education, you think elite and expensive with manicured lawns and white kids.” Professor Ocho also asserted he would like to see an increase of student, faculty, and administrative diversity at Catholic institutions.

La Raza Recommendations for Mexican-American/Chicana/o Scholars

Examining La Raza narrative recommendations on behalf of Mexican-American and Chicana/o scholars interested in pursuing an academic career in Catholic higher education, the following recommendations were provided by La Raza participants: a) seeing the connection between Catholic Mexicans and Catholic higher education; b) understanding the expectations and culture of the department and institution; and c) being assertive and self-promoting and connecting with a scholar in your field of a similar ethnicity.

Seeing the Connection between Catholic Mexicans and Catholic Higher Education

A few La Raza participants reinforced there is a connection between Catholic Mexicans and Catholic higher education by acknowledging the historical connection and current trend of the Catholic Mexican population in the United States. According to Professor Uno, “The true value of the Catholic Church is remembering what its real mission was ... which was to create a space and to educate those that were marginalized.” A similar response was offered by Professor Dos, who believes that Mexican Americans have a lot of reasons to make a “claim” in Catholic higher education:

Without us, without immigrants, the Church would be gone. We have a special role in Catholic higher education, which they’re denying us, and most Catholics in the world are not white, there’re not European. We are the future of the Church, yet, they’re not even hiring Mexican Americans. There aren’t even very many Mexican-American staff ... the diversity here at the university is black and white. Their ignorance about us and refusal to integrate us, as you can see in the lack of Chicano faculty here, I think it’s really appalling. So I think if it’s your fight, if you’re Mexican and Catholic, it’s a fight worth having (Professor Dos).

Professor Cinco believes that Mexican-American and Chicano scholars seeking academic careers in higher education, no matter where they go, were not going to feel culturally at home, although he expressed a positive view regarding Catholic institutions of higher education:

Understand, it’s being in a more welcoming place and it feels like home because of the Catholic Church and because Latinos are such a presence now in the American Catholic Church. My thought has been that Mexican Americans and Chicanos are just the perfect fit, not only being Catholic, but within the Catholic institution, this is home to us. When I went to a Catholic university as an undergrad, that was home; the church was there ... I could just go when I felt like it just being there. I had a lot of people to talk to and supports. Yeah, it’s a perfect fit. You can’t really quantify that and Catholic universities provide that. These institutions know that they have to become more relevant to the Latino community. Norte Dame, Georgetown, Loyola, all these Catholic schools are making a big investment because they want to be the place that has the Latino intellectuals, the elite; they understand we are the majority of Catholics on this side of the world (Professor Cinco).

Understanding the Expectations and Culture of the Department and Institution

The second recommendation provided on behalf of La Raza scholars is related to understanding the expectations and the culture of the department and institution. La Raza participants provided various suggestions for scholars seeking academic careers in Catholic higher education. Professor Dos stressed, “The work we do is super important because our major role is role modeling.” Professor Tres made the point, “If you’re only interested in doing research, you have to be willing to take on teaching and service, not to the detriment of research.” He also recommended not challenging important Catholic issues, such as “choice, gay rights, and women in clergy,” at the university level, because this may cause negative repercussions influencing your opportunity for promotion and/or tenure. Although it has been suggested by other faculty members, and depending on the Catholic institution, there is less emphasis on research in comparison to public institutions (Research 1s) that emphasize research and publications. Professor Seis made the following statement to assist scholars in developing clarity of expectations for careers at Catholic institutions of higher education:

Most academic institutions in the United States will have teaching and research expectations, so try to be very clear with what that is about. What are the publication expectations? Try to get as much clarity as possible from the department, school, or college that you are applying to so that you are not surprised why you were not promoted. What are the teaching expectations and the advising expectations and what types of supports are there if you need help developing those skills? Again, many programs do not explicitly prepare you to be a good teacher; we’re supposed to pick it up by osmosis. Also, if you’re going to be the only person of color in your department, is that something that makes you comfortable or uncomfortable; will you perceive that as a potential issue? Be very clear about what you want to get out of the institution as much as the institution wants to get out of you (Professor Seis).

Being Assertive and Self-Promoting and Connecting with a Scholar in Your Field with a Similar Ethnicity

The third and last recommendation provided for La Raza scholars seeking academic careers in Catholic higher education is to be assertive and self-promoting and connect with a scholar in your field with a similar ethnicity. Professor Siete provides insightful advice on this topic for Mexican-American and Chicana/o scholars:

Get involved with research. I know Latino culture tells you to be humble and not to be so aggressive and assertive, so a lot of times Latino students might not have those opportunities because they're not out there knocking on professors' doors being assertive. Sometimes you need to be bicultural to be successful, you have to promote yourself. If you want to get tenure, you have to do that, you have to think like that. You have to be more self-promoting than you're comfortable with. You got to get your writing done ... if you never get tenured, you're never going to get to help those people in the long run. So in some ways, our values of helping other people gets in the way of the tenure process. You got to have a good mentor who's going to guide you and say this is okay to do ... it's temporary ... you're not being egotistical ... but it's hard because it's counter to our Latino values ... but in many ways you have to do that to be successful (Professor Siete).

It would be ideal for many scholars to connect with counselors and/or faculty of the same ethnicity, although oftentimes, they are overburdened with workloads or merely not available in your department or on campus. In light of his recommendation, Professor Ocho suggests "connecting with other Latino scholars in other fields: There's a real strength there. Also, stay connected with a faith community ... a Latino faith community because they keep you honest."

La Raza Recommendations for Mexican-American/Chicana/o Faculty

Examining La Raza narrative recommendations on behalf of Mexican-American/Chicano faculty toward tenure and promotion in Catholic higher education, the following recommendations were provided from La Raza participants: a) clearly understand the tenure requirements and exceed those requirements; b) do not isolate

yourself and get a mentor; and c) protect your time and set limits. Some La Raza participant responses overlapped with their recommendations for Mexican-American/Chicana/o scholars pursuing academic careers in Catholic higher education.

Clearly Understand the Tenure Requirements and Exceed the Requirements

The first recommendation provided on behalf of tenure-track faculty was to clearly understand the tenure requirements and exceed those expectations. Professor Cuatro stressed the importance of completing publications prior to tenure review and “count your publications ... whatever they say get that plus one.” He provided additional advice related to teaching:

The first year, really focus on your teaching and really try to put students at ease with your teaching and material because I think that teachers get reputations among students and it can snowball in either direction ... so I would be cautious of that (Professor Cuatro).

Navigating and completing a doctoral program may seem complicated, although Professor Cinco stated, “I think a lot of us think the struggle is in getting the Ph.D. and the job ... [but] no, it’s getting tenure.” He also stressed that “we can’t give them an excuse not to give us tenure” as he echoed the sentiments of the aforementioned professor, “So whatever the tenure requirements are ... we need to meet those and surpass them.” He continued by providing advice pertinent to managing time in lieu of achieving tenure:

I see a lot of professors try to teach and be involved on committees and in the community...you don’t get credit for that. So my recommendation would be ... if you can’t balance that ... don’t do it at the expense of not fulfilling the requirements of tenure (Professor Cinco).

Both Professors Seis and Ocho emphasized the importance of “clarity” as a pertinent ingredient in the tenure process. Professor Seis stressed that tenure-track faculty

“be very clear of the expectations,” and if you cannot gain clarity from your institution, “document somewhere so if you have to file a grievance, you have some evidence that you requested clarity and you didn’t receive it.” Similar advice was offered by Professor Ocho:

Get a lot of clarity on what is asked of you and don’t be fooled by “Oh you’re a great presence here.” All of your reviews have a paper trail. Ask yourself, what am I lacking, what’s expected of me, and have I done all that’s expected of me (Professor Ocho)?

Do Not Isolate Yourself and Get a Mentor

The second recommendation provided on behalf of tenure-track faculty is not to isolate yourself and to get a mentor. Professor Dos inferred that the hiring process has “recently become increasingly hostile and political” and that it increases the probability of faculty of color leaving academia:

I would say that until recently, if you did your job, you were probably going to get tenure. What I am noticing now, it’s like self-deportation going on; you just make it so hostile that people want to leave. It’s sort of self-deportation from academia because you just have this low level of resistance because of bad schedules, no verbal approbation, and isolation. I think it’s going to be hard for faculty of color unless the school is more forthcoming about welcoming them and welcoming their perspective. Now I’m noticing them not appointing people because of political reasons. So you got to be careful if you take one of these jobs and consider: Am I going to have colleagues, am I going to be isolated, which is very wearing and a form of hostility, where I’m just going to want to leave (Professor Dos).

Professor Tres also expressed the importance of not isolating as a tenure-track faculty member. “You just can’t do it on your own; you got to seek out those mentors. Don’t do this in isolation ... don’t isolate yourself,” he said.

Both Professors Tres and Siete stressed the importance of a mentor. Professor Tres said that the institution would assign tenure-track faculty a formal mentor, “but,” he continued, “I think it’s incumbent upon any new faculty member at a Catholic university

or elsewhere to seek out informal mentors.” He also suggested seeking other tenure-track faculty in different departments to compare experiences and to seek mentors in another department. Professor Siete encouraged tenure-track faculty to “find a good mentor and rely on that person because you really need someone looking out for your best interests.”

Protect Your Time and Set Limits

The third recommendation provided on behalf of tenure-track faculty was protect your time and set limits, which was offered by three La Raza participants as a crucial facet for tenure-track faculty throughout their tenure process. Professor Cinco stressed the importance of “protecting your time to meet tenure requirements because not until we have that security are we fully part of the faculty... You can’t even be close; you have to surpass it ... even if you have to sacrifice not being involved as much as you want in the community or being involved on campus.”

Professor Siete suggests not only protecting your time but also setting limits for tenure-track faculty throughout their tenure process. He provided the rationale for his suggestions:

You will be in demand more than your white colleagues and a lot more will be expected of you sort of implicitly because everybody wants more diversity and inclusiveness on their committees, right, and when you have a smaller number of faculty of color, that means more service for them. Be able to know when to say no and set limits, otherwise you’ll be pulled into doing things like services and then you’re not going to get your scholarship done and you’re not going to get tenure (Professor Siete).

Concluding this recommendation, Professor Ocho suggests setting time aside for publishing, “even if it means that you cannot devote the time you want to your students; if you don’t, you won’t be around.”

An additional recommendation was provided by Professor Uno, who believes that faculty, particularly tenure-track faculty, “Need to get out of their comfort zone and become part of the institution” by serving on committees and getting to know professors, because “so many decisions” are a result of “face-to-face interactions.” He also shared that explicit and implicit obligations to the institution can become political if you’re not actively involved:

Here it’s a little bit messier. They pull you in to do so much work for events, homecoming, dinners, and in fact you start to lose a lot of points if you don’t show up for those things. You also have to commit to the Catholic mission; it gets political and it gets uncomfortable (Professor Uno).

La Raza Recommendations for Academic Administrators

Examining La Raza narrative recommendations on behalf of academic administrators in Catholic higher education to assist in the recruitment, promotion, and retention of Mexican-American/Chicano faculty, the following recommendations were provided : a) diversity must be a top-down decision and priority; b) offer incentives and grow your own; and c) awareness of diversity and cultural differences.

Diversity Must Be a Top-Down Decision and Priority

In accord with the first recommendation, crucial decisions relevant to the credentialing, employees, diversity, progress, and reputation of any college or university are by and large perceived as the responsibility of the president and other senior administrative staff with the authority to make crucial decisions for departments and employees. According to Professor Dos, “Well that’s the most important question because that’s about the top-down commitment, and there’s only so much you can do as faculty members to change a hostile environment.” She continued to share her frustrations with increasing diversity on campus:

So we've taken the horse to water, but we haven't been able to make the horse drink: Our school has refused to drink from the trough of diversity. It's about the top and what they want to do is have these little token events, bring in the most harmless speakers to campus, and really colonize diversity so it's harmless: A very low commitment to any kind of diversity (Professor Dos).

Professor Tres also commented on the top-down process and importance of their role for change. "Make it a priority from the president on down, articulate that priority by developing programs ... then institutionalize and formulate that with money," he said.

Offer Incentives and Grow Your Own

The second recommendation entails offering incentives as a potential method to increase Mexican-American and Chicana/o faculty in Catholic higher education. These incentives would need to be supported and prioritized by the president of the institution.

Professor Uno said that he has seen the use of incentives work before at another university:

The dean of the college had a pot of money and he said, "Here's a half a million dollars and it's available to anybody who's going to actively recruit faculty of color. You can put any parameters you want around it; you request areas of discipline; then they compete for the money. If no one comes for the money, the money's there." I would think there has to be some incentives to recruit faculty of color. It's not rocket science; it's pretty easy (Professor Uno).

Professor Uno further recommended that administrators develop a scholar incentive program to recruit and retain non-tenure-track faculty at the institution by "establishing a post-doc ... you teach and you still have time to do research. We check you out ... good teacher, the students like you, doing research ... Hey, let's give him a gig." Professor Tres echoed the aforementioned recommendation, saying "Develop a program where they would develop their own." He continued to elaborate his recommendation for administrators:

Meaning that, you identify strong Latino candidates that are going on to graduate school, think about investing in them. Maybe give them forgivable loans and if they come back to teach that loan will be forgiven. So invest, grow your own; don't depend on the Research 1s to grow them for you (Professor Tres).

Further discussing incentives, Professor Cinco suggests that administrators “not impose community service on junior faculty the first couple of years” to allow junior faculty to become oriented with the tenure expectations and devote their time to research and publication. Professor Cinco added an alternative facet for administrators to consider when hiring Mexican-American/Chicana/o scholars for employment at Catholic institutions of higher education:

First, I think they have to understand that we finish school in deeper debt than the average Ph.D. student. So I think salaries have to be considerably higher for Latino hires. Our salaries are not our salaries; we have to help our families and I'm still paying for student loans. So salaries are really important (Professor Cinco).

Awareness of Diversity and Cultural Differences

Taking into account the third and last recommendation when examining cultural characteristics in order to diversify faculty and staff, particularly Mexican-American and Chicana/o employees; it is crucial that administrators understand the unique cultural norms, values, and customs that may become apparent within the interview process, as well as within their interactions with colleagues. Professor Seis further elaborated on this theme relative to diversity and cultural differences of prospective faculty:

There are cultural practices that translate into individual behaviors that may be problematic to our institution ... that people act out of a cultural context, which in their mindset is perfectly normal, but could be potentially problematic in an “alien context.” For example, sometimes people are normally quite or restrained because they are uncertain about the perception of their comments or perspective in an audience that is perceived by them as different or not like them. To bring that awareness to the interview process ... try to be sensitive that people from different cultures will relate differently at an interpersonal level, at a small group or large group level, and that difference does not mean a deficit. Someone who is

quite and participates little can still have very valuable contributions and that difference has to be acknowledged and respected. Understand that individuals may bring with them both life experiences, cultural values, and cultural awareness that nobody else may have because of the person's unique background and that is something we're investigating (Professor Seis).

Professor Cuatro shared that his institution was "doing some really good stuff" related to diversity, although he stated, "it has more to do with the culture of the place than actually the intentions of trying to diversify." He continued to elaborate on the hiring process of people of color:

When they have a diversity hire and that person leaves or doesn't get tenure, make sure that that line is still attached to another diversity hire. In other words, don't let the department absorb the line and have it become, "Okay, now we can just get an American. Especially pay attention to smaller departments where they don't have a history of diversity; it's really isolating to the faculty they're bringing in. I think the administration has to pay attention to that. The administration has to learn how to just have a strong back bone and say, "Look, these people are treated differently, so we're going to give them more support." And right now, I think what ends up happening is that people of color are treated unevenly, asked to do more and asked to deal with certain tensions, but everybody on the support end wants to be egalitarian (Professor Cuatro).

Additional recommendations for administrators included mentoring and networking. Professor Siete said he would like to see more students of color become involved in research and suggested developing a mentor program that would entail matching graduate students of color with faculty of color for that purpose, although he then stated, "but there isn't enough faculty of color." His solution to this dilemma was to "hire more people of color." Professor Ocho stressed the importance of administrators encouraging faculty to make an effort to network with other Latinos on campus, as well as being visible and interactive with Latino students and their family members at social events on campus:

Be present at any attempts to bring Latinos on campus ... you go to show the flag ... even if you don't speak Spanish, smile, shake a few hands. Ask them, what

brings you here, how can we better serve your community, and how can we better serve you (Professor Ocho)?

Summary

This chapter provided detailed narratives of La Raza participants' responses to La Raza Faculty Interview Protocol (Appendix H), constructed to address the research questions of this study. The intent of the interview protocol was to explore La Raza participants' experiences in the following five sections: (1) Academic Background; (2) Career Progression (Self-Perceived Supports and Challenges) in Catholic Higher Education; (3) Social and Cultural Climate in Catholic Higher Education; (4) Level of Satisfaction in Catholic Higher Education; and (5) Recommendations for Catholic Higher Education. Findings of La Raza narratives provided an overwhelming amount of experiences ranging from early education to securing tenure as faculty members in higher education, as well as themes and recommendations that emerged from the narratives. The information participants provided will be valuable in assisting and informing other Mexican-American and Chicana/o scholars interested in pursuing a career in higher education and current faculty members and academic administrators in Catholic higher education.

The next chapter will provide a discussion of the findings to further convey La Raza counter-story narratives. The counter-story narratives will be explicated further in a point-counterpoint format to compare the associated master narratives with the themes elicited from the counter-story narratives. The counter-story narratives will address five central areas: (1) Graduate School Experiences and Preparation for the Professoriate; (2) Campus Climate Issues (Diversity, Cultural Climate, and Collegiality); (3) Mentoring; (4) Tenure and Promotion; and (5) Experiences of Discrimination and Racism.

CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION, IMPLICATIONS,
AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

Aside from the scarcity of research literature existing on Hispanic and Latino faculty in Catholic higher education, there are many aspects within the context of this study that are significant to the development of literature in this subject. Given the underrepresentation of Hispanic and Latino faculty, specifically Mexican Americans/Chicanas/os in higher education, it was imperative to further identify variables contributing to the supports and challenges in their journey toward careers in academia. Restricting this study to a specific Hispanic sub-group is of significance, as noted by Solórzano (1995). Taking into consideration that most studies do not recognize the importance of examining Hispanic sub-groups independently, the intent of the qualitative methodology in this study was to conduct semi-structured and open-ended in-depth interviews in narrative format with a sample of self-identified Mexican-American and Chicana/o tenure and tenure-track faculty to explore their personal and professional lived experiences, as well as their perceived supports, challenges, and level of satisfaction in academia.

This study was conducted utilizing a sample of eight self-identified native-born Mexican-American/Chicana/o tenure and tenure-track faculty employed at four Catholic universities. The four Catholic universities are all located in California, which is one of three states in America representing the largest numbers of self-identified Hispanics and Latinos, particularly of Mexican origin (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011/May).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to explore the personal and professional lived experiences of the few self-identified native-born La Raza (Mexican Americans and Chicana/os) that have been successful in achieving the level of faculty membership at institutions of Catholic higher education, and to further explore their experiences as an underrepresented minority within academia. The eight participants of mixed gender in this study were selected among self-identified native-born Mexican-American and Chicana/o full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty from the University of San Francisco, Santa Clara University, Loyola Marymount University, and the University of San Diego during the fall 2012 academic year. Participants were selected based on meeting a specific criteria and were invited to provide their personal and professional lived experiences sought to address the purpose and research questions of this study.

This study utilized a qualitative narrative methodology employing the critical race tenets of counter-storytelling and the permanence of racism that allowed this researcher to increasingly ascertain and apprehend the lived experiences of the La Raza faculty that participated in the project (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004). Their counter-story narratives shed light on various degrees of racism pertaining to their social and cultural climate, tenure and promotion process, and level of job satisfaction as ethnic minority faculty members in Catholic higher education. These counter-story narratives did not copiously counter the white master narrative rationalizing and justifying privilege through white sovereignty. La Raza participants also provided numerous recommendations to assist Mexican-American/Chicana/o scholars in their pursuit of academic careers in Catholic higher education; current Mexican-American/Chicana/o faculty with the process of tenure and

promotion; and academic administrators in their recruitment, promotion, and retention of Mexican-American/Chicana/o faculty in Catholic higher education. As apparent in their counter-story narratives, each La Raza participant has made personal and professional commitments and contributions to sustain the cultures of both their self-identified ethnicity and of their university.

Themes Elicited from La Raza Faculty Counter-Story Narratives

After the interview field text data of the eight La Raza participants was transcribed, I analyzed the data repeatedly using research methods of narrative analysis (Creswell, 2008), which elicited certain similar and consistent themes across the counter-story narratives. La Raza counter-story narratives marginally correlated with the literature pertaining to faculty of color in higher education discussed in the literature review (chapter 2). Although La Raza participants' personal and professional lived experiences marginally substantiated findings of previous studies related to faculty of color, their narratives enhanced the limited findings with more depth and detail specific to Mexican-American and Chicana/o faculty employed in Catholic higher education. To present the themes, the data was organized into the following five central areas:

1. Graduate School Experiences and Preparation for the Professoriate
2. Campus Climate Issues
 - Diversity and Cultural Climate
 - Collegiality
3. Mentoring
4. Tenure and Promotion
5. Experiences of Discrimination and Racism

Each of the central areas will further convey La Raza counter-story narratives and will be explicated further in a point-counterpoint format to compare the associated master

narratives with the themes elicited from the counter-story narratives that address the aforementioned five central areas.

Graduate School Experiences and Preparation for the Professoriate

Master Narrative of Graduate School Experiences and Preparation for the Professoriate

As Mexican-American and Chicana/o students' progress toward graduate school, they continue to encounter similar barriers in the educational pipeline as well as "feeling invisible ... like outsiders or imposters" because "most graduate programs tend to be racially exclusive, featuring predominately white students, faculty, and curricula that omit [Mexican-American and] Chicana/o histories and perspectives" (Yosso & Solozaro, 2006, p. 2). In a qualitative research study conducted by Austin (2002) of 79 doctoral students interested in pursuing faculty careers, her results concluded that students felt unprepared for their roles in student advising and service, as well as writing proposals, and felt incompetent most notably in teaching (Austin, 2002). In addition, in a prior survey conducted by Golde (1997) of 187 doctoral students, a majority of the students believed they were competent in conducting research, although approximately one-third of the doctoral students believed they were not competent in committee work or advising undergraduate students.

La Raza Counter-Story Narrative of Graduate School Experiences and Preparation for the Professoriate

Although the majority of La Raza participants shared positive experiences throughout graduate school, they equally expressed being unprepared for their profession upon graduation, particularly in the areas of teaching, mentoring others, and service work.

La Raza counter-story narratives all seemed to reveal that the participants had positive support systems and the determination to pursue their academic endeavors leading to the doctoral graduate program. When posing the question, did graduate school prepare you for your role as a faculty member, particularly as regards to teaching, research, and service, the majority of the participants expressed that their doctoral program had primarily prepared them to conduct research, with responses among participants varying from “Well” to “Barely.”

A majority of the participants said their doctoral program did not prepare them for the teaching facet of their job, although Professors Dos, Cinco, and Ocho were fortunate to have gained teaching experience while in graduate school prior to being hired at their institution. Professors Uno and Tres said they learned other facets of their work in academia. Professor Uno emphasized, “You need to have an ally,” and reported that having an ally in the doctoral program assisted him toward navigating the politics through the program toward completion of his doctoral degree. Professor Tres emphasized, “Make sure you’re going to a program where you have faculty that are going to support you or you won’t finish.” He then added, “It certainly prepared me for conducting research, but in terms of teaching, absolutely not.” He also said that the doctoral program prepared him in “understanding the academic environment in graduate school and how to interact with faculty.” Professor Siete reported that the doctoral program did not prepare him for mentoring or doing service work.

In comparison to the other La Raza counter-story narratives, Professor Cuatro’s was the most despairing as he described his experience in his graduate doctoral program in preparation for an academic career in higher education:

Barely ... you know grad school teaches you how to do research ... usually not very well. It doesn't teach you how to be a human being interacting with other human beings ... it didn't teach me how to teach ... didn't teach me how to serve on committees ... didn't teach me how to balance my time ... didn't teach me how to submit essays for publication ... didn't teach me how to develop a career and strategize where to publish or how to publish, with whom to speak ... didn't teach me how to share my work with other colleagues, which everybody does (Professor Cuatro).

Counter-Narrative of Graduate School Experiences and Preparation for the Professoriate

It was apparent that there was a deficiency in many of the doctoral programs in terms of preparing students for all facets of the professoriate, including research, teaching, services, and mentoring to adequately prepare them for academic careers in higher education. To conclude, the comparison of the master narrative with La Raza counter-story narratives supported the idea that doctoral graduate programs did not adequately prepare graduates for the faculty roles of teaching, advising students, and service work.

Campus Climate Issues

The first section will address the master narrative of diversity and cultural climate issues followed by La Raza counter-story narrative and the counter-narrative of diversity and cultural climate pertaining to issues within their departments. The next section will address the master narrative of collegiality within their departments followed by La Raza counter-story narrative and the counter-story narrative of collegiality within their departments.

Master Narrative of Diversity and Cultural Climate

According to Jayakumar et al. (2009), "despite antidiscrimination legislation and affirmative action, faculty of color remain significantly underrepresented in higher

education ... and approximately 5.3% of full professors in the United States are African American, Hispanic, or Native American” (p. 538). Additionally, a 30-year analysis of national trends on the persistent stratification of faculty of color by institution type found that “faculty of color are most underrepresented at private four-year institutions and at select institutions, while concurrently overrepresented in the lower academic ranks and less prestigious academic fields” (Jayakumar et al., 2009, pp. 542–543).

The campus climate in higher education proposes conflicting issues for many faculty members, although implications for faculty of color are additionally troublesome. Harvey (1991, as cited in Leon & Nevarez, 2006) described the campus climate as one of “culture, habits, decisions, practices, and policies that make up campus life” (p. 2). According to Turner and Myers (2000), faculty of color described their work environment as “one fostering feelings and experiences of exclusion, isolation, alienation, and devaluation,” all of which are experiences that decrease levels of job satisfaction due to an “unwelcoming environment” (p. 83). In addition to these campus climate issues, Torres, J. et al. (2004) concluded that “racism or perceived racism” served as a barrier for many faculty of color, particularly Latino faculty. Therefore, it may be suggested that issues related to “race or perceived racism” remain at the premise of the problem perpetuating challenges of foreseen obstacles toward job satisfaction for faculty of color, including La Raza faculty with aspirations of an academic career.

To address the aforementioned issues within the campus climate, hiring more faculty of color within a department may provide a strategy to diminish feelings of exclusion and devaluation, among many other negative feelings experienced by La Raza faculty. To support this notion, Strunk and Robinson (2006) argued increasing the

diversity among faculty can be helpful because “teachers will be more likely to remain employed in a college or university where there are relatively more faculty members of their own race” (p. 80). Another proposed strategy for hiring faculty of color by Moody (2004) is the method of “cluster hiring” because it “will prevent the solo phenomenon” and “project the implication that the institution is making a conscious effort to decrease obstacles often encountered by faculty of color such as isolation” (p. 102).

La Raza Counter-Story Narrative of Diversity and Cultural Climate

Regarding the diversity and cultural climate of their departments, six La Raza participants described their departments as being the most ethnically diverse within their institutions, although Professor Uno shared that within his institution, “...we have zero full-time tenured African-American faculty...zero.” Exploring concerns related to the reasoning for a lack of faculty of color no longer employed at their institution, Professor Dos stated, “My guess is that people of color check out when they find out they’re not going to be heard, they just check out.” Professor Tres said when he initially arrived at his department nearly 30 years ago the majority of the faculty was white, but since then the college has hired several African-American faculty, but never more than one in the department. Contrasting the shared sentiments of the other participants, Professor Siete informed that the diversity of the faculty composition within his department was “very good,” and believed his colleagues value issues of multiculturalism and underserved populations in what they teach and impart to students, although he did not believe his department currently maintained a diverse faculty membership.

Counter-Narrative of Diversity and Cultural Climate

For most La Raza participants, the matters of diversity and cultural climate were not overly significant as noted in the master narrative, although some expressed an increased need to diversify within their departments and throughout their institutions due to the current lack of faculty of color, especially of African-American and Hispanic/Latino/a faculty.

One of the issues shared in La Raza narratives was that prior faculty of color may have left the institution because they realized that what they have to offer and their presence as faculty of color is underappreciated, unsupported, and unwelcome. Further research into this matter might provide a clearer motivation into the reason(s) for faculty of color leaving their employment prior to achieving tenure.

I pondered if a majority of La Raza participants were employed in non-ethnic discipline departments would they tell a different story more consistent with the master narrative for faculty of color employed in higher education, especially Catholic colleges and universities throughout the United States. To further explore La Raza counter-story narratives, I inquired about their level of collegiality within their departments.

Master Narrative of Collegiality

Prior studies have argued that the presence or absence of collegiality contributes to the retention of new faculty (Ambrose et al., 2005; Quezada, & Louque, 2004; Zhou & Volkwein, 2004). Rather than experiencing collegiality, many faculty of color feel isolated and identify racial and ethnic bias as a major challenge in the academic workplace (Turner, Myers & Creswell, 1999).

In addition, Quezada and Louque (2004) implied that the term *collegiality* can be a code word for favoring candidates with backgrounds, interests, and political and social perspectives similar to one's own, in turn, sustaining a trend of "hiring people who look like the majority of faculty who are already there" (p. 3). Until this trend is quashed, La Raza faculty and other faculty of color will continue to experience unsupportive and unwelcoming work environments, rather than collegiality or even acceptance by their colleagues.

La Raza Counter-Story Narrative of Collegiality

Again, considering that six of the participants are within departments of an ethnic-related discipline, most La Raza counter-story narratives shared positive and supportive collegial relationships among other faculty within their department. Professor Uno said, "We've been lucky to hire some incredible faculty in our department ... We work well together." Professor Dos shared similar sentiments, saying, "It's wonderful and supportive, although in [another department], there are some very good people that I like, but for me there's no collegiality." Professor Cinco said, "I think it's amazing. It's really good. I'm lucky, I know I'm an anomaly, I know that for sure. Other colleagues say they hate even walking into their departments." Although Professor Siete and Ocho are in departments of different disciplines than the other participants, they also shared a high level of positive and supportive collegiality within their department. Professor Siete is in a department of predominately white colleagues and described the level of collegiality within his department as "very strong." He considered himself "very supported" by his colleagues and concluded, "So I'm lucky, I know it's not the same in all the departments here."

Counter-Narrative of Collegiality

The notion of collegiality may imply comradely associations with other faculty members in higher education, although this notion often is an obstacle for faculty of color, which was not the situation expressed in the majority of La Raza counter-story narratives. It was apparent that La Raza faculty had learned how to navigate themselves through the obstacles and barriers that seem to have caused other faculty of color to leave their institutions, according to the master narrative.

Most La Raza counter-story narratives did not express overt concerns with the aspect of collegiality within their departments, although as stated earlier, there remains an obvious concern pertaining to the lack of diversity and employment of faculty of color throughout their institutions, which may also correlate to collegiality, resulting in faculty of color remaining at or leaving the institution. The matters of a lack in both diversity and collegiately with other faculty of color of similar ethnicity may be a pending cause for leaving the institution, especially if the faculty of color is the only one of a specific ethnic group within their department, as noted in the literature review (chapter 2), causing feelings of isolation and an increasingly stressful workplace.

Mentoring

Master Narrative of Mentoring

The presence of mentors in higher education provides guidance to junior faculty, especially in relation to maneuvering the pathway toward tenure and promotion. Quezada and Louque (2004) asserted that there is “minimal support in the form of mentoring for junior faculty of color after they have been hired, in turn, impairing their odds for success in the tenure process” (p. 4). Leon and Navarez (2006) referenced a prior study conducted

by Reyes and Halcon in 1998 proposing that “Chicano faculty, like other faculty of color, develop strategies to cope with hostile institutions of higher education” (p. 3). In addition, Leon and Navarez (2006) argued that “mentoring newer faculty can increase the number and retention of Latino faculty by providing a successful academic environment” (p. 3). In a literature review of prior interviews conducted to examine the experiences of faculty of color in higher education, Turner (2003) proposed that “mentoring is an important intervention that minority faculty use toward succeeding in higher education” (p. 119) and that “narratives provide insight into the importance of the presence of faculty of color” (p.120).

La Raza Counter-Story Narrative of Mentoring

Sharing their counter-story narrative mentorship experiences as junior faculty members at their institutions, Professor Uno said he received mentoring, although it was not within his assigned departments. “You know who did it ... it was other Latino faculty at other institutions ... those guys really took me under their wing ... I really owe them a lot,” he said. Professor Dos also said she did not receive mentoring within her department and said the assigned mentor “didn’t really understand my perspective,” so she searched for mentors outside of her department that “were of like opinion.” She stressed the importance of seeking mentors that “mirror your reality and your perspective.” Professor Tres said he received mentoring from non-Latino colleagues within the department because at the time “they [Latino colleagues] just weren’t around.” The dean of his department provided him mentoring, although it was informal because, at the time, there was no “formal or systematic or sustaining” type of mentoring established at his institution.

Professor Cuatro said when he initially arrived at his institution “they had nothing in writing for what it took to get tenure,” and thereafter he received a mentor “officially through the university.” He shared having a really good mentorship, although not within his department. In addition, Professor Cuatro said he gained mentoring through Fellowships, which “were primarily at the time for people of color.” Professor Cinco, a tenure-track faculty member, said he currently has an assigned mentor at his institution. He said when he arrived at his institution his mentor within the department approached the president of the University to advocate on his behalf:

Look, this kid is one of the top race scholars coming out of grad school right now, he has an Ivy league Ph.D., and he could probably get a job at any other school, but he’s willing to come back because this is his alma mater and because he knows that Loyola Marymount University is a family-based school and he wants to be close to his family (Professor Cinco).

Professor Seis said he received informal mentoring at the university through conversations with various department chairs throughout the years within his department regarding the progress of his research, preparing manuscripts for publishing, and the tenure process and requirements. He said the “real mentoring” he received was through an Ignatius institution group for faculty members meeting once a month to assist in building opportunities for “shared discernment on professional and personal issues”:

More experienced faculty brings to the table specific tactics or strategies to help you address problems. There’s nothing like it at any other place in the world, only Santa Clara University has it, it’s where it was designed and first implemented, and it’s been absolutely invaluable; that’s what saved my life. I myself did not receive any kind of formal mentoring from colleagues; I collaborated on some research projects, but [there was] no formal mentoring (Professor Seis).

Professor Siete said he received informal mentoring at a previous public institution before arriving at the University of San Francisco, where he was assigned a

mentor. He said initially, “I wasn’t so excited about the choice because there were other faculty of color that I felt that I really connected with.” He then went on to say, “My mentor’s fantastic; I have a formal mentor that really looks out for me and I can go to her for support.” Professor Siete elaborated on the assistance and support he has received from his mentor:

You think only in the business world, but in academia, there are all kinds of politics. My formal mentor is not shy about protecting me from getting pulled into too much service and I think that that is one of the roles of a good mentor. She always says, “Always thank the person for the invitation ... say that’s a very interesting offer ... let me talk to my mentor about it.” If there’s a power differential ... let’s say it’s a dean or an associate dean that’s asking me to do something, she says, “Don’t say no to the dean or the provost or the president, but you can say no to the chair or a chair from another department (Professor Siete).

Professor Ocho said he received “a lot of good mentoring,” although he did not believe it was “officially part of the system.” He attributes receiving mentoring to the Jesuit community. “The people I lived with ... I would ask them questions or they would advise me ... I felt like there were a lot of good people looking out for me.” Professor Ocho’s experiences, like those of most La Raza participants, echo the inability to obtain formal mentoring for Mexican-American and Chicana/o junior faculty members within their institutions. Fortunately for Professor Ocho, he was able to obtain guidance, support, and mentoring within his religious-affiliated community.

Counter-Narrative of Mentoring

In accordance with the literature review, for faculty of color, in this case Mexican-American and Chicana/o faculty, there is “minimal support in the form of mentoring for junior faculty of color after they have been hired, in turn, impairing their odds for success in the tenure process” (Quezada & Louque, 2004, p. 4). When posing

the question, “Are you currently receiving or did you formally receive mentoring as a junior faculty,” the response of nearly all La Raza participants was that they received “informal mentoring” at their institution, with a few participants sharing that their mentor was located outside of their department or outside of their institution.

Perhaps offering La Raza junior faculty access to La Raza senior faculty will increase retention and decrease feelings of isolation within departments and institutions. Unfortunately, not all colleges and universities offer a formal mentoring component within their departments. Therefore, to gain a mentor or some form of mentoring is solely the responsibility of many faculty of color, an issue that was conveyed in most La Raza counter-stories. However, a few La Raza participants said that the current process for assigning mentors to junior faculty has become better since most of them were tenure-track faculty members, although the issue remains of junior faculty not being matched with senior faculty mentors of similar ethnicity.

Tenure and Promotion

Master Narrative of Tenure and Promotion

The achievement of tenure is considered the pinnacle of higher education for those in pursuit of this quest. However, this is a pinnacle rarely achieved by faculty of color, apparent in their disproportionate numbers as faculty members at colleges and universities nationwide. According to the November 2010 Employees of Postsecondary Institutions report from the National Center for Educational Statistics, 5% of African-American and 4% of Hispanic professors were tenure at degree-granting institutions (Knapp et al., 2010). This is a phenomenon that warrants increased attention by administrators in higher education responsible for assessing and implementing strategies

toward retention and promotion of faculty of color, especially considering the fact that Mexican Americans and Chicanos/as are currently the largest Hispanic sub-population in the United States and will eventually occupy more colleges and universities nationwide.

Jackson (2008) noted that faculty evaluations in higher education are “used for contract renewal for new faculty, tenure decisions, promotion in rank (i.e., assistant, associate, and full professor), and merit pay” (p. 1008). Critical to job satisfaction, faculty of color are less likely to be tenured and often occupy lower academic ranks than their white co-workers. Racism and prejudice, as well as experiencing feelings of isolation, also negatively affect the level of job satisfaction for faculty of color (Brewer & McMahan-Landers, 2003). Guanipa, Santa-Cruz, and Chao (2003) argued that some universities are failing in the area of faculty diversity, especially for Hispanic faculty seeking tenure and promotion at U.S. colleges and universities.

Quezada and Louque (2004) argued that “sometimes the criteria for promotion and tenure has subtle discrimination built into it,” and for those faculty of color pursuing service-oriented assignments, “they are the only voices supporting issues of diversity, social justice and equity in community forums and school board meetings” (p. 4). Cooper and Stevens (2002) suggested that minority faculty often feel “unwelcome, unappreciated and unwanted” while continually attempting “to prove that they deserve their positions” (p. 6). Cooper and Stevens argued that the presence of both structural and personal barriers to academic success is reflective of tenure and promotion. The authors provide the following list as potential barriers for minority faculty:

- Minority faculty continue to be underrepresented in the academy, holding a higher percentage of part-time and non-tenure track positions;
- Minority faculty remain disproportionately located in less prestigious community and four-year colleges;

- In the face of discrimination, minority faculty tend to leave the academy before they obtain tenure in significantly larger numbers;
- Research on minority-related topics is attacked as nonacademic or inappropriate because of a focus on social change and minority issues;
- Minority faculty hold more split or joint appointments, which can serve as a barrier during the tenure review process;
- Minority faculty often feel isolated, lack mentors, experience higher rates of occupational stress, and have to deal with institutional sexism and racism;
- Teaching is undervalued if it involves minority-related subjects or courses;
- When minorities are hired, they may face disproportionate advising and services loads because they are often the only minorities in a department;
- Minority faculty tends to spend more time on teaching and service, leaving them vulnerable to attack at the point of tenure and promotion (pp. 6–8).

In conclusion, “minority faculty continues to be perceived as the ‘other’ and suffers from institutionalized racist attitudes.” Based on “dominant white Western values and norms,” their differences are looked upon as inferior (Cooper & Stevens, 2002, p. 7).

According to Springer (2004), institutions of higher education typically expect faculty to focus on teaching and research, rather than service, which is often valued the least when evaluated for tenure. Nevertheless, minority faculty often encounters disproportionate advising and service responsibilities because they are often the only faculty of color in their department. Further examining traditional academic roles of faculty in higher education, Rosser (2004) specifically addressed the facet of service: “There is no other aspect of academic work than the service and committee work component that can draw the life and time away from a faculty member. Although it is critically important to serve all aspects of academic life, the amount of time allocated to service and committee work can have positive and negative implications on faculty members’ work, satisfaction, and whether they pursue other career alternatives, particularly to women and ethnic minorities” (p. 302).

Lastly, at times, faculty of color are penalized for contributing too much time to service when evaluated for tenure (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995). Examining differences relative to the tenure and promotion process among public and private institutions of higher education is somewhat difficult due to the scarcity of literature available on this process at private institutions, particularly Catholic institutions of higher education. Conversely, in a qualitative study of 16 faculty of color at a private research university, Baez (2000) argued that “the construct of ‘service’ ... may set the stage for a critical agency that resists and redefines academic structures that hinder faculty success ... and ... faculty of color ... may engage in service to promote the success of racial minorities in the academy and elsewhere” (p. 363).

La Raza Counter-Story Narrative of Tenure and Promotion

La Raza counter-story narratives all provided various examples of their tenure and promotion processes related to their self-identified ethnicity at their institutions. Professor Uno did not believe that his self-identified ethnicity or gender limited his progress for tenure or promotion in academia and stated, “You had to learn the game of the dominant society and learn it so well that you could challenge them or beat them at their own game; that’s strategy.” However, he did believe he had to work harder because “we’re doing work that other people have not done and we need to seek inaccessible resources because these are marginal areas of research.” Professor Dos also did not believe her ethnicity or gender limited her progress for tenure or promotion at her institution and thought she was well treated. She added, “I was the ‘token’ girl and I think they really wanted me to succeed.” As a faculty of color, her counter-story informed me she has done “more than other faculty in terms of mentoring and service” as well as “working with students of

color.” Professor Cinco’s counter-story revealed he is “definitely careful” with his choice of words among others within his department and institution and said, “The fact that I have to think about it ... is culturally isolating.” He also identified himself as a “targeted minority hire” at his institution and due to his belief, he needs to “meet certain standards and reach a certain level of success.” Professor Seis did not displace blame onto anyone else and accepted responsibility for his tenure and promotion progression, saying, “I blame me. It’s been my work and my procrastination and my laziness if anything.” Professor Ocho stressed connecting with Latino communities to recruit faculty that “can move in both worlds” and said that Latino faculty, especially being bilingual, are “that much more valuable.”

Counter-Narrative of Tenure and Promotion

A few La Raza counter-story narratives shared how overwhelmed they can become with the service workload. They shared being “inundated” with service commitments and requirements within their departments and institutions due to being approached by committee members requesting their presence and expertise relative to their self-identified ethnic group. In addition, one La Raza participant shared his frustrations with having white colleagues frequently referring students to him for advising and faculty of color to him for consultation. These additional service requests and commitments appeared to create increased stress for La Raza faculty who needed time to devote to research and publication as they sought tenure and promotion.

One matter of concern evident in La Raza counter-story narratives was the trend of faculty members referring students and faculty of color for mentoring and consultation to other faculty of color. It was unclear if the students and faculty of color were referred

by a faculty member with a similar ethnicity or not; if this was the case, this would be a significant reason for hiring more faculty members of color within the department and institution, which would lessen the workload among current faculty of color already felling inundated with work and service responsibilities.

Experiences of Discrimination and Racism

Master Narrative of Experiences of Discrimination and Racism

There is a multitude of issues encountered by faculty of color in higher education that are perceived as forms of discrimination and racism. These forms of discrimination and racism encountered by faculty of color are experienced directly and indirectly through recruitment and retention, lack of departmental diversity and a culturally unwelcoming climate, insufficient mentoring, and obstacles toward tenure and promotion, all of which affect the level of job satisfaction, as discussed in the literature review (chapter 2). This concept is supported by Brewer and McMahan-Landers (2003) who proposed that racism and prejudice as well as experiencing feelings of isolation negatively affects the level of job satisfaction for faculty of color (2003).

Further exploring the discrimination and racism encountered by faculty of color in higher education, Jackson (2008) suggested that the insufficient numbers of faculty of color in higher education may be related to the “unwelcoming and unaccommodating environment at institutions of higher education created by discrimination in the workplace ... and [that] discrimination in the higher education workplace could go undetected for the most part because of its covert nature” (p. 1012). Delgado-Romero et al. (2007) asserted that collegiality also negatively influences the workplace in higher education for Latinos/as (including Mexican Americans and Chicanos/as) because of “the

absence of others within the department sharing values such as *personalismo*, *simpatia*, *familismo*, and *allocentrism* may not only put Latino/a individuals at a disadvantage in such an environment but may also leave them feeling used and isolated” (p. 45).

To better understand the prevalent issues encountered by faculty of color in the academic workplace, Jackson (2008) provided the following five themes: “lack of support; revolving door syndrome; tokenism; typecasting one minority per pot; and brown-on-brown taboo” (pp. 1013–1015). In addition, Delgado-Romero et al. (2007) suggested that tenure and promotion of Latino/a faculty may be “influenced by the departmental attitudes and tenure committee values toward faculty pursuing brown-on-brown research and ethnically oriented service contributions to campus and community minority groups” (p. 38).

Lastly, another phenomenon briefly discussed in the literature review (chapter 2) pertains to the preference of institutions of higher education in the hiring of foreign-born faculty rather than native-born faculty of color (Moody, 2004), which is another form of discrimination. To support this notion, Delgado-Romero et al. (2007) contended that “because current data are not provided by national origin or ethnicity, statistics on Latinos/as usually do not permit for an analysis of the representation of Chicano/a faculty ... [because current statistics reveal] ... that 49.2% of Latino/a faculty are immigrants, which raises concern for the status of U.S Latinos/as and has implications for the state of the educational pipeline in the Unites States” (p. 41).

Delgado-Romero et al. (2007) asserted these matters are problematic for two reasons: “in terms of social justice if Chicanos/as are systematically at the bottom of the

Latino/a prestige hierarchy; and if the success of non-Chicano/s faculty is based in part on discrimination against Chicanos/as” (p. 41).

La Raza Counter-Story Narratives of Experiences of Discrimination and Racism

Thoughts of being perceived by colleagues, administrators, and others as different particularly based on race and/or ethnicity can increase feelings of isolation within the department and institution. In their counter-story narratives, La Raza participants further elaborate on these issues throughout their careers in Catholic higher education.

Professor Uno stated, “Here at the university, I think it’s microaggression.” He said “there are ways of silencing people or keeping them out of the discussion ... it happens a lot; you just have to confront it.” He believes it may be related to a lack of understanding by others making inaccurate comments. He said he is currently working on a project and submitted his ideas to the administration although he has experienced a lack of support with no reasons for denying his ideas. He stated, “I am a person of color and instead of having a dialogue with me ... giving me my respect ... they’re not going to respond to me; they’ve chosen to ignore me.” However, the project is important to Professor Uno, and he said he will be patient and continue “working at it.”

Professor Dos has experienced discrimination and racism at her institution in “terms of marginalization, silencing, exclusion, and microaggression.” Having studied racism in higher education extensively, she asserts it is “systemic and comes from the top ... All scholars say unless the president’s office, the mission statement, and administration set the tone, not much will change.”

Professor Tres said he was originally hired at his institution without having finished his dissertation, although he stated, “That was not unusual back then for Latinos

or for any faculty per se,” whereas white males were required to finish their dissertation prior to being hired. He said he has held many positions at his institution and he thinks that other faculty members believe he was hired in those positions not because of merit but because of solely being Mexican American or Chicano. “So there’s always having to prove yourself a little bit more in terms of why you got that position,” he said.

Professor Cuatro said that he has not experienced racism, prejudice, or discrimination directly or overtly, although shared he has a Latino colleague in his department with more pronounced Latino features and “I showed up for a meeting once and he wasn’t at the meeting and one of my colleagues said, ‘Where is your twin?’ We don’t look anything alike.

Professor Cinco said his only experience with any type of racism, prejudice, or discrimination thus far in his department has been an encounter with a former professor who made a comment to him when he accepted employment at his institution. She said, “Oh we need a token Spanish last name on the doors or the walls,” something like that.

Professor Siete said he has not personally observed any type of racism, prejudice, or discrimination directed toward himself. He shared witnessing subtle instances, although believes there is a “lack of recognition about what faculty of color do to some degree.” He also believes there is “a problem with a lack of representation of faculty of color in administrative positions versus faculty positions,” and did not believe it was racism, but “it’s ... something that’s systemic that marginalizes.”

Professor Ocho also said he has observed subtle instances of racism, prejudice, and discrimination within his department among colleagues and stated, “Sometimes

people believe we are where we are because of our race.” He went on to say, “There’s racism at the academy and I’m very concerned about this.”

Counter-Narrative of Experiences of Discrimination and Racism

La Raza counter-story narratives illustrated detailed and specific experiences of discrimination and racism, although they did not disclose a significant number. Considering there was a marginal number of experiences with discrimination and racism correlating with the content of the master narrative, a few La Raza participants shared their experiences as marginalization, silencing, exclusion, microaggression, seen as an ethnic category first, and a token hire. Experiences shared by La Raza faculty did not appear to differentiate by generation status in the United States or by being bicultural versus solely identifying as Mexican American/Chicana/o. In addition, all La Raza participants, except for one, were tenured; therefore it was anticipated that they would have encountered a greater frequency of experiences with discrimination and racism throughout their career as faculty members in higher education consistent with the master narrative, although this was not the shared consensus.

Conclusion

According to Delgado-Romero et al. (2007), prior attempts by scholars to highlight the issues of Latino/a faculty over the years have been done through narratives. Although the legitimacy of narrative research may not be considered academically relevant by some, “Narratives can give voice to unaddressed barriers in academia and provide validation, identification, catharsis, and relief to readers about the structural, sociopolitical, and interpersonal dynamics in higher education” (p. 44).

This qualitative research study was an attempt to explore the process toward attaining faculty membership at Catholic institutions of higher education. Specifically, this study was conducted to better understand the process of educational, personal, and professional lived experiences of La Raza participants in their journey toward faculty membership in academia, and to substantiate if their experiences correlated with the content of the master narratives pertinent to faculty of color, and specifically Mexican Americans and Chicanas/os. In the course of narrating La Raza participants' experiences, counter-story narratives were constructed to give "voice" to their experiences as self-identified native-born Mexican-American and Chicana/o tenured and tenure-track faculty members.

The procedure of counter-storytelling, a technique used to "analyze the role of race and racism through the experiences of people of color," assisted as "both a method of telling the story of those experiences that have not been told and a tool for analyzing and challenging the stories of those in power whose story is a natural part of the dominant discourse—the majoritarian story" (Yosso & Solórzano, 2005, p. 124). La Raza counter-story narratives correlated with the literature pertaining to issues encountered by faculty of color in higher education, as discussed in the literature review (chapter 2, e.g., discrimination and racism pertaining to social and cultural climate, level of satisfaction, and tenure and promotion), though findings were not overtly substantial.

Considering La Raza participants' personal and professional lived experiences marginally confirmed findings of previous studies related to faculty of color, their narratives enhanced the limited findings with more depth and detail specific to Mexican-American and Chicana/o faculty employed in Catholic higher education.

Furthermore, a few La Raza participants shared experiences of microaggression within their departments and institutions, which included isolation, feeling devalued as a colleague and researcher, feeling ignored by the administration, being inundated with workloads and service requirements, a lack of departmental mentorship, and subtle racial comments and assumptions made by colleagues because of their racial phenotype. However, most La Raza participants expressed acceptance and comfort in their current departments, partly due to being in a department among other self-identified Hispanic and Latino faculty members. In addition, as stated earlier, it was apparent in their counter-story narratives that each La Raza participant has made personal and professional commitments and contributions to sustain the cultures of both their self-identified ethnicity and of the university.

Implications for Catholic Higher Education

Considering there has been limited research conducted on faculty of color at Catholic institutions of higher education, this study was important for numerous reasons. First, it provided an opportunity for this Hispanic sub-group of the professoriate to share the counter-story narratives of their personal and professional experiences as faculty employed at Catholic institutions of higher education. Second, the personal and professional lived experiences of Mexican-American and Chicana/o faculty were explored with a qualitative narrative methodology within a critical race paradigm, which provided a means for gaining a more in-depth understanding of their unique experiences as Mexican-American and Chicana/o faculty at Catholic institutions of higher education. More specifically, this study identified how Mexican-American and Chicana/o faculty prepared for a career in academia, the supports and challenges they experienced within

their departments and at their institutions, and recommendations they provided for prospective Mexican-American scholars, current faculty, and current academic administrators at Catholic institutions of higher education.

Through counter-story narratives, Mexican-American and Chicana/o faculty had the opportunity to “voice” the realities of their lived experiences in academia. The findings of the study revealed that Mexican-American and Chicana/o faculty experience academia in both similar and dissimilar ways regardless of the Catholic institution’s order, congregation, or diocese, which includes encountering supports and challenges upon entering academia.

Considering that Mexican Americans and Chicanas/os continue to remain underrepresented in academia, including Catholic institutions of higher education, it was important to gain a greater understanding of their personal and professional lived experiences. A quantitative narrative methodology in combination with counter-storytelling and theories of racism provided the means for revealing their stories.

From this study, there are some important implications for Catholic higher education. Mexican-American and Chicana/o scholars interested in an academic career should first become familiar with the institutions, specifically the departments and the culture, to decide if they coincide with their own rigor as a scholar, as well as with their own personal and ethnic cultural values and beliefs. Second, mentoring can assist Mexican-American and Chicana/o tenure-track faculty toward succeeding in academia, particularly toward acquiring tenure and promotion. It was also suggested by La Raza participants, because of the lack of available faculty of color, tenure-track faculty need to acquire mentors of similar ethnicity outside of their department or, in some cases, outside

of their institution. Third, senior faculty and administrators can serve as culturally conscientious mentors by increasing their own knowledge and understanding of their faculty members' cultural traditions, beliefs, and values. Administrators can also provide incentives to recruit greater numbers of Mexican-American and Chicano tenure-track faculty and other ethnic minority faculty from within their own departments and institutions. As suggested by a few La Raza participants, ultimately the decision to increase diversity and develop an inclusive plan for ethnic minority faculty must be a "top-down priority."

Recommendations

The recommendations in this study were derived from the literature review, as well as from the lived experiences of the La Raza participants in the study.

Recommendations pertain to faculty of color and diversifying within institutions of higher education, particularly at Catholic colleges and universities, through recruitment and retention strategies, and reassessing current institutional policies and procedures to increasingly diversify the demographics of the staff, faculty, and administrators. I will first provide the recommendations by La Raza participants and then conclude with personal recommendations for future research at Catholic institutions of higher education.

La Raza Recommendations

To reiterate the recommendations provided by La Raza participants in the narrative findings (chapter 4), this section will include the research questions with the associated recommendations on behalf of Mexican Americans and Chicanas/os in Catholic higher education.

What recommendations would you have for Mexican-American/Chicano scholars interested in pursuing an academic career in Catholic higher education?

First some La Raza participants supported the idea that there is a connection between Catholic Mexicans and Catholic higher education. They believe there is an increased sense of belonging at Catholic institutions of higher education, grounded in a long history between Catholic Mexicans, Catholic institutions, and Catholic education. The second recommendation contends that Mexican-American/Chicana/o scholars in pursuit of careers in higher education need to clearly understand the expectations and culture of the department and institution where they are seeking employment. It was also noted that this was not a recommendation isolated to pursuing an academic career at a Catholic college or university, but pertained to all institutions of higher education. The third recommendation had to do with being assertive and self-promoting. La Raza participants emphasized pursuing other faculty members and administrators to clearly understand the role and requirements of faculty members at the institution prior to accepting employment. And last, La Raza participants stressed connecting with a scholar of a similar ethnicity in your field. Considering the lack of faculty of color, specifically Mexican-American/Chicana/o faculty, scholars may need to locate faculty members with a similar ethnicity outside of the prospective department or institution.

What recommendations would you have for Mexican-American/Chicano faculty pertaining to tenure and promotion in Catholic higher education?

First La Raza participants recommended that tenure-track faculty members clearly understand tenure requirements and exceed those requirements. La Raza participants emphasized clearly understanding the tenure process to know what was specifically expected of them to be successful in higher education. It was also suggested, after clearly understanding the tenure process and expectations, to exceed those requirements through

teaching, research, and scholarship. Therefore, they would be prepared prior to the tenure review process, ensuring an increased probability of securing tenure. Second, La Raza participants recommended not isolating yourself and getting a mentor. They advised obtaining a mentor shortly after accepting employment in higher education to guide and support them thorough the tenure process. Lastly, La Raza participants emphasized protecting your time and setting limits. Often faculty of color are approached and requested to serve on multiple committees, which frequently takes time away from succeeding in other requirements of the tenure process.

What recommendations would you have for academic administrators in Catholic higher education to assist in the recruitment, promotion, and retention of Mexican-American/Chicano faculty?

La Raza participants provided three recommendations for academic administrators in Catholic higher education. First, they recommended that diversity be a top-down decision and priority in order for changes to occur at the institutional level. It was recommended, in order for this to be accomplished, that the president and other key administrators perceive the value of diversity at their institution and make a consistent commitment to diversifying their institution. Second, La Raza participants recommended that administrators offer incentives to prospective Mexican-American/Chicana/o scholars to increase the numbers of current faculty members of color. It was also recommended that institutions attempt to “grow your own” scholars toward securing faculty positions at the institution and be less dependent on other institutions of higher education to provide prospective faculty members. Lastly, La Raza participants recommended that the president and key administrators increase their awareness and understanding of diversity and cultural differences that exist and are encountered by prospective and current

Mexican-American/Chicana/o faculty members, as well as other faculty members of color.

Recommendations for Future Research

Grounded on the findings of this study, there are numerous recommendations I would propose for future research at Catholic institutions of higher education. First, I would propose continued research be conducted to further address the findings of this study, which marginally correlated with the master narratives and literature review pertaining to Mexican-American/Chicana/o faculty.

Second, I would propose conducting a mixed-methodology study to further explore and inquire about the predominant issues that self-identified ethnic minority faculty encounter at Catholic institutions of higher education, such as socialization, isolation, tokenism, workloads and service requirements hindering tenure and promotion. By conducting a mixed-methodology study, the researcher could construct a survey based on the interview protocol of this study, and then proceed with interviews with self-identified ethnic minority faculty members to compare and contrast results from the survey data.

Third, considering all, except one, of the participants in this study were tenured, I would propose conducting a study to explore and compare the professional experiences of younger and older tenured and tenure-track faculty members employed at Catholic participants were men, I would also propose conducting a study with an equal number of gendered tenured and tenure-track faculty members.

Lastly, I would also propose conducting a study with administrators from various Catholic institutions of higher education to explore their policies on diversifying their

faculty membership and their own thoughts and duties related to recruitment, promotion, and tenure of ethnic minority faculty members. This study may also include the administrators' perceived understanding of the level of job satisfaction of their ethnic minority faculty members.

Concluding Thoughts

The premise of this research study was based on my own observations associated with a deficiency of faculty of color, specifically native-born Mexican-American and Chicana/o faculty, throughout my journey in higher education. As an undergraduate and graduate student, I often questioned the reasoning behind this deficiency of native-born La Raza faculty members at the colleges and universities I attended. Aside from what was presented in the literature review pertaining to experiences of faculty of color and/or ethnic minority faculty in higher education, I believed it was important to personally explore and obtain answers to this observed phenomenon directly from faculty members of a similar ethnicity at Catholic institutions of higher education.

While conducting this research study, I frequently revisited the responses I obtained from La Raza participants pertaining to the questions associated with their own experiences of discrimination and racism. At times, I felt as if La Raza participants were guarded in disclosing their own personal experiences related to discrimination and racism, which I found to a large degree consistent within the master narratives for faculty of color in higher education. Acknowledging their personal story narratives, I contemplated about my own unvoiced experiences of discrimination and racism in higher education.

As I reflected on my own experiences, I recall having feelings of isolation and disengagement within higher education and partly attribute those feelings to being unable to connect with a faculty member of a similar ethnicity at the universities and colleges I attended. In addition, at times I believed I was merely a token student of color at each of these colleges and universities, which was supported by the discrimination I encountered at each institution I attended, although later to be assisted by a faculty member who advocated on my behalf. Nevertheless, I consider myself fortunate to have had the opportunity to connect with a few faculty members who understood the obstacles I encountered and would encounter because of my self-identified ethnicity and culture, and who showed a genuine interest in my progress and success in higher education.

Although the faculty in higher education is lightly peppered with faculty of color and the journey toward careers in higher education is occasionally referred to as “perilous,” I have not been deterred from seeking the fulfillment of my own ambitions of one day soon entering and joining the ranks of faculty at a Catholic college or university.

REFERENCES

- Aguirre, A., Jr. (2000). *Women and minority faculty in the academic workplace: Recruitment, retention and academic culture*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass
- Ali, P. (2009). Job satisfaction characteristics of higher education faculty by race. *Educational Research and Reviews, 4*, 289–300
- Ambrose, S., Huston, T., & Norman, M. (2005). A qualitative method for assessing faculty satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education, 46*, 803–830. doi:10.1007/s11162-004-6226-6
- Antshel, K. M. (2002). Integrating culture as a means of improving treatment adherence in the Latino population. *Psychology, Health, and Medicine, 7*(4), 435 – 449
- Antonio, A. L. (2002). Faculty of color reconsidered: Reassessing contributions to scholarship. *The Journal of Higher Education, 73*, 582–603. doi:10.1353/jhe.2002.0043
- August, L., & Waltman, J. (2004). Culture, climate, and contribution: Career satisfaction among female faculty. *Research in Higher Education, 45*(2), 177–192. doi:10.1023/B:RIHE.0000015694.14358.ed.
- Austin, A. E. (2002). Preparing the next generation of faculty. Graduate school as socialization to the academic career. *Journal of Higher Education, 71*, 1, 94–122
- Baez, B. (2000). Race-related service and faculty of color: Conceptualizing critical agency in academe. *Higher Education, 39*, 363–391. doi:10.1023/A:1003972214943
- Beutel, A. M., & Nelson, D. J. (2006). The gender and race-ethnicity of faculty in top social science research department. *The Social Science Journal, 43*, 111–125. doi:10.1016/j.soscij.2005.12.011
- Blackburn, R. T., & Lawrence, J. H. (1995). *Faculty at work: Motivation, expectation, satisfaction*. Baltimore, MD: The John Hopkins University Press
- Branch-Brioso, K. (2008, October 16). UCLA study reveals growing gender gap among Hispanic college students. *Diverse Issues in Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://diverseeducation.com/>
- Brayboy, M. J. (2003). The implementation of diversity in predominantly white colleges and universities. *Journal of Black Studies, 34*, 72–86. doi:10.1177/0021934703253679
- Brewer, E. W., & McMahan-Landers, J. (2003). Job satisfaction among industrial and technical teacher educators. *Journal of Industrial Teacher Education, 40*(2), 1–17

- Castellanos, J., & Jones, L. (Eds.), (2003). *The majority in the minority: Expanding the representation of Latina/o faculty, administrators and students in higher education*. Sterling, VA: Stylus
- Cooper, J. E., & Stevens, D. D. (2002). The journey toward tenure. In J. E. Cooper & D. D. Stevens (Eds.), *Tenure in the sacred grove: Issues and strategies for women and minority faculty* (pp. 6–7). Albany: State University of New York Press
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational Research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall
- Creswell J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Crissey, S. R. (2009). *Educational attainment in the United States: 2007*. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/>
- DeAngelo, L., Hurtado, S., Pryor, J. H., Kelly, K. R., Santos, J. L., & Korn, W. S. (2009). *The American college teacher: National norms for the 2007–08 survey*. Retrieved from <http://heri.ucla.edu/>
- DeCuir, J. T., & Dixon, A. D. (2004). So when it comes out, they aren't that surprised that it is there: Using critical race theory as a tool of analysis of race and racism in education. *Educational Researcher*, 33(5), 26–31. doi:10.3102/0013189X033005026
- Delgado, R. & Stefancic, J. (2012). *Critical race theory: An introduction*. New York University Press. ISBN 978-0-8147-2136-0
- Delgado-Romero, E. A., Manlove, A. N., Manlove, J. D., & Hernandez, C. A. (2007). Controversial issues in the recruitment and retention of Latino/a faculty. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 6, 34–51. doi:10.1177/1538192706294903
- Ennis, S. R., Rios-Vargas, M., & Albert, N. G. (2011). *The Hispanic population: 2010*. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/>
- Gandara, P., & Contreras, F. (2009). *The Latino education crisis: The consequences of failed social policies*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press
- Garza, H. (1998). The 'barrioization' of Hispanic faculty. *Educational Record*, 68, 122–124

- Gildersleeve, R. E.; Croom, N. N.; Vasquez, P. L. (2011). "Am I going crazy?!" A critical race analysis of doctoral education, equity & excellence in education, 44:1, 93-114. Retrieved May 10, 2013 from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2011.539472>
- Godina-Martinez, G. T. (2010). *The sustainability of critical Xicana/Xicano educators* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). California State University, Sacramento
- Golde, C. M. (1997, November). Gaps in the training of future faculty: Doctoral student perceptions. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Albuquerque, NM
- Guanipa, C., Santa-Cruz, R. M., & Chao, G. (2003). Retention, tenure, and promotion of Hispanic faculty in colleges of education: Working toward success within the higher education system. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 2, 187–202. doi: 10.1177/1538192702250622
- Hagdorn, L. & Sax, L. (2004). Marriage, children, and aging parents: The role of family-related factors in faculty job satisfaction. *Journal of Faculty Development*, 19(2), 65–76
- Hagedorn, L. (1996). Wage equity and female faculty job satisfaction: The role of wage differentials in a job satisfaction causal model. *Research in Higher Education*, 37, 569–598. doi:10.1007/BF01724939
- Harvey, W. B. (1991). Faculty responsibility and tolerance. *Thought & Action*, 7, 115–136
- Hayes-Bautista, D. E., & Chapa, J. (1987). Latino terminology: Conceptual bases for standardized terminology. *American Journal of Public Health*, 77, 61–68. doi:10.2105/AJPH.77.1.61
- Hernandez, F. (1997, June/July). Mexican gender studies and the American university. *The American Behavioral Scientist*, 40(7), 968–974
- Jackson, J. F. L. (2008). Race segregation across the academic workforce. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 51, 1004–1029. doi:10.1177/0002764207312003
- Jayakumar, U. M., Howard, T. C., Allen, W. R., Han, J.C. (2009). Racial privilege in the professoriate: An exploration of campus climate, retention, and satisfaction. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 80, 538–563. doi:10.1353/jhe.0.0063
- Johnsrud, L. K., & Rosser, V. J. (2002). Faculty members' morale and their intentions to leave: A multilevel explanation. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 71(1), 34–59
- Knapp, L. G., Kelly-Reid, E. J., & Ginder, S. A. (2010). *Employees in postsecondary institutions, Fall 2009, and salaries of full-time instructional staff, 2009–10* (NCES 2011–150). Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/>

- Ladson-Billings, G. (1998). Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a nice field like education? *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *11*, 7–24. doi:10.1080/095183998236863
- Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record*, *97*, 47–68.
- Leon, D., & Nevarez, C. (2006). *Promoting Latino faculty and senior-level administrators*. California Chicano-Latino intersegmental convocation policy summit. JcPublication & MDC Design.
- Leon, D. J., & Nevarez, C. (2007). Models of leadership institutions for increasing the number of top Latino administrators in higher education. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, *6*, 356–377. doi:10.1177/1538192707305344
- Love, B. J. (2004). Brown plus 50 counter-storytelling: A critical race theory analysis of the “majoritarian achievement gap” story. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *37*: 227–246. doi: 10.1080/10665680490491597
- Marin, G., & Vanos-Marin, B. (1991). Research with Hispanic populations. Applied Social Research Methods Series, volume 23. SAGE Publications Inc.
- Marston, S. H., & Brunetti, G. J. (2009). Job satisfaction of experienced professors at a liberal arts college. *Education*, *130*, 323–347
- McKinley, B., & Brayboy, J. (2003). The implementation of diversity in predominately white colleges and universities. *Journal of Black Studies*, *34*, 72–86. doi:10.1177/0021934703253679
- Moody, J. (2004). *Faculty diversity: Problems and solutions*. New York, NY: Taylor and Francis
- Mooney, K. M., & Reder, M. (2007). Faculty development at small and liberal arts colleges. In D. R. Robertson & L. B. Nilson (Eds.), *To improve the academy* (Vol. 26; pp. 158–172). Bolton, MA: Anker
- Moreno, J. F., Smith, D. G., Clayton-Pedersen, A. R., Parker, S., & Teraguchi, D. H. (April 2006). The revolving door for underrepresented minority faculty in higher education: An analysis from the campus diversity initiative. *The James Irvine Foundation*. Retrieved from http://irvine.org/assets/pdf/pubs/education/insight_Revolving_Door.pdf
- Motel, S., Patten, E. (Feb. 2013). Statistical portrait of Hispanics in the United States, 2011. *Pew Hispanic Center*. Retrieved from <http://www.pewhispanic.org/2013/02/15/statistical-portrait-of-hispanics-in-the-united-states-2011/#1>

- National Center for Education Statistics. (July 2012). *Table 264*. Full-time instructional faculty in degree-granting institutions, by race/ethnicity, sex, and academic rank: Fall 2007, 2009, 2011. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d12/tables/dt12_264.asp
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2011a). *Digest of education, fast facts*. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=37>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2011b). *Table 235*. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d10/tables/dt10_235.asp
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2010). Full-time faculty by race/ethnicity, gender, and tenure status for the 2009–10 academic year in the U.S. <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/datacenter>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2010a). *Table 299*. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d01/dt299.asp>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2010b). *Table 302*. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d99/tables/PDF/Table302.pdf>
- Pew Research Center (2013). *Statistical Portrait of Hispanics in the United States, 2011*. Retrieved from <http://www.pewhispanic.org/2013/02/15/statistical-portrait-of-hispanics-in-the-united-states-2011/>
- Pino, D. M., & Ovando, M. N. (2005). *Persistence of first-generation Mexican American university students in a Hispanic serving institution*. Paper presented at University Council of Educational Administration Annual Convention, Nashville, Tennessee
- Ponjuan, L. (2005). *Understanding the work lives of faculty of color: Job satisfaction, perception of climate, and intention to leave* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and theses database. (UMI No. 982791191)
- Quezada, R. L., & Louque, A. (2004). The absence of diversity in the academy: Faculty of color in educational administration programs. *Education, 125*(2), 213–221. Retrieved February 20, 2010 from Research Library. (Document ID: 792784901)
- Reybold, L. E. (2005). Surrendering the dream: Early career conflict and faculty dissatisfaction thresholds. *Journal of Career Development, 32*(2), 107–121
- Rodriguez, R. (1996). *The origins and history of the Chicano movement* (Julian Samora Research Institute: Occasional Paper no. 07). Retrieved from <http://www.jsri.msu.edu/>
- Rodriguez, T. (2009, September 7). The decline of Latino-male achievement in postsecondary education. *The Hispanic Outlook in Higher Education, 14–16*

- Rosser, V. (2004). Faculty members' intentions to leave: A national study on their work life and satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education*, 45, 285–309. doi:10.1023/B:RIHE.0000019591.74425.f1
- Rosser, V. (2005). Measuring the change in faculty perceptions over time: An examination of their worklife and satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education*, 46(1), 81–107
- Sabharwal, M., & Corley, E. A. (2009). Faculty job satisfaction across gender and discipline. *The Social Science Journal*, 46, 539–556. doi:10.1016/j.soscij.2009.04.015
- Saenz, V. B., & Ponjuan, L. (2009). The vanishing Latino male in higher education. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 8, 54–89. doi:10.1177/1538192708326995
- Smith, D. G. (2000). How to diversify the faculty. *Academe*, 86(5), 48–52. doi:10.2307/40251921. Retrieved from <http://www.multiculturaladvantage.com/recruit/higher-education/How-to-Diversify-the-Faculty.asp>
- Smith, J. P., & Edmonston, B. (Eds.) (1997). *The new Americas: Economic, demographic, and fiscal effects of immigration*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press
- Solórzano, D., & Yosso, T. J. (2002). Critical race methodology: Counter-storytelling as an analytical framework for education research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 8, 23–44. doi:10.1177/107780040200800103
- Solórzano, D. G. & Yosso, T. J. (2001). Critical race and LatCrit theory and method: Counter-storytelling. *Qualitative studies in education* 14(4), 471–495.
- Solórzano, D., Ceja, M., & Yosso, T. J. (2000). Critical race theory, racial microaggressions, and campus racial climate: The experiences of African American college students. *Journal of Negro Education*, 69, 60–73
- Solórzano, D. (1998). Critical race theory, racial and gender microaggressions, and the experiences of Chicana and Chicano scholars. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 11, 121–136
- Springer, A. D. (2004). Faculty diversity in a brave new world. *Academe*, 90(4), 68–78
- Stanley, C. A. (January/February 2007). When counter-narratives meet master narratives in the journal editorial-review process. *Educational Researcher*, 36 (1), pp. 14–24. DOI: 10.3102/0013189X06298008. Retrieved from http://legacy.aera.net/uploadedFiles/Publications/Journals/Educational_Researcher/3601/03_Stanley_14.pdf

- Stanley, C. A. (2006). *Faculty of color: Teaching in predominantly white colleges and universities*. Bolton, MA: Anker
- Strunk, K. O., & Robinson, J. P. (2006). Oh won't you stay: A multilevel analysis of the difficulties in retaining qualified teachers. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 81(4), 65–94. doi:10.1207/s15327930pje8104_4
- Tierney, W. G., & Sallee, M. W. (2008). Do organizational structures and strategies increase faculty diversity? A cultural analysis. *American Academic*, 4, 149–184
- Torres, J., Santos, J., Peck, N. L., & Cortes, L. (2004). *Minority teacher recruitment, development, and retention*. Retrieved from <http://www.alliance.brown.edu/>
- Trevino, F. (1987). Standardized terminology for Hispanic populations. *American Journal of Public Health*, 77, 69–72
- Trower, C. A. & Chait, R. P. (2002, March–April). Faculty diversity: Too little for too long. *Harvard Magazine*. Retrieved from <http://harvardmagazine.com/>
- Turner, C. S. (2003). Incorporation and marginalization in the academy: From border toward center for faculty of color? *Journal of Black Studies*, 34, 112–125. doi: 10.1177/0021934703253689
- Turner, C. S. V., Gonzalez, 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
- Turner, C. S., & Myers, Jr., S. L. (2000). *Faculty of color in academia: Bittersweet success*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon
- Turner, C. S., Myers, S. L., Jr., & Creswell, J. W. (1999). Exploring underrepresentation: The case of faculty of color in the Midwest. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 70, 27–45. doi:10.2307/2649117
- Turner, C. S., & Taylor, D. V. (2008). Faculty of color in academe: What 20 years of literature tells us. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 1(3), 139–168. doi: 10.1037/a0012837
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2011/May). Hispanic Population: 2010 Census Briefs. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-04.pdf>
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2008). *Projections of the population by sex, race, and Hispanic origin for the United States: 2010 to 2050*. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/>
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2009). *Educational attainment of the population 18 years and older, by age, sex, race, and Hispanic origin: 2008*. Retrieved from <http://www.forprofitedu.com/>

- U.S. Office of Management and Budget. (1994). *Race and ethnic standards for federal statistics and administrative reporting*. Retrieved from http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/fedreg_notice_15
- Valencia, R. (2008). *Chicano students and the courts: The Mexican American legal struggle for educational equality*. New York: New York University Press.
- Valverde, M. R., & Rodriguez, R. C. (2002). Increasing Mexican American doctoral degrees: The role of institutions of higher education. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 1*, 51–58. doi:10.1177/1538192702001001005
- Verdugo, R. R. (1995). Racial stratification and the use of Hispanic faculty as role models: Theory, policy, and practice. *Journal of Higher Education, 66*(6), 669–685. doi:10.2307/2943835
- Vigil, J. D. (1998). *From Indians to Chicanos: The dynamics of Mexican-American culture*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press
- Washington, V., & Harvey, W. (1989). *Affirmative rhetoric, negative action. African-American and Hispanic faculty at predominantly White institutions*. Retrieved from <http://www.ericdigests.org/>
- Wikipedia.org. (2013). *La Raza*. Retrieved from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/La_Raza
- Yosso, T. J. & Solórzano, D. G. (2006, March). *Leaks in the Chicana and Chicano Education Pipeline*. Latino Policy & Issues Brief, no. 13. UCLA Chicano Studies Research Center
- Yosso, T. J. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race, Ethnicity and Education, 8*, 69–91. doi:10.1080/1361332052000341006
- Yosso, T. J., & Solórzano, D. (2005). Conceptualizing a critical race theory in sociology. In M. Romero & E. Margolis (Eds.), *The Blackwell companion to social inequalities* (pp. 117–145). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Zhou, Y., & Volkwein, F. (2004). Examining the influences of faculty departure intentions: A comparison of tenured versus non-tenured faculty at research universities using NSOPF-99. *Research in Higher Education, 45*, 139–176. doi: 10.1023/B:RIHE.0000015693.38603.4c

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO IRB APPROVAL (#12-009)

From: USF IRBPHS <irbphs@usfca.edu>
To: carrillo_serrano@verizon.net
Cc: mitchell@usfca.edu
Sent: Tuesday, May 22, 2012 2:43 PM
Subject: IRB Modification Application #12-009 - Modifications Approved

May 22, 2012

Dear Mr. Serrano:

The Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (IRBPHS) at the University of San Francisco (USF) has reviewed your request for modification of your human subjects approval regarding your study.

Your modification application has been approved by the committee (IRBPHS #12-009).

1. Approval expires twelve (12) months from the date noted above. At that time, if you are still collecting data from human subjects, you must file a renewal application.
2. Any modifications to the research protocol or changes in instrumentation (including wording of items) must be communicated to the IRBPHS. Re-submission of an application may be required at that time.
3. Any adverse reactions or complications on the part of participants must be reported (in writing) to the IRBPHS within ten (10) working days.

If you have any questions, please contact the IRBPHS at (415) 422-6091.

On behalf of the IRBPHS committee, I wish you much success in your research.

Sincerely,
Terence Patterson, Ed.D., ABPP
Chair, Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects

IRBPHS – University of San Francisco
Counseling Psychology Department
Education Building – Room 017
2130 Fulton Street
San Francisco, CA 94117-1080
(415) 422-6091 (Message)
(415) 422-5528 (Fax)
irbphs@usfca.edu
<http://www.usfca.edu/soe/students/irbphs/>

APPENDIX B: SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY IRB APPROVAL (#12-03-138)

From: Protocols@scu.edu
Sent Date: Wednesday, March 14, 2012 14:47:34 PM
To: fvserrano@usfca.edu, psoukup@scu.edu
Cc:
Bcc: protocols@scu.edu,ksullivan@scu.edu
Subject: IRB Submission Approved: 12-03-138, Frank Serrano

Message:

The IRB has approved the submission with the following details.

Protocol ID: 12-03-138

Principal Investigator: Frank Serrano

Department: Education

Protocol Title: LIFE, LIBERTY, AND THE PURSUIT OF LA RAZA VOCES: AN EXPLORATION OF THE PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL LIVED EXPERIENCES AND SELF-PERCEIVED CHALLENGES AND SUPPORTS OF MEXICAN AMERICAN FACULTY AT CATHOLIC INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN CALIFORNIA.

Form Type: NEW

Review Type: EXEMPT

Approval Date: March 14, 2012

For New Protocols, Continuing Reviews and Amendments, please go to <https://scu.keyusa.net> to access your formal approval letter, which is available on the Event History tab of the protocol. This is a notification only.

Please be aware of your post-IRB approval submission requirements:

http://www.scu.edu/Documents/provost/irb/Post_IRB_Approval_Submission_Req.doc.

APPENDIX C: SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY HUMAN SUBJECTS RESEARCH
CURRICULUM COMPLETION REPORT (3/9/2012)

Learner: Frank Serrano (username: fvserrano)
Institution: Santa Clara University
Contact Information

518 Via Sorrento
Morgan Hill, CA 95037 United States
Phone: 408-779-5100
Email: carrillo_serrano@verizon.net

Social/Behavioral Research Course:

Stage 1. Basic Course Passed on 03/09/12 (Ref # 7616072)

Required Modules	Date Completed	
Santa Clara University	03/09/12	no quiz
Belmont Report and CITI Course Introduction	03/09/12	3/3 (100%)
History and Ethical Principles - SBR	03/09/12	4/4 (100%)

For this Completion Report to be valid, the learner listed above must be affiliated with a CITI participating institution. Falsified information and unauthorized use of the CITI course site is unethical, and may be considered scientific misconduct by your institution.

Paul Braunschweiger Ph.D.
Professor, University of Miami
Director Office of Research Education
CITI Course Coordinator

APPENDIX D: LOYOLA MARYMOUNT UNIVERSITY IRB APPROVAL

From: Paterson, Julie [mailto:Julianne.Paterson@lmu.edu]

Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 10:32 AM

To: Serrano, Frank

Subject: IRB Query

Dear Mr. Serrano,

The LMU Institutional Review has received and reviewed your request to contact one or two faculty members, referred to you by another faculty member at USF or another institution.

I am pleased to inform you that the LMU IRB approves this request. It is not necessary to go through the IRB process to contact the faculty at LMU to invite them to be a part of your study.

Best Regards,

Julie Paterson

Julie Paterson | IRB Coordinator | Loyola Marymount University | 1 LMU Drive | U-Hall #1718 | Los Angeles, CA 90045 | (310) 258-5465 | jpaterso@lmu.edu

NOTICE: This email message and/or its attachments may contain information that is confidential or restricted. It is intended only for the individuals named as recipients in the message. If you are NOT an authorized recipient, you are prohibited from using, delivering, distributing, printing, copying, or disclosing the message or content to others and must delete the message from your computer. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender by return email.

APPENDIX E: UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO IRB APPROVAL



9/17/12

Institutional Review Board Project Action Summary

Action Date: September 07, 2012 Note: Approval expires one year after this date.

Type: New Full Review New Expedited Review Continuation Review Exempt Review
 Modification

Action: Approved Approved Pending Modification Not Approved

Project Number: 2012-08-233

Researcher(s): Frank V. Serrano Doc USF
Dr. Patricia Mitchell Fac USF
Dr. George Reed Fac USD

Project Title: Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of La Raza Voices: An Exploration of the Personal and Professional Lived Experiences of Mexican-American and Chicana/o Faculty at California Catholic Institutions of Higher Education

Note: We send IRB correspondence regarding student research to the faculty advisor, who bears the ultimate responsibility for the conduct of the research. We request that the faculty advisor share this correspondence with the student researcher.

Modifications Required or Reasons for Non-Approval

None

The next deadline for submitting project proposals to the Provost's Office for full review is N/A. You may submit a project proposal for expedited review at any time.

Dr. Thomas R. Herrinton
Administrator, Institutional Review Board
University of San Diego
herrinton@sandiego.edu
5998 Alcalá Park
San Diego, California 92110-2492

Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost
Hughes Administration Center, Room 214
5998 Alcalá Park, San Diego, CA 92110-2492
Phone (619) 260-4553 • Fax (619) 260-2210 • www.sandiego.edu

APPENDIX F: INFORMED CONSENT LETTER

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

CONSENT TO BE A RESEARCH SUBJECT

Purpose and Background

Mr. Frank V. Serrano, a graduate student in the School of Education at the University of San Francisco, is conducting a research study to explore the personal and professional lived experiences and self-perceived supports and challenges of underrepresented ethnic minority faculty at Catholic institutions of higher education in California.

I have been asked to participate because I self-identify as a native-born Mexican, Mexican American, or Chicano/a tenured or tenure-track faculty member employed at a Catholic institution of higher education in California.

Procedures

If you agree to be a participant in this study, the following will occur:

1. I will complete a short demographic questionnaire providing information on identity of race/ethnicity, age, gender, marital status, citizenship, and generational status in America, religious affiliation, academic rank, employment status (tenured or tenure-track) and parents identified race/ethnic group and their highest level of education completed.
2. I will participate in a 60–90 minute audio-tape recorded qualitative interview with Frank V. Serrano, during which I will be asked questions about my personal and professional lived experiences and self-perceived supports and challenges as a faculty member in Catholic higher education.
3. I will complete any related forms and participate in the interview at a mutually agreeable location between the researcher and myself.

Risk and/or Discomforts

1. It is possible that some of the questions on the interview protocol may make me feel uncomfortable, but I am free to decline to answer any questions I do not wish to answer or to stop participation at any time.
2. Participation in research may result in a loss of confidentiality. Study records will be kept as confidential as is possible. No individual identities will be used in any reports or publications resulting from the study. Study information will be coded and kept in locked files at all times. Only the researcher will have access to the files.
3. During the interview, any written notes or recordings acquired will not be shared with anyone other than me, the dissertation committee, or any other related party assisting with this research.

Benefits

There will be no direct benefit to me from participating in this study. The anticipated benefit of this study is a better understanding of the personal and professional lived experiences and self-perceived challenges and supports of underrepresented ethnic minority (Mexican, Mexican-American, Chicano/a) faculty members employed at Catholic institutions of higher education utilizing a phenomenological design.

Cost/Financial Consideration

There will be no financial costs to me as a result of my agreed participation in this study.

Questions

If I have any questions or comments about participation in this study, I may contact the researcher: Frank V. Serrano by phone at (408) 710-9068 or email at fvherrano@usfca.edu. I may also contact the researcher's dissertation chair, Dr. Patricia Mitchell, at (415) 422-2079 or at mitchell@usfca.edu for additional information.

In addition, I may contact the Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (IRBPHS), which is concerned with protection of volunteers in research projects, by calling (415) 422-6091, by electronic mail at IRBPHS@usfca.edu, or by writing to the IRBPHS, University of San Francisco, Counseling Psychology Department, 2130 Fulton Street, San Francisco, CA 94117-1080.

Consent

I have been provided a copy of the "Research Subjects' Bill of Rights" and acknowledge the researcher's obligation to provide me with a signed copy of this consent form.

PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH IS VOLUNTARY. I am free to decline participation in this study, or withdraw at any point. My decision as to whether or not to participate in this study will have no influence on my present or future status at my institution.

Subject's Signature

Date of Signature

Signature of Person Obtaining Consent

Date of Signature

APPENDIX G: UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO CONSENT TO BE
A RESEARCH SUBJECT

Research Subjects' Bill of Rights

The rights listed below are the rights of individuals who are asked to participate in a research study.

As a research subject, I have the following rights:

1. To be told the extent to which confidentiality of records identifying the subject will be maintained and of the possibility that specified individuals, internal and external regulatory agencies, or study sponsors may inspect information in the medical record specifically related to participation in the clinical trial.
2. To be told of any benefits that may reasonably be expected from the research.
3. To be told of any reasonably foreseeable discomforts or risks.
4. To be told of appropriate alternative procedures or courses of treatment that might be of benefit to the subject.
5. To be told of the procedures to be followed during the course of participation, especially those that are experimental in nature.
6. To be told that they may refuse to participate (participation is voluntary), and that declining to participate will not compromise access to services and will not result in penalty or loss of benefits to which the subject is otherwise entitled.
7. To be told about compensation and medical treatment if research-related injury occurs and where further information may be obtained when participating in research involving more than minimal risk.
8. To be told whom to contact for answers to pertinent questions about the research, about the research subjects' rights, and whom to contact in the event of a research-related injury to the subject.
9. To be told of anticipated circumstances under which the investigator without regard to the subject's consent may terminate the subject's participation.
10. To be told of any additional costs to the subject that may result from participation in the research.
11. To be told of the consequences of a subject's decision to withdraw from the research and procedures for orderly termination of participation by the subject.
12. To be told that significant new findings developed during the course of the research that may relate to the subject's willingness to continue participation will be provided to the subject.
13. To be told the approximate number of subjects involved in the study.
14. To be told what the study is trying to find out.
15. To be told what will happen to me and whether any of the procedures, drugs, or devices are different from what would be used in standard practice.

16. To be told about the frequent and/or important risks, side effects, or discomforts of the things that will happen to me for research purposes.
17. To be told if I can expect any benefit from participating, and, if so, what the benefit might be.
18. To be told of the other choices I have and how they may be better or worse than being in the study;
19. To be allowed to ask any questions concerning the study both before agreeing to be involved and during the course of the study.
20. To be told what sort of medical or psychological treatment is available if any complications arise.
21. To refuse to participate at all or to change my mind about participation after the study is started; if I were to make such a decision, it will not affect my right to receive the care or privileges I would receive if I were not in the study.
22. To receive a copy of the signed and dated consent form.
23. To be free of pressure when considering whether I wish to agree to be in the study.

If I have any questions or comments about participation in this study, I may contact the researcher: Frank V. Serrano by phone at (408) 710-9068 or email at fvserrano@usfca.edu. I may also contact the researcher's dissertation chair, Dr. Patricia Mitchell, at (415) 422-2079 or at mitchell@usfca.edu for additional information.

In addition, I may contact the Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (IRBPHS), which is concerned with protection of volunteers in research projects by calling (415) 422-6091, by electronic mail at IRBPHS@usfca.edu, or by writing to the IRBPHS, University of San Francisco, Counseling of Psychology Department, 2130 Fulton Street, San Francisco, CA 94117-1080.

APPENDIX H: LA RAZA FACULTY INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Section 1: Academic Background

1. What were your experiences in primary and secondary education as a self-identified ethnic minority student?
2. What were your experiences in undergraduate and graduate education as a self-identified ethnic minority student?

Section 2: Career Progression (Self-Perceived Supports and Challenges) in Catholic Higher Education

3. When did you realize you were interested in an academic career?
4. Did graduate school prepare you for your role as a faculty member?

Probe: If yes, what type of specific coursework and/or training did you receive?

5. Are you currently receiving or did you formerly receive mentoring as a junior faculty?

Probe: If yes, how has or did mentoring as a junior faculty member benefit your career progression and current status as a faculty member?

6. What recommendations did you receive, if any, from Hispanic/Latino faculty or academic administrators in your pursuit of an academic career in Catholic higher education?
7. What attracted you to an academic career in Catholic higher education, rather than public higher education?
8. What supports have you experienced as a faculty member in Catholic higher education?
9. What challenges have you experienced as a faculty member in Catholic higher education?
10. Have you personally experienced racism, prejudice, or discrimination at your institution? If so, what did you experience and what strategies did you apply?

Section 3: Social and Cultural Climate in Catholic Higher Education

11. What is your level of association with the cultural values and practices of your self-identified ethnic group?
12. Are you involved with any self-identified ethnic-related committees in your department or university? If yes, which committees?
13. How would you describe the level of collegiality among faculty members in your department?
14. How would you describe the ethnic and cultural composition among faculty members in your department?
15. Do you feel accepted by non-ethnic minority faculty in your department? Please give an example.

16. Do you feel isolated in your department among other faculty because of your self-identified ethnicity or gender? If yes, how would you describe your feelings of isolation?
17. Do you believe that your self-identified ethnicity or gender has limited your progress for tenure or promotion in academia? If yes, please give an example.
18. Do you believe that you have to work harder than your colleagues to be perceived as a legitimate scholar due to your self-identified ethnicity or gender? If yes, please give an example.
19. Do you believe that the cultural values of your self-identified ethnicity conflict with the cultural values of other faculty members in your department? If yes, please give an example.
20. Do you believe that you have intentionally suppressed the cultural values and beliefs of your self-identified ethnicity to be accepted in your department? If yes, please give an example.
21. Do you believe that you have a “voice” that is respected by other faculty members in your department? Please give an example.
22. Is most of your socialization in the department and/or institution with faculty members and staff that self-identify with the same ethnicity?

Section 4: Level of Satisfaction in Catholic Higher Education

23. How would you describe your level of satisfaction with your institution’s mission, vision, and values as a Catholic institution of higher education?
24. How would you describe your level of satisfaction with the cultural climate of your department and institution?
25. What are the most rewarding aspects about being a faculty member in Catholic higher education?
26. What are the least rewarding aspects about being a faculty member in Catholic higher education?

Section 5: Recommendations in Catholic Higher Education

27. What recommendations would you have for Mexican-American/Chicano scholars interested in pursuing an academic career in Catholic higher education?
28. What recommendations would you have for Mexican-American/Chicano faculty toward tenure and promotion in Catholic higher education?
29. What recommendations would you have for academic administrators in Catholic higher education to assist in the recruitment, promotion, and retention of Mexican-American/Chicano faculty?

APPENDIX I: LA RAZA DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

LA RAZA DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Gender:
2. Age Group:
 - a. Younger than 35
 - b. 35–49
 - c. 50–64
 - d. 65 and older
3. What is your self-identified race?
4. What is your self-identified ethnicity or ethnic group?
5. Were you born in the U.S.? Yes or No
 - a. If yes, which state were you born? (state)_____
 - b. If no, which country were you born? (country)_____
6. How would you identify you generational status in the United States?
7. Do you speak Spanish? Yes or No
 - a. If yes, was Spanish your first language? Yes or No
8. Marital Status:
 - a. Single
 - b. Partner
 - c. Married
 - d. Separated
 - e. Divorced
 - f. Widow/Widower
9. Religious Affiliation (please specify):
10. Country your father was born?
 - a. Father's self-identified ethnicity or ethnic group:
 - b. Father's highest level of education completed:
11. Country your mother was born?
 - a. Mother's self-identified ethnicity or ethnic group:
 - b. Mother's highest level of education completed:
12. Are you the first in your immediate family to have graduated from a four-year college or university? Yes or No

13. Are you the first in your extended family to have graduated from a four-year college of university? Yes or No
14. Did you attend and/or graduate from a Catholic college or university? Yes or No
15. Major of highest degree earned? _____
16. The year you began your career as a faculty member?
17. Number of years as a faculty member at your institution?
18. Primary position at your current institution?
19. Current faculty status and academic rank at your institution?
20. Department of current faculty appointment?
21. Types of courses you primarily teach?