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ABSTRACT

The rapid increase in the number of non-tenure-track faculty members (Curtis, 2014), has prompted research about this group (Allison, Lynn, & Hovermann, 2014; Coalition on the Academic Workforce, 2012; Eagan & Jaeger, 2009; Umbach, 2007). There is also a large body of literature that explores the experiences of faculty members of color (Joseph & Hirshfield, 2011; Stanley, 2006a; Turner, González, & Wood, 2008). However, there is very little research about the experiences of non-tenure-track faculty members of color (NTFOCs).

This study centered the experiences of NTFOCs to understand how this group experiences racism and other forms of systematic oppression in their work environments. The theoretical frameworks for this study were critical race theory (CRT) (Bell, 1980; Delgado & Stefancic, 2012; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995) and critical race feminism (CRF) (Wing, 1997). Critical race methodology was integrated throughout the research process (Solórzano & Yosso, 2001; Solórzano & Yosso, 2002). The sample consisted of 24 NTFOCs who worked at four-year, historically White colleges and universities. Data was collected through semi-structured interviews.

Ten themes emerged that revealed the ways NTFOCs experienced racism and marginalization in their work environments: (a) not treated like a professional; (b) lack of support; (c) formal discrimination; (d) racialized evaluations; (e) racialized and gendered microaggressions; (f) feeling unsafe in the classroom; (g) unpaid labor; (h) balancing job responsibilities; (i) lack of resources; (j) different treatment than White colleagues. Four additional themes regarding the ways NTFOCs navigated these experiences with oppression and marginalization: (a) relying on systems of support; (b) negotiating speaking out against forms of oppression; (c) disclosing personal information; (d) deciding how to interact with department/program colleagues. These findings have implications for the personal well-being of NTFOCs, how they perform their job, and their ability to gain secure employment. The findings highlight the need for campus constituents to recognize the work of NTFOCs and to create better work conditions for them.
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GENERAL AUDIENCE ABSTRACT

There has been a rapid rise in the number of non-tenure-track faculty members (Curtis, 2014). These faculty members are underpaid and lack job security relative to their tenured and tenured-track colleagues (Allison, Lynn, & Hovermann, 2014; Coalition on the Academic Workforce, 2012; American Federation of Teachers, 2010a). However, there is little research that considers race and the experiences of non-tenure-track faculty members of color (NTFOCs).

This study sought to explore how NTFOCs experienced racism in their work environments. I interviewed, 24 non-tenure-track faculty members of color about the ways they experienced racism in their classrooms and departments, and how they navigated these experiences. Participants worked at predominantly and historically White colleges and universities across the United States.

Ten themes emerged that revealed the ways NTFOCs experienced racism and marginalization in their work environments: (a) not treated like a professional; (b) lack of support; (c) formal discrimination; (d) racialized evaluations; (e) racialized and gendered microaggressions; (f) feeling unsafe in the classroom; (g) unpaid labor; (h) balancing job responsibilities; (i) lack of resources; (j) different treatment than White colleagues. Four additional themes regarding the ways NTFOCs navigated these experiences with oppression and marginalization: (a) relying on systems of support; (b) negotiating speaking out against forms of oppression; (c) disclosing personal information; (d) deciding how to interact with department/program colleagues. The findings highlight ways that NTFOCs are marginalized by the nature of their positions as well as intersections of racism and sexism.
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CHAPTER ONE
Introduction

Brave New Films produced a short movie called “Professors in Poverty” (2015) that shed light upon the porous working conditions of many adjunct faculty members. The project centers upon the story of Dr. Wanda Evans-Brewer, an adjunct faculty member and mother of a young daughter, who is on government assistance. Dr. Evans-Brewer a Black woman, details her frustration of having to rely upon government assistance despite earning a Ph.D. Her story is deeply moving, and highlights the ways institutions of higher education reproduce systematic forms of oppression. In watching the movie, I was immediately interested in learning more about Dr. Evans-Brewer’s life. It was one of the first times I witnessed the experiences of a Black woman adjunct faculty member highlighted in a popular media representation of contingent faculty members. As such, I wanted to know how race and racism may have shaped the experiences of Dr. Evans-Brewer. Knowing that race continues to serve as a major organizing system in society (Omi & Winant, 2014), I believed there may have been more to her story than what was presented in the short film. Watching this film reaffirmed my interest in learning more about the experiences of non-tenure-track faculty members of color. My desire to capture the stories of this group of faculty and to challenge systemic forms of racism and oppression led me to this project about the experiences of non-tenure-track faculty members of color and the ways they experience racism in their work environment.

Racism has been and continues to be a major problem in the United States. Half of Americans believe that race relations have worsened in the United States, up from 30% in 2014 (Rasmussen Reports, 2016). While these survey results mask the systematic nature of racism, they do reveal growing tensions surrounding issues of racism in the country. With the Black Lives Matter Movement bringing increased national attention to issues of police violence against Black Americans (Altman, 2015), the shooting of nine Black Americans in a church in Charleston, South Carolina by a teenager who desired to start a race war (Workman & Kannapell, 2015), and the racially charged presidential campaign of Donald Trump (Milbank, 2015), race and racism have been at the forefront of the national public discourse.

College campuses, particularly predominantly White institutions (PWIs), are not immune to racism. Students of color are underrepresented at public four-year universities (40%) and private non-profit institutions (34%) and overrepresented at public two-year (49%) and private
for-profit four-year colleges (64%) (National Center for Education Statistics, 2016). Scholars have highlighted the hostile racial climate that students of color have faced at predominantly White institutions of higher education (Allen, 1992; Beasley, 2011; Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Hurtado, 1992). Alongside these empirical findings, recent campus protests have illuminated the prevalence of racism and the unwelcoming environment that students of color experience. For example, demonstrations at the University of Missouri resulted in the resignation of the university’s president and system’s chancellor (Eligon, 2015), and similar protests took place at Yale University, Claremont McKenna College, and the University of Wisconsin, Madison.

While researchers have frequently examined racism in terms of undergraduates at PWIs, racism is also a problem for faculty members of color, or those who identify as Black/African American, Hispanic/Latinx, Asian American, American Indian/Alaskan Native, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, and two or more races. Faculty members of color are an underrepresented group on college and university campuses comprising 22% of all faculty members (National Center for Education Statistics, 2017). Black faculty members make up 6% of the professoriate, while Hispanic/Latinx faculty members make up 4% (National Center for Education Statistics, 2017). Conversely, Blacks and Hispanic/Latinx are 13.2% and 17.4% of the total U.S. population, respectively (United States Census Bureau, 2015). Moreover, the numbers do not reflect the lived experiences of faculty members of color in higher education. Faculty members of color experience racism through each major function of the university structure: teaching, research, and service.

When teaching, faculty members of color are more likely than their White counterparts to have their expertise challenged by students in their classrooms (Lugo-Lugo, 2012; Pittman, 2010; Stanley, 2006a; Tuit, Hanna, Martinez, Salazar, & Griffin, 2009). This is particularly true for women faculty members of color (Lugo-Lugo, 2012; Pittman, 2010). Students frequently internalize stereotypes about the intellectual inferiority of people of color (Lugo-Lugo, 2012). This leads students to question information presented by faculty members of color and to challenge their knowledge in the classroom more frequently than they challenge White faculty members (Lugo-Lugo, 2012; Sulé, 2011; Tuit et al., 2009). In order to legitimize themselves, faculty members of color must spend significantly more time preparing for class in order to receive the same student evaluations of teaching as their White counterparts (Lazos, 2012; Pittman, 2010). This translates to less time devoted to research or their personal lives, which
puts them at a disadvantage in meeting requirements for tenure and promotion, particularly at research-intensive institutions.

Faculty members of color also experience racism when their research is evaluated (Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002). They are more likely to produce research challenging dominant Eurocentric epistemologies that center whiteness and exclude the cultural resources of people of color (Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002; Stanley, 2007; Villalpando & Delgado Bernal, 2002); however, the faculty reward structure does not recognize such contributions (antonio, 2002). For faculty members of color who conduct research about race and racism, consequences can be even more harsh since their research is often viewed as too narrow in scope, not objective, or insignificant (Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002; Stanley, 2007; Villalpando & Delgado Bernal, 2002). Thus, faculty members of color who conduct research on race and racism must spend time legitimizing their research or decide to study other topics that are more likely to earn them tenure (Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002).

Finally, faculty members of color also experience racism in regard to their service. They are often asked to assume larger service loads than their White counterparts. Padilla (1994) used the term “cultural taxation” to refer to the increased service loads of faculty members of color. “Cultural taxation” occurs because administrators, in an attempt to meet diversity goals, often require that faculty members of color serve on various university committees. Women of color faculty members often face double forms of cultural taxation on account of their race and gender (Hirshfield & Joseph, 2012). Due to the low numbers of faculty members of color, they have to serve on a disproportionately high number of committees (Baez, 2000; Padilla, 1994; Wood, Hilton, & Nevarez, 2015). This takes time away from research and teaching responsibilities, two areas that are typically more heavily weighted in the tenure and promotion process (Baez, 2000; Padilla, 1994).

Despite these disturbing findings, the literature on faculty members of color encounters with racism largely reflects the experiences of those who are tenured or on the tenure track, however (Baez, 2000; Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002; Pittman, 2010; Stanley, 2006b). These experiences may not mirror those of non-tenure-track faculty members of color (NTFOCs). I use the term non-tenure-track faculty members as an umbrella term to refer to full-and part-time non-tenure track faculty members.
Non-tenure-track faculty members have been a part of the university structure for a long time. They began to populate college campuses at two distinct time periods (Kezar & Sam, 2010a; National Institute for Learning Outcomes, 2014; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). The first came in the 1960s following the opening of higher education to the masses through the expansion of community colleges (Kezar & Sam, 2010a). Significant numbers of part-time faculty members were hired to accommodate the increase in students (Kezar & Sam, 2010a). Thus, the majority of these positions focused almost exclusively on teaching. The second period of increased hiring of non-tenure-track faculty members occurred in the 1990s as state and institutional budgets shrank and higher education saw increased corporatization (Baldwin & Chronister; Kezar & Sam, 2010a; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006; Slaughter & Rhoads, 2004). Some of this growth occurred in the full-time non-tenure track faculty ranks due to a rapid increase in nontraditional age college students, increased public scrutiny about graduate students teaching courses, and reductions of state and federal allocations to higher education (Kezar & Sam, 2010a). While teaching was and continues to be the primary job responsibility for many full-time non-tenure track faculty members, some now have research, administrative duties, and service in their job responsibilities (Chronister & Baldwin, 2001; National Institute of Learning Outcomes, 2014).

In 1975, part-time non-tenure track faculty members made up 31.4% of the academic labor force, while full-time non-tenure track faculty members were 12.8%. By 2011, these percentages increased to 51.4% and 19.4%, respectively (Curtis, 2014). Taken together, as of 2011, there were 1,059,179 non-tenure-track faculty members across all sectors of higher education, or 70.8% of the total faculty labor force (Curtis, 2014). This is up from 280,022 faculty members, or 44.2% of the faculty labor force in 1975. Women occupy the majority of non-tenure-track positions, holding 52.0% of these positions (Curtis, 2014). The largest percentages of non-tenure-track faculty members are at private for-profit institutions (99.0%) and public community colleges (83.8%) (Curtis, 2014). The smallest percentage of non-tenure-track faculty is at doctoral and research universities; however, they still make up 57.9% of the faculty at these institutions. Thus, the significant change in the labor force means that faculty members are much more likely to find themselves in positions that will not lead to tenure.

This is particularly true for faculty members of color. Faculty members of color make up 19% of the non-tenure-track faculty labor force (Curtis, 2014). Approximately 78% of African
American faculty members, 72% of Latinx faculty members, 74% of American Indian, and 56.5% of Asian/Asian American faculty members in all institutions of higher education are not on the tenure track (Curtis, 2014). These numbers are compared to 70.8% of White faculty members (Curtis, 2014). Part-time faculty members represent the largest portion of these groups, with the majority of African American (61%), Latinx (54%), and American Indian (52%) faculty members occupying part-time positions (Curtis, 2014). Women of color are overrepresented in non-tenure-track faculty positions, holding larger numbers of these positions than men of color (Curtis, 2014). This illustrates the ways women of color are particularly vulnerable in these positions (Navarro, 2017). Thus, there are inequities along racial and gender lines in the appointment of NTFOCs.

Non-tenure-track faculty members are a diverse group of individuals in regard to their motivations and reasoning for occupying their positions (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Kezar & Sam, 2010a; Kezar & Sam, 2010b). Gappa and Leslie (1993) created a typology of part-time faculty members based upon four categories: (a) career enders; (b) specialists, experts, and professionals; (c) aspiring academics; and (d) freelancers. Career enders are people who have retired or are in the process of retiring. Teaching part-time serves as a transition to full retirement. Specialists, experts, and professionals are people who come with broad experience in a field and teach for the love of it rather than a need for income. Aspiring academics are those who desire a tenure track position and are in non-tenure-track positions not by choice but because they have been unable to secure a more permanent position. Finally, freelancers are people who have multiple jobs and teaching in higher education is only one of them. Unlike aspiring academics, freelancers choose to work in a non-tenure-track position (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). These various motivations are important distinctions because they impact the ways people experience non-tenure-track faculty positions (Kezar & Sam, 2010a). Of these groups, some believe that the aspiring academics are the fastest growing of these categories (National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment, 2014). For all non-tenure-track faculty members, regardless of full-time or part-time status, it is important to consider whether one is in a non-tenure-track position voluntarily or involuntarily (Maynard & Joseph, 2008). Whether one is voluntarily or involuntarily in a non-tenure-track faculty position plays a major role in determining the experiences and perceptions of their position (Maynard & Joseph, 2008).
The primary driver of the rise of non-tenure-track faculty members is the economic benefit to the institution (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Kezar & Sam, 2010a; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). Non-tenure-track faculty members are cheaper to hire and provide flexibility to administrators who seek to meet fluctuating enrollment demands (Benjamin, 2002; Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2005; Hollenshead et al., 2007). Full-time non-tenure-track faculty members can be assigned higher teaching loads since they typically do not have heavy research demands within their job descriptions. Part-time non-tenure-track faculty members can be hired at the last minute to account for changes in demand for classes. Both types of faculty provide universities with financial flexibility that cannot be achieved by hiring tenure-track faculty members (Brennan & Magness, 2016; Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2005). Tenured and tenure-track faculty members require higher salaries than non-tenure-track faculty members, and are granted full benefits, which part-time, non-tenure-track faculty may not receive (Hollenshead et al., 2007; National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment, 2014). As a result, an increase in the number of non-tenure-track faculty members offsets the costs of the higher salaries and benefits accrued by tenured and tenure-track faculty (Benjamin, 2002; Brennan & Magness, 2016; Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2005).

While non-tenure-track faculty members may allow university administrators to reduce expenses when compared to hiring tenured and tenure-track faculty members, this trend has many disturbing implications. First, non-tenure-track faculty members are often underpaid relative to their tenured and tenure-track peers (Shulman et al., 2017; United States Government Accountability Office, 2017). The average faculty salary in 2016-2017 across all ranks was $80,095 (Shulman et al., 2017). However, for instructors and lecturers, designations often not on the tenure-track, average salaries were $55,405 and $58,875 respectively. Part-time faculty earn on average $20,508 per year across all institutions (Shulman et al., 2017). This low pay has resulted in 25% of part-time faculty members receiving some sort of public assistance (Jacobs, Perry, & MacGilvary, 2015). Thus, the trend to hire non-tenure-track faculty members, particularly adjunct faculty members, has implications for the financial well-being of this group of employees.

Second, non-tenure-track faculty members are often not provided with proper resources to conduct their work (National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment, 2014). They are frequently not provided professional development funds or office space (Kezar, 2012). This is
particularly true for part-time faculty members. Such a lack of resources leads many non-tenure-track faculty members to feel like second-class citizens and isolated from their departments (Allison, Lynn, & Hoverman, 2014; Kezar, 2012; National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment, 2014). Similarly, limited resources infringe upon their ability to do their job. They find it more difficult to meet with students when they do not have private office spaces and lack access to resources (such as student support services information and student records) that may assist them in supporting students (National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment, 2014).

Finally, many researchers have shown that increased hiring of non-tenure-track faculty members has led to negative student learning outcomes. For example, exposure to non-tenure-track faculty members has negative impacts on associate degree completion (Jaeger & Eagan, 2009), graduation rates (Jacoby, 2006), persistence (Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2005), transfer rates to four-year institutions faculty (Eagan & Jaeger, 2009), and exposing students to academic rigor (Johnson, 2011). Non-tenure-track faculty members are also less productive in research and less committed to their institutions than their tenured and tenure-track colleagues (Bland, Center, Finstad, Risbey, & Staples, 2006). These studies do not suggest a lack of commitment or competency among non-tenure-track faculty. Non-tenure-track faculty members are highly committed to their jobs and enjoy the nature of their work (American Federation of Teachers, 2010a; Coalition on the Academic Workforce, 2012; Leslie & Gappa, 2002; Maynard & Joseph, 2008). However, these studies point to the need to provide sufficient resources and support for non-tenure-track faculty members.

Despite the relative wealth of literature on tenured and tenure-track faculty members of color, and the body of work on non-tenure-track faculty, little is known about NTFOCs. Given the likelihood that faculty members of color will work in non-tenure-track faculty positions rather than tenured and tenure-track positions, and the obstacles that non-tenure-track faculty and faculty members of color face, there is a need to produce research that centers the experiences of NTFOCs.

Critical race theory (CRT) is an effective conceptual framework to examine the experiences of NTFOCs because it (a) places race and racism at the center of analysis; (b) assumes the intersectionality of identities and social categories; and (c) challenges dominant narratives of colorblindness that assume race is not an important factor in society (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012; Solórzano & Yosso, 2002). CRT is action-oriented, seeks to eradicate the
uneven distribution of power and resources, and aims to uproot systems of oppression (Dixson & Rousseau, 2005; Lawrence, Matsuda, Delgado, & Crenshaw, 1993; McCoy & Rodricks, 2015).

CRT emerged from legal scholars such as Derrick Bell, Lani Guinier, Charles Lawrence, and Kimberlé Crenshaw who were frustrated with the failure of Civil Rights legislation to make significant progress towards racial justice (Taylor, 2009). These authors were influenced by the field of critical legal studies, or CLS. CLS scholarship argued that the rationality of the law was arbitrary and served to maintain the existing power structure by hiding injustices (Taylor, 2009). However, these scholars grew concerned with CLS’s inability to address concerns regarding racism, thus leading them to create CRT (Taylor, 2009).

There are seven key tenets of CRT (McCoy & Rodricks, 2015). The first is racism as normal (Taylor, 2009). This tenet centers the idea that racism is prevalent and manifests itself in everyday occurrences. It is embedded in societal structures and cannot be explained as infrequent individual acts. The second tenet is interest convergence. The theory of interest convergence emerged from the work of Derrick Bell (1980). It is the idea that progress towards racial equality is made only when the interest of people of color in challenging racism overlaps with the interests of elite Whites. To explain this theory, Bell (1980) argued that the passage of the Brown v. Board of Education decision, in which the Supreme Court outlawed the practice of segregation, came about only because elite Whites were concerned about presenting a positive global image in the midst of the Cold War and struggles against communism. Ending legal segregation was a mechanism to achieve this goal.

A third tenet of CRT is intersectionality. While race is central to a CRT analysis, through intersectionality CRT scholars note the way that various facets of identity shape people’s experiences. Intersectionality has roots in the scholarship and activism of Black women. Kimberlé Crenshaw (1991) argued that the experiences of women of color are impacted by their gender and class statuses. These categories are not additive and cannot be separated. Thus, interlocking systems of oppression are central to CRT.

A fourth tenet is the notion of whiteness as property, a theoretical construct that emerged from the work of Cheryl Harris (1993). Harris argued that whiteness is a form of property and that Whites seek to protect the benefits associated with it. Further, whiteness and property are connected and have led to the establishment and maintenance of a system of racial and economic domination (Harris, 1993; McCoy & Rodricks, 2015).
A fifth key tenet is counterstorytelling. Majoritarian narratives often exclude the voices and perspectives of people of color (Solórzano & Yosso, 2001). Thus, CRT privileges the experiences of people of color, and highlights these experiences as valuable forms of knowledge. This form of storytelling is used to shatter dominant narratives and to unsettle the status quo.

In addition to these five tenets, CRT challenges the ideas of liberalism and is social justice oriented. With the challenge to liberalism comes a critique of the concepts of neutrality, objectivity, colorblindness, and meritocracy (Delgado & Stefanic, 2012; McCoy & Rodricks, 2015; Lawrence et al., 1993). These concepts are integral to the legal understanding of equal rights. The critique of these concepts is in contrast to the dominant legal understanding of equal rights, which disregards social context and ignores racism (Lawrence et al., 1993). CRT centers racism, and challenges such notions that the law is colorblind and objectives (Lawrence et al., 1993). Further, CRT research must lead to action. Thus, CRT is about more than simply producing research. It is committed to eradicating racism and other forms of oppression (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004).

While CRT has origins in law (Bell, 1980; Crenshaw, 1991; Harris, 1993), it is interdisciplinary and incorporates various intellectual traditions that foreground race and racism. Its applicability has been extended beyond legal studies to other fields, including education. Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995) argued for incorporating CRT into education research. They highlighted three points to make this argument:

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

In using CRT, they argued for a systematic restructuring of the educational system that considers racial inequities rather than reform strategies that have been promoted through multicultural paradigms and civil rights activists.

CRT has been a dynamic tool and framework for highlighting the ways that institutions of higher education perpetuate and produce racism and racial inequality. Most notable for this study, CRT has illuminated experiences with racism among faculty members of color. Scholars have used CRT to show how faculty members of color struggle to find an academic identity and navigate racism within their departments (Diggs, Garrison-Wade, Estrada, & Galindo, 2009;
Stanley, 2006a), face hostile experiences in teaching (Tuitt et al., 2009), have their knowledge and scholarship devalued (Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002), and face racism in the journal review process (Stanley, 2007). As Patton (2015) noted, CRT has played and should continue to play an important role in exposing and dismantling the ways in which institutions of higher education perpetuate racism.

Given the overrepresentation of women of color in the non-tenure-track faculty ranks, significant attention must be given to the ways gender and other aspects of identity collectively impact the experiences of NTFOCs. As such, Critical Race Feminism (CRF) should be incorporated with CRT to understand the experiences of NTFOCs. CRF is a part of the CRT movement (Wing, 1997; Pratt-Clarke, 2010). It builds from the work of CLS, CRT, and feminist jurisprudence. (Wing 2015). However, CRF scholars critiqued each of these other bodies of scholarship. CLS was a progressive form of scholarship that challenged the idea of the law as neutral and highlighted how the law perpetuated inequities (Wing, 2015). Similar to CRT, CRF scholars critiqued CLS scholarship for not taking seriously issues of race and the law (Wing, 1997, Wing 2015). CRF shares many similarities with CRT. Both theoretical frameworks are action oriented and view storytelling as vital to the research process (Pratt-Clare, 2010). However, CRF scholars have critiqued CRT for essentializing people of color, and minimizing the experiences of women of color (Wing, 2015). Feminist jurisprudence focused on issues of patriarchy and gender oppression. But CRF scholars believed that it centered the experiences of upper-class White women, and treated the experiences of women of color as a mere footnote. (Wing, 2015).

Central to CRF is anti-essentialism, or the idea that experiences of people of color or women cannot be reduced to a single perspective. This is done through a careful consideration of how race, gender, and other aspects of identity intersect. These social identities cannot be divided (Wing, 2015). While CRT also notes the importance of intersectionality, CRF centers the experiences of women of color and forces scholars to note the ways that systemic forms of oppression intersect to shape their experiences. CRF has been used in research about the experiences of the women faculty members of color. In particular, it has been used to illuminate the barriers faced by Black women who achieved the status of professor (Croom, 2017), how Black woman and Latina faculty members navigate their classroom experiences (Sulé, 2011) and to foreground the lived experiences of women faculty members of color at PWIs (Turner,
Thus, in a study about NTFOCs, CRF can complement CRT by creating a more holistic account of the experiences of NTFOCs by foregrounding how race, gender, class, and other systems of oppression intersect to shape their experiences.

**Statement of the Problem**

Racism has historically been and continues to be a major problem in society (Rasmussen Reports, 2016). Major protests surrounding systemic racism and news stories highlighting racism have brought issues of race and racism increased national attention (Altman, 2015; Workmann & Kannapell, 2015). Institutions of higher education have not been immune to such incidents (Allen, 1992; Beasley, 2011; Harper & Hurtado, 2007), as many campuses have erupted in protests by students demanding institutions do more to address concerns of racism (Eligon, 2015).

The research on faculty members of color reveals how racism plays out in multiple contexts. Faculty members of color are more likely to have their expertise challenged in their classroom than their White counterparts (Lazos, 2012; Pittman, 2010; Stanley, 2006a). They are also more likely to have their scholarship devalued (antonio, 2002; Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002; Villalpando & Delgado Bernal, 2002) and to be burdened with additional service loads (Baez, 2000; Padilla, 1994). The bulk of the literature, however, focuses on the experiences of tenured and tenure track faculty members of color (Baez, 2000; Delgado Bernal, 2002; Pittman, 2010; Stanley, 2006b).

Over the past 30 years, there has been a dramatic increase in the number of non-tenure-track faculty members (Curtis, 2014). Such growth has coincided with more scholarly attention devoted to this group (Kezar & Sam, 2011). The body of scholarship on non-tenure-track faculty members has noted the lack of resources (Allison, Lynn, & Hoverman, 2014; Coalition of the Academic Workforce, 2012), unfavorable working conditions (Hollenshead et al., 2007; National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment, 2014) and the effectiveness of this group (Bland et al., 2006; Eagan & Jaeger, 2009). However, there is little research about how race and racism may impact the experiences of this growing group of faculty.

Critical race theory (CRT) and Critical Race Feminism (CRF) are effective frameworks to explore this topic. Using CRT as a framework for such a study would place race and racism at the center for analysis (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012; Solórzano & Yosso, 2002), allow for an analysis of the intersection of race, work and other social categories (Crenshaw, 1991), and...
challenge dominant narratives (Dixson & Rousseau, 2005; McCoy & Rodricks, 2015; Solórzano & Yosso, 2001) surrounding non-tenure-track faculty members. CRF builds from CRT, but foregrounds an anti-essentialism perspective about the experiences of NTFOCs, by highlighting how race, gender, class and other systems of oppression intersect to shape their experiences (Pratt-Clarke, 2010; Wing, 1997).

The literature is clear on several points. First, faculty members of color live with racism on college campuses (Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002; Stanley, 2006b). Second, the ranks of non-tenure-track faculty members continue to grow at postsecondary institutions (American Federation of Teachers, 2010a; Coalition of the Academic Workforce, 2012; Curtis, 2014), and the number of NTFOCs is growing (American Federation of Teachers, 2010b; Curtis, 2014). However, most of the research on racism in the academy has focused on tenured and tenure track faculty members (Baez, 2000; Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002; Pittman, 2010; Stanley, 2006b). If campus leaders hope to address the needs of NTFOCs, they need more information about the experiences of these professionals. My study aimed to provide that information.

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this study was to examine how racism and other systemic forms of oppression operate in institutions of higher education. I used critical race theory (CRT) (Bell, 1980; Crenshaw, 1991; Delgado & Stefancic, 2012; Harris, 1993; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; McCoy & Rodricks, 2015) and critical race feminism (CRF) (Wing, 1997; Wing 2015) as theoretical frameworks to examine this issue. From CRT, I foregrounded race and racism by drawing upon CRT’s main tenet, Racism as Normal, or the idea that racism is engrained in societal structures and manifests itself in everyday occurrences (Taylor, 2009). I also drew upon the central principle of CRF, anti-essentialism, or the idea that the experiences of people of color and women cannot be defined by a single narrative (Wing, 1997).

Specifically, I was interested in the experiences of non-tenure-track faculty members of color (NTFOCs). For the purposes of this study, I explored the experiences of NTFOCs who met the following criteria: (a) they were not eligible for tenure or promotion; (b) their primary responsibility was instruction; (c) they were in at least their second academic year at an institution; (d) they worked at a four-year, doctoral, predominantly White institutions of higher education (PWIs) with higher or highest research activity; and (e) they were seeking a more stable or permanent academic position. The term *faculty members of color* referred to
individuals who identified as members of one or more of the following groups: American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian or Asian American, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latinx, Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian, or two or more races.

This study used critical race methodology and was qualitative in nature. I conducted an in-depth interview with each participant. In interviews, participants described their own experiences as NTFOC.

**Research Questions**

The present study explored three primary research questions regarding racism and the experiences of NTFOCs.

1. How do NTFOCs experience racism on college campuses?
2. How does the intersection of one’s social identities (e.g., race, gender, etc.) shape the work experiences of NTFOCs?
3. How do NTFOCs negotiate their experiences with racism and other oppressive systems on their campus?

**Significance of the Study**

The present study had significance for practice, research, and policy. The results were significant for several campus constituencies. Consider, for example, academic deans. This study provided information about the experiences of NTFOCs. Academic deans may use these results to assess the programs and services they offer for this growing population of faculty.

This study also held significance for chief diversity officers. In this study, I sought to understand racism on college campuses. Chief diversity officers could use findings to evaluate the programs, services, and initiatives that relate to faculty diversity, particularly diversity among NTFOCs.

Finally, this study held significance for department heads. This study sought to understand how racism affects the experiences of NTFOCs. Department heads may use findings to assess the racial climate within their departments.

The study also had significance for future research. For example, I examined racism at PWIs through the experiences of NTFOCs. Future studies may examine racism at PWIs through the experiences of administrators of color. Such a study would expand the literature about how racism is understood at PWIs.
A future study could examine racism through the experiences of NTFOCs at two-year institutions of higher education. My study examined the experiences of NTFOCs at four-year institutions. A study about the experiences of NTFOCs at two-year institutions might lead to an understanding of how institutional contexts shape the experiences of non-tenure-track faculty members.

Future research may also examine other topics related to faculty members of color who are not on the tenure-track. My study examined the institutional experiences of these faculty members. Future studies may examine issues of work-life balance and quality of life for NTFOCs.

Finally, this study was significant for future policy. The findings provided information about the experiences of NTFOCs in regard to racism. These results could be used to encourage university administrators to evaluate institutional policies that relate to racism on campus.

This study also had policy implications regarding institutional hiring practices. The findings for this study provided information about the general encounters of NTFOCs and their relationship with the institution. Human resource officers could use this information to evaluate hiring policies and contracts.

Finally, this study had implications for state employment practices. The study provided information regarding the working conditions for NTFOCs. Legislators could use the findings to evaluate current state employment laws, policies, and practices.

**Delimitations**

Like all research studies, the present study had some initial delimitations. The first related to the sample. This study examined racism at PWIs through the experiences of NTFOCs. Participants were from colleges and universities throughout the country. Because race and racism have different meanings depending on region, the study was bounded by the regions where participants lived and worked.

A second delimitation related to the methodological approach used in the study. This study was qualitative. While qualitative studies are appropriate to investigate lived experience, findings may not be transferable to other settings and contexts.

A third delimitation of the study related to the participants. Participants volunteered for this study. As such, participants may have had exceptionally positive or negative experiences that prompted them to volunteer. Despite these delimitations, this study was worthwhile due to
the need for more research about the growing population of NTFOCs and racism in higher education.

**Organization of the Study**

My institution allows for an alternative approach to writing a dissertation that includes two articles rather than a traditional Chapter Four that typically contains results, and a Chapter Five that usually contains the discussion and conclusion. I pursued this alternative dissertation format. The present study is organized around six chapters. I introduced the statement of the problem, statement of purpose, the significance for research, and delimitations in Chapter One. In lieu of a traditional literature review, I present an annotated bibliography of relevant research in Chapter Two. A discussion of the methodologies, methods, data collection, and data analysis is provided in Chapter Three. Chapter Four contains a general summary of findings. Chapters Five and Six include articles regarding the most salient findings.
CHAPTER TWO
Annotated Bibliography

As previously indicated, I have chosen to pursue an alternative dissertation format that results in two articles about the most compelling findings rather than a traditional Chapter Four and Chapter Five. Consequently, in lieu of a traditional literature review, Chapter Two is an annotated bibliography of literature that I can use when writing those two articles. This annotated bibliography consists of relevant journal articles, books, and reports used to inform this dissertation. It is divided into three main bodies of literature: (a) research on non-tenure-track faculty members; (b) research on faculty members of color; and (c) relevant theoretical frameworks.

Research on Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members

The body of research on non-tenure-track faculty members is expansive. It includes four main bodies of literature: (a) descriptive and summary reports, (b) research on effectiveness and job status, (c) research on the experiences of non-tenure-track faculty members, and (d) influential books. Together, the literature on non-tenure-track faculty members includes manuscripts that address various issues and concerns related to both full-time and part-time non-tenure-track faculty members.

Descriptive and Summary Reports

This section includes reports about non-tenure-track faculty members. It includes demographic information, discussions of their working conditions, and overviews of studies about non-tenure-track faculty members.


Allison, Lynn, and Hoverman conducted the largest study of non-tenure track faculty members at a single institution. They surveyed 241 non-tenure-track faculty members at George Mason University. The researchers found that non-tenure track faculty members often earned less than a living wage, received no benefits, did not have job security, and lacked representation. Despite these shortcomings, they generally enjoyed their work. The findings in this study were
consistent with other studies about non-tenure-track faculty members in showing the unfavorable working conditions of this group.


The researchers of the report conducted 500 phone interviews with part-time/adjunct faculty members who were employed at two- and four-year institutions. The goal of the survey was to understand the conditions and roles of part-time/adjunct faculty members. The findings included: (a) non-tenure-track faculty members enjoyed teaching, (b) the experiences with their institution varied, and (c) that they were unhappy with the financial and professional support they received from their institution. The report is an attempt to provide a general description of part-time/adjunct faculty members.


The Coalition on the Academic Workforce (CAW) created an online survey to better understand part-time faculty members. The CAW collected responses from 19,850 respondents. The survey contained questions related to part-time faculty members’ demographics, working conditions, and professional support. The authors of the report found that part-time faculty members were often underpaid relative to their degree attainment, received little support, but held a great deal of passion for teaching.


This is a report of IPEDS demographic information about all faculty members. The data illustrate the dramatic increase in non-tenure-track faculty positions.
since the 1970s. This study also highlighted disparities in faculty status across
gender and racial lines. It included information about the individuals who occupy
non-tenure-track faculty positions.

diversity. (Research Report). Report accessed from TIAA Institute website:

The report used 2013 IPEDS data to note the changes in faculty demographics
from 1993 to 2013. The authors highlighted the changes in the faculty labor force
by appointment and institution type as well as by gender and race, and the
intersection of the two categories. They argued that while some gains have been
made in terms of hiring women and underrepresented minority faculty members,
there continues to be a need for more growth in these areas.

best of both worlds: Findings from a national institutional-level survey on non-tenure-
faculty. Retrieved from University of Michigan, Center for Education for Women
website:
http://www.cew.umich.edu/sites/default/files/CEW%20Final%20Report%20PP34.pdf

The report is a national survey of 144 university administrators regarding their
perceptions of non-tenure-track faculty members on their campuses. The purpose
of the study was to provide a general understanding of non-tenure-track faculty
members. The report included a discussion about the working conditions and
numbers of non-tenure-track faculty members, as well as recommendations for
how institutions can support and integrate them into their overall faculty. The
second part of the study contained an overview of the statistical data about non-
tenure-track faculty members. Unlike most studies about non-tenure-track faculty
members, this study presented the views of administrators, so findings must be
read in this context.

Kezar, A., & Sam, C. (2010a). Special issue: Understanding the new majority of non-tenure-
track faculty in higher education—demographics, experiences, and plans of action. ASHE
In this monograph, Kezar and Sam provided a broad overview of the research about non-tenure-track faculty members. They noted the historical developments related to the hiring of non-tenure-track faculty members as well as their demographics and working conditions. They concluded by providing suggestions and improvements for policy and research. More specifically, they highlighted the need for more research that considers context, the voices of non-tenure-track faculty members, and their diversity.


In this special issue, Kezar and Sam identified economic theories, sociological theories, psychological and social psychological theories, organizational theories, and labor relations as the main theoretical frameworks used in studies about non-tenure-track faculty. The authors argued that there are too few theoretical lenses that have been applied in these studies. Similarly, much of the research has presented conflicting information, which is a result of tensions about ideology, practice, and empirical information. Ultimately, they made a case for more theoretical frameworks in studies about non-tenure-track faculty members.

**Effectiveness and Faculty Status**

This section contains articles that examine the effectiveness of non-tenure-track faculty members. Given increased attention to assessment and accountability, this is an important body of scholarship.


In this AAUP brief, Benjamin used engagement theory to argue that the increased use of non-tenure-track faculty members in institutions of higher education would lead to decreased levels of student learning. He noted that full-time tenure-track faculty members were more qualified and better positioned to dedicate more time to supporting student learning.

Bettinger and Long used data from four-year public colleges and universities in Ohio to examine the effect of adjunct professors on student outcomes. Using adjunct faculty members and graduate students meant undergraduates were less likely to persist to their second-year. The findings from this study counter previous studies that suggested that increased use of non-tenure-track faculty may increase student interest in subject material.


Using the 1999 NSOPF dataset, the authors examined the impact of appointment type (tenure/tenure-track vs. non-tenure track) on faculty productivity and commitment to the institution. After controlling for institutional mission and appointment hours, they found that tenure and tenure-track faculty members were significantly more productive in research, education, more committed to their positions, and worked about four more hours per week than faculty members not on tenure-track appointments. Non-tenure-track faculty members spent more time giving individual student instruction and more time in office hours advising students. The researchers encouraged administrators to consider these findings when making decisions about hiring more non-tenure-track faculty members.


In this quantitative study, Eagan and Jaeger used human and social capital theories to examine the effect of increased exposure of part-time faculty on students’ transfer rates to four-year institutions. Data came from student transcripts, faculty information, and institutional data from California community colleges for students entering the colleges in 2000 and 2001. Eagan and Jaeger found that increased exposure to part-time faculty members led to a decreased
likelihood that students would transfer to four-year institutions. For every 10% increase in exposure to part-time faculty members, students were 2% less likely to transfer. These findings contradict the earlier findings from Jacoby (2006), which suggested a benefit of increasing numbers of non-tenure-track faculty members as long as they were present in adequate numbers to support students.


Using data from the College Board, Ehrenberg and Zhang examined whether colleges’ and universities’ increased use of non-tenure-track faculty members had an adverse impact on undergraduate graduation rates. They found that an increase in non-tenure-track faculty members resulted in a decrease in undergraduate graduation rates, with the largest impacts occurring at public master’s institutions and public research institutions.


This was a case study that took place at Northwestern university to determine the effectiveness of non-tenure-track faculty members. The findings suggested that non-tenure-track faculty members were better teachers. This was measured by first-year students increased likelihood to take additional classes in the subject area and their better performance in subsequent field courses than students taught by tenured or tenure-track faculty members. The authors suggested this occurred because the worst non-tenure-track faculty members could be removed for ineffective teaching, whereas the least effective tenured and tenure-track faculty members cannot be easily removed for poor teaching. Because Northwestern is an elite institution and many of its non-tenure-track faculty members have long-term contracts, results may not be generalizable to other institutions.


Jacoby examined the impact of part-time faculty members on graduation rates of students at community colleges. He used 2001-2002 IPEDS data from community college across the nation. Jacoby found a negative relationship,
where an increased use of part-time faculty members led to lower graduation rates at community colleges. He suggested that this loss may be offset if part-time faculty members are hired in large enough numbers where their capacity to help students increase.


The study is a companion to Eagan and Jaeger (2009). The authors used human and social capital theory to examine the relationship between part-time faculty members and the likelihood of students completing an associate degree. Data came from student, faculty, and institutional data from California community colleges. They found a negative effect on students’ exposure to part-time faculty members and the likelihood of completing their associate’s degree. A 10% increase in exposure to part-time faculty members led to a 1% decrease in a students’ likelihood of completing an associate’s degree. Findings have implications for how administrators use part-time faculty members at community colleges.


Johnson challenged the methodological decisions of previous studies that have measured the effectiveness of non-tenure-track faculty members. She argued that studies that show negative relationships between non-tenure-track faculty members and student outcomes often fail to account for the fact that students who take many courses from non-tenure-track faculty members have different characteristics than those who do not. These studies measure student characteristics rather than the effectiveness of instructors. Using data from a large research institution, Johnson used cross-classified and multiple membership models to measure faculty status on student grades and first year persistence. There were no differences in persistence, but there were significant differences in grades. Non-tenure-track faculty members were likely to award higher grades
than their tenured and tenure-track peers. These findings have implications for academic rigor and grade inflation.


This article is a review of empirical research about non-tenure-track faculty members. Ochoa found that study results have often been mixed and contradictory. However, she suggested there is enough information to indicate that a large presence of non-tenure-track faculty members in introductory classes are harmful to students. She concluded by providing recommendations for institutions when hiring non-tenure-track faculty.


Umbach used social exchange theory to examine the effectiveness of non-tenure-track faculty members. He found that non-tenure-track faculty members, particularly part-time non-tenure-track faculty members spent less time preparing for class, used active and collaborative teaching techniques less, and had lower expectations than tenure-track colleagues. These findings were applicable for full-time tenure ineligible faculty members but not to the same degree. Non-tenure-track faculty members were more committed to teaching than tenured and tenure track instructors. He did not find evidence that the percentage of non-tenure-track faculty members had an impact on the effectiveness of teaching at the institution. He concluded by recommending institutions do more to support non-tenure-track faculty members.

**Research on the Experiences of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members**

This section contains articles examining the experiences of non-tenure-track faculty members. This research addresses their satisfaction, identities, resources, and broader working conditions.

Antony and Valadez examined the satisfaction of part-time college faculty members. Using 1992-93 NSOPF data, they compared faculty satisfaction between part-time and full-time college faculty members. They found that part-time faculty members were generally satisfied, while full-time faculty members were more likely to consider leaving their job. These findings contradict the common perception of part-time faculty members as an exploited and disenfranchised group. However, as the researchers stated, the study’s findings should not diminish the concerns of part-time faculty. The study may warrant further examination of the satisfaction of different types of part-time faculty members.


Brennan and Magness argued that providing adjuncts with additional resources would be too costly for institutions. They argued that such concessions are not affordable for some institutions and if financial resources were available, institutions may be best served by putting money toward supporting low-income students. To make this point, they created models that illustrated the additional costs to institutions if they increased salaries for adjunct faculty members. In my opinion, the authors assumed a static financial model for institutions, and made a “straw-man” argument that puts funds towards low-income students at odds with resources for adjuncts. Nevertheless, the article underscores that financial tradeoffs are necessary if additional resources were provided for adjunct faculty members.


This study noted the significant role that departments play in the experiences of non-tenure-track faculty members. Using a constructivist framework, Kezar conducted a case study of 25 academic departments across three institutions to determine how department policies impacted non-tenure-track faculty members’
willingness, capacity, and opportunity to perform at four-year institutions. She found four different types of cultures: (a) destructive, (b) neutral, (c) inclusive, and (d) learning. The neutral culture was the most pervasive, while destructive and learning cultures were the least common. The destructive and neutral cultures had the most negative impact on non-tenure-track faculty members. While inclusive departments were supportive of non-tenure-track faculty members in terms of their identity, they did not in fact support student learning. Kezar argued that campuses should strive for a learning culture that seeks ways to enhance the performance of non-tenure-track faculty members.


Kezar’s qualitative study examined non-tenure track faculty members’ perception of how departmental policies impacted their performance. Kezar interviewed 107 faculty members at three different master’s colleges and universities. Her findings indicated that non-tenure track faculty perceived departmental policies as having an impact on their performance. While much of the previous literature on work performance has focused on work satisfaction, Kezar used the work of Blumberg and Pringle (1982) to note how working conditions have played a significant role in work performance. This article provides a theoretical grounding to explain the importance of working conditions for non-tenure track faculty members.


Kezar and Sam argued that researchers have made incorrect assumptions when conducting research related to non-tenure-track faculty members. These false assumptions have led researchers to apply business and economic theories to studies of non-tenure-track faculty members, which has resulted in researchers approaching studies about non-tenure-track faculty members from a deficit model.
The authors concluded their study by advocating that researchers use sociological theories to studies about non-tenure-track faculty members.


Leslie and Gappa explored the similarities and differences between part-time and full-time faculty members in community colleges. They used 1993 NSOPF data and data from the Center for the Study of Community Colleges. They found many similarities between the two groups of faculty. Part-time faculty members enjoyed teaching and viewed themselves as professionals. Contrary to popular discourse, only a small percentage of part-time faculty members were seeking full-time employment opportunities.


The authors explored the identity claims of part-time faculty members at a research university, a master’s institution, and a community college. Building from identity theory, the authors found that part-time faculty members had a divided identity. In the classroom, they perceived of themselves as professionals who were able to take complex ideas and translate them to students. In terms of their standing within their academic department and the university, part-time faculty members felt like outcasts. They were not allowed to participate in departmental meetings, serve on committees, and often not given an office or other resources necessary for their job. The study underscored the need for administrators to provide part-time faculty members with greater resources and opportunities to participate in university affairs and activities.


Through interview data of 18 non-tenure track faculty members, Levin and Shaker found that full-time non-tenure track faculty members possessed a
dualistic and hybrid identity. Their roles contained some elements of a profession and others of a job. They enjoyed teaching, but as members of the profession, they felt dissatisfied with the lack of prestige and disconnected from their fields of study. The researchers drew from identity theories, and institutional and professional theories. This led them to explain the identities of full-time non-tenure track faculty members through four areas: (a) figured worlds, (b) positionality, (c) self-authoring, and (d) agency.


Maynard and Joseph used a "person-job fit" theoretical lens to examine job satisfaction and commitment of full-time faculty members, part-time faculty members preferring full-time jobs, and voluntary part-time faculty members. This is a case study at a mid-sized public four-year university. They found that involuntary part-time faculty members were dissatisfied with advancement, compensation, and job security. Voluntary part-time and full-time faculty members had similar levels of dissatisfaction. Surprisingly, all part-time faculty members reported higher emotional commitment to the institution than full-time faculty members. This study is important because it points to how differences in motivations across part-time faculty members impact their experiences.


The authors used Hackman and Oldham’s (1980) Job Characteristics Model to compare full-time non-tenure track faculty members and full-time tenure track faculty members’ experiences with professionalization, working conditions, and commitment to their workplace. Findings indicated that non-tenure track faculty members did not view their work substantially differently than those in tenure-track positions. They were less satisfied than tenure-track faculty members in terms of interaction with colleagues but more satisfied with the variability of work
Overall, faculty not on the tenure-track did not view their jobs as less than or different from tenure track faculty members.


Seifert and Umbach explored the impact of faculty demographics and disciplinary context on job satisfaction. They argued that financial, career, convenience, relationships with coworkers, and adequacy of resources were factors that contributed to job satisfaction. For their study, the authors used 1999 NSOPF data. They found that women were generally less satisfied with their jobs than men. Faculty members of color showed mixed results in regard to the dimensions of job satisfaction. Results were mixed regarding the relationship between disciplinary context and job satisfaction. This is one of the few studies to examine the influence of academic discipline on job satisfaction.


Zhou and Volkwein examined the factors determining faculty departure for tenured and non-tenured faculty members at research universities. Building from the work of Smart (1990) and Matier (1990), they hypothesized a model that would predict faculty departure. This study used data from the 1999 NSOPF survey. The researchers found several factors that were important to both tenured and non-tenured faculty members’ intentions for departure. These factors were: (a) seniority, (b) compensation, (c) academic rank, (d) doctoral degree, (e) minority status, (f) satisfaction with compensation, (g) satisfaction with job security, and (h) external extrinsic rewards. Seniority had the strongest direct impact on departure intentions for both groups. For tenured faculty members, satisfaction with compensation was very important, while for non-tenured faculty members, job security was very important. Overall, the model is a strong predictor of faculty departure, although it still possesses some limitations.
Influential Books

This section contains important books that have informed and shaped the body of literature surrounding non-tenure-track faculty members. These books provide context for the increase in non-tenure-track faculty members as well as in-depth examinations of part-time and full-time faculty members, broader faculty issues, and changes in the academic labor market.


Whereas Gappa and Leslie (1993) offered an overview of part-time faculty members, Baldwin and Chronister explored the conditions of full-time non-tenure-track (FTNTT) faculty members. They listed several external and internal factors that have resulted in the increase in FTNTT faculty members. This book included demographic data about FTNTT faculty members, the terms of their contracts, and discussed the implications for the increase in FTNTT faculty. The authors took an agnostic stance about the increase in FTNTT faculty members being beneficial or harmful to higher education writ-large. They suggested 13 institutional policies that would improve the status of FTNTT faculty members.


Cross and Goldenberg were senior administrators at the University of Michigan who were concerned with the lack of information and data about non-tenure-track faculty members. They examined the rise and conditions of non-tenure-track faculty members at 10 large research institutions (five public, four private, and one hybrid private-public). They argued that while there were ways that institutional leaders could have offered better support for this group of faculty members, non-tenure-track faculty members at large research institutions were not treated as poorly as media representations led the public to believe. They believed that these faculty members were often indistinguishable from their tenure-track colleagues. They further argued that the numeric increase of this group had more to do with unforeseen consequences of budgeting and planning models, and less to do with explicit attempts to reduce costs and exploit this group. They also made a case for why the growing presence of faculty unions for
non-tenure-track faculty members was not beneficial. They concluded by presenting a series of dilemmas related to non-tenure-track faculty members that administrative leaders must address.


Gappa, Austin, and Trice described the changing nature of faculty work in an attempt to suggest policies and practices for institutional leaders to attract high quality and committed faculty members. According to the authors, changes in higher education’s fiscal landscape, calls for accountability, growing enrollments, increasing diversity of students, and changes in technology have resulted in changes in the professoriate. Some of the changes include: (a) more faculty members not hired on the tenure-track, (b) declining faculty autonomy, (c) increased faculty workload, and (d) potential loss of an academic community. As a result of these changes, institutions have struggled to create appropriate appointment types and retain faculty. To address these concerns, the authors made the following suggestions: (a) create equity in academic appointments, (b) sustain commitment to academic freedom by institutional leaders, (c) ensure flexibility of academic appointments, (d) ensure opportunities for professional growth, and (e) promote collegiality. The study highlighted more recent responses to uncertainty in the professoriate. As this uncertainty is felt among faculty members and the cost of turnover remains high, it is important for institutions to consider practices to best support faculty members.


Gappa and Leslie were motivated by a lack of data regarding part-time faculty members and partisan arguments about the value of part-time faculty members that were not grounded in data. They used data from the 1988 NSOPF survey and conducted interviews with part-time faculty members, department chairs, administrators, and university leaders across 18 campuses. They noted several themes. First, there was a split class system of faculty members, with many part-time faculty occupying the lower class. Second, part-time faculty members
needed to be supported in their work. Third, department chairs played an
important role in the success of part-time faculty members. Finally, many
individuals blame part-time faculty members for declines in institutional
educational goals. However, they should not be blamed for this. The authors
concluded by suggesting that the increased usage of part-time faculty members is
a trend that is likely to stay and as such, it is important to support them.
Subsequently, they provided 43 recommendations to improve the conditions for
part-time faculty.


Rhoades used sociological theories to frame his study on the conditions of faculty
work. Having reviewed and analyzed more than 470 faculty contracts, Rhoades
found that faculty work has been restructured in five key areas: (a) reward
structures, (b) the management of productivity, (c) the increase in part-time labor
force, (d) use of technology, and (e) and intellectual property rights. Rhoades
concluded that despite the popular belief of faculty autonomy, faculty members
are in fact “managed professionals.” They are increasingly managed by
administrators, and also through union contracts (although he applauds unions for
limiting complete administrative control over faculty work). This management
has resulted in increased stratification of the faculty and has forced faculty
members to increasingly align their work with “the market.”


The authors argued that the current moment is one of radical change for higher
education, brought forth by increased information technology, globalization, and
market-driven approaches to higher education. These changes have altered the
academic profession in marked ways. Using a host of data from faculty surveys,
Schuster and Finkelstein highlighted changes in the profile of the faculty and the
nature of faculty work. They argued that these changes in the faculty labor force
and academic work present potential issues for the recruitment of faculty
members, how graduate schools prepare students for the academic workforce, increased stratification of faculty, and ensuring quality of higher education.


Slaughter and Rhoades argued how institutions of higher education have become increasingly linked with the economy and have been less concerned with the public good. There are six key areas of academic capitalism: (a) policy, (b) patents, (c) copyrights, (d) departments, (e) administrators and trustees, and (f) marketing to students. While the book is not explicitly about non-tenure-track faculty members, Slaughter and Rhoades argued that the increase in these types of faculty appointments is a move to increase revenue.

**Research on Faculty Members of Color**

In this section, I highlight research related to the experiences of faculty members of color in academe. The research in this section focuses on the underrepresentation of faculty members of color in institutions of higher education, the hostile campus racial climate they face, the obstacles they are presented in teaching, research and service, and the impact of racism on their working conditions. It is organized around four sections: literature reviews; research on classroom experiences; underrepresentation, satisfaction, and the impact of campus climate; and strategies and barriers for achieving success.

**Literature Reviews**

This section provides summary information about the literature reviews relating to the experiences of faculty members of color.


Stanley provided a brief overview of the themes found in the literature about the experiences of faculty members of color at predominantly White institutions. She described the challenges faculty members of color faced in several areas: (a) campus life and climate, (b) tenure and promotion, (c) sexism and racism, (d) and teaching. Stanley also called for greater empirical research on faculty members of color in higher education.

Turner, González, and Wood summarized the literature on faculty members of color over a twenty-year period. From 1988 to 2007, they found 252 publications related to faculty members of color in higher education and more than 300 researchers who have written on the subject. The authors divided this research into three categories: (a) departmental, (b) institutional, and (c) national. They showed how studies on faculty members of color have often focused on their experiences of isolation and lack of support. Many studies also included recommendations for administrators to better support faculty members of color. Most importantly, this article also illuminates gaps in the literature. Very little work has been done on faculty members of color across institutional type and non-tenure-track faculty members of color.

**Classroom Experiences**

The scholarship in this section examines hostile experiences that faculty members of color, and particularly women of color faculty members, had when teaching at predominantly White institutions. It includes discussions about racist assumptions from students and colleagues, strategies that faculty members of color have employed to overcome these adverse interactions, as well as the positive impact faculty members of color have in the classroom.


Ford examined the ways White students misrecognize and recognize the body of women faculty members of color and how these (mis)recognitions impact the interactions between women faculty members of color and White students. She conducted interviews with 21 women faculty members of color at a large research institution in the midwest. Three themes emerged from the study: (a) how White student misrecognize women faculty members of color based upon their physical appearance and speech; (b) how misrecognitions impact their interactions; (c) how women faculty members of color negotiate those racialized and gendered
assumptions. Findings suggest how these experiences shape the performance and retention of women faculty members of color.


Harlow examined the role of race in faculty members’ experiences in the classroom. She conducted a qualitative study consisting of interviews with 29 White and 29 Black faculty members at a large, Midwestern state university. Harlow found that the experiences of Black and White faculty members differed significantly. Black faculty members were frequently challenged by students and felt that they needed to prove their worth to the students in their class. These faculty members addressed this by spending more time preparing for class than their counterparts, dressing in more formal attire, and listing their credentials to students. White faculty members were not concerned with these issues. The study is one of the first to consider race in the context of the undergraduate classroom.


Lazos examined the experiences of women faculty members of color in classroom spaces. She argued that women faculty members of color are stereotyped as incompetent and have their authority challenged by students, yet they must always be likeable and warm to students if they hope to receive positive teaching evaluations. While Lazos noted that the data are unclear about whether women and faculty members of color receive lower teaching evaluations because of their race and gender, they must spend significant time to counteract stereotypes, which creates additional work and stress. Administrators need to do more to account for this system that penalizes women and faculty members of color.

Lugo-Lugo, C. R. (2012). A prostitute, a servant, and a customer service representative: A
Lugo-Lugo shared her experience as a Latina in the classroom. She stated that as a Latina she was stereotyped as hypersexualized, and expected to serve the students. She argued that Latinas must challenge these stereotypes and assumptions. These challenges are not faced by their White male counterparts.


Pittman examined the teaching experiences of women faculty members of color. She interviewed 17 women faculty members of color at a large, predominantly White research institution. She found that these women experienced racism and sexism in their classroom experiences. They had their expertise and authority challenged by White male students. They also received threats from students. The article is significant as it one of the first studies that examined women faculty members of colors’ perception of their classroom teaching experiences.


This study used critical race feminism to examine how Black women and Latina faculty members navigated their classroom experiences at a large preeminent public university. Ten semi-structured interviews were conducted. Findings suggested that Black women and Latina faculty members spent considerable time legitimizing themselves to students. They were likely to employ pedagogical strategies that promote equity. Sulé argued that both of these techniques are oppositional strategies that challenge racism and stereotypes about women of color.

The research team discussed how teaching for faculty members of color can be an uncomfortable and hostile experience. They used a composite narrative from five faculty members to describe the racism that faculty members of color experienced while teaching. Faculty members of color were often viewed as incompetent and as such, had to prove their worth to students and colleagues.


Umbach used 2003 national survey data of more than 13,000 faculty members to examine the impact of faculty members of color on undergraduate education. He found that faculty members of color made significant contributions to undergraduate education. His results showed that faculty members of color used a greater range of pedagogical techniques in the classroom, were more likely to interact with students than their White peers, and that increased compositional diversity of the faculty resulted in greater use of effective educational practices. The study is important because it highlights the specific contributions of faculty members of color to institutions.

**Underrepresentation, Satisfaction, and the Impact of Campus Climate**

This section includes studies about the underrepresentation of faculty members of color in academe, their satisfaction at predominantly White institutions, and the impact of the campus racial climate on their experiences. This body of literature also provides recommendations for improving the experiences of faculty members of color in higher education.


Croom and Patton (2011) employed critical race theory and critical race feminism to examine the experiences of Black women full professors. The position of full professor grants many benefits such as serving on tenure and promotion committees, access to additional resources, and potential to run larger academic organizations. The authors argued for a critical examination of the systematic barriers leading to the underrepresentation of Black women full professors. A research agenda using critical race theory and critical race feminism could explore
questions regarding access for Black women to attain the position of full professorship.


The research team examined the racial climate for Black and Latino faculty members at the University of Georgia, University of Maryland at College Park, and the University of Texas at Austin using a qualitative, case study methodology. They employed the campus climate framework for their study. The authors found that Black and Latino faculty members perceived an uncomfortable campus climate. This stemmed from problems in the recruitment and retention of faculty members of color at their respective campuses and a lack of institutional support for their research interests. The researchers suggested campus administrators move towards creating a transformative discourse of diversity (one that elevates diversity concerns), and away from a discourse of preservation (one that focuses solely on compositional diversity). They concluded by providing a framework for discussing faculty and campus climate.


In this study, the research team interviewed 28 Black faculty members to examine how they responded to racism within their work environments. Previous literature pointed to Black faculty members responding to negative campus experiences by departing the institution. However, the research team found that Black faculty members employed additional strategies to counteract negative experiences such as forming networks, pursuing service work, and confronting stereotypes. The findings from this study illustrate the need for administrators to not assume Black faculty members are happy simply because they do not depart an institution.


In this article, the authors developed the campus climate framework to help policy makers and institutional leaders think about diversity on college and university campuses. They described four dimensions of campus climates: (a) an institution’s historic legacy of inclusion/exclusion of various racial or ethnic groups, (b) its structural diversity, (c) the psychological climate of perceptions and attitudes between and among groups, and (d) the behavioral climate dimension. These dimensions work together to create a positive campus climate. Although the authors explicitly addressed the role of students and the institution, there is room to consider the campus climate’s implications for other groups on campus.


The authors employed critical race theory in this quantitative study about the factors influencing faculty members’ satisfaction and retention. They found that racial climate, autonomy and independence, and the tenure and promotion process influenced faculty satisfaction and retention rates. The most significant factor was racial climate. When faculty members of color were considered in the aggregate, racial climate was not a significant factor influencing satisfaction when institution type was controlled. However, when groups were disaggregated, a negative racial climate remained a significant source of dissatisfaction for Black and Latino faculty members. Conversely, Whites appeared more satisfied at institutions that had negative racial climates.


Perna used data from the 1993 NSOPF survey to examine sex and racial group differences among several different employment experiences. She measured differences in employment status, salary, rank, and tenure status. She found that human capital, and structural and market characteristics explained differences in
these categories between men and women and most of the differences between racial groups. The findings suggested differences in the reward structures at 2-year and 4-year institutions. Although based on data from 1993, this study provided a conceptual model for understanding the experiences of faculty at 2-year institutions.


The research team used data from IPEDS to examine the status of Black faculty members and administrators at public institutions in the South. They found that racial inequities exist among full-time faculty members and administrators. These differences are largest at the highest faculty ranks and administrative positions.


The research team discussed several retention initiatives they created for diverse faculty members in the College of Liberal Arts and Human Sciences at Virginia Tech. These initiatives included: (a) benchmarking the institution; (b) focus groups of diverse, untenured faculty; (c) new faculty development breakfasts where faculty members could engage in topics about issues pertinent to their experiences; (d) and a university-wide faculty retention workshop. The authors received positive feedback from faculty members and administrators concerning these efforts, but they caution that it will take more time to determine if these initiatives have had an impact on faculty diversity and retention.


The researchers examined successful strategies for hiring diverse faculty members. They hypothesized that institutions that designated at least one diversity condition in the job search process (job description used to attract diversity, institutional “special hire,” or a diverse search committee) would result
in more diverse faculty hires. The authors used data from three large, public, flagship universities to test their hypothesis. Using both quantitative and qualitative data, they found their hypothesis to be supported. Faculty members of color were not hired nearly as frequently when traditional hiring practices were employed. This was particularly true for African American and American Indian faculty members who were largely hired as special hires, and for jobs in diversity areas such as Ethnic Studies fields. They concluded their article with a call for institutions to think beyond normal hiring practices and institute special hiring processes to increase the number of underrepresented faculty members on campuses.


Turner, Myers, and Creswell conducted a mixed methods study to examine the conditions of faculty members of color at colleges in eight Midwestern states. They noted several findings: (a) faculty members of color were underrepresented in higher education at Midwestern colleges and universities; (b) this underrepresentation was due to the academic pipeline, market forces, and a “chilly climate”; and (c) there was inadequate institutional support for faculty members of color. They suggested expanding the pool of candidates for faculty positions and improving the workplace environment for faculty members of color could remedy these problems.


The research team created a model to investigate the relationship between campus racial climate and overall faculty satisfaction. They drew upon data from a 2004-2005 faculty survey sponsored by the Higher Education Research Institute. While there were differences by racial group in regard to level of satisfaction, all groups reported a strong positive relationship between campus racial climate and overall satisfaction. The relationship was so strongly positive that the researchers
suggested that views of the campus racial climate can be used as a “litmus test” to determine overall faculty satisfaction. The finding points to how a positive campus climate is important for all faculty members, not just faculty members of color.

**Strategies and Barriers for Achieving Success**

This section of the literature discusses various obstacles faced by faculty members of color to achieve success and the strategies they use to overcome them. The research includes discussions of how faculty members of color face a devaluation of their scholarship and have higher service loads, but also contains examinations of the ways faculty members of color navigate the difficult environment at institutions of higher education.


Baez interviewed sixteen faculty members of color to understand their experience with service work. Through these interviews, Baez argued that rather than serve as a burden, service work has the capacity to provide agency for faculty members of color. It provided spaces for faculty members of color to transform oppressive structures and to advance racial justice within institutions of higher education. Consequently, service can contribute to making institutions of higher education more equitable places.


In this manuscript, Dancy and Jean-Marie highlighted the ways imposter syndrome impacts faculty members of color. They conducted literature reviews about imposter syndrome and faculty members of color to show the ways imposter syndrome disparately impacts their success. Significantly, they showed how imposter syndrome is passed down from faculty members to students.

Bernal and Villalpando (2002) described the ways the structure of academe has led to faculty members of color being marginalized and having their scholarship and cultural resources discredited. The authors used national data to illustrate how faculty members of color were more likely to be represented in lower faculty ranks, and to be found in underfunded humanities departments. They employed a critical race narrative about the promotion to tenure case of a Chicana faculty member to illustrate the denigration of faculty members of color in institutions of higher education. They showed how someone using a dominant Eurocentric framework would interpret this faculty member’s dossier as lacking rigor and decide it is unworthy of tenure. Conversely, someone using critical race perspective would offer a counternarrative that highlights the strength of this faculty member’s dossier. The author’s showed how academe intentionally and unintentionally relegates faculty members of color to the status of second-class citizens.


The research team shared the experiences of four faculty members of color (three junior faculty members and one tenured faculty member) in a department of education at a predominantly White institution of higher education. Using Critical race theory to share a counternarrative, the authors described struggles negotiating their academic identity, challenges confronting diversity in their department, the importance of creating a mentoring space. They found that small informal mentoring spaces for faculty members of color where they discussed the emotional and social challenges in their department, which the authors termed, “the afterparty,” were critical for their survival. The researchers suggested that while such spaces may not be essential for all departments, if they do arise, universities should support them.

Duncan used her own experience as a woman of color working in a women’s studies program to highlight the marginalization and the exploitation of women of color faculty members in women’s and gender studies programs. Duncan argued that the neoliberal institution has created the contradictory belief that women of color faculty members are simultaneously viewed as “hot commodities” and “cheap labor,” Duncan illuminated how the structural dynamics that led to her racialized gendered marginalization within her department.


Garcia used counterstories to understand the experiences of Latina faculty members. Garcia focused on the ways Latina faculty members negotiated race, class, and gender and other forms of oppression in their professional lives. She highlighted the ways Latina faculty members dealt with a lack of mentoring, having their research about race, gender, and class challenged, cultural taxation, and isolation. The narratives are provided to help other Latina faculty members who may be confront similar situations.


Griffin and Reddick used an intersectional framework to examine Black professors’ mentoring patterns. They interviewed 37 Black professors across three predominantly White research universities. They found that racism and sexism influenced how and whether Black professors mentored. Black women were expected to do more mentoring than men, and they were more likely to report feeling burdened by mentoring. Black men compartmentalized their mentoring relationships in order to avoid accusations of improper relationships.

Harley discussed the ways Black women faculty member are overworked in all aspects of their jobs (teaching, research, service). Harley used the metaphor of the maid to describe the ways that Black women faculty are burdened with additional work, and receive no recognition for this work. In addition to describing this work, she also wrote about the psychological and health implications for Black women faculty members as a result of carrying this burden. Harley concluded the article by offering a list of recommendations and strategies to improve the conditions for Black women faculty members.


Building from Padilla’s concept of cultural taxation, Hirshfield and Joseph put forth the idea of identity taxation to note how individuals from various marginalized identities are overburdened with service. This is a qualitative study that examined the ways race and gender shape women of color faculty members’ experiences with service work. In particular, the authors noted how women faculty members of color were uniquely burdened with certain types of service and faced specific expectations as a result of their race and gender.


In this short article, Padilla identified major issues confronting faculty members of color at institutions of higher education. These issues included the types of research projects to pursue to earn tenure, finding a mentor, where to publish, and “cultural taxation.” The concept of “cultural taxation” is defined as the additional responsibilities of faculty members of color to be good citizens. These additional responsibilities allowed university administrators to showcase the institution’s commitment to diversity, but negatively impact faculty members of color.


Sadao conducted a qualitative study examining the individual factors that led to the success of faculty members of color. She interviewed 19 faculty members at
the University of Hawaii-Manoa, 17 of whom were tenured or tenure-track. The participants identified parents/role models, cultural experiences, family background, and international experiences as providing them with the skills and drive to be successful. Her most important finding was that these faculty members learned to be “bicentral.” “Bicultural” referred to the ability to navigate their own culture, and the dominant culture. The above factors provided these faculty members with insight into the dominant culture, which allowed for a successful transition into their work as faculty members. However, the idea of a bicultural identity still identifies a dominant culture that is not accessible to all, which must be addressed to ensure the success of faculty members of color.


Stanley employed critical race theory to discuss the challenges facing faculty members of color at predominantly White institutions (PWIs). Drawing from 24 narratives, Stanley centered the experiences of faculty members of color to amplify a voice for this group, offer suggestions for how to navigate PWIs, and to provide recommendations to administrators for improving the working conditions of faculty members of color. Critical race theory allowed Stanley to illuminate how faculty members of color experience PWIs differently than their majority White colleagues, specifically in the realms of teaching, mentoring, collegiality, identity, service, and racism. By centering the experiences of faculty members of color, she challenged the experiences of White faculty members as normative, in hopes of creating a more inclusive campus environment.


Using critical race theory, Stanley provided a counternarrative of the editorial review process. She noted challenges in this process such as the ways reviewers questioned her ability to remain “objective” in her research on race, asking her to compare the experiences of faculty members of color to White faculty members, and encouraging her to take a positivist approach. She concluded by offering
suggestions for editorial review boards to reexamine their roles. This is a one of few studies that highlights racism in the editorial review process.


Turner detailed the experiences of women faculty members of color in academe. Through interviews with 64 women faculty members of color, she illustrated how this group was marginalized as a result of their race and gender in five different areas: (a) feeling isolated and not respected; (b) salience of race over gender; (c) being underemployed and overused by departments; (d) being torn between family, community, and career and (e) being challenged by students. She noted how research on faculty members of color has often privileged the experiences of men and excluded discussions on the impact of gender, while research on women faculty members has often remained silent about race.


Turner and Myers conducted a study of the experiences of African American, Asian Pacific American, American Indian, and Latino faculty members who worked from 1993-1995 in states that were a part of the Midwestern Higher Education Commission. They examined the following areas: (a) the extent of minority faculty underrepresentation, (b) the climate for faculty of color, (c) hiring practices, (d) reward structures, and (e) market forces. The results from the study indicated that faculty members of color were continuously underrepresented, and faced a hostile climate at their institutions. Turner and Myers also found that the widely held belief that there was a lack of faculty members of color due to a dearth of qualified Ph.D. recipients was not true. With this study, the authors aimed to discuss best practices for the successful recruitment and retention for faculty members of color. While the study is outdated, many of the findings remain consistent with the current literature on the experiences of faculty members of color at PWIs, illustrating the extent of the problem.


Villalpando and Delgado Bernal conducted a critical race analysis of the racialized barriers that impede the success of faculty members of color. They used data over a 30-year period to discuss the stratification of faculty members of color. They argued that the scholarship, knowledge, and teaching of faculty members of color are not valued. They examined how institutional reward structures operate differently for faculty members of color and White faculty. They concluded by providing suggestions for institutions to eradicate these barriers for faculty members of color.


Using data from the three public 4-year institutions in Arizona, the researchers examined faculty participation in service. They found that faculty members of color were more likely to serve in liaison service roles, or those roles where faculty members served as a liaison from their department to the university. Faculty members of color were also more likely to serve on national organizations. This study confirms previous research about the disproportionate amount of service for faculty members of color.


The research team conducted a qualitative study about early career, faculty members of color experiences with mentoring. Using intersectionality and social capital as theoretical frameworks, they interviewed 58 underrepresented faculty members at 22 institutions of higher education. Findings revealed (a) the importance of lifespan mentoring that promotes the accumulation of social capital, (b) there are barriers that devalue scholarship by faculty members of
color, and (c) the importance of having mentors who understand the experiences of faculty members of color. Mentoring can play a key role in the success of faculty members of color.

**Relevant Theoretical Frameworks (CRT and CRF)**

This section describes literature about relevant theories pertaining to critical race theory and critical race feminism. It includes articles about essential theories for each of these theoretical frameworks that are relevant to this study.


Allen used her own experience as a faculty member to argue against the logic that Black women law faculty members should primarily be hired as faculty members because Black women law students need them as role models. Allen acknowledged the benefit of having Black women faculty members as role models for other students. However, she warned that using this as the primary argument for why they should be hired is dangerous. Such an argument remains problematic because it can promote opposition to affirmative action, essentializes Black women as natural mentors, has an implicit undertone that Black women faculty members are not as gifted in other aspects of their work, and lets White men off the hook for mentoring Black women students. As such, Allen warned audiences to be careful of the argument that Black women law faculty should be hired because they are good role models.


In this seminal text, Bell defined the theory of interest convergence. Interest convergence is the idea that progress on addressing concerns and issues involving racism can only occur when it is in the interest of Whites. Bell illustrated this point by showing how the passage of the Civil Rights Act occurred as a result of U.S. government concerns over the global image of the nation as it was involved in the Cold War.

In this text, Bonilla-Silva made a compelling case for the changing nature of racism. He argued that while racism may not be as overt as in the past, colorblind racism and other, more subtle forms of racism continue to have a major impact upon society. He laid out several ways that colorblind racism works. In his most recent edition, he updated his text to account for recent political events.


In this text, Collins argued that Black women have a rich intellectual tradition. While facing racism and sexism and other systems of oppression, Collins argued that Black women have a unique standpoint to understand their experiences. Collins also laid out the core themes of Black feminist thought. One of the key terms in the text is a matrix of domination, or the ways individuals experience various structures of oppression. These structures intersect, and each individual has a unique relationship to each form of oppression.


In this article, Crenshaw examined the ways racism and sexism intersect and lead to violence against women of color. Crenshaw employed the term intersectionality to refer to these interlocking systems of oppression, arguing that the individual categories of racism and sexism are not adequate to understand the experiences of women of color. Crenshaw used many stories of the experiences of women of color to show how a failure to address their concerns through an intersectional framework resulted in violence against them.


Delgado and Stefancic wrote this short text to serve as a broad overview of critical race theory (CRT). They outlined the key tenets and arguments of CRT. This text serves an introduction to CRT and a place to begin for individuals just learning about the field.

In this article, Harris argued for an anti-essentialist perspective in examining the experiences of Black women. She used the term “gender essentialism” to note the ways that individuals argue for a universal woman’s experience, and “race essentialism” for those that argue for a monolithic Black or Latinx experience. For Harris, essentialism of any form fragments the identities and experiences of women of color. As such, it is imperative to utilize an anti-essentialist framework when conducting research focusing on women of color.


In this article, Harris argued for the link between identity and property. She argued that whiteness is a form of property that is protected by law, that has resulted in the domination of Blacks and Native Americans. She noted that Whites seek to protect their whiteness as a form of property. As such, whiteness as property has been maintained as a way to preserve the current system of racial order.


Ladson-Billings and Tate argued for the inclusion of critical race theory (CRT) in education for three reasons: (a) race continues to be a significant factor in the U.S.; (b) US society is based-upon property rights; (c) the importance of understanding the intersection race and property. They further argued that using critical race theory is much more appropriate than the multicultural paradigm, because of its attention to power and social justice.


Pratt-Clarke explored sociological and legal questions surrounding the opening of the Detroit Male Academy (DMA), a school designed for Black male students. Pratt-Clarke utilized critical race theory, critical race feminism, feminist theory, social movement theories, collective action theory and discourse analysis to create a transdisciplinary applied social justice model. She applied the model to understanding the experiences of students at the DMA.
This book is an essential anthology of critical race feminism (CRF). In it, Wing foregrounded anti-essentialism as a critical component of CRF. Although the volume includes sections on motherhood, sexual harassment, work, criminality, and global issues, most relevant for this project is the section on the marginalization on women of color law faculty members.

Wing defined critical race feminism (CRF) and documented its historical legacy. In addition to defining CRF, Wing applied CRF to the experiences of Arab women during the War on Terror and following the Arab-Spring. Wing concluded the article by noting how CRF research can play an important role in improving the conditions of women of color.
CHAPTER THREE
Methodology

The purpose of this study was to examine how racism and other systemic forms of oppression operate in institutions of higher education. I used critical race theory (CRT) (Bell, 1980; Crenshaw, 1991; Delgado & Stefancic, 2012; Harris, 1993; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; McCoy & Rodricks, 2015) and critical race feminism (CRF) (Wing, 1997; Wing 2015) as theoretical frameworks to examine this issue. From CRT, I foregrounded race and racism by drawing upon CRT’s main tenet, Racism as Normal, or the idea that racism is engrained in societal structures and manifests itself in everyday occurrences (Taylor, 2009). I also drew upon the central principle of CRF, anti-essentialism, or the idea that the experiences of people of color or women, cannot be defined by a single narrative (Wing, 1997).

Specifically, I was interested in the experiences of non-tenure-track faculty members of color (NTFOCs). For purposes of this study, I explored the experiences of NTFOCs who met the following criteria: (a) they were not eligible for tenure or promotion; (b) their primary responsibility was instruction; (c) they were in at least their second academic year at an institution; (d) they worked at a four-year, doctoral, predominantly White institutions of higher education (PWIs) with higher or highest research activity; and (e) they were seeking a more stable or permanent academic position. The term faculty members of color referred to individuals who identified as members of one or more of the following groups: American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian or Asian American, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latinx, Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian, or Two or more races.

This study used critical race methodology and was qualitative in nature. I conducted an in-depth interview with each participant. In interviews, participants described their own experiences as NTFOC.

The present study explored three primary research questions regarding racism and the experiences of NTFOCs.

1. How do NTFOCs experience racism on college campuses?
2. How does the intersection of one’s social identities (e.g., race, gender, etc.) shape the work experiences of NTFOCs?
3. How do NTFOC negotiate their experiences with racism and other oppressive systems on their campus?
In this chapter, I provide an overview of the methodology of the study. I begin with a description of critical race methodology before offering a section on positionality. I then discuss the participant selection process and interview protocol. Next, I provide a description of my data collection and analysis procedures. I conclude with a section on trustworthiness.

**Critical Race Methodology**

Critical race methodology is “a theoretically grounded approach to research that foregrounds race and racism in all aspects of the research process” (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002, p. 24). It challenges dominant methodologies that silence the voices of people of color and rejects the notion of an objective reality (Brayboy, 2005; McCoy & Rodricks, 2015). Critical race methodology centers the experiences of people of color (McCoy & Rodricks, 2015; Solórzano & Yosso, 2002). It does so through a variety of forms that include narratives, testimonies, and stories. While often thought of as qualitative, critical race methodology transcends the boundaries of traditional research and should be “problem centered” and have a goal of seeking racial justice (Dixson & Rousseau, 2005).

There are five essential elements in critical race methodology (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002): (a) the intercentricity of race and racism with other forms of subordination; (b) the challenge to dominant ideology; (c) the commitment to social justice; (d) the centrality of experiential knowledge; and (e) the transdisciplinary perspective, or using knowledge from a multitude of disciplines and fields to understand the experiences of people of color (McCoy & Rodricks, 2015; Solórzano & Yosso, 2002). Collectively, these elements challenge dominant methodologies and epistemologies (McCoy & Rodricks, 2015; Solórzano & Yosso, 2002).

Counterstories are an essential component of critical race methodology (McCoy & Rodricks, 2015). Counterstories are “a method of telling the stories of those people whose experiences are often not told (i.e., those on the margins of society)” (Solorzano & Yosso, 2002, p. 32). These stories can disrupt dominant narratives and discourses about racism (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002). Additionally, they can challenge the notions of “truth,” “fairness,” and “justice” (Taylor, 2009).

There are three different types of counterstories. First, personal stories allow individuals to share their own experiences with various forms of oppression (McCoy & Rodricks, 2015; Solórzano & Yosso, 2002). Second, other people’s stories allow someone to describe another individual’s experiences with and responses to oppression (McCoy & Rodricks, 2015; Solórzano
Finally, composite stories utilize the stories of many individuals to reveal people of colors’ experiences with various forms of subordination (McCoy & Rodricks, 2015; Solórzano & Yosso, 2002).

Critical race methodology is a useful approach to highlighting the permanent nature of racism and through its use of stories, is well-suited to amplify the voices of marginalized groups. More than providing voice, it is justice-oriented and should lead to action. As such, it is an appropriate methodology to examine the experiences of NTFOCs.

**Positionality**

Positionality refers to the interests and background of the researcher and how this information can influence a study (Marshall & Rossman, 2011). The position of the researcher can both guide and restrict research (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). The ability to reflect about one’s own identity in relationship to the research study is particularly important in research about race (Milner, 2007). Failure to do so may lead to unchecked assumptions and faulty conclusions that can have detrimental effects to individuals who are targets of racism (Milner, 2007).

I identify as a Black, middle class, heterosexual, cisgender man, who was born and raised in the United States. I grew up with a strong sense of racial identity and at a young age learned about the impact of racism on myself and society writ large. I have long believed that the construction of race and racism have shaped and continue to shape society (Omi & Winant, 2014). As an undergraduate and graduate student who has attended three different PWIs, I witnessed first-hand the debilitating effects that racism had on students of color. I experienced routine microagressions from other students and struggled to find my place within these institutions that possessed cultural values and norms that were often at odds with my background as a person of color. This caused a great deal of stress for me.

Because of my experiences as a student attending PWIs, I decided to pursue a professional career to ameliorate these issues. For the past five years, I have worked at institutions of higher education in various capacities designed to improve the campus racial climate. As a higher education professional, not only did I continue to experience routine microaggressions, but I gained greater insight into the structural nature of racism at PWIs. At all of the institutions where I worked, administrative leaders indicated a commitment to improving the racial climate, but few provided the necessary resources to bring about this change. From my perspective, university administrators did not prioritize efforts to improve the campus racial
climate even though they voiced support for a strong and diverse campus. Despite this disconnect, these experiences furthered my passion to pursue ways to expose and ameliorate racism on the campuses of PWIs by illuminating the pressing nature of this problem.

My professional experiences have primarily focused on supporting students of color as they access and succeed at higher education institutions. As my career progressed, however, I began to witness the ways faculty members of color were impacted by the campus racial climate as well. This experience primarily came from my partner, as well as friends and colleagues who identify as faculty members of color. All of them were in tenured or tenure-track appointments. They frequently told stories about students who made racist and sexist assumptions about them. These incidents angered them and forced them to spend unnecessary time addressing these issues, affording them less time to attend to other professional and personal activities.

These faculty members also noted how they often served as avenues of support for students of color on their campuses who were struggling to adjust to life at a PWI. While they enjoyed offering support and assistance for these students and viewed it as important and a meaningful part of their job, this work was usually not rewarded in the formal promotion and tenure process and often took a toll on their emotional and psychological well-being.

Given that the majority of faculty members are not tenured or on the tenure track (Curtis, 2014; Finklestein, Conley, & Schuster, 2016), I began to wonder how NTFOCs experience and address racism and other forms of oppression in their institutions given the nature of their work contracts. Such ideas motivated me to pursue this study. My identity as a person of color, and as someone who has scholarly knowledge and first-hand experiences with racism in higher education spaces, provides me with the background to pursue this project.

However, I have never worked as a non-tenure-track faculty member. While some may argue that this is positive as it provides me with further distance from the research so as not to “bias” this study (Christians, 2011), I view it as an impediment. I do not possess experiential knowledge about what it means to be a member of this group, which may lead some participants to question my credibility and motivations to conduct such a study. When pursuing research with vulnerable populations, it may be difficult to gain access as an outsider due to power relations and mistrust. More specifically, given the lack of protections in NTFOC’s contracts (Christians, 2011), they may fear that speaking with a researcher about their experiences could result in exposure and losing their jobs. As such, it was essential that I develop a strong rapport
with study participants. Given the dearth of literature concerning the experiences of NTFOCs, it was paramount that I listen to the participants and not make assumptions about their experiences.

It is because of my background and experiences that I approached this study seeking to better understand racism and other oppressive systems in higher education and find ways to ameliorate it. There is a need for more research about faculty members of color, particularly NTFOCs, and their experiences with racism at institutions of higher education. Not having been a non-tenure-track faculty member may shape my relationship to the study and participants. However, my knowledge and experiences with racism on college and university campuses provide me with a lens to approach this study.

**Participant Selection**

The sample for this study consisted of NTFOCs. I sought participants who could speak about the relationship between their experiences with racism, other systemic forms of oppression, and their working conditions at PWIs. Participants had to meet six criteria to participate in the study. First, in an attempt to center the experiences of people of color, all participants had to identify as a member of a minoritized racial/ethnic group (i.e., American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian or Asian American, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latinx, Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian, or two or more races). Because this study was concerned with highlighting the experiences of NTFOCs, this criterion for participation was essential.

Second, participants could not be eligible for tenure or promotion. In maintaining consistency with the goals of this study, it was critical that participants be working on a renewable contract and not eligible for tenure or promotion.

Third, participants had to be teaching faculty members at the time of data collection. Non-tenure-track faculty members can have a wide array of job responsibilities (National Institute for Learning Outcomes, 2014). For this study, I was concerned with the experiences of non-tenure-track faculty members whose primary responsibility was teaching. Such faculty members were well positioned to articulate experiences with students as well as with faculty colleagues.

Fourth, participants had to be in at least their second academic year as a NTFOC at an institution. This criterion ensured that respondents had been working at an institution long
enough to have sufficient classroom experience and knowledge of the institution’s culture and climate, and could speak clearly about them.

Fifth, participants had to be employed at a PWI classified as a four-year doctoral university with either higher or highest research activity. The number of non-tenure-track faculty members is growing more quickly at doctoral institutions of higher education than other types of universities (Schulman, 2015), indicating a need to understand the experiences of non-tenure-track faculty members at these institutions.

Finally, participants had to be what Gappa and Leslie (1993) termed “aspiring academics,” or those seeking a more permanent position, such as a tenure-track faculty position. Motivation for being in a non-tenure-track faculty position impacts how people experience their work (Maynard & Joseph, 2008). For example, the experiences of someone who works in a non-tenure-track faculty position who aspires to a tenure-track position and who relies on income from that non-tenure-track position may differ from a full-time working professional who teaches classes at a university and is not dependent upon this work for financial stability. I was interested in the experiences of the former group given critical race methodology’s focus on intercentricity of racism and other forms of oppression.

I began the participant selection process by contacting board members at the New Faculty Majority (NFM) to assist with identifying potential participants (see Appendix A). The organization is an advocacy group for non-tenure-track faculty members. NFM “is dedicated to improving the quality of higher education by advancing professional equity and securing academic freedom for all adjunct and contingent faculty” (New Faculty Majority, 2015). I spoke with leaders of the organization about my study and solicited their support.

Second, once granted support from the NFM, I sent the organization a Call for Participants (see Appendix B). The Call for Participants included information about the study and requirements to participate. This call was sent over NFM listservs to solicit potential respondents for the study.

If the NFM call did not yield a sufficient number of potential participants from a variety of PWIs and backgrounds, then I extended the call to other groups that support faculty members of color (e.g., Ford Foundation Fellows listserv, online social media groups supporting faculty members of color). Sending the Call for Participants to these groups ensured that I was reaching
individuals in organizations that support non-tenure-track faculty members and/or faculty members of color.

To express interest in participating in the study, potential respondents followed an Internet link in the Call for Participants that took them to a survey hosted by Qualtrics Survey Software (see Appendix C). The survey asked potential participants to answer questions about their background and provided them with space to leave their contact information. This survey was used to ensure that potential participants met all study criteria. Additionally, the tool was used to create a diverse potential sample for the study. I sought respondents who represented an array of racial groups, gender identities, institutions, disciplines, and geographic region. I also considered other factors such as parental status, length of time at the institution, and length of time as a non-tenure-track faculty member. Having a diverse sample allowed for a broader understanding of how racism is experienced and provided a more nuanced analysis of how racism and other systems of oppression operate within PWIs. Individuals who did not meet the study criteria or add to the diversity of participants were sent an email thanking them for their interest, but indicating that they were not selected to participate in this study (see Appendix D).

I identified individuals who met all the selection criteria and could contribute to the diversity of the sample. I contacted these potential participants via phone to verify that they met all criteria to participate in the study and were positioned to share their experiences (see Appendix E). If I believed they would be appropriate participants for the study, I scheduled a time for an interview with them.

Finally, if these steps did not yield a sufficient number of respondents, additional participants were identified via snowball sampling. Snowball sampling means that individuals who have been interviewed refer others to participate in the study. Snowball sampling is a good strategy for interviewing marginalized populations, or people from groups that may be reluctant to participate in a research study (Atkinson & Flint, 2001). NTFOCs may have been hesitant to participate in the study due to their contract status and fear of not having their contract renewed if they spoke ill of their college or university. While my sampling strategy of working with organizations to recruit participants may have helped to assuage this trepidation, having another individual refer them may have alleviated remaining concerns.

The key to sampling in qualitative studies is saturation. Saturation occurs “when fresh data no longer sparks new insights or reveals new properties” (Creswell, 2014, p. 189). In this
study, I targeted a sample of approximately 20 participants, but I sought participants until I reached data saturation.

**Instrumentation**

The instrument for the study was created with a goal of gathering narratives about NTFOC’s experiences with racism and other forms of systematic oppression. I relied upon semi-structured interviews to collect information for the study. This structure allowed for clarification and follow-up with participants about any of their responses. Participants could potentially be located across the U.S. As such, interviews were conducted via Skype, Google Hangout, or FaceTime. These are online video chat services.

The interview protocol consisted of 18 questions and was divided into four sections: Background Questions, Interactions with Students, Department Experiences, and Summative Questions (see Appendix F). The first section, Background Questions, was designed to learn more about the participants and build a relationship with them. This section consisted of two questions. I asked them to tell me what motivated them to pursue a career in academia, and how they ended up working in their current position.

The second and third sections consisted of questions that aimed to get at the participants’ experiences working at their institution of primary employment. In keeping with critical race methodology, several of the questions focused on the intercentricity of racism and sexism (and to a lesser extent, other systems of oppression). The second section of the interview protocol, Interactions with Students, was designed to elicit responses about participants’ teaching experiences with students. This section consisted of six questions. For example, I asked them to tell me what they enjoyed most about working with students and to provide examples of when students’ perceptions of their race and/or another identity impacted their teaching.

In the third section, Department Experiences, I asked seven questions related to participants’ experiences within their department. For instance, I inquired about what they enjoyed most about working in their department. I also asked them to describe one or two experiences they had where perceptions of their race and/or another identity played impacted their interactions with other faculty members.

In the final section of the interview protocol, Summative Questions, I asked three questions as a way to conclude the interview. For example, I asked participants about how their current position relates to their future career goals. I also asked them to provide me with
suggestions for their department head and other administrative leaders to improve their situation. In summary, the protocol helped elicit data I could use to answer the research questions, and in doing so, challenged the dominant ideology of a “colorblind” society by highlighting how racism and other oppressive systems impact NTFOCs.

After drafting the interview questions, I consulted with experts in qualitative research to ensure questions would elicit relevant information from respondents. I then pilot tested the instrument with NTFOCs at PWIs who were not part of this study. I revised the protocol based upon feedback I received after each of these steps before moving to the interviews.

**Data Collection Procedure**

Data collection began following the development of the instrument. First, I obtained approval for the study from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at my home institution (see Appendix G). This ensured that my study complied with institutional policy and protected the participants.

After identifying participants through the sample selection process, I then sent them an online Informed Consent Form (see Appendix H). I asked that they review the form prior to our interview and mentioned that verbal consent would be obtained at the start of the interview.

A week before their interview, I called to remind them of their scheduled interview time. I also confirmed that they had reviewed the Informed Consent form. If they had not reviewed the form, I asked them to do so. I also inquired about what video chat application they preferred for the interview (Skype, Google Hangout, or FaceTime) and asked them to make sure that the application was working properly.

I sent participants a reminder email about our scheduled interview two days prior to the interview. I also reminded them to make sure they would be in a private location for the interview so that we would not be interrupted and that they would have a reliable internet connection.

Prior to the interview, I tested Skype, Google Hangout, or FaceTime (depending on the choice of the participant) and ensured that my recording equipment was functioning properly. After ensuring that my equipment was working properly, I contacted the participant at the scheduled time. I then asked them if they were in a quiet space and would not be interrupted for the interview.
Next, I verified that they were willing to participate in the study and to have the interview recorded. Once they verbally consented, I conducted the interview. These interviews were approximately 90 minutes in length. This length of time ensured that I had enough time with participants to gather pertinent information. However, I did not want to make the interview any longer in an effort to be respectful of participants’ time and to prevent them from becoming fatigued and resulting in their no longer providing meaningful answers to the questions. At the conclusion of the interview, I told participants that I would send them a transcription of the interview so that they could make corrections or amendments to it.

Following the interview, I recorded my thoughts into an audio recording. This allowed me to encompass my immediate impressions about the interview. I then wrote notes about my general thoughts and impressions of the interview in a “contact summary form” (Appendix I) (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014). This form contained pre-set questions that provided me with an avenue to reflect upon the interview and verify that the interview yielded information that would allow me to answer the given research questions. This form was completed within one-week of each interview. Analytic memos were also written throughout the data collection and analysis processes. These were attempts to condense data and make meaning of the information collected (Marshall & Rossman, 2011; Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014). As I collected new data and as new ideas emerged, I continued to write memos and refine my ideas.

I transcribed all interviews. Upon completion of each transcription, in maintaining a social justice perspective that seeks to improve the conditions of participants and do no harm to them (Solórzano & Yosso, 2001; Solórzano & Yosso, 2002), I sent the transcript to the participant for review. I gave participants one week to respond with feedback about the transcription. Specifically, they were told to correct or amend the transcript if there was a discrepancy with what was said, or if something was said in the interview that they no longer wished to be a part of the record due to a change in circumstance or fear of retribution from their employer or other source of authority. I told participants that if I did not hear from them after one week, I would assume they had no major concerns and would move forward with data analysis.

I also told respondents that once I had analyzed the data, I would share with them the narratives I developed to report my findings. Again, they would be given one week to provide feedback about whether these narratives captured their experiences or if they needed to be
revised or reconsidered. If I did not hear from them within a week, I would assume that they had no concerns about the narratives.

Through these steps, I elicited information from participants who were able to provide meaningful information about racism, and other systems of oppression and the experiences of NTFOCs. The information gathered through this process was then prepared for analysis.

**Data Analysis Procedure**

Data analysis was an inductive process designed to produce composite narratives that answered the research questions. To develop a composite narrative, it was essential that I gather information and analyze data from four sources (Solórzano & Yosso, 2001). The first source came from the data itself. The literature related to the topic was the second source. The third source was my professional experiences. The final source was my personal experiences (Solórzano & Yosso, 2001).

I followed the constant comparative method of data analysis (Glaser, 1965). This process allowed me to create themes that would be integrated into the composite narratives. Data analysis occurred concurrently with data collection and data were constantly analyzed at each step of the process. This approach allowed me to reflect continuously upon existing data and to think about how to strengthen the data collection process (Charmaz, 2014; Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014).

I started by reading over the interview transcripts, memos, and summary contact reports and listening to audio notes. This ensured that I became familiar and engaged with the data. I then prepared the data by cleaning up transcripts to eliminate pauses or other incoherent phrases from the interviews.

After preparing the data, I began coding. Coding “is the process of organizing the material into chunks or segments of text and assigning a word or phrase to the segment in order to develop a general sense of it” (Creswell, 2014, p. 241). All transcripts were coded twice. First, I conducted descriptive coding. Descriptive coding summarizes the topic of a line, sentence, or other unit of analysis from the transcript (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014, p. 74). This was done to gather the underlying meaning of participants words. The comment was the unit of analysis. Comments could be a phrase, sentence or a series of phrases/sentences that reflected the same topic. Once the participant moved to another idea, I identified it as a new comment and worthy of a new code. Each comment was coded. All codes were added to a list
of codes. New codes were added to the list after coding each transcript. After coding the first five transcripts, I created a master code list. This master code list included all of the codes generated from the coding of these transcripts as well as definitions of each code (Hernandez, 2012). These first five transcripts and all subsequent transcripts were then recoded using this master list. If codes emerged in the subsequent transcripts that were not on the master list of codes, they were added to the list and those transcripts that had already been reviewed were examined again for the new codes.

Next, I organized codes into categories of codes through the second coding process, pattern coding. Pattern coding allowed me to compare descriptive codes for relationships among them (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014). I collapsed codes with similar meanings into broader categories. Thus, categories were created based on codes that exhibited a strong relationship to one another.

Once categories were established, I began the process of identifying themes. Themes were identified if categories emerged in at least three instances across transcripts. This was done to ensure that themes were supported by data. However, if other important categories emerged from the data that had compelling evidence but did not meet the three-instance standard, they could also become a theme. For example, if two individuals spoke in great detail about the intersectionality of their race and sexual or gender identity and how this impacted their work experience, this could rise to the level of a theme. Themes were also compared with audio recordings, memos and summary contact reports to ensure consistency of findings. I also noted any subthemes that may have emerged from the themes.

After generating themes, I then sorted themes into one of four documents. The first three documents were related to the research questions. These documents were titled: (1) How do NTFOCs experience racism on college campuses (RQ1)?; (2) How does the intersection of one’s social identities (e.g., race, gender, etc.) shape the work experiences of NTFOCs (RQ2)?; and (3) How do NTFOC negotiate their experiences with racism or other oppressive systems on their campus (RQ3)?; and (4) Miscellaneous? This sorting process ensured that the information obtained could answer each research question. The Miscellaneous document was for themes that could not be assigned to any of the research questions. This document allowed me to remain flexible with data and to provide space for emergent ideas.
Next, I needed additional support to better understand themes. First, in ensuring that I followed the steps necessary to develop a critical race composite narrative, it was essential that I integrate relevant literature to help me interpret themes. All themes were compared with the tenets central to this study (Racism as Normal; Anti-essentialism). I read relevant literature to determine if themes exhibited a relationship to these tenets of CRT and CRF. Themes that related to a tenet were then highlighted and made central in the composite narrative. Consistent with the role of counterstorytelling in critical race methodology (McCoy & Rodgers, 2015; Solórzano & Yosso, 2001), this exercise ensured I could place themes within the context of previous research about the ways racism and other systems of oppression operate in United States.

For example, I asked participants to provide me with examples of how their race and gender impacted their teaching. One participant might have said, “students frequently question my qualifications to teach this course because I am Latina.” This would generate a code of “presumed incompetent.” A second participant might have said, “I spend a lot of time answering questions from students, questioning the validity of the content in my lectures. I doubt they would do this if I wasn’t a Native American woman.” I would code this as “questioning course content.” A final participant might have said, “I have had a few students tell me that my courses are biased in my discussions about racism and sexism because I am a Black woman.” I would assign this quotation a code of “challenging knowledge and worldview.” I would merge these codes into a broader category of “challenging expertise” because they all address students questioning the expertise of faculty members because of their race and gender. Then, because this category had support from three participants, I would identify it as a theme. This theme would then be assigned to document 2 (RQ2), because it most clearly addressed that research question (i.e., anti-essentialism). Anti-essentialism (Wing, 1997) addresses the ways in which the oppressive systems of racism and sexism have historically and continue to work together to impact the everyday experiences, and disrupts the notions of an essential narrative about what it means to be a person of color or a woman. Thus, the theme “challenging expertise” would be made central in the write-up of findings.

While the data analysis process helped to develop themes to answer the research questions, other themes could emerge that were not related to the two tenets and outside of the scope of the study’s research questions. If themes did not relate to Racism as Normal or Anti-
essentialism, I read additional relevant literature to determine if other theories and constructs could help interpret them. This included other ideas central to CRT and CRF, or other theories and constructs not related to them. For example, if multiple participants spoke about their departments being hostile working environments because they had to compete for resources with tenure-track faculty members, I would identify this as a theme of “competition with tenured/tenure-track faculty members.” I would relate this theme to Bolman and Deal’s (2013) “Political Frame” and would use this theory to illustrate how the organizational structure puts the two groups of faculty members in competition over monetary resources to perform their jobs, which led to a hostile work environment. This would then be incorporated into the composite narrative.

Finally, in addition to incorporating relevant literature to interpret themes, I also used my own professional and personal experiences. Building from Strauss and Corbin’s (1990) construct of “theoretical sensitivity” (p. 41), Delgado Bernal (1998) developed the concept of “cultural intuition” to refer to the ways a researcher’s experiences can shed light on the meaning of the data. However, unlike theoretical sensitivity, cultural intuition extends the concept of personal experience to include collective knowledge and memory (Delgado Bernal 1998; Solorzano & Yosso, 2001). This process centers the experiences of people of color and recognizes them as legitimate bearers of knowledge (Solórzano & Yosso, 2001). Thus, my own personal experiences with racism and professional experiences working in higher education shaped how I interpreted themes. In addition to my own experiences, I drew from the stories and shared experiences of family, friends, and professional experiences (Solórzano & Yosso, 2001). For example, if a theme emerged from the data where participants expressed feelings of racism in their job search process, I could relate this theme to my own personal and professional experiences with racism in the job search process, as well as the stories of friends and colleagues. This information could potentially highlight the structural nature of racism in the hiring process at institutions of higher education rather than as simply an individual experience.

In maintaining consistency with critical race methodology, findings were reported as narratives in order to amplify the voices of NTFOCs (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012). The development of composite characters based on research is a way for scholars to put “a human and familiar face to educational theory and practice” (Solórzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001, p. 327). Thus, I developed composite narratives (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002) of participants. These
composite narratives were based upon key themes from the interviews, but also included information from the relevant literature and my personal and professional experiences. The composite narratives contained a story surrounding multiple NTFOCs. Narratives cut across individuals to highlight the ways themes manifested in multiple individuals. Compelling quotes from the interviews were integrated into the composite narratives to illustrate the stories. However, no information that might identify individual participants was included in the narratives.

Composite narratives were shared with participants to solicit feedback to ensure they reflected participants’ meaning, and that they did not have major concerns with my analysis. If a participant strongly disagreed with my analysis, or believed that his/her identity was not protected, I made appropriate changes to the narratives. If there was a disagreement about my analysis, I went back to the data to verify my interpretations and, if I deemed it appropriate and necessary, made subsequent changes. I gave participants one week to review composite narratives. If I did not hear from them after one week, I assumed they had no issues and moved forward with the study.

**Trustworthiness**

Trustworthiness refers to the credibility of results in qualitative research (Creswell, 2014). For this project, I followed appropriate steps to ensure I collected, analyzed, and interpreted information that yielded information that reflected the values and meanings of participants. First, in the data collection process, I made certain to select participants who could provide meaningful information related to the research questions. For this reason, I sought out organizations that were likely to attract faculty members who could speak about their experiences working as a non-tenure-track faculty member (e.g., NFM). By being a part of such organizations, participants had likely thought about issues related to the experiences of non-tenure-track faculty members. I also used the screening tool and initial conversations with the participants to ensure they would make contributions to the study. Thus, participants were primed to contribute meaningful information in the interviews.

Second, I pilot tested the interview protocol. I interviewed three pilot participants prior to the formal collection of data and revised the protocol per their suggestions. This allowed me to ensure that interview questions stimulated relevant and significant responses to the research questions posed in the study (Marshall & Rossman, 2011).
Third, expert review occurred during the review of the protocol. Experts in qualitative research were consulted about the protocol to ensure interview questions would elicit relevant responses. Expert review is another way to enhance trustworthiness (Creswell & Miller, 2000).

Fourth, I performed member checks (Creswell & Miller, 2000). Member checks occur when the researcher shares transcripts and data analyses with participants (Marshall & Rossman, 2011). Member checks occurred after the interviews were transcribed. I also shared composite narratives with participants. This ensured that the data I analyzed were consistent with the meanings participants intended to convey and allowed me to gain additional support for my analysis of the data.

Fifth, I triangulated my results (Creswell, 2014). In the coding process, I did not label language as a theme unless I had support for it in at least three instances. This ensured that themes were based upon reoccurring ideas and concepts from participants. However, if themes did not meet this standard, I ensured they had sufficient support and were necessary to include in the study because of their profound impact as expressed by participants.

Sixth, I compared my themes with my contact summary forms, memos, and audio recordings. As previously mentioned, each of these steps was conducted throughout the data collection and analysis process. Comparing my themes with additional sources verified consistency of findings and ensured I was not imposing my personal ideas and beliefs onto the participants.

Seventh, I grounded my themes in relevant existing theoretical constructs. By comparing my themes to, “Racism is Normal” and “Anti-essentialism,” I ensured consistency across the entire study and that I was answering the research questions. Additionally, comparing other relevant themes to existing theories and constructs provided me with additional ways to interpret the themes and to place them in context with previous research.

Eighth, in keeping with the process of developing a critical race composite narrative, I used my personal and professional experience, as well as the knowledge and experiences of colleagues, friends, and family, to interpret themes (Delgado Bernal, 1998). This ensured that I centered the knowledge of people of color.

Finally, critical race methodology was operationalized throughout the research process. The research and protocol questions highlighted the intercentricity of race and other identities in the experiences of NTFOCs. These questions also challenged the dominant ideology of a
“colorblind” society by asserting the pervasiveness of racism, sexism, and other oppressive systems. Through the member checking process, sensitivity to the vulnerability of NTFOCs, and commitment to improving the working environment for NTFOCs, the research process was social justice oriented. Additionally, findings will be shared with organizations that work to improve conditions of non-tenure-track faculty members of color and faculty members of color. This includes the New Faculty Majority, American Association of University Professors, National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity, contingent faculty unions, as well as institutional leaders. By doing so, the findings can be used to draw attention to the issues most pertinent to NTFOCs and lead to actions, policies, resources that better support NTFOCs. By focusing on the experiences of people of color and employing a counternarrative format, the study centered the lived experience of people of color. Finally, while drawing mostly from higher education research, this project resonated with the idea of transdisciplinarity. The study included participants in multiple academic disciplines and, through the conceptual framework, was informed by the fields of law, sociology, and ethnic studies.

In summary, this study was about NTFOCs and their experiences with racism, and other systems of oppression. I used critical race methodology, which allowed for the amplification of voices of a marginalized group, centered the experiential knowledge of members of this group, and uncovered additional ways that racism and systems of oppression operate at institutions of higher education. Through a rigorous participant sample selection process, I interviewed participants who provided information pertinent to the research questions. Through coding strategies that led to themes, I ensured that the responses of the participants provided rich information to the study that could be reported in composite narratives. Finally, through several techniques to enhance trustworthiness, I made certain that information was reported in a consistent and reliable manner.
CHAPTER FOUR

Summary of Findings

In this chapter, I present revisions to the manner in which I conducted the study, information about participants of the study, as well as an overview of my findings. This chapter serves as a summary of my overall findings and provides context for the subsequent chapters of this dissertation.

My institution offers an option of writing manuscripts that can be submitted for publication in lieu of writing traditional Results and Discussion chapters. I have elected to pursue this option by writing articles on the most compelling of my findings. Therefore, Chapter Five is the first of two manuscripts including references for that article. Chapter Six is the second manuscript, which is also followed by a reference list of sources relevant for the article.

Revisions to the Proposed Study

I made several revisions to the proposed study described in Chapter Three. The first set of revisions related to the research questions posed in the study. I initially proposed the first two research questions as follows:

1. How do NTFOCs experience racism on college campuses?
2. How does the intersection of one’s social identities (e.g., race, gender, etc.) shape the work experiences of NTFOCs?

Upon analysis of the data, however, it became clear that participants often discussed their inability to isolate various forms of oppression. Rather, their experiences with racism, sexism, and sometimes classism and homophobia were all connected. This was particularly true for women of color faculty members who were often unable to distinguish when they faced racism from when they dealt with sexism, as the two systems of oppression work together to shape their experiences. This is consistent with theory of intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1991), which notes the nature of interlocking systems of oppression. Therefore, these two questions were merged into the following research question:

1. What are the ways NTFOCs experience racism, sexism, and other forms of oppression within their workplace?

A small change was made to the remaining of the three original research questions, as well. Initially, that question read, “How do NTFOCs negotiate their experiences with racism and other systems of oppression on their campuses?” To more fully account for the agency exerted
by NTFOCs in their work environments, I added the word “navigate” to this question. I also more prominently foregrounded sexism in the question, to underscore the racialized gendered experiences of women of color faculty members. The (now) second research question in the study thus reads:

2. How do NTFOCs navigate and negotiate their experiences with racism, sexism, and other systems of oppression on their campuses?

The second set of revisions involved the criteria used to select participants for the study. Several changes were made to be more inclusive of the experiences of NTFOCs and to secure a sufficient number of respondents. In Chapter Three, I proposed that participants had to teach at four-year, doctoral, predominantly White institutions of higher education. For the study, I included participants who worked at four-year historically White colleges and universities. The term historically White institutions overlaps with predominantly White institutions (Willie, 2003); however, rather than simply referring to the racial composition of a college or university, the term “historically White college and university” is used “to refer to an institution of higher education whose histories, traditions, symbols, stories, icons, curriculum, and processes were all designed by whites, for whites, to reproduce whiteness via a white experience at the exclusion of others (Brunsma, Brown, & Placier, 2012; p. 719).” This term historically White colleges and university (HWCU) highlights the structural nature of racism and the reproduction of White supremacy at these institutions. As such, there are many institutions that while compositionally are not majority White, were historically created to serve the needs of White students and continue to reproduce whiteness. Thus, using “historically White institution” allowed me to include participants working at a broader group of institutions.

Additionally, I revised the selection criteria to include participants from all four-year institutions rather than simply doctoral institutions. I included individuals who worked at masters and baccalaureate institutions, as well as individuals who worked at liberal arts colleges. While this decision limited the transferability of results, I was able to secure more participants and consider experiences of NTFOCs across institutional types.

In the original proposal, I also stated that participants could not be eligible for tenure or promotion. I changed this requirement to ineligibility for tenure. This change addressed the diversity of working conditions of individuals occupying non-tenure-track positions. It also expanded the pool of potential participants.
I also changed the criteria for length of time that participants had to have worked at an institution. Initially, I sought participants who had worked one year at an institution. I modified this to one academic term (semester or quarter). I made this change in hopes of securing more adjunct professors, who may not have been able to gain consistent work at an institution.

Revisions were also made to the sample selection process. In Chapter Three, I proposed a process of reaching out to the New Faculty Majority for support and subsequently posting my Call for Participants to listservs created to support non-tenure-track faculty members as well as faculty members of color. I had planned on posting my Call for Participants to websites three different times throughout the sample selection process to ensure that I was reaching as many individuals as possible. I began my sample selection process following these steps. However, this initial process did not yield a sufficient number of participants. Consequently, I contacted various academic colleagues, who helped in sending my Call for Participants to individuals who fit the criteria for my study, posted it on their social media sites, and shared it with networks and organizations that support faculty members of color. I also reached out to a prominent academic figure who runs an organization that supports faculty members of color. She posted my Call for Participants to her social media site as well.

Additionally, I received support from the American Associate on University Professors (AAUP). The AAUP is an organization that seeks:

- to advance academic freedom and shared governance; to define fundamental professional values and standards for higher education; to promote the economic security of faculty, academic professionals, graduate students, post-doctoral fellows, and all those engaged in teaching and research in higher education; to help the higher education community organize to make our goals a reality; and to ensure higher education's contribution to the common good (AAUP, 2017)

The AAUP allowed me to place my Call for Participants on the blog for their publication, *Academe*, as a guest author.

Throughout the sample selection process, additional participants were identified via snowball sampling. Snowball sampling connected me to a system-wide campus lecturers’ union. This union placed my Call for Participants in their monthly newsletter. Recruiting participants via organizations and individuals that support faculty members of color and/or non-tenure-track faculty members ensured that potential participants had spent time thinking about issues related to my study and were positioned to provide answers to interview questions. Thus, securing a
sufficient number of respondents for this study, required reaching out to many organizations and individuals. This ultimately, led to a diverse sample of participants who could speak about their experiences.

I also made changes to the consent process. In Chapter Three, I indicated that I would email participants the consent form, have them sign and scan it, and email it back to me. Per the request of Virginia Tech’s Institutional Review Board, I did not ask participants to email the completed form to me. Instead, consent was obtained verbally. I sent participants the consent form when they expressed interest in participating in the study. I gave them several days to review the form. I also sent them a reminder to review the form prior to the interview. At the start of each interview, I asked participants if they had looked over the interviews and obtained consent after they indicated they had done so.

Finally, I made changes to the write-up of findings. In my proposal, I suggested I would write findings using composite narratives. Given the diversity of participant experiences, this approach was not well suited, as I sought to honor the diversity of individual stories and experiences of participants. Thus, findings below are reported in broad themes, that are informed by the experiences of participants.

**Demographic Characteristics of the Sample**

This qualitative study elicited data from NTFOCs working at historically White colleges and universities. There were 24 participants in the study. Table 1 represents demographic data from the participants.

In an online survey, respondents were asked to self-identify their race and gender. Of the 24 participants, nine (37.5%) identified as either Black or African American, six (25.0%) identified as either Asian, Asian American, or South Asian, and six (25.0%) participants identified as Latinx, Latina, or Latino. In addition, three (12.5%) participants noted that they were multiracial. One participant stated she was Native America/White/Latina. Another identified as South Asian and White. A final participant racially identified as multiracial, but in our interview, discussed her Latin American heritage and identified as multiracial to acknowledge the different races that occupy the categories Latinx and Hispanic. Thus, the sample represented a diversity of individuals from various racial groups.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Department(s)</th>
<th>Length of Contract</th>
<th>Institution Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jackie</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Applied Science</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Private; Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa</td>
<td>Hispanic/Latina</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>Semester</td>
<td>Private; Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Public; Highest Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alma</td>
<td>Hispanic/Latina</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Private; Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Public; Highest Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayesha</td>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Private; Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linh</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Private; Liberal Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramon</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>Private; Liberal Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Latinx/Puerto Rican</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Private; Higher Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>Private; Highest Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmen</td>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Public; Highest Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amr</td>
<td>South Asian/White*</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary/Applied Science</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Public; Highest Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Multiple (Humanities/Social Science/Interdisciplinary)</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Public; Highest Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Public; Higher Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriella</td>
<td>Native American/White/Latina</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Private; Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Field</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Public;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marisól</td>
<td>Latina</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>Semester</td>
<td>Private;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Private;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>Semester (ongoing)</td>
<td>Private; Highest Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eun</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Private;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minh</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>Private;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vidya</td>
<td>South Asian</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Private;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Public;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Public;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

*The author altered the category to protect the individual from being identified. The participant was very specific in how he identified which could have made him easier to identify. In order to protect his identity, I selected more general descriptors.*
In terms of gender, eighteen (75%) participants identified as either female or woman. Six (25%) identified as male. The demographic survey asked participants to self-identify their gender, but some participants provided descriptors such as male and female. Although such terms are more accurately used to describe sex than gender, I reported the terms participants provided.

Women were overrepresented in the sample. However, women of color occupy the majority of non-tenure-track positions (56% vs. 44%) (Curtis, 2014). Thus, my sample is reflective of this discrepancy in the non-tenure track population.

Participants also worked in a wide-array of departments. Eleven participants worked in social science fields (45.8%) and were overrepresented in the sample. Five (20.8%) participants worked in humanities based departments, and another five (20.8%) worked in interdisciplinary departments. One (4.2%) participant worked in applied sciences, two (8.3%) taught in multiple departments, and one individual taught in departments that ranged from humanities, social sciences, and interdisciplinary fields. The final respondent taught in an interdisciplinary department as well as an applied science field.

Participants also had a range of contract lengths. The majority of participants (58.3%) held one-year contracts. Three (12.5%) participants were on two-year contracts. Four (16.7%) participants were on three-year contracts. It is common for non-tenure-track positions, particularly part-time faculty members, to have one-semester contracts. Only three (12.5%) participants in the study were on such contracts. Perhaps one-semester employees felt more vulnerable about their employment status or pressed for time, hence were hesitant to participate. It could also be that larger numbers of one-semester employees work at community colleges, not four-year institutions (Curtis, 2014). Either way, this group was underrepresented in the sample (Curtis, 2014).

Participants also represented a wide range of institution types. All institution classifications came from the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education. Nine (37.5%) participants worked at public institutions, while 15 (62.5%) worked at private not-for-profit institutions. Eleven (45.8%) worked at research institutions of varying degrees. Of these eleven participants, seven (63.6%) worked at institutions of highest research activity, two (18.2%) at institutions of higher research activity, and two (18.2%) at institutions of moderate research activity. Of the 24 participants, eight (33.3%) worked at Masters institutions. Four
(16.7%) participants worked at liberal arts institutions. Finally, one (4.2%) participant worked at a baccalaureate institution. In total, although participants came from a variety of institutional types, private institutions were overrepresented in the sample.

Finally, participants worked at institutions from diverse regions of the U.S. I identified seven regions. The largest number of participants, eight (33.3%), worked at institutions located in the northeast. Six participants worked at institutions located in the Midwest (25%). Five (20.8%) participants worked at institutions in the west. Four (16.7%) participants worked at institutions in the southeast. One participant (4.2%) worked at an institution located in the southwest. No participants worked at institutions located in the plains or mountain regions. In general, these 24 respondents were diverse across a wide range of characteristics.

**Overview of Findings**

The primary purpose of this study was to understand the ways racism operate for NTFOCs at historically White institutions colleges and universities. The study was designed to explore how NTFOCs experience forms of oppression in their work and how they negotiate their work experiences. I explored two primary research questions:

1. What are the ways NTFOCs experience racism, sexism, and other forms of oppression within their workplace?
2. How do NTFOCs navigate and negotiate their experiences with racism, sexism, and other forms of oppression on their campuses?

In this section I provide an overview of findings, highlighting themes that respond to each research question.

**Research Question 1: Experiences with Oppression and Marginalization**

The findings related to the first research question appear in Table 2, which is two pages long and should be read from the bottom up. I started by coding all the data and then collapsed those codes into groups for a first iteration of data analysis. Next, I collapsed the groups into categories in the second iteration of data analysis. Finally, I was able to identify themes from those categories and those themes are reflected in the third iteration of data analysis. In this chapter, I describe only the 10 themes related to ways in which NTFOCs oppression and marginalization in the workplace: (a) not treated like a professional; (b) lack of support; (c) formal discrimination; (d) racialized evaluations; (e) racialized and gendered microaggressions;
RQ 1: What are the ways NTFOCs experience racism, sexism, and other forms of oppression and marginalization within their workplace?

### Table 2

**Table of Themes for First Research Question**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Third Iteration: Themes</th>
<th>Second Iteration: Category Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Not Treated Like a Professional</td>
<td>1a. Being Ignored in Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lack of Support</td>
<td>1b. Not Being Included in Department Events/Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Formal Discrimination</td>
<td>1c. Asked to Do Non-Faculty Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1d. Infantilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1e. Not Viewed as Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2a. Not Being Believed by Colleagues About Student Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2b. Lack of Mentorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Formal Discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Racialized Student Criticisms</td>
<td>4a. Accusation of Promoting Personal Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Racialized and Gendered Microaggressions</td>
<td>4b. Critique of Being Biased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Feeling unsafe in the classroom</td>
<td>5a. Racialized and Gendered Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Unpaid Labor</td>
<td>5b. Challenges from White Male Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Fear of Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7a. Supporting Marginalized Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7b. Teaching Faculty Members About Race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7c. Service Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Balancing Job Responsibilities</td>
<td>8a. High Teaching Load/No Time for Publishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Lack of Resources</td>
<td>8b. Needing Time for Job Search</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Different Treatment than White Colleagues</td>
<td>8c. Motherhood and Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9a. Exclusions from Financial Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9b. Non-Financial Exclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10a. Holding faculty of color to harsher standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10b. More respect for White faculty members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First Iteration: Examples of Groupings of Initial Codes

1a. Ignored by other faculty members
1a. Feeling invisible in department
1b. Not invited to department work events
1b. Not invited to department social events
1b. No communication about positions
1c. Asked to do work of administrative assistant
1c. Asked to babysit
1d. Referred to as a child because of age, race, gender, and height
1d. Referred to as a graduate student
1e. Not asked for opinions about supporting students
1e. Not acknowledged as a researcher
2a. Directors dismissing claims about potential student violence
2a. Faculty members not believing claims of student disrespect
2b. No formal mentorship for opportunities
2b. Not receiving mentorship from colleagues
3. Less qualified White male given tenure-track position
4a. “Making them hate White people”
4a. “Talking about superiority” of people of color
4b. Race makes them “biased” about material
4b. Accused of not presenting conservative viewpoints
5a. Students make anti-Muslim comments
5b. Reinforcing racial stereotype
5c. Point out mistakes in the syllabus
5c. Frequent arguments with faculty members
6. Student behavior causing others to feel unsafe
6. Threatening communication from students
7a. Supporting well-being of marginalized students
7a. Promoting academic success of students of color
7b. Sounding board about race
7b. Leading department workshops on race
7c. Serving on committee to serve diversity needs
7c. Doing additional service work because of desire for TT position
8a. High teaching load makes it difficult to do research
8a. Needing to do twice as much work to get a tenure-track position
8b. Need time to apply for jobs
8b. Struggle to have classes covered when going on campus interviews
8c. No time to do research due to balancing work and family life
8c. Department scheduling things at bad times
8c. Can’t move family, so is limited in job search
9a. Needing summer money
9a. Not eligible for grants
9b. Can’t participate in professional development workshops
9b. Not able to sit on certain committees
10a. Complaints about policies that are easier/same as White male colleagues’
10a. Complain about difficulty of faculty of color
10b. Challenging and disrespecting faculty members of color
10b. Showing greater deference towards White male faculty members

*Meant to be read from the bottom up.*
(f) feeling unsafe in the classroom; (g) unpaid labor; (h) balancing job responsibilities; (i) lack of resources; (j) different treatment than White colleagues.

Not treated like a professional. While some participants described positive interactions with their colleagues, many NTFOCs felt they were not often treated as professionals by their colleagues. First, respondents reported that they were ignored by their colleagues. Some even mentioned that they did not receive departmental communications or invitations to various events hosted by their department. Some highlighted how they were asked by their colleagues to perform non-academic work, including the work of administrative assistants because they were assumed not to be busy. In one case, a respondent was asked on multiple occasions to babysit for a program director. Second, many participants also described feelings of infantilization. They were often confused with students, or treated as if they were young and unknowledgeable about academe. Finally, many participants described being viewed as a non-academic by their tenure-track and tenured colleagues. This manifested in never being asked about their research or about their opinions regarding ways to support the students in their department.

Lack of support. NTFOCs often described a lack of support from colleagues in their department. This lack of support took two forms. The first was not being believed when they reached out for support from departmental colleagues regarding inappropriate student behaviors. In such cases, colleagues did not believe them and/or they were not given the support to address such matters. The second form involved a lack of mentorship or assistance in navigating the institution from their tenured and tenure-track colleagues. Faculty members of color are less likely to receive mentorship (Turner, Myers, & Creswell, 1999), which impacts their ability to navigate and succeed in academe. In a similar vein, this lack of mentorship contributed to NTFOCs’ marginalization in their positions.

Formal discrimination. Most NTFOCs described how they faced more subtle forms of everyday racism. However, there were instances of formal discrimination. This took the form of positions given to White male faculty members who were less qualified than the NTFOC. Such discrimination resulted in NTFOCs not receiving additional financial benefits and/or greater job security.

Racialized evaluations. One of the major ways that NTFOCs described experiencing racism from their students was through student evaluations. In these evaluations, students often reported that NTFOCs had a personal agenda. This included invalid criticisms that they were
making students “hate White people” or “talking about the superiority of people of color” because the NTFOC talked about issues of race, White privilege and White supremacy. Similarly, students criticized NTFOCs alleging that they were biased in their material because they presented alternative forms of knowledge that challenged knowledge that centered whiteness and White supremacy.

**Racialized and gendered microaggressions.** NTFOCs frequently experienced microaggressions couched in racism and sexism. This was most evident in two ways. The first way this disrespect emerged was through comments from students towards NTFOCs that reinforced racialized and gendered stereotypes. Many NTFOCs, particularly women, described being frequently challenged in class by White male students. Students often pointed out mistakes by the NTFOCs or challenging the accuracy of the information presented in class. This is consistent with the research where women of color faculty are more likely to be challenged in the classroom than their White male counterparts (Pittman, 2010; Tuitt et al., 2009). Second, NTFOCs also described microaggressions by faculty colleagues as well. These were comments that while subtle in nature, often reinforced certain racialized and gendered stereotypes.

**Feeling unsafe in the classroom.** In one of the most concerning themes, many women NTFOCs described feeling unsafe in their classrooms because of expressed threats of violence from White male students. Students exhibited intentionally disruptive behavior in the classroom and challenged the authority of women NTFOCs. White male students also communicated threatening behavior in their verbal interactions, via email messages, or using their physical presence to intimidate NTFOCs. These racialized and gendered threats of violence often led NTFOCs to feel at risk in their work environments and that impacted the learning environment for students.

**Unpaid labor.** The seventh theme related to the significant amount of unpaid work that NTFOCs performed. Although this theme was reflective of nearly all participants, the nature of this work was highly gendered. The participants of the study described a passion for and personal goal of supporting marginalized students on campus. For many participants, being a role model for and supporting the academic success of students of color, first-generation, low-income, and LGBTQ students was a motivating factor in entering the professoriate. They found this work to be necessary and rewarding. However, participants described experiences where
because there were so few faculty members of color at their institution, they spent a significant portion of time meeting with students from marginalized communities who saw them as role models and support systems while navigating a hostile racial climate. NTFOCs were typically not paid for this work.

NTFOCs also described spending time teaching departmental colleagues about race, and diversity and inclusion efforts. This took place in formal and informal ways. Formally, some participants described leading workshops related to diversity in their field. Informally, several participants spoke about White colleagues approaching them to learn more about racism and seeking suggestion on how to become a better ally. This was most poignant following the results of the 2016 presidential election.

Finally, participants, particularly but not limited to those who had longer-term contracts, often described being inundated with service work. These assignments were described as work that tenure-track and tenured faculty members did not want to do. Additionally, they were called upon to do service work in order for the university to fulfill its diversity goals. Thus, even though they were not tenure-track or tenured faculty members, they were placed on service committees because the institution lacked enough tenure-track and tenured faculty members of color to achieve racial diversity on many committees and task forces.

**Balancing job responsibilities.** Respondents described difficulties managing the various aspects of their work. Many described large teaching loads, which made it difficult for them to have time for research and publishing, achievements necessary to secure a tenure-track position. In addition to high teaching loads, NTFOCs needed time to apply for jobs. Because their job contracts were not secure and they desired positions with more permanent contracts or tenure-track positions, applying for jobs was necessary. Finally, participants who were mothers described challenges balancing motherhood with their work. They found it difficult to find time for research. Additionally, many described departments that they believed were not supportive of their roles as a mother, including scheduling events early in the morning or late in the evening, times that conflicted with their roles as mothers. Finally, participants who were mothers described the difficulties associated with a national job search that might involve moving out of the area and uprooting a family. In some cases, these participants could not move due to custody disputes.
Lack of resources. NTFOCs also lacked resources in their positions. This took place most notably in terms of financial exclusions. Some participants on shorter contracts were not eligible for funding during the summer, which imposed a financial strain. In terms of professional opportunities, many participants lacked access to grants for research. Participants also described lacking non-financial resources. Most important, many were excluded from participating in on-campus professional development opportunities, including teaching workshops. They were also not allowed to sit on certain committees. While some participants expressed relief in not sitting on certain committees, others described it as hurtful that they could not contribute their knowledge or expertise to the broader community simply because of their employment status.

Different treatment than White colleagues. Finally, participants often spoke about being treated differently than White male colleagues. This was evident in two ways. First, students often complained about the classroom policies of NTFOCs, but not the harsher policies of White male tenured faculty members. Secondly, participants stated that they believed students also showed greater respect in class towards White male faculty members than NTFOCs. This meant to that they were more likely to be challenged and disrespected by students in their classroom.

Research Question 2: Negotiating Experiences

The second research question in the study focused on how NTFOCs navigated and negotiated their experiences with racism and other systems of oppression. I used the same data analysis process as I used for the first research question. This analysis resulted in four major themes: (a) relying on systems of support; (b) negotiating speaking out against forms of oppression; (c) disclosing personal information; (d) deciding how to interact with department/program colleagues. Table 3 summarizes the three iterations of data analysis and should be read from bottom to top. Overall, the analysis revealed that NTFOCs negotiate many decisions that must balance protecting self, standing up for beliefs, and the reality of their contingent contract status. Navigating these tensions had impacts on their work in the classroom and how they approached their search for more stable work contracts.

Relying on support systems. One of the critical ways that NTFOCs described navigating their work was through support systems. For some, department chairs mentored and advocated
RQ2: How do NTFOCs navigate and negotiate their experiences with racism, sexism, and other systems of oppression on their campuses?

**Table 3**

*Table of Themes for Second Research Question*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Third Iteration: Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Relying on Systems of Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Negotiating Speaking Out Against Forms of Oppression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Disclosing Personal Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Intentionality of Interactions with Department/Program Colleagues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second Iteration: Category Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a. Support of Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. Outside Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Support of Colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d. Institutional Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Fear of Losing Job Due to Contact Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Personal Motivating Factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c. Support within Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a. Explaining Contingent Status to Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. Fear of Sharing Personal Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c. Sharing Personal Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. Limiting Interactions with Colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. Forging Connections with Colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c. Trying to Appear Friendly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Iteration: Examples of Groupings of Initial Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a. Chair advocating for additional resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a. Chair proactively addressing issues of racism/sexism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a. Chair advising on how to use time efficiently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Must discuss power and oppression with students because no one else will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Commitment to standing up for marginalized students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Feeling comfortable with approach in calling out oppression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Remaining silent to protect self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c. Uses picture of family in class to show diversity of family, to indicate support for all students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c. Share personal information to remove power dynamics in classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Continued on next page)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. Keeping distance creates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1b. Informal network of scholars in field
1b. Using online communities for support
1b. Attending national conferences
1b. Using national fellowship/professional development networks

1c. Colleagues sharing syllabi
1c. Colleagues offering emotional support
1c. Colleagues provide mentorship

1d. Ability to access research funding
1d. Accessing funds for conference travel
1d. Union support

2a. Speaking out may lead to a layoff
2a. Not colleagues to turn on them
2a. Believe must always reaffirm students to avoid bad evals
2a. Fearing negative student evals will hurt job prospects

2c. Colleagues respond positively when racism is called out
2c. Support of chair in correcting students
2c. Colleagues are committed to diversity and inclusion work

2d. Spends more time as NTT assuaging students, for fear of getting a negative evaluation
2d. Would be more vocal if in a tenure-track or tenured position.

3a. Tells students about status and working conditions
3a. Tells students about status by setting boundaries on responsibilities
3a. Students learn about status when faculty are leaving

3b. Afraid of disclosing information can have negative consequences
3b. Does not talk about identity with students

4a. Doesn’t like to leave office to protect self
4a. Doesn’t invest a lot of time into relationships

4b. Builds community with others
4b. Has regular informal meetings with colleagues

4c. Tries to be “superfriendly” with others
4c. Smiles a lot as a strategy to appear friendly

*Meant to be read from the bottom up
for them. Many NTFOCs also relied on support from others outside of their institution. This included colleagues in their field at other institutions and at national conferences. Many participants also used online communities of people in similar situations as a source of support. Some NTFOCs relied on the support from colleagues within their department. They described experiences where colleagues mentored them and cared about their personal well-being. Finally, respondents also relied on institutional resources for support. In some cases, NTFOCs were able to access research funds as well as funds for conference travel. Finally, some participants had access to unions that they sought out to advocate for greater resources.

**Negotiating speaking out against forms of oppression.** One of the critical tensions for participants was navigating how they could speak out against forms of oppression in their work. Participants were committed to challenging racism and other forms of oppression in their department and in the classroom, but struggled to negotiate this given their status. Many NTFOCs described a fear of speaking out. Because of their status, they feared their contract would not be renewed or they could be laid off. Others feared challenging students because that might trigger negative student evaluations that could impact their contract and as well as potential future employment opportunities. Some respondents readily and openly spoke out because they felt a personal obligation to call out these injustices and were willing to live with the potential consequences. They believed this was a central component of their job and did not have much confidence that students would get this knowledge from other faculty members in their department. Those participants who felt comfortable verbalizing their concerns often had the support of their departments, either by knowing their colleagues would be receptive to what they had to say or the support of the chair when challenging students. Finally, participants acknowledged that their status impacted how they responded to situations.

It is critical to note that many participants said they would be more willing to challenge various forms of oppression if tenured. While some noted they would feel more comfortable speaking out if on the tenure-track, others noted they might also be hesitant to speak out at that stage because it might compromise their bid for tenure.

**Disclosing personal information.** The third theme related to how NTFOCs negotiated revealing certain information to students. Some participants described revealing their employment status to students. Most explained that students were unaware of the contingent status of NTFOCs. They revealed this information in three ways. First, some were upfront with
this information and felt it important for students to know the realities of their instructor’s life. Second, some revealed their status when setting boundaries with students, often referring to what they would and would not do because it was not in their contract (e.g., attending events, providing additional non-academic support). Finally, NTFOCs revealed this information to students upon their departure. This either came up when students did not see them on the schedule of classes for the following semester, or if students asked for support the following year and the NTFOC could not commit to it.

Respondents were hesitant to reveal personal information. As faculty members of color, many felt they were asked and expected to reveal information about themselves. Some participants felt reticent to do this as they thought revealing too much personal information could harm them, as such information could lead to certain biases colleagues or students had about them. Additionally, they wanted to lead with their identity as a faculty member, thus revealing personal information could distort that perception. However, some willingly shared personal information with students. This was often done to try to prevent students from making claims about bias against them and to protect their identity. For male respondents, this was also done as a way to diminish power dynamics in the classroom.

Deciding how to interact with department/program colleagues. Finally, NTFOCs were intentional in the ways they interacted with colleagues. Many participants described avoiding their colleagues in order to feel safe in their environment. Less frequently, NTFOCs forged relationships with their colleagues. Building these relationships helped them to form community and to navigate the institution. Finally, participants described simply trying to appear friendly with colleagues. They expressed little interest in forging meaningful relationships with colleagues, but tried to remain friendly and smile so as to not appear antagonistic towards colleagues.

This, then, summarizes the themes associated with the two revised research questions posed in the study. The most compelling results, however, related to NTFOCs experiences with racism and other forms of oppression, and how they were asked to take on abundant service responsibilities. Consequently, I chose to write one manuscript about the various ways NTFOCs experienced racism and sexism in their classroom environments, and that appears in Chapter Five. The second manuscript on how NTFOCs faced cultural taxation appears in Chapter Six. In each manuscript, I discuss the implications for future practice, policy, and research.
CHAPTER FIVE

“I’m constantly having to think about my contingent status”: The racialized and gendered experiences of non-tenure-track faculty members of color in classroom spaces

Abstract: Using critical race theory and critical race feminism, this qualitative study examined the ways non-tenure-track faculty members of color (NTFOCs) experienced racism and sexism in their classroom environment. The sample consisted of 24 NTFOCs who worked at four-year historically White colleges and universities. Findings revealed that NTFOCs experienced racism and sexism in their classrooms in three ways: racialized evaluations, different treatment than White colleagues, and feeling unsafe in the classroom. Findings have major implications for practice and future research.

On May 6, 2012, The Chronicle of Higher Education published an article that followed Melissa Bruninga-Matteau, a recent Ph.D. recipient in medieval history and adjunct faculty member who received government assistance due to her low wages (Patton, 2012). Dr. Bruninga-Matteau, a 43-year old single mother, earned $900 a month teaching two classes at a college in Arizona, not nearly enough to cover her living expenses. Her story is not unique. As of 2015, approximately 70% of faculty members were in non-tenure-track positions (Unites States Government Accountability Office, 2017). From 2009-2011, 25% of part-time college faculty were enrolled in at least one government assistance program (Jacobs, Perry, & MacGillvary, 2015).

Dr. Bruninga-Matteau’s situation gained national attention by highlighting the horrid living conditions of many adjunct faculty members. In the same article, Patton (2012) interviewed Kisha Hawkins-Sledge, a Black single mother of twin boys and part-time faculty member at Prairie View State College. Like Bruninga-Matteau, Hawkins-Sledge did not make enough money to support her family and was also on government assistance. Most striking about her experience were her thoughts about the role her race and gender played in her life:

My name is Kisha. You hear that name and you think black girl, big hoop earrings, on welfare, three or four babies' daddies... I had to work against my color, my flesh, and my name alone. I went to school to get all these degrees to prove to the rest of the world that I'm not lazy and I'm not on welfare. But there I was and I asked myself, 'What's the point? I'm here anyway.'
Hawkins-Sledge was fighting for a job with financial resources and security denied to her in her part-time, non-tenure-track position. She perceived racism and gendered racial stereotypes as pivotal elements to this fight. Arguably, her sentiments are central to understanding the experiences of non-tenure-track faculty members of color (NTFOCs).

The research about non-tenure-track faculty members has clearly illuminated the financial inequities associated with these positions (Allison, Lynn, & Hovermann, 2014; Coalition on the Academic Workforce, 2012; Shulman et al., 2016) as well as the troubling conditions in which some non-tenure-track faculty members work (Kezar, 2012; National Institute for Learning Outcomes, 2014). This scholarship has highlighted the need for more equitable treatment for non-tenure-track faculty members. Little is known, however, about the experiences of non-tenure-track faculty members of color.¹ Faculty members of color make up 19% of the non-tenure-track workforce (Curtis, 2014)² and Black, Latinx, and Native American are overrepresented in these positions (Finkelstein, Conley, & Schuster, 2016). Approximately 78% of African American faculty members, 72% of Latinx faculty members, 74% of Native American, and 56.5% of Asian/Asian American faculty members in all institutions of higher education are in non-tenure-track positions, with women of color occupying the majority of these positions (Curtis, 2014). These numbers do not tell the entire story about racism in the experiences of NTFOCs, however.

Race is a principal organizing characteristic in society (Omi & Winant, 2014). It is “a concept that signifies and symbolizes social conflicts and interests by referring to different types of human bodies” (Omi & Winant, 2014, p. 110) and is rooted in historical and social processes, rather than biological terms (Omi & Winant, 2014). Additionally, racism is:

individual actions (both intentional and unconscious) that engender marginalization and inflict varying degrees of harm on minoritized persons; structures that determine and

¹ I recognize that there are many terms for non-tenure-track faculty members, and a diversity of experiences and conditions represented in each label. I have chosen to use the label non-tenure-track faculty members to refer to this group. This label is broad enough to encapsulate the varied experiences of participants of this study. When appropriate, I will distinguish between part-time and full-time faculty members. But when using the term non-tenure-track faculty members, I am referring to this broader group of individuals.

² Faculty members of color includes those that identify as Asian or Asian American, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, American Indian or Alaskan Native, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, and Two or More Races.
Harper’s definition notes how racism occurs in individual interactions, within societal structures and institutional norms and practices. It allows for an examination of the impact of racism on an individual, while noting how institutions of higher education have and continue to perpetuate racism (Patton, 2015). However, one cannot assume an essentialized experience with racism (Wing, 2015). For women of color, the intersection of experiences with racism and sexism cannot be separated, and are vital for any study about racism (Crenshaw, 1991; Wing, 1997). As such, a study of racism must account for the racialized gendered experiences of women of color.

This qualitative study centered the experiences of NTFOCs and addressed the following research question: what are the ways NTFOCs experience racism and sexism in their classroom environments? I focused on classroom environments because teaching is the primary work of many of non-tenure track faculty members (National Institute of Learning Outcomes, 2014). To answer the research question, I conducted interviews with 24 NTFOCs working at historically White colleges and universities across the nation. I begin by describing critical race theory and critical race feminism, the conceptual frameworks I used to highlight the persistent nature of racism and sexism in shaping the experiences of NTFOCs. I then offer an overview of the literature pertaining to the working conditions of non-tenure-track faculty members to highlight their work environment and conditions, while also noting the ways this literature has not accounted for the racialized, gendered experiences of NTFOCs. I also discuss relevant literature about the experiences of faculty members of color, including women faculty of color. This is followed by a description of the research design before offering findings of the study. I conclude with a discussion of the findings as well as the study’s limitations and implications for practice and research.

**Theoretical Framework: Critical Race Theory and Critical Race Feminism**

This study is guided by critical race theory (CRT) and critical race feminism (CRF). Together these theoretical foundations provide a useful framework for understanding the ways NTFOCs experience racism and sexism in classroom spaces.
Critical Race Theory

Critical race theory (CRT) reflects a social justice orientation that seeks to eradicate systems of oppression (Dixson & Rousseau, 2005; Lawrence, Matsuda, Delgado, & Crenshaw, 1993; McCoy & Rodricks, 2015). CRT has its roots in the work of legal scholars such as Derrick Bell, Lanier Guinier, Charles Lawrence, Kimberlé Crenshaw among others, who were frustrated with the lack of progress of the Civil Rights Movement in uprooting racial inequality (Taylor, 2009). The early founders of CRT were also influenced by critical legal studies (CLS) and the idea that the law was created to maintain existing power structures. However, they were frustrated with CLS scholars’ lack of attention to racism. This spawned the creation of CRT (Taylor, 2009).

There are seven key tenets of CRT: (a) racism as normal, or the idea that racism is engrained in structures and is a part of everyday occurrences; (b) interest convergence, or the idea that racial progress is only made when challenges to racism only overlap with the interest of Whites (Bell, 1980); (c) intersectionality, or the way interlocking systems of oppression work together to shape the experiences of individuals (Crenshaw, 1991); (d) whiteness as property, or whiteness as a form of property that Whites seek to protect (Harris, 1993); (e) counterstorytelling, using the stories of communities of color to challenge dominant narratives (Solórzano & Yosso, 2001); (f) challenge to liberalism or a challenge to the concepts of colorblindness, neutrality, objectivity, and meritocracy in law (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012; McCoy & Rodricks, 2015; Lawrence et al., 1993); (g) action-orientation, or the idea that CRT research must lead to action that supports efforts to eradicate racism and other forms of oppression (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004).

Although grounded in legal scholarship, CRT has expanded to the field of education. Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995) were the first to advocate using CRT in education research. They argued for a complete restructuring of the education system that pays attention to racial inequities. Since then, CRT has become an important framework for highlighting racism in K-12 systems of education, as well as higher education. In particular, it has been used to illuminate the impact of racism on the careers and work conditions of faculty members of color, including racism in their department (Diggs, Garrison-Wade, Estrada, & Gallindo, 2009), and having their scholarship devalued (Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002). As such, CRT is an appropriate
framework for this study given that it can be used to challenge dominant systems of oppression and offers insight into the ways racism impacts the experiences of NTFOCs.

**Critical Race Feminism**

Critical race feminism (CRF) is a movement that centers the experiences of women of color. It builds from CLS, CRT, and feminist jurisprudence (Wing, 2015), but CRF offers critiques of each. Similar to CRT scholars, CRF scholars contend that CLS scholars did not adequately account for the experiences of women of color (Wing, 2015). CRF is a part of the CRT movement, that seeks to uproot racism and systems of oppression (Pratt-Clarke, 2010; Wing, 1997). However, CRF focuses on gender, criticizing CRT research as not adequately accounting for the experiences of women of color (Wing, 2015). CRF is also influenced by the work of feminist jurisprudence by paying attention to gender and patriarchy in the law. However, many CRF scholars felt that feminist jurisprudence highlighted the experiences of upper-class White women and often excluded the experiences of women of color (Wing, 2015).

CRF is not simply about critiquing existing theoretical frameworks; it has offered its own unique analytical frame. This is most notable is the theoretical concept of anti-essentialism, which looks at the intersection of race and gender identities rather than assuming an essentialized voice for women or people of color. This also comes from Crenshaw’s concept of intersectionality (1991). CRF forces attention to the way racism, sexism, and classism are widespread and cannot be delineated (Wing, 2015).

CRF has been used to highlight the experiences of women faculty members of color with racism and sexism in higher education. This has included illuminating the barriers faced by Black women who achieved the status of professor (Croom, 2017) and the lived experiences of women faculty members of color at PWIs (Turner, González, & Wong, 2011). CRF is a useful tool when examining the challenges faced by women faculty members of color and could be useful as a theoretical framework to examine the experiences of NTFOCs. Additionally, given that women of color occupy non-tenure-track positions in significantly higher numbers than men (United States Government Accountability Office, 2014), CRF becomes an appropriate framework to use for this study. CRF allows for an examination of the way racism and sexism intersect as systems of oppression.

In this study, I draw upon specific aspects of each theory. CRT is used to note the permanence and ordinary nature of racism and as a way to reject the colorblind notions of racism
articulated by the students. From CRF, I employ anti-essentialism by noting how racism and sexism intersect to shape experiences women NTFOCs in unique ways. Taken together, these allow for the centering of NTFOCs and note the systems of oppression that impact their work experiences. Additionally, they elicit a call to action to improve the conditions for NTFOCs. Thus, these two theoretical frameworks complemented each other in framing this study.

**Literature Review**

Two bodies of work informed the study. The first was about the experiences of non-tenure-track faculty members, highlighting their increased presence on college and university campuses, and their working conditions. The second examined the experiences of faculty members of color, including women faculty members of color, with racism and sexism. Examining these two bodies of research revealed that there is little research about the experiences of NTFOCs and in particular, the ways racism and sexism shape their experiences.

**Research About Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members**

The number of non-tenure-track faculty members has rapidly increased over the past 40 years. Currently, non-tenure-track faculty members account for over 70% of all faculty positions at institutions of higher education (United States Government Accountability Office, 2017), up from nearly 44% in 1975 (Curtis, 2014). These numbers include both part-time and full-time appointments. While such positions have been a part of the faculty structure for quite some time, the number of non-tenure-track employees has grown due to two major occurrences. The first involved federal efforts in the 1960s to expand access to institutions of higher education to the masses (Kezar & Sam, 2010). Part-time faculty members were hired in large numbers to help meet the demands for instructors (Kezar & Sam, 2010). The second growth spurt occurred in the 1990s following state budget shortfalls. As a consequence of budget constraints and the increased corporatization of higher education, colleges and universities increasingly began to rely upon non-tenure-track faculty members (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Kezar & Sam, 2010; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004).

Overall, administrative leaders have hired non-tenure-track laborers in increased numbers for two reasons. First, they are cheaper to hire than tenured and tenure-track faculty members (Hollenshead et al, 2007; National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment, 2014). This has allowed institutions to reduce costs, which was important during periods of budget shortfalls. Second, they provided increased flexibility. Non-tenure-track faculty members can be hired
rather quickly in order to account for the changes in demands for certain classes and majors. In
addition, they can shoulder heavier teaching loads than tenured/tenure-track faculty members,
particularly full-time non-tenure-track faculty members (Brennan & Magness, 2016; Ehrenberg
& Zhang, 2005). In essence, their work has offset the higher salaries, benefits, and lighter
teaching loads of tenured and tenure-track faculty members (Benjamin, 2002; Brennan &
Magness, 2016; Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2005).

Working conditions of non-tenure-track faculty members. Although hiring additional
non-tenure-track faculty members may have increased cost efficiency and administrative
flexibility, institutional stakeholders have recognized the negative impacts of the changing
employment patterns on the professoriate writ-large (Maxey & Kezar, 2015). Non-tenure-track
faculty members are underpaid relative to their tenured and tenure-track colleagues (Government
Accountability Office, 2017). Part-time faculty members made $20,508 on average for the 2016-
2017 academic year, compared to $80,095 for ranked (tenure-track and tenured) professors
(Shulman et al., 2017). These numbers do not include the costs of benefits such as health care,
retirement, and professional development funds for which part-time faculty members are usually
ineligible. The situation is better for instructors and lecturers, two designations that are usually
not tenure-eligible and (based upon the data) are assumed to be full-time. Their average salary
was $55,405 and $58,875 respectively (Shulman et al, 2017), still significantly lower than
tenured and tenure-track faculty members. These salaries can vary dramatically depending upon
the institutional type, location, and discipline and do not include potential differences in types of
benefits.

Beyond the immense financial disparity, non-tenure-track faculty members are often
placed in porous working conditions. Many are not provided with proper resources to perform
their job, including necessities such as office space (National Institute for Learning Outcomes
Assessment, 2014). Lacking an office can make it difficult to meet with students particularly
when students need to discuss personal or confidential issues. Few are awarded professional
development funds that can be used to improve their teaching praxis (National Institute for
Learning Outcomes Assessment, 2014). For others, gaining access to simple resources such as a
photocopy machine can be a challenge (Navarro, 2017). Many describe feelings of isolation and
marginalization in their departments (Allison, Lynn, & Hoverman, 2014; Kezar, 2012; National
Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment, 2014). This includes being ignored by colleagues,
not being recognized as equals with tenure-eligible faculty members, and not being viewed as making valuable contributions to the department. Additionally, for some, the lack of job security has had a serious impact upon their psychological and emotional well-being (Navarro, 2017). These realities paint a grim picture of the conditions of many non-tenure-track faculty members.

**The Experiences of Faculty Members of Color**

Racism can have a direct bearing upon faculty members of color. It impacts their ability to perform their work and overall satisfaction in their workplaces (Jayakumar, Howard, Allen, & Han, 2009; Stanley, 2006; Turner, González, & Wood, 2008). The racial climate also has an impact upon overall recruitment and retention of faculty members of color (Fries-Britt, Rowan Kenyon, Perna, Milem, & Howard, 2011). A negative racial climate can push faculty members of color out of an institution (Fries-Britt et al., 2011) illustrating the importance that racial climate and experiences with racism have on the work lives of faculty members of color.

Faculty members of color encounter racism in myriad ways in their work environments. One of these is in their classroom spaces. Faculty members of color are more likely to be challenged by students in the classroom than their White counterparts (Stanley, 2006; Tuitt, Hanna, Martinez, Salazar, & Griffin, 2009). White students often question faculty members of color regarding their authority in the classroom and their general knowledge regarding subject matter (Stanley, 2006; Tuitt et al, 2009). This is particularly the case for women faculty members of color, who are often presumed to be ineffectual and must prove that they are experts in their field (Pittman, 2010; Harris & González, 2012). As a result, women faculty members of color spend significantly more time preparing for class than their White counterparts (Pittman, 2010, Lazos, 2012). Despite this additional work, faculty members of color are more likely to receive lower teaching evaluations than their White colleagues (Huston, 2005; Reid, 2010). For example, Black and Asian faculty members are evaluated lower than their White counterparts in terms of quality (Reid, 2010). Women of color are doubly impacted by this phenomenon, as women are likely to receive lower teaching evaluations than men (Boring, Ottoboni, & Stark, 2016; Huston, 2005).

Part of the reason faculty members of color are likely to experience racism in the classroom stems from their low numbers at four year institutions. Approximately 19% of faculty members at four-year institutions of higher education are people of color (Myers, 2016). Women faculty members of color make up just under 8% of all faculty members (Myers, 2016). These
numbers can be even lower at smaller, non-research institutions (Myers, 2016). This means that students rarely (if ever) have classes taught by faculty members of color. Students bring their own explicit and implicit biases and stereotypes about the intellectual inferiority of faculty members of color, which can lead to them to question and challenge the expertise of those teachers (Lugo-Lugo, 2012).

The low numbers of faculty members of color influences how they navigate such environments. Many such faculty members feel isolated (Diggs et al, 2009; Stanley, 2006) and do not having sufficient mentoring from colleagues who can relate to their experiences (Zambrana et al., 2015). Thus, without adequate patronage, faculty members of color may struggle to navigate their environment and find spaces where they are supported in facing racism in the classroom.

Clearly, the research on faculty members of color reveals that they experience racism in their classroom experiences. However, those studies have largely reflected the experiences of faculty members of color who are in tenured and tenure-track appointments, despite the fact that faculty members of color and most notably women of color remain exploited in the systems of faculty labor (Duncan, 2014; Navarro, 2017). As noted, faculty members of color are far more likely to occupy non-tenure-track positions (Curtis, 2014; Finkelstein et al, 2016). Given that classroom environments are where non-tenure-track faculty members send a significant portion of their time, it is critical to examine the ways NTFOCs experience racism in their classroom environments.

**Research Design**

This study was informed by critical race methodology. Critical race methodology “is a theoretically grounded approach to research” (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002, p. 24). It “foregrounds race and racism in all aspects of the research process” (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002, p. 24) while noting how race, class, and gender intersect to shape the experiences of people of color. In centering the experiences of people of color and sharing their stories, critical race methodology seeks to challenge dominant narratives and epistemologies (Solórzano & Yosso, 2001; Solórzano & Yosso, 2002). Finally, critical race methodology must be grounded in action that fosters solutions about uprooting racism and oppression in society (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002). As such, this study follows a critical race methodology by foregrounding racism and other systems of oppression in each phase of the research process, sharing the stories of NTFOCs and how they
experience racism, and by leading to a call to action to create environments that support the work and lives of NTFOCs.

**Sampling Procedure**

Purposeful sampling was used to identify and select participants in this study. To participate in the study, participants had to meet six criteria. First, in centering the experiences of people of color, participants had to identify with one or more of the following racial/ethnic groups: American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian or Asian American, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latinx, Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian, or two or more races. Second, participants could not be eligible for tenure in their current positions. Third, they had to work at a four-year, historically White colleges or university. By requiring participants to work at institutions that were created to serve White students, and particularly White men (Brunsma, Brown, & Placier, 2012), I ensured that respondents worked in an environment where they could speak about their broad experiences with racism.

Fourth, participants had to teach classes as a part of their contract. Non-tenure-track faculty members can have a wide range of job responsibilities (National Institute for Learning Outcomes 2014). However, because this study was about racism in the classroom, it was essential that all participants serve in teaching capacities.

Fifth, participants had to be in at least their second academic term (semester or quarter) at the same institution. This ensured that they had been at an institution long enough so that they had experiences to discuss. This criterion was also put in place to account for the experiences of adjunct faculty members who may not be at institutions for longer periods of time due to the short nature of their contracts.

Finally, participants had to be “aspiring academics” (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Aspiring academics are non-tenure-track faculty members who are seeking more permanent academic positions, such as a tenure-track position. This criterion was put in place because motivation for having a position can influence one’s experience in the job.

Participants were identified by contacting organizations that worked with non-tenure-track faculty members as well as organizations and programs that supported faculty members of color. These groups posted my call for participants through their websites lists, blogs and social media spaces. I also reached out to colleagues and individuals who worked at historically White colleges and universities who could distribute the call to individuals on their campuses as well as
to their various networks, including social media spaces. Going through these organizations and individuals provided additional assurances to non-tenure-track faculty members who may have been hesitant to participate in the study given the tenuous nature of their contract.

To demonstrate willingness to participate in the study, participants completed an online screening survey, which solicited information related to demographic information, institutional profile, and work conditions. The purpose of the tool was to ensure potential participants met all of the study’s criteria and could contribute to the study.

Participants

The final sample consisted of 24 non-tenure-track faculty members of color (NTFOCs) (see Table 1). Nine (37.5%) participants identified as African American or Black, six (25%) identified as Asian, Asian American, or South Asian, and six (25%) identified as Hispanic, Latino, Latina, or Latinx. Three (12.5%) participants identified as multiracial. One identified as Native American/White/Latina. Another participant identified as South Asian and White. A final participant identified as multiracial. Regarding gender, eighteen (75%) participants self-identified using the terms female or woman, while six (25%) self-identified as male. Women were overrepresented in this sample; however, women of color hold non-tenure-track positions at higher rates than men of color (56% vs. 44% respectively) and are considerably more likely to find themselves in non-tenure-track positions (Curtis, 2014).

Participants also had contracts that ranged in length from one semester to three years. The majority of participants (58.3%) had one-year contracts. Three (12.5%) participants had two-year contracts, while four (16.7%) had three year contracts. Three (12.5%) participants were on semester long contracts, although many participants spoke about previous experience working as an adjunct on semester-long contracts. Those employed by semester are underrepresented in the sample; large number of non-tenure-track employees are contracted by semester (Curtis, 2014). Perhaps they are underrepresented in the study because they felt most vulnerable to speak out or pressed for time. It could also be that the largest numbers of this group work at community colleges, while significant numbers also work at minority serving institutions, institutional types that were not the focus of this study.

Participants also worked at a variety of departments. Eleven (45.8%) participants worked in social science departments. These participants were overrepresented in the sample. Five (20.8%) participants worked in humanities departments and another five (20.8%) in
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>African American/Black</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian/Asian American</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic/Latinx</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female/Woman</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Current Contract</td>
<td>Semester</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One Year</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two Years</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three Years</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Discipline</td>
<td>Applied Science</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interdisciplinary</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution Type</td>
<td>Highest Research</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher Research</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate Research</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
interdisciplinary departments. One (4.2%) worked in applied sciences, two (8.3%) taught in multiple departments.

All but one participant was working at a single institution at the time of data collection, although several had experiences working at multiple institutions at a given time. At the time of the interview, participants worked at a variety of Carnegie institution types. Nine (37.5%) participants worked at public institutions while 15 (62.5%) worked at private not-for-profit institutions. Eleven (45.8%) worked at research institutions. Of these eleven participants, seven (63.6%) worked at institutions of highest research activity, two (18.2%) at institutions of higher research activity, and two (18.2%) at institutions of moderate research activity. Of the 24 participants, eight (33.3%) worked at master’s institutions. Four (16.7%) participants worked at liberal arts institutions. Finally, one (4.2%) participant worked at a baccalaureate institution.

**Data Collection**

I relied upon semi-structured interviews to collect data. I pilot tested the protocol prior to formal interviews. Findings from these interviews were not included in the study, but the pilot interviews provided me with feedback to strengthen questions for the interviews.

In using critical race methodology, the final interview protocol focused on NTFOCs’ experiences with racism in their workplace. All but two interviews were conducted using video chat services such as Skype, Google Hangout or FaceTime, depending upon the preference of the participant. The remaining two participants preferred to conduct interviews over the telephone.

Interviews ranged in length from 43 minutes to 107 minutes. Most interviews were between 60-70 minutes in length. Following each interview, I immediately recorded my initial impressions. In the following days, I wrote notes about each interview in a “summary contact form” (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014). The form provided me with preset questions related to the study’s larger research question. Throughout the data collection and analysis processes, I also wrote analytic memos that allowed me to condense data and to be able to make connections across interviews (Marshall & Rossman, 2011; Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014).

All interviews were transcribed. In an attempt to help maintain participants’ confidentiality, I sent participants a copy of their transcript. Participants were told to identify any discrepancies in the transcript and to note if there were items that they wished to be removed from the transcript due to a fear of retribution from individuals at their institution or potential employers. Participants were also sent copies of the study’s preliminary findings before they
were finalized. This allowed participants another opportunity to ensure they felt their identity was protected.

**Data Analysis Procedure**

Data analysis was an inductive process designed to produce themes related to the research question. To begin, I followed the constant comparative method (Glaser, 1965), which allowed me to create a series of themes to answer the research question. Data analysis occurred concurrently with data collection, as data were analyzed throughout both processes.

I started data analysis by looking over all interview transcripts, analytic memos, summary contact reports and listening to audio notes to familiarize myself with the data. I then began the coding process (See Table 2). Coding took place in two phases. The first phase was descriptive coding, which summarized the major point of a line, sentence, or paragraph (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014). The second phase of coding was pattern coding. Pattern coding allowed me to create category codes or to merge descriptive codes with similar meanings into broader categories (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014). After completing the first phase of coding for the first five transcripts, I created a master list of codes, containing all category codes from these transcripts (Hernandez, 2012). These first five transcripts as well as the remaining transcripts were recoded based upon this master list. Following the coding process, I then created themes. Themes were identified if categories emerged in at least three separate occasions. Themes were then examined in the context of the research question to ensure that they could be used to answer that question.

I then sought out additional support for emerging themes. In remaining consistent with the theoretical framework, I compared themes to the central tenets of CRT and CRF. In particular, I focused on the ways themes highlighted the everyday nature of racism, the rejection of color-blind racism, and used an anti-essentialist perspective to note the ways that various systems of oppression, most notably race and gender, converged to shape the experiences of NTFOCs. This allowed me to provide greater depth in the themes.

**Trustworthiness**

I performed several steps to enhance the accuracy of the data. To start, I pilot tested my interview protocol to ensure I was soliciting information relevant for the broader research questions. Expert review occurred during the analysis of initial themes and transcripts (Creswell & Miller, 2000). I consulted with experts in qualitative research to review my initial transcripts
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question: What are the ways NTFOCs experience racism in their interactions with students?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third Iteration: Themes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Racialized Evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Different Treatment that White Faculty Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Feeling Unsafe in the Classroom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Second Iteration: Category Codes</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a. Only making class about people of color</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Holding faculty of color to harsher standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Feeling unsafe in the classroom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1b. Being against White people |
| 2b. More respect for White faculty members |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>First Iteration: Examples of Initial Codes</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a. Students frustrated course centered people of color</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Complaints about policies that are easier/same as White male colleagues’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Student behavior causing others to feel unsafe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1a. Students complained course was taught towards students of color |
| 2a. Complain about difficulty of faculty of color |
| 3. Threatening communication from students |

| 1b. “Making them hate White people” |
| 2b. Challenging and disrespecting faculty members of color |
| 3. Not feeling supported when facing threats from white male students |

| 1b. Speaking negatively about white people |
| 2b. Showing greater deference towards White male faculty members |

*Meant to be read from the bottom up*
and themes to ensure that the appropriateness of my data analysis process and that themes were grounded in the data (Creswell & Miller, 2000). I also performed member checking. Member checking is when researchers shares data and data analysis with participants (Marshall & Rossman, 2011). I triangulated my results by not naming a theme unless a category appeared across three separate occurrences. Additionally, I compared all themes with analytical memos, summary contact reports, and audio notes. This ensured that themes could be verified throughout the process. I also compared themes to existing literature about racism and sexism. This allowed me to ground themes in relevant research.

Finally, I integrated CRT and CRF throughout the research process. First, I centered the experiences of people of color by telling the stories of NTFOCs and how they experience racism and other forms of oppression in their workplaces. The interview protocol was designed to highlight the ordinary nature of racism, while also noting how racism and sexism work together as interlocking systems of oppression. By working with organizations that strive to improve the working conditions of non-tenure-track faculty members as well as faculty members of color, and ultimately sharing results with them, the findings may be used to further advocate to improve the conditions of NTFOCs, the type of action that is pivotal to CRT and CRF.

**Positionality**

Central to this study was the notion that racism has played and continues to play an important role in society as well as in institutions of higher education. As a person of color who has worked as a higher education administrator, I believe that racism is engrained in the structures of colleges and universities and has an impact on the success of students, staff, and faculty of color. While acknowledging this throughout the research process, I never assumed that participants would feel they had experienced racism in their environment. I hoped to elicit data that reflected the experiences of NTFOCs who are invisible in the scholarship and to make sense of those experiences. As someone who has not been an instructional faculty member (although I have taught many classes in my role as a practitioner), I recognized the differences in my experiences versus those of the participants. As someone who identifies as a cisgender man, I did not share the experiences with racialized sexism of most participants. Not having this experiential knowledge or background may have led some participants to question my motivations for pursuing such a study. However, as a person of color who hopes to continue to
challenge various systems of oppression in institutions of higher education, I was able to build rapport with participants.

Findings

This study produced three themes related to the ways NTFOCs experienced racism in their classroom environments: racialized evaluations, different treatment than White male colleagues, and threats of violence. For many women NTFOCs, these themes reflected their racialized gendered experiences. That is, they could not be attributed solely to their race. As such, in describing the themes, I attempt to reflect an anti-essentialist approach to include discussion of racialized gendered experiences, rather than to homogenize the experiences of NTFOCs (Harris, 1990). Each theme reveals important issues that impact NTFOCs in the classroom.

Racialized Evaluations

Most participants stated that they did not experience overtly racist comments from students. Instead, they typically reflected what Bonilla Silva (2014) called, “color-blind racism.” Color-blind racism is a more covert and subtle form of racism, but nonetheless a tool to preserve the existing racial order. One of the most pronounced forms of racism that NTFOCs experienced was through anonymous student evaluations of teaching. One prominent critique of NTFOCs, particularly for those teaching about race and other issues of power, was they only focused on communities of color. Michael, an Asian American faculty member at a large research institution, described an example of such a criticism in one of his student evaluations.

I remember when I taught a course focused on Asian Americans]... And I remember someone writing in an evaluation, "I thought this was a good class but after week x, he basically only made it about Asian-Americans and directed it toward the Asian-American students." Which is funny, because I make a conscious effort to emphasize that this is a part of American history, there are all sorts of connections between different groups. I'm not trying to guilt anyone because that's not productive. And it's just one of those things, like when I was sitting in my Western civilization class as an undergrad, it never crossed my mind to say, "I hated this professor because he only made it about Greek people."

Rebecca, a Latinx faculty member at a private research institution, described a similar situation in a class that she taught on reproductive justice. She depicted a situation where she had fairly positive interactions with the students throughout the semester. However, in the
evaluations, she received a tremendous amount of blowback from the students regarding her teaching:

In the end of my semester, I get these evaluations where they're saying things like, "Rebecca likes Black and Hispanic mothers, but denigrates White mothers." I'm like, "Oh, that's interesting," because this is probably one of the only classes many of them have ever taken where women of color issues are in the front and center of the class. Another thing is saying things like, I'm nicer to students of color.

Michael and Rebecca both noted that they believed such criticisms from students were based on the fact that they were people of color. That is, the White students in their classes assumed that because the instructor identified as a person of color, they focused on people of color rather than recognizing that the class was intentionally designed to focus on people of color. Although these student comments do not explicitly critique the faculty members on the grounds of their race, they are a form of racism that normalizes and maintains the power of whiteness, while denigrating the experiences of people of color.

NTFOCs were also accused by White students of making students “hate themselves.” Teresa, a Latina NTFOC at a private master’s institution, offered a prime example. She had taught a variety of courses, many of which were not explicitly about issues of race and power. However, she did find it necessary to include issues of race and gender in her courses. On one occasion, she was lecturing about the rise of feminism. For some students, particularly White male students, this was an eye-opening lecture. However, some White male students wrote in their evaluations, “'You are trying to make me hate myself and now I hate you.'” Similar to Michael and Rebecca, the students were upset that they were being forced to learn about content that challenged dominant forms of knowledge. They took their frustration out through racialized and negative evaluations of the faculty members.

It was clear that participants received negative evaluations because of their identity and because they centered the experiences of marginalized groups. Many White students were unwilling to accept the viewpoints and different forms of knowledge that these NTFOCs shared in their class and wrote so in their evaluations. These critiques were rarely verbalized to the faculty members and were only made known to them in an anonymous evaluation process. For the participants, these evaluations represented a penalty for being a person of color who challenged White students’ dominant ways of viewing the world.
Different Treatment Than White Colleagues

Participants also described being treated differently by students than their White male colleagues. One of the ways this manifested was in the manner students responded to classroom expectations and policies. For instance, Emma, a Black woman at a public master’s institution discussed how students routinely made unsubstantiated complaints about her to her department chair, a tenured White male faculty member. One of these complaints was regarding her late policy:

I had a student complaining about my late policy. My late policy is you may turn your papers in late for 10 points off as long as I'm still grading the assignment. So, I had a student complaining about that saying, "Well, you know stuff happens and I had to ... turn in the paper late." I took 10 points off. And the chair was not listening to the complaint because you know what his late policy is? 50 points off! You lose 50 points for one day then the next day you've gotten a zero. So why are you complaining about Emma’s policy when it's one of the easiest late policies in the department?

In short, the student complained about Emma’s late policy even though it was far less stringent than that of the department head. She also noted that the chair had never received complaints about his late policy, despite the fact that his policy was significantly harsher. Fortunately, for Emma, she had a supportive chair who recognized such complaints as based in racism and sexism and supported her throughout these situations. Nevertheless, students treated her differently than her White, male colleague.

Jackie, a Black woman faculty member at a private master’s institution, had a similar experience. She explained that when she began teaching a new course, she used the same assignments as a previous instructor, a White male. When comparing the evaluations of the course, she noted a discrepancy in their evaluations, particularly in terms of the assignments.

You read his, he's awesome. He's the best thing since apple juice and then I'm doing the exact same assignment and [students said], "Oh, [the assignments are] not fair. It isn’t right... She's too demanding.

Emma and Jackie’s experience are consistent with the research about women of color faculty members. Students held them to different standards than White male faculty members, illustrating their comfort in challenging the authority of women of color faculty members (Pittman, 2010).

NTFOCs also described the ways students treated them differently than their White male colleagues in terms of general level of respect. Several NTFOCs witnessed students treat White
male colleagues with greater levels of deference and respect. Ramón, a Latino faculty member at a liberal arts institution, revealed how students frequently challenged him in the classroom, with some showing explicit disrespect, challenging his authority, and disengaging in his lectures. He offered an example of this disrespectful treatment when he had a guest lecturer come to his class:

I recently had a colleague, who I really respect and is a White man. He came in my classroom and I asked him to guest lecture on this one topic in which he is an expert. I thought it would be great for the students to engage with him. He just commanded the room and I don’t mean like he set up shop and he dictated. I mean like their attention was caught up with him, and to some degree, he’s silent teaching… I found that students were just a little bit more willing or happy [to listen to him] or interested in challenging me.

According to Ramón, the students treated the guest lecturer with more respect because he was a White male, hence presumed to be more knowledgeable. Faculty members of color are more likely than their White colleagues to be challenged by their students (Lugo-Lugo, 2012; Tuitt et al., 2009). For Ramón, this incident confirmed his belief that students showed more disrespect to him because he was not a White male faculty member.

**Feeling Unsafe in the Classroom**

Perhaps one of the most discomforting themes from the study was feeling unsafe in the classroom, an experience expressed by several women NTFOCs. These feelings of insecurity typically stemmed from the challenges of White male students. Male participants never expressed feeling unsafe. Indeed, many of the male participants acknowledged their privilege in the classroom and recognized they could address students in ways that they knew women of color could not.

For instance, Diane, a Black women faculty member at a public research institution described a situation where she was made to fear coming to class. She spoke about a student who was repeatedly disrespectful in class. Diane had a policy where she did not allow students to use laptops in class. However, one White male student refused to abide by this rule in every class, even when she reminded him several times about the policy. The student said to her, “I just have a lot of stuff to do.” Diane felt disrespected and taken aback by the comment. Yet, the student’s behavior continued. Diane then noted:

He was still doing the laptop thing, and he started to mutter under his breath about the class being bullshit, and me being bullshit. And we were discussing, I can’t remember what textbook, but he made [inappropriate and threatening] comments. And it got to a
point where the entire class shut down… And I said, “I don’t think this guy is a safe guy. I think he has some problems.” And it got to the point where I would feel nauseous about going to class. I had an image about him shooting up the classroom.

For Diane, the fact that the student continued to disrespect her, and ultimately made threatening comments made her genuinely feel unsafe in her classroom. For her, the student’s behavior was so inappropriate that she feared that he would inflict violence upon the classroom. Diane later explained that she spoke to her two different department directors, yet was dismissed by them and made to feel that she was exaggerating the situation. This lack of support only furthered her feelings of insecurity. It was not until two White women students approached her and voiced similar concerns fearing for their safety in the classroom that the student was ultimately removed from the course. This situation is an example of interest convergence (Bell, 1980). Diane’s directors only sought to address the situation when two White students complained, or when they recognized that the incident could have a larger impact upon their programs, rather than responding to Diane’s concerns.

Carmen, a multiracial faculty member at public institution of highest research also described a situation where a student in her class sent her unsettling emails:

I had a student, he had issues. We had to contact the dean of students because he was sending me very scary emails. And he was very upset that, one he was older than me and that I was Latina and female and that the class and [I] were not respecting him in the way that he deserved… I had a grad student in my class and I was like, "Just in case you see something, I don't have to tell you anything just call my 911." He's like, “Okay.” I had a friend that was taking a class in that same hallway where I was at the same time, so I was like, "If something happens, you just run to my classroom. If you hear anything just run here.” So, I had backup plans if something [happened]. But that was a whole semester.

Like Diane, Carmen also told a campus leader, but he dismissed her claims. Turner (2002) and Pittman (2010) wrote about how women faculty members of color experienced being challenged in their work setting and attempts at intimidation they suffered from White male faculty members. Diane and Carmen’s experiences show how such vulnerabilities are experienced by faculty women of color as well. The women of color in this study felt their claims were not taken seriously. As non-tenure-track faculty members without the support of their directors, they found it difficult to address such situations and on multiple occasions went to class genuinely fearing for their safety.
Discussion

Findings suggest NTFOCs experienced racism in their interactions with students in three ways: racialized critiques, different treatment than White faculty male faculty members, and feeling unsafe in the classroom. These experiences were similar to those of tenured and tenure-track faculty members of color (Stanley, 2006; Tuitt et al., 2009; Turner, Gonzalez, & Wood, 2008). However, the contingent nature of their contracts created additional obstacles for NTFOCs and made them incredibly vulnerable to poor treatment from students.

To start, racialized evaluations have implications for NTFOCs maintaining their jobs. All participants in this study were seeking more stable employment options, and most were seeking some sort of tenure-track position. My findings confirmed prior research that faculty members of color receive more hostile feedback in their evaluations than their White colleagues (Huston, 2005; Reid, 2010). This is particularly true for women faculty members of color, as they face negative evaluations due to their race and gender (Lazos, 2012; Turner, 2002). For many non-tenure-track faculty members, student evaluations of teaching (SETs) are a dominant way in which they are evaluated and used to determine if their contract is renewed (National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment, 2014). SETs can serve as a way to punish non-tenure-track faculty members by not renewing contracts if the scores are too low, thus putting non-tenure-track faculty members out of work (Hou, Lee, & Gunzenhauser, 2017). Women NTFOCs may be most vulnerable to these consequences as they can be punished because of their race and gender (Crenshaw, 1991; Harris, 1990). White students often read women of color as less theoretical and, if speaking about issues of race and gender, as having a political agenda (Ford, 2011). As such, women NTFOCs are increasingly vulnerable to receiving lower teaching evaluations and may find themselves in more precarious situations because of the ways racial and gender bias infiltrate classroom evaluations (Lazos, 2012). Hence, if individuals in charge of hiring are not attuned to the ways SETs reflect racial and gender bias and readily account for these biases in their hiring process, NTFOCs, and particularly women NTFOCs, are at a significant disadvantage in maintaining current jobs.

These evaluations also have implications for NTFOCs seeking more permanent positions. It is difficult to move from a non-tenure-track position to a tenure-track position; only about one-third of non-tenure-track faculty members are able to do so (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). However, for part-time non-tenure-track faculty members, it is significantly more challenging to
land a tenure-track role or simply a full-time non-tenure-track position (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). Any negative criticisms can make this search particularly challenging, as when applying for positions, candidates often have to submit evidence of effective teaching. Women NTFOCs are particularly vulnerable as they were likely to receive lower teaching evaluations on account of their race and gender (Boring, Ottoboni, & Stark, 2016; Huston, 2005). While many participants spoke of having positive evaluations, there were fears that their negative teaching evaluations could adversely impact their job prospects if hiring committees were not familiar with the ways the critiques were racialized and gendered. Given that they are not given a chance to respond to such criticisms when applying for position, this was particularly troublesome.

While all non-tenure-track faculty members need to be aware of negative teaching evaluations, for NTFOCs, and especially women NTFOCs these critiques based upon race and/or gender placed them at a disadvantage when applying for positions simply because of their identities. The second theme directly reflects how NTFOCs are treated differently than their White male counterparts. For women NTFOCs, this was as much about their race as their gender. This has significant implications for their work. NTFOCs are aware that they are treated differently than their White male colleagues, and in a testament to the pervasiveness of racism on their campuses, they expected this to occur. As such, this meant having to do additional work than their White male colleagues. This was particularly true for women NTFOCs. For some, women NTFOCs, this meant having to offer copious citations as a way to offset being “presumed incompetent” (Harris & González, 2012). Other women NTFOCs, spoke about creating extraordinarily lengthy syllabi in order to make explicitly clear all classroom policies and leave little room to be challenged about class rules. Finally, some even spoke about keeping a paper trail of all interactions with students in order to have documentation in case a student made a complaint about them. All of these actions resulted in increased time spent on their classes due to the expectation that they would be treated harshly by students because of their race and gender. For many full-time NTFOCs, who in many cases were teaching four or even five courses in a semester, this additional level of preparation became extraordinarily time consuming. However, these reports are consistent with prior research where women faculty of color spent more time preparing for the lectures due to challenges from White male students (Lazos, 2012; Pittman, 2010). Women NTFOCs face an intensified burden simply because of the systems of oppression through which students and colleagues target their identities. The
additional time NTFOCs devote to class preparation can be difficult to manage when balancing work responsibilities, publishing demands, meetings with students, and performing a job search. The third theme that emerged from the interviews related to women NTFOCs feeling unsafe in their classroom. Prior studies have revealed that White male students are likely to challenge and engage in acts of intimidation against women faculty members of color (Pittman, 2010) and my findings confirm this trend. Yet, because of their contingent status, participants felt little could be done to address these situations. They expressed great fear that mishandling these situations might result in negative student evaluations or complaints to their directors or a potential loss of their job. Adding to their fears, the participants in the study who felt threatened by White male students all went to their directors or other campus leaders and in each case, were not believed or were simply dismissed. For many women faculty members of color, complaints about racism or sexism are often not believed or lead to them being viewed as lacking collegiality (Duncan, 2014). As such, the women NTFOCs in this study believed they had no choice but to endure these situations, a fact that speaks to their status. Participants often reported that they would handle situations differently if they had a different employment status, because they could be more forthcoming and not have to be as concerned about the repercussions of a single negative student interaction. Thus, several women NTFOCs were made to feel unsafe in their classroom spaces due to their race and gender. To make matters worse, they felt constrained in how they could address these situations due to their contingent status.

Additionally, these feelings of vulnerability are tied to broader issues of gender oppression and White male domination of women of color. While detailing sexual violence on college campuses, Harris and Linder (2017) argue that sexual violence is commonly viewed as only impacting White women, thus erasing and minimizing experiences with sexual violence by women of color (as well as other minoritized individuals). Through dehumanizing stereotypes of women of color as promiscuous and subservient (Scott, Singh, & Harris, 2017), sexual violence against women of color becomes legitimized. It is a way of conferring power to White men to instill fear and terror in women of color (Scott, Singh, & Harris, 2017). While this research specifically refers to sexual violence, it serves as an appropriate way to think about the experiences of several women NTFOCs in this study. First, the experiences shared by my respondents show a similar pattern of White men attempting to inflict fear upon them in order to gain power over them. Second, the stories of women NTFOCs were minimized and silenced by
the lack of actions from campus leaders. The fact that in Diane’s case, the director only responded when two White women students expressed their discomfort with the threatening student serves as an example of how the experiences of women of color in terms of violence are not believed and minimized. This perpetuates a system of domination that silences the voices of women of color. Thus, this theme speaks to larger concerns for campus leaders to address issues of power, privilege, and oppression through an intersectional lens that takes seriously the concerns of women of color (Harris & Linder, 2017).

**Limitations**

While the results are compelling, there are several limitations to this study that merit mention. The first is that findings may be transferable in only very limited situations. Both part-time and full-time faculty members were a part of this study, but there were significantly more full-time faculty participants. Full-time NTFOCs have greater resources than part-time NTFOCs, including higher salaries and access to more benefits. As such, the participants do not reflect the realities of the largest numbers of non-tenure-track faculty members who are part-time.

Second, participants had to identify as a faculty member of color. This means participants were from a broad range of racial and ethnic groups. Each of these groups is inflected with its own meanings (Omi & Winant, 2014). For example, several Black women participants spoke about performing their work while navigating the stereotype of the angry Black woman. Conversely, some Asian American women faculty members combatted a stereotype of being seen as being meek and silent. Each of these is a racist stereotype that serves to maintain the dominant racial order, but illustrates the different ways racism operates and impacts groups differently.

Third, participants were from four-year historically White colleges and universities. This included different types of institutions. Because different institutional types have varying goals and structures, particularly with respect to teaching, the findings across institutions should be considered in that context.

Finally, institutions were located across the country. The way racism operates can change by region, so the ways various NTFOCs experienced racism could have been different based upon the location of their institution and the demographics surrounding the institutions.
Implications

Despite these limitations, several implications for practice emerged from this study. On an institutional level, administrators need to continue to examine institutional policies that perpetuate racism and sexism, and note how this affects people of color on their campuses. Most relevant for this study is how they impact NTFOCs. Administrators need to insure they are continuing to engage in practices to eradicate embedded forms of racism and sexism and to account for how they may influence the experiences of NTFOCs, in order to put NTFOCs in positions where they can best perform the responsibilities of their job. This includes creating channels where NTFOCs can discuss challenges related to racism and sexism in their classroom and receive support for addressing such challenges.

Administrators and hiring committees need to be aware of the challenges NTFOCs face. NTFOCs are likely to receive lower evaluations than their White counterparts, with women NTFOCs being particularly vulnerable to receiving lower evaluations. As a result, hiring committees when assessing the work of NTFOCs need to take this into account and to not penalize NTFOCs for students’ racist/sexist behavior. They need to create systems that recognize that evaluations are not race or gender neutral. These systems of evaluation need to consider the ways that racism and sexism play a role in the evaluation process.

NTFOCs also described needing longer and better contracts. This included full-time positions, tenure-track positions, teaching tenure-track positions, or simply longer term full-time contracts, where they could feel institutionally and psychologically supported and valued, particularly when teaching about issues of power and oppression. Doing so would not only help NTFOCs; it could create a better classroom environment for students.

Student affairs practitioners need to create channels to hold students accountable for threatening behaviors in the classroom. There also should be systems for faculty members, including NTFOCs to report such behavior. However, in the case of NTFOCs, it is important that they are comfortable reporting such behaviors without fear of retaliation.

On an individual level, tenured and tenure-track faculty, administrators, and department heads need to continue to foster relationships with and listen to the realities of NTFOCs. By engaging in these conversations, they can better understand NTFOCs’ working conditions and create better systems of support for them.
Moreover, this study has several implications for research. More research needs to be done using CRT and CRF to examine the experiences of NTFOCs. This is an understudied population, thus expanded research is warranted. First, my study examined the experiences of NTFOCs, both part-time and full-time. Future research can use CRT and CRF to separately examine the ways part-time and full-time NTFOCs experience racism to gain a better understanding of the ways contractual terms influence their experiences. Second, a CRT analysis can be done on the experiences of NTFOCs of particular racial groups. This can provide greater depth into the ways racism is experienced and the impact it has on the work and lives of NTFOCs who are members of those groups. Finally, there is a need for CRF research that centers the experiences of women NTFOCs. Examples of such studies might include the experiences of NTFOCs who are mothers, or the ways that women NTFOCs confront being “presumed incompetent” (Harris & González, 2012).

Conclusion

Non-tenure-track faculty members represent 70% of all faculty in institutions of higher education (Government Accountability Office, 2017) and NTFOCs are overrepresented (Finkelstein et al., 2016). If this trend continues, and academic leaders expect to sustain high standards of teaching, they need to pay attention to the experiences of NTFOCs. In particular, they need to focus on the ways these faculty members experience racism and how the terms of their contracts create a system that perpetuates racism and unjustly penalizes NTFOCs. This not only has an impact upon the conditions of NTFOCs, but has the potential to impact student learning by influencing the content and methods that NTFOCs use in the classroom. As such, this is a problem that needs to be acknowledged and addressed by campus constituents, including institutional leaders, tenured and tenure-track faculty members, and student affairs professionals. It is only through a collaborative effort that institutional leaders can make a commitment to improving the working conditions of NTFOCs and take steps to uproot systems of oppression in higher education.
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CHAPTER SIX
“We’re just not acknowledged”: An examination of the cultural taxation of non-tenure-track faculty members of color

Abstract: This qualitative study of 24 non-tenure-track faculty members of color (NTFOCs) at historically White colleges and universities examined the ways NTFOCs experienced cultural taxation in their work. Critical race theory and critical race feminism were used as the theoretical frameworks. Participants experienced cultural taxation in three ways: supporting marginalized students, teaching colleagues about race, and committee work. Findings revealed how NTFOCs are faced with additional barriers in the working conditions than White colleagues.

Linh is a full-time non-tenure-track faculty member working at Oaks College\(^3\), a private, historically White, liberal arts institution. He is on a one-year contract. Despite his contingent employment status, Linh enjoys many advantages relative to many non-tenure-track faculty members: he teaches only two classes per semester and is given time to write and conduct and research. He has excelled in his teaching and has been successful in producing publications while in this position. However, in addition to his formal job responsibilities, he is engaged in many activities to improve the conditions for marginalized populations at Oaks. Linh views the institution as a hostile climate for students from these communities.

As someone who identifies as Asian, and who grew up in a low-income household, Linh tries to connect with individuals on campus who come from marginalized groups. He advises student organizations, formally and informally mentoring their members, and serves as a source of support for students who feel excluded from the wider Oaks community. Additionally, he attends various committee meetings, and has helped to mobilize staff members and the non-tenure-track faculty members surrounding issues related to their treatment at Oaks. He receives no credit for these activities. For Linh, his actions demonstrate his commitment to uprooting systems of power and privilege. He believes he must assume an activist role on his campus given the hostile climate for marginalized communities at Oaks. Yet, it takes up a good amount of his time. Linh’s contract terminates at the end of year and despite his success, his department has not indicated that they will extend him a more permanent offer. While Linh is fortunate and

\(^3\) Oaks College is a pseudonym for Linh’s actual place of employment.
has secured a position at another institution, it is evident to him that Oaks did not recognize the additional labor he performed in his role as a faculty member.

In this qualitative study, I use critical race theory (CRT) and critical race feminism (CRF) to examine the ways non-tenure-track faculty members of color (NTFOCs) experience “cultural taxation.” Padilla (1994) defines cultural taxation as

the obligation to show good citizenship toward the institution by serving the needs for ethnic representation on committees, or to demonstrate knowledge and commitment to a cultural group, which may even bring accolades to the institution, but which is not usually rewarded by the institution on whose behalf the service was performed (p. 26).

For Padilla, cultural taxation is the additional race-based service work that falls upon faculty members of color, that is less likely to be taken up by White faculty members. I was interested in the work of NTFOCs that goes beyond teaching and research (Blackburn & Lawrence 1995; Baez, 2000). In particular, I focused on the service within the institution, rather than broader community or national service work. In this study, I asked the following research question: In what ways do NTFOCs experience cultural taxation in their work environments?

To answer this question, I conducted semi-structured interviews with 24 NTFOCs, working at historically White colleges and universities. I begin by describing the conceptual frameworks that guided the study. I continue with a review of the literature concerning the conditions of non-tenure-track faculty members before discussing the research surrounding service and faculty members of color. These reviews reveal the limited research about NTFOCs. Next, I provide an overview of the design of the study. I then present the findings from the study before offering a discussion of their significance as well as their implications for practice and research. Through this study, I hope to highlight the invaluable but overlooked contributions of NTFOCs to make their campuses better places.

**Theoretical Framework: Critical Race Theory and Critical Race Feminism**

The theoretical frameworks for this study were critical race theory (CRT) and critical race feminism (CRF). These theoretical bases draw attention to the ways various forms of oppression are endemic within larger structures and have an impact upon people of color. Each is defined below in greater detail.

**Critical Race Theory (CRT) and Critical Race Feminism (CRF)**

CRT emerged from legal scholars who were frustrated with the Civil Rights Movements’ lack of progress in eradicating racism. These individuals were also involved in the critical legal
studies movement (CLS) (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012; Taylor, 2009), a field of law based on the idea that the law existed to maintain existing power structures. However, the lack of attention that CLS scholars gave to examining the impact of racism within the law exasperated CRT scholars and led to the development of CRT (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012; McCoy & Rodricks, 2015; Taylor, 2009).

CRT is a social justice-oriented movement that seeks to eradicate racism and other systems of oppression. Central to CRT is the idea that racism is permanent and deeply embedded within structures of society (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004; McCoy & Rodricks, 2015). In addition to the permanent nature of racism, there are several fundamental tenets to CRT. One is interest convergence (Bell, 1980). Interest convergence refers to the notion that progress to eradicate racism is only made when it aligns with the interests of Whites. Bell (1980) illustrated this by showing how Civil Rights legislation only occurred when government officials, who were concerned with the intensifying Cold War with the Soviet Union, feared that a system of legal segregation harmed the global image of the United States. Another central CRT tenet is whiteness as property (Harris, 1993). That is, whiteness is a form of property that Whites seek to protect. Intersectionality, or interlocking systems of oppression, is another critical component of CRT (Crenshaw, 1991). Crenshaw illustrated intersectionality by showing how racism, sexism, and class discrimination intersect to shape the experiences of women of color. Overall, CRT research must be social justice-oriented (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012) and produce counterstories or counternarratives (Solórzano & Yosso, 2001, 2002). Counternarratives are the stories about the experiences of people from communities that are often not told and that challenge dominant Eurocentric epistemologies (Solórzano & Yosso, 2001, 2002).

While CRT has its origins in law, it has expanded to other fields. Education is one of these fields, beginning with the foundational work of Ladson-Billings & Tate (1995), who argued that educational structures reproduce racist practices. Scholars in education use CRT to highlight how the education system creates barriers for people of color (Taylor, 2009). It has also been used to challenge dominant Eurocentric views of knowledge by foregrounding the experiences of people of color.

An offshoot of CRT, CRF centers the experiences of women of color (Pratt-Clarke, 2010; Wing, 1997). Similar to CRT, CRF builds upon the idea of the endemic and permanent nature of racism (Pratt-Clarke, 2010; Wing, 2015). However, CRF scholars were frustrated with the lack
of attention to gender and sexism in CRT scholarship. For CRF scholars, CRT research often essentialized the experiences of people of color (Wing, 2015). Similarly, CRF scholars have voiced frustration with feminist jurisprudence scholarship and its focus on elite, White womanhood, often excluding the work of women of color (Wing, 2015). As such, CRF makes a valuable contribution in terms of foregrounding anti-essentialized understandings of identity (Wing, 2015). Building upon the work of Crenshaw (1991), CRF highlights how various systems of oppression come together. In particular, it notes the ways racism, sexism, and class discrimination are endemic and intersect to shape individual experiences.

This study is grounded in CRT and CRF, and assumes the permanent nature of racism. It challenges dominant epistemologies by spotlighting the experiences of NTFOCs, a group whose experiences are largely absent in the research about non-tenure-track faculty members. Additionally, building from the work of CRF scholars, the study highlights the different backgrounds of NTFOCs, and illustrates the way gender intersects with race to shape the experiences of participants. In this sense, the two theoretical frameworks complement one another and are appropriate standards for the study.

**Review of the Literature**

This literature review is guided by two main bodies of research. The first revolves around the working conditions of non-tenure-track faculty members. The second is the body of work concerning faculty members of color, with a special focus on the scholarship about service and cultural taxation. While the literature makes clear the troublesome working conditions of some non-tenure-track faculty members and the significant impact of racism upon the experiences of faculty members of color, it also exposes a need for research that centers the experiences of NTFOCs.

**Research About Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members**

The numbers of non-tenure-track faculty members have increased on college campuses over the past 40 years. They currently account for more than 70% of all faculty members in institutions of higher education (United States Government Accountability Office, 2017), up from just 44% in 1975 (Curtis, 2014). In 2011, full-time non-tenure-track faculty members made about 19% of the population, while part-time non-tenure-track faculty members comprised 51% of this population (Curtis, 2014).
Non-tenure-track, or contingent, faculty members have significantly different working conditions than their tenured and tenure-track colleagues (Allison, Lynn, & Hoverman, 2014; Coalition on the Academic Workforce, 2012). To begin, they are underpaid. On average, part-time non-tenure-track faculty members are paid $20,508 per year (Shulman et al., 2017). This does not include benefits such as health care and retirement benefits, for which part-time faculty are usually not eligible (Kezar & Sam, 2010). The situation is marginally better for full-time non-tenure-track faculty members. For instructors and lecturers, two designations that often indicate full-time non-tenure-track status, the average salary is $55,405 and $58,875 respectively (Shulman et al, 2017). Full-time, non-tenure-track faculty members usually have benefits similar to tenured and non-tenure-track faculty members (Kezar & Sam, 2010). However, tenured and tenure-track faculty members on average make a salary of $80,095 per year (Shulman et al., 2017). Thus, non-tenure-track faculty members are paid significantly less than their colleagues.

Part of this differential stems from the unbundling of faculty work, or the way academic work is segmented (MacFarlane, 2011). Faculty members are increasingly asked to perform specialized functions (Paulson, 2002). This means that fewer faculty members are asked to perform all three major functions of faculty life (teaching, research, and service) (MacFarlane, 2011). Non-tenure-track faculty members often conduct the work that tenured and tenure-track faculty members do not wish to perform such as teaching lower division courses, overseeing teaching assistants, and program service roles (Kezar & Sam, 2010). These non-tenure-track faculty members are often placed in teaching-only or teaching-heavy positions (National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment, 2014).

One of the major problems for non-tenure-track faculty members is that while they may be in teaching specialized positions, their job descriptions are often unbalanced; they have little involvement in governance, curriculum, planning, and evaluation processes (Gehrke & Kezar, 2015). In addition to being excluded from these essential procedures and processes, many non-tenure-track faculty members, especially part-time faculty members, are not provided with the necessary resources to perform the functions of their jobs. Despite being in teaching-heavy roles, many non-tenure-track faculty members are excluded from professional development opportunities (Gehrke & Kezar, 2015; National Institute for Learning Outcomes and Assessment, 2014). Many non-tenure-track faculty members also lack basic support, such as adequate office space (National Institute for Learning Outcomes and Assessment, 2014) or access to a copy
machine (Navarro, 2017). Given the large role that non-tenure-track faculty members play in supporting undergraduate education, there is a disconnect between the resources they are provided and the demands of their responsibilities (Gehrke & Kezar, 2015; Kezar & Sam 2010).

Perhaps the most concerning reality for many non-tenure-track faculty members is the lack of job security (American Federation of Teachers, 2010). Because contracts for non-tenure-track faculty members are restricted, they continuously fear losing their positions (Kezar & Sam, 2010). For full-time, non-tenure-track faculty members, one year contracts are the most common (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001). Part-time faculty members are typically hired by semester (Kezar & Sam, 2010). Given the termed nature of their contracts, the lack of job security can have a negative psychological impact upon non-tenure-track faculty members (Navarro, 2017). Thus, non-tenure-track faculty members frequently operate in troubling working conditions.

**Research on Faculty Members of Color**

The literature on faculty members of color in the academy also reveals disturbing trends. These individuals are significantly underrepresented in institutions of higher education. About 19% of faculty members at four-year institutions of higher education identify as people of color (Myers, 2016). Asian/Asian Americans represent the largest demographic within this group at 10%. Black faculty members represent 5%, Latínx faculty members 4%, and Native American faculty members 0.4% (Myers, 2016). These latter three groups are severely underrepresented in the faculty ranks at four-year colleges and universities.

Beyond being underrepresented, faculty members of color deal with racism in all aspects of their work. They are more likely than their White colleagues to be challenged by students in the classroom (Lugo-Lugo, 2012; Pittman, 2010; Stanley, 2006a). They are also more likely to have their research questioned by faculty colleagues. This is particularly true for faculty members of color who study race and racism. Such scholarship is often viewed as not objective and too narrowly focused (Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002; Stanley, 2007; Villalpando & Delgado Bernal, 2002).

Faculty members of color are often burdened with increased service responsibilities to which their White counterparts are immune. This “cultural taxation” (Padilla, 1994) entails performing a disproportionate amount of service due to their identities as people of color. These responsibilities include serving on committees, teaching colleagues about race and difference, supporting students of color, and working as an intermediary between campus constituents when
sociocultural differences arise. Such efforts detract from other professional and personal responsibilities. Moreover, these kinds of tasks are not assigned to White faculty members to the same degree (Joseph & Hirshfield, 2011; Turner, 2003; Wood, Hilton, & Nevarez, 2015).

Women faculty members of color are particularly overburdened with service work due to their race and gender (Hirshfield & Joseph, 2012). These women are expected to advocate for diversity initiatives as well as assume a mothering role for students and fellow faculty members (Hirshfield & Joseph, 2012). Despite the additional work associated with cultural taxation, however, some faculty members of color find service work to be important, particularly in allowing them spaces to meet other faculty members of color, and creating mechanisms for them to cope with any isolation they may feel within their departments (Baez, 2000).

In addition to these formal service roles, faculty members of color also spend more time than their White colleagues advising and supporting students (Johnson, Kuykendall, & Laird, 2005). This is particularly true for African American and Latinx faculty members, including those at the instructor and lecturer ranks (Johnson, Kuykendall, & Laird, 2005). Even within these roles, however, there are differences by gender. Women of color are more likely to offer academic and personal support to students (Griffin, Bennett, & Harris, 2011; Hirshfield & Joseph, 2012) and they are often expected by students of color to be nurturing and caring, thus burdening them further (Griffin & Reddick, 2011; Hirshfield & Joseph, 2012).

Faculty members of color express feeling overwhelmed and overcommitted by their work, particularly their service work (Joseph & Hirshfielded, 2011). Their service is often devalued, particularly when it comes to the promotion process (Aguirre, 2005; Baez, 2000; Wood, Nevarez, & Hilton 2015). This is particularly problematic for faculty members of color who are committed to their service work and who play an important role in the instructional mission of the university, yet must continue to meet the requirements necessary for promotion.

It is essential to note, however, that the research about faculty members of color and service largely reflects the experiences of tenured and tenure-track faculty members. This is troubling given that NTFOCs represent the majority of faculty members of color (Curtis, 2014), and that women NTFOCs are most vulnerable to exploitation in these positions (Navarro, 2017). Little is known about the ways NTOFCs experience cultural taxation. Given that the majority of faculty members of color are not on the tenure-track, it is important to consider how NTFOCs
experience cultural taxation and how they negotiate these demands while working in contingent positions. I examined these issues in this study.

**Research Design**

The study employed critical race methodology. Critical race methodology is “a theoretically grounded research approach that foregrounds race and racism in all aspects of the research process” (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002, p. 24). Critical race methodology challenges dominant ideologies and narratives through the centering of the voices of people of color (Solórzano & Yosso, 2001; Solórzano & Yosso, 2002). This can include counterstorytelling, or the sharing of stories of individuals that are usually not told and that challenge dominant epistemologies (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002). This study embeds critical race methodology throughout the research process by foregrounding race and racism, while sharing the untold stories of NTFOCs and how they experience cultural taxation.

**Sampling Procedure and Participants**

I used a purposive sampling strategy to recruit participants for the study (see Table 1). Participants were secured by working with organizations and individuals who support non-tenure-track faculty members and faculty members of color. These organizations and individuals posted my call for participants on their websites and to their social media networks.

To participate in this study, respondents had to meet six criteria. First, they had to identify with one or more of the following groups (American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian or Asian American, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latinx, Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian, or two or more races). Second, they could not be eligible for tenure in their positions. Third, they had to work at a historically White college or university. In using the term historically White colleges and universities, I call attention to the structural nature of racism that goes beyond mere demographic numbers by noting how these institutions were designed to serve White students (Brunsma, Brown, & Placier, 2012).

Fourth, participants had to have worked at their institution for at least one semester. This ensured participants had worked in their current settings long enough to be able to provide adequate information for the study. This also enabled me to reach more part-time faculty members who are often employed on semester-long contracts. Fifth, participants had to have teaching as a part of their responsibilities since teaching remains the dominant job responsibility for non-tenure-track faculty members (National Institute for Outcome Assessment, 2014). As
Table 1
Participants’ Demographic Data (n = 24)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>African American/Black</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian/Asian American</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic/Latinx</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female/Woman</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Current Contract</td>
<td>Semester</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One Year</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two Years</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three Years</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Discipline</td>
<td>Applied Science</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interdisciplinary</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution Type</td>
<td>Highest Research</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher Research</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate Research</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
such, I wanted to make sure these experiences were accounted for. Finally, participants had to be “aspiring academics” (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Aspiring academics are individuals who are seeking more permanent academic positions, such as a tenure-track position. Motivation for tenure-track position is a key factor in shaping their experiences (Maynard & Joseph, 2008). As such, I was interested in those who sought out more permanent positions and wanted to continue working in academia.

There were 24 respondents from diverse backgrounds who participated in the study. They represented a variety of racial and ethnic backgrounds. Black/African American participants were the largest group (37.5%), followed by equal numbers of Asian/American and Latinx faculty members (25%), and three participants who identified as multiracial (12.5%). Women were overrepresented in the sample. However, women of color are more likely to be in non-tenure-track faculty positions than men of color (Curtis, 2014). The sample reflects this reality.

Participants also came from a variety of institutional types. The majority (62.5%) worked at private not-for-profit institutions. Almost half (45.8%) were employed at research institutions of some type while a third (33%) worked at master’s institutions. Participants resided in a variety of departments. The greatest number were in social science fields, followed by humanities and interdisciplinary fields. Participants also worked at institutions across the country, with the largest representation (33.3%) employed at institutions in the northeast.

**Data Collection**

I used semi-structured interviews to collect data. The findings reported here are part of a larger study about the ways NTFOCs experienced racism in their work (not just their service). In keeping with critical race methodology, the broader research protocol centered racism by focusing on the ways NTFOCs experienced racism in their departments and in their interactions with students, as well as how they navigated their work environments.

I pilot tested the interview protocol on two NTFOCs whose responses were not included in the final dataset. This ensured that the protocol was able to elicit information related to the aims of the study. Most interviews were conducted using internet video chat services: Skype, Google Hangout, and FaceTime, depending upon the preference of the participant. Two interviews were conducted over the phone at the request of the respondents. Interviews typically lasted between 60 and 70 minutes. Following each interview, I recorded audio notes to
document my immediate reactions. I then completed a summary contact report (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014). This was a form that contained pre-set questions aimed at understanding how each interview contributed to answering the larger research question. Throughout the data collection and analysis processes, I wrote analytic memos that allowed me to think about ways to connect interviews and shape ideas.

All interviews were transcribed, and I sent participants a copy of their transcript. In an attempt to protect their identities, I told participants to review transcripts and note if there were any discrepancies, as well as any sections that they would like removed from the transcript due to a fear of retribution from their employers and/or supervisors. Participants also received the study’s findings in a final attempt to ensure that all respondents felt comfortable that their identities were protected.

**Data Analysis**

I analyzed data via an inductive process designed to elicit themes from the stories of NTFOCs. To begin, I followed the constant comparative method (Glaser, 1965), where data were compared throughout the entire research process. I began data analysis by reviewing all transcripts, audio notes, summary contact reports and analytic memos.

Following the review of materials, I began coding transcripts. Coding took place in two phases: descriptive coding and pattern coding (see Table 2). The initial phase, descriptive coding, involves summarizing the meaning of each line, sentence, or paragraph of text (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014). After descriptive coding, I began pattern coding. Pattern coding is the process of merging descriptive codes with similar meanings into broader category codes (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014). After completing this process with the first five transcripts, I created a list of master codes. These were then used to code the remaining transcripts as well as to recode the first five transcripts (Hernandez, 2014). At the conclusion of coding, I was able to create larger themes related to the study’s research questions. I created themes by determining which categories had enough support. Themes emerged if categories arose in at least three separate occasions. I also noted when certain categories were related and could be connected in an overarching manner. In those instances, categories were merged to create a theme. Themes were then compared to the larger research question to ensure they corresponded appropriately.
**Table 2**

*Cultural Taxation Coding Scheme*

Research Question: In what ways do NTFOCs experience cultural taxation in their work environments?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Third Iteration</th>
<th>Second Iteration</th>
<th>First Iteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Supporting Marginalized Students</td>
<td>2. Teaching Colleagues About Race</td>
<td>3. Committee Work/Volunteer Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. Promoting success of students of color</td>
<td>2b. Leading conversations activities about race</td>
<td>3. Serving on undesirable committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a. Mentoring students of color</td>
<td>2a. Faculty members informally approach them to discuss race</td>
<td>3. Serving on committees to fulfill diversity needs of institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a. Cultivating relationships with students of color</td>
<td>2b. Organizing discussions on race</td>
<td>3. Departmental service work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. Working with student groups</td>
<td>2b. Facilitating workshops on race for colleagues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Once themes were identified, I sought additional support by connecting themes to the central tenets of CRT and CRF. In particular, and consistent with critical race methodology (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002), racism was the center of analysis through a focus on the permanent and structural nature of racism. Additionally, my analysis was shaped through an anti-essentialist approach by paying attention to the ways certain themes may have emerged due to an intersection of various systems of oppression. Using the theoretical framework to compare themes allowed for greater consistency throughout the research process and provided additional support for the themes.

**Trustworthiness**

Several steps were taken to ensure the trustworthiness of the study. First, I pilot tested the interview protocol (Marshall & Rossman, 2011). This ensured that the questions I asked would elicit responses that could answer the study’s research question. Second, I compared findings from my transcripts with audio notes, analytic memos, and summary contact reports. Reviewing notes throughout the research process allowed me to ensure greater consistency of findings throughout the entire study. Third, I triangulated (Creswell, 2014) my themes, by making sure that I did not identify a theme unless it occurred on at least three separate occasions. Fourth, I shared all transcripts and findings with participants. This ensured that themes were based upon reoccurring ideas and concepts from participants. This is a form of member checking (Creswell & Miller, 2000; Marshall & Rossman, 2011) that ensures the accuracy of the data by giving participants a chance to note potential discrepancies in the transcripts. Finally, I ensured trustworthiness by integrating critical race methodology throughout the research process. I foregrounded race and racism when collecting and analyzing data. Additionally, I centered the experiences of NTFOCs by sharing their stories, which are often unheard.

**Positionality**

A researcher’s position and assumptions have an important impact upon any research study (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). In studies about race, it is critically important to reflect upon one’s own identity and how this identity shapes the research process (Milner, 2007). A failure to do so can have a detrimental impact upon communities of color, who have often been targets of faulty research practices that assume the inferiority of communities of color (Milner, 2007).

A key to this study is my belief that racism is embedded within structures of higher education and profoundly impacts the experiences of people of color on historically White
college and university campuses. This belief is partially based upon my own experience as a Black male who has worked at several historically White universities. It also stems from years of reading scholarship concerning race and racism in society and in institutions of higher education. While holding this belief, I did not assume all participants would share this belief. Rather I hoped to share the overlooked stories of NTFOCs.

I have worked as an administrator in higher education for several years. In that role, I have taught classes at historically, White colleges and universities about race and systems of power and privilege. Still, I have not been a non-tenure-track faculty member, and thus have not faced the same classroom pressures as my participants. Additionally, I identify as a cisgender man. Given that the majority of participants identified as women, I did not personally share the experiences of racialized sexism with them. Thus, I recognize the differences in experiences that I have had from those of my participants, and understand how these differences can produce particular obstacles to gaining their trust. However, as someone who identifies as a person of color who has worked in higher education, I believe I was able to develop rapport with participants, which made them comfortable to share their stories with me.

Findings

The data analysis produced three themes related to the ways NTFOCs face cultural taxation: supporting marginalized students, teaching colleagues about race, and committee work. Each of these themes merits a full explication and discussion. Although the study centered racism, each of these themes was also related to sexism. The majority of stories reflect the racialized gendered experiences of women NTFOCs. For women of color, it is impossible to separate racism and sexism (Collins, 2000; Crenshaw, 1991). As such, I attempt to capture those experience through the findings and discussions.

Supporting Marginalized Students

One of the major forms of cultural taxation for NTFOCs came through supporting marginalized students on campus. This was particularly true for women NTFOCs. Women of color faculty members are often expected to assume mothering and nurturing roles for students, thus they are burdened with more demands from students than their male counterparts (Griffin & Reddick, 2011; Hirshfield & Joseph, 2012). Regarding status, academic administrators often expect non-tenure-track faculty members, especially full-time non-tenure-track faculty members to support and mentor students (Hollenshead et al., 2007; Kezar & Sam, 2010). -However, for
many non-tenure-track faculty members who are paid by the number of courses they teach or student credit hours, supporting and mentoring students is work that may not be compensated (Kezar & Sam, 2013). For the participants in this study, supporting students went beyond normal expectations.

For example, respondents articulated a strong commitment to supporting students of color and other marginalized students on campus. As such, students from marginalized backgrounds often sought them out for support. Vidya, a South Asian faculty member at a liberal arts institution, provided one of the clearest examples of this commitment. Following President Trump’s announcement in January 2017 of an executive order that restricted travel to the U.S. from seven predominantly Muslim countries, many Muslim students at her institution who were planning on studying abroad approached Vidya for support. They relayed a deep fear of being detained by U.S. Customs officials and being unable to reenter the United States. Vidya held several conversations with administrators to gain institutional support for the students. However, college leaders did not find it necessary to respond to the students concerns. Without adequate support from the institution, Vidya took it upon herself to help the students:

I was very open with the students who came to see me and I [brought them food and drinks] and I said, "What are your questions, what are your worries? Let me hear the worries?" Because to speak to them means that we will be less anxious because sometimes you just need to say what you are most worried about. Even if we can't fix it. Then, I have them partner up and say, "You and you, partner up and do mock interviews of each other as if you were immigration attorneys asking the very questions you're afraid they will ask. Starting with take off your hijab." Let's role play it, right here on campus, where we are safe, with each other, the people we trust and know, so that in the unlikely event that it will happen you're not going to be blindsided. That is really fifty percent of where we lose track of that, when we're blindsided. Right? I can't control what the immigration officer is going to act like or what they're going to do, but I can help you think it through.

Students came to Vidya even though she does not identify as Muslim because they recognized her as a source of support and as a caring, compassionate voice on campus. As Vidya explained throughout her interview, she is deeply committed to fighting injustice and supporting students. She routinely spoke out against injustice on campus because she held little confidence that her students would receive this kind of support elsewhere. For her, this additional work represented an emotional labor. The lack of institutional support for these students, coupled with her non-
tenure-track status and impending layoffs at her college, made her vulnerable, yet she was compelled to act.

Vidya’s example is related to students seeking her out in response to a major national policy. Other NTFOCs described students of color intentionally and frequently searching for assistance in general. Sean, a Black faculty member at a private institution of highest research activity, described his experience co-teaching a course about race with a White woman faculty member. Sean was bombarded with students during his office hours:

[My teaching partner said] "All the students come to you." She noticed quickly, "They're not coming to me after class. They're not trying to have office hours with me after class. They're all coming your way for some reason or another…” I think specifically because again, these are all Dominican or Haitian or Afro-Latino students, they're coming to me for a specific reason. Because that experience is similar to them. It's not the White students who are signing up for all the office hours. I think it's very obvious… She's never taught, but actually she's an incredible teacher. So, it's not the dynamic in the classroom. She's actually great in the classroom. It's much more about my own identity and how they feel comfortable with it in different ways.

Sean described how students intentionally sought him out as a source of support because they felt they shared similar life experiences. He enjoyed fostering meaningful relationships with students and saw this as an integral part of his job. However, the fact that he was bombarded with students, while his co-instructor was not, highlights the fact that the students of color rely on faculty members of color for support and that such support is critical at historically White institutions where there are few faculty of color to serve as guides.

Mentoring students was not limited to full-time NTFOCs, however. Marisól, a part-time NTFOC at a private master’s institution, talked about engaging in this work: “I can't formally take on any sort of student as a mentor. I do informal mentoring.” Marisól’s contract does not include mentoring students. However, she does this work informally because of her commitment to the students. Additionally, throughout the interview, she spoke about serving on student panels and being a role model and support system for many Black and Latina students in her classes. These students can relate to her, so serving as a source of support for Black and Latina students came up multiple times in her interview. Taking on mentoring responsibilities when one is not required to but feels an obligation to do so illustrates cultural taxation. It reflects the assumption of tasks related to one’s identity that are uncompensated and unrecognized but that the faculty member believes to be essential for students.
While participants generally enjoyed meeting with and supporting marginalized students, they acknowledged the difficulty of doing this work. This is best exemplified by Carmen, a multiracial faculty member at a public institution of highest research activity who spoke about her experience supporting Latinx students:

I was mentoring grad students, so working with [them] on their CVs, their proposals, everything. I'm not part of their committees. I get recognition because they put me in their “thank yous” in their dissertations and in their programs. Some of their faculty members know they work with me. So, I was mentoring grad students, mentoring undergrad students, helping them with job applications, some for applications for grad school.

In short, Carmen was spending a great deal of time supporting Latinx students. This type of mentoring and advising of doctoral students is typically reserved for tenure-track and tenured faculty members, but she did this type of work because she found it necessary to support Latinx students. She filled a gap that the ranked faculty members in her department could not provide. Thus, Carmen and other participants continued to engage in significant levels of service to support marginalized students not only because they wanted to, but also because they were from marginalized racial groups themselves, hence could serve as role models and mentors.

In order to not become overburdened with service, some participants tried to find ways to limit this work. Minh, an Asian woman NTFOC at a liberal arts institution, set boundaries with students, often telling them to seek out a tenured or tenure-track faculty members for support.

I tell my students, "You have tenured professors to help you. Go to the department chair. Go to these people." I tell them, "This is not why I'm here." I tell my students, “I deeply do care about your success, but you have other people, other resources on campus that will help facilitate this.” If a student is in crisis, I'm not kicking them out of my office, I'm not like one of these people, but I have to tell them so that they can demand on their own whatever they think they need or want.

The fact that Minh had such an approach illustrated the high volume of students that sought her for support. Minh was direct with her students about the constraints imposed by her contingent status. Yet she was committed to helping students. Throughout the interview, she spoke about her deep commitment to supporting students, particularly, first-generation, low-income, and students of color at the institution. This included attending their events and mentoring them. However, recognizing the limitations of her position, and in order to get students to question power structures (something central to her pedagogy), she told them to seek out tenured and tenure-track faculty members in the department. Minh’s stated she used this approach with
students to force them to examine institutional practices and policies. She believed it compelled them to think about the lack of faculty members of color on an institutional level, and the stratification of resources allocated based on employment status. She stated that if she wanted students to examine their own lives critically, she had to role model this behavior and this approach was a way to do that. If greater numbers of NTFOCs pursued similar strategies, institutional leaders might find it extremely difficult to fully support students. In this way, Minh’s strategy exposes how institutions rely upon NTFOCs to support students of color.

**Teaching Colleagues About Race**

In addition to supporting students, NTFOCs also spent time engaging their colleagues in discussions about race. This was a responsibility that most commonly fell upon many of the women NTFOCs in this study. These discussions took several forms. The first was in informal conversations. These conversations usually occurred when White tenured or tenure-track colleagues approached NTFOCs to learn more about race and racism. For several participants, this was most pronounced following the election of Donald Trump in 2016. Joy, a woman NTFOC at a research university of moderate activity and the only Black person in her department recalled that following the election, every person in her department came to her on separate occasions to talk about race:

> My first year was when Trump got elected. So, everybody started fucking running to me about some shit. I don’t know how to explain this in any other way but curse words. But I literally had people on the floor, and I’ve made friendships with people on the floor, but I’ve literally had people run down the floor to me like, in tears, White women. I’m sorry, I felt like people were coming in to check with me and see if they were being good allies and shit. And I was like, “I don’t fucking know, I’m still trying to figure this out.”

For Joy, the fact that so many of her colleagues approached her for support following the election, led to a sense of frustration. Throughout her interview she described additional examples of faculty members coming to her to “assuage themselves of their White fucking guilt.” She found this incredibly exasperating. As a Black woman who was in a non-tenure-track position, she was being asked to provide emotional support to her White colleagues as they navigated questions around race and identity, yet was not given the opportunity or space to work through these questions herself. As she later explained, because she was in her first year and in a non-tenure-track position, and because the colleagues coming to her were all tenured or on the
tenure-track, she did not feel comfortable voicing her true feelings. Instead, she had to listen to their concerns and offer support.

Joy was not unique in this instance. Diane, a Black woman NTFOC at a public research institution also explained, “The recent election or anything that involves race… they all come to me. I’m shook too. I don’t know what you want from me.” Like Joy, Diane described a situation where colleagues approached her to gain her perspective about issues involving race and racism. Like Joy, Diane was frustrated by these conversations and felt she needed her own space to process what was happening around her. She was being asked to support her White colleagues as they tried to make sense of current events that foregrounded race and racism, but as a NTFOC, she found it untenable to extract herself from these situations.

Teaching colleagues about race and racism was not always a negative for NTFOCs. Some engaged in teaching colleagues about race in formal ways, for example. This often involved offering workshops regarding race. Gabriella, a Native American/Latina/White NTFOC at a private master’s institution, noted: “One time I did an in-service that my chair asked me to do for the faculty on how to broach issues of race, culture, and any type of differences that you might have, as a faculty member with students.” Gabriella appreciated this experience, as it presented her with a setting in which she felt she was valued for her knowledge and could make a contribution to the department. This was empowering for her. However, she was still tasked with educating her colleagues about race because of her race, and she performed this additional labor without compensation.

Committee Work

Committee work was the third way that NTFOCs experienced cultural taxation at their institutions. While some participants discussed being excluded from committee work, others spoke about being overburdened with such service to the institution. For example, several respondents spoke about being appointed to committees so that the committee would be “diverse.” Nicole, a Black woman NTFOC working at public baccalaureate institution, stated:

So, committees I get asked to serve on periodically, or certain committees that I was asked to be put on when I looked at the rest of the committee, I was the only dot of color in there. Working with the new person who's running all of that stuff, I'm like, “You have to get over the racial ethnic piece of that. The committee can be diverse without having a person of color on it.”
For Nicole, it was apparent to her that she was asked to serve on committees as a way to make that committee membership appear more diverse. She was angered by how diversity was viewed simply in terms of race and ethnicity. This myopic view of diversity resulted in her, as one of very few faculty members of color at her institution, serving on a large number of committees. Nicole’s example illustrates whiteness as property (Harris, 1993). Administrators and other faculty members only recognized diversity through the racial and ethnic composition of committees, thus White faculty members were immune from this cultural taxation, even though their presence could represent other forms of diversity. White faculty members not being assigned to these committees illustrates how whiteness represents a privilege that is protected.

Diane had a similar experience while sitting on committees as a full-time non-tenure-track faculty member:

Now, I’m on the strategic planning committee. I was asked to be on it last year. I was wondering why, because I am non-tenure-track, and I don’t really have the same kind of stakes. I’m on the strategic planning committee for the [college]. I was wondering about that, and the first day of our meeting, I walked in and I said “Oh, I see why.” Nobody else of color was in there. It also struck me as weird but angering that [the college] couldn’t find tenured or tenure-track faculty of color to sit on this. You had to get a NTT (non-tenure-track) faculty of color. So that bothered me. But in those conversations, those meetings, it’s very difficult, because we’re just not acknowledged. NTTs aren’t acknowledged as existing, which is weird because we’re the majority of faculty. We’re just not acknowledged and then to hear talk of diversity, faculty retention, recruitment, and I’m wondering, “Who are you talking about?” The only faculty of color you have on here is a NTT and you don’t even acknowledge that NTTs exist.

Diane was vexed about serving on the strategic planning committee. Her anger stemmed from several sources. First, it was clear that she was chosen for the committee because of her identity. While there were two other members of the committee who were from other countries, she was the only person of color on the committee. She was also the only non-tenure-track faculty member on the committee. The committee was required to have at least one non-tenure-track faculty member on it. For Diane, being both a Black woman NTFOC, allowed the committee to fulfill two committee compositional goals with one person: having representation from a faculty member of color and someone who was non-tenure-track. Finally, she was frustrated because in the conversations that occurred in the committee’s meetings, her voice as a non-tenure-track faculty member was silenced. The other committee members never addressed non-tenure-track faculty members, even though they comprised the majority of the faculty. Diane felt tokenized
on this committee. She believed her presence was not valued and she was simply chosen to serve on the committee because of her race and employment status.

For other participants, their role as non-tenure-track faculty members directly led to their increased service load, particularly service that tenured and tenure-track faculty did not want to undertake. This was true for Melissa, a Black woman part-time NTFOC at private institution of highest research activity:

I think too that oftentimes the part-time faculty, whether they’re a lecturer or simply an adjunct, they’re called upon quite a bit for the service activities, which I love to do personally, but it is most times to compensate for a tenure-track individual who is not willing to sit on that committee, or is not willing to be a part of the Master’s thesis capstone review. So, some of that is put on us as part-time faculty.

To add another dimension to this dynamic, as Melissa explained throughout her interview, all the part-time faculty members in her department come from minoritized communities. Melissa interprets this as follows:

So, it’s kind of a two for one deal when it comes to certain things. Whether it’s a committee that you want committee diversity but it just so happens to be someone who is not tenure-track. So, I think it’s really fascinating how we are pulled into that and treated quite differently than what I believe I would be treated as full-time or tenure-track faculty.

Similar to Diane, Melissa’s presence on a committee, as both a woman of color and a non-tenure-track faculty member allows the institution to claim the committee was diverse in two ways: racially and by employment type. Thus, it is the intersection of her racial identity and contingent status that leads to her being asked to perform a significant service load as a part-time faculty member.

**Limitations**

All research studies have limitations, and this study was no exception. First, the participants of this study were both part-time and full-time NTFOCs. However, full-time faculty members were overrepresented in the sample. This meant that the participants in this study had greater access to resources and were in more favorable positions than if the sample consisted of mostly part-time faculty members. This also meant that participants were more likely to be expected to perform service, as is the case with full-time non-tenure-track faculty members compared to part-time faculty members (Kezar & Sam, 2010). As such, the findings should be transferred only with caution.
Second, participants worked at a variety of institutional types. These institutions have different goals and missions, particularly with respect to service. The results should be interpreted in that context.

Finally, women were overrepresented in this sample. Women faculty members of color are often responsible for doing greater portions of mentoring or advising of students of color (Griffin & Reddick, 2011; Hirshfield & Joseph, 2012). The findings about cultural taxation need to be considered in light of the composition of the sample.

**Discussion**

The findings from the study illuminate the ways that NTFOCs are faced with cultural taxation in addition to their assigned work responsibilities. While much of the research has focused on NTFOCs’ work in the classroom, these findings illustrate how NTFOCs, and particularly women NTFOCs, are engaged in significant forms of additional labor. The participants in this study were culturally taxed through their increased obligations to support students of color, teach their colleagues about race, and meet extensive committee obligations. The findings reveal significant implications about the working conditions of NTFOCs and present potential concerns about how university administrators are attempting to fulfill their broader missions, particularly as it relates to educating students and diversity.

**Potential Impact on Students of Color**

The vast majority of participants spoke about their commitment to supporting and working with marginalized students on college campuses, a value that many institutional leaders claim to support through their diversity initiatives (Iverson, 2007). Yet, based upon the experiences of these participants, administrators have created systems where NTFOCs could not always commit to this work either because of the nature of their contracts or the constraints of their contingent status. Essentially, the very administrators who publicly proclaim their desire to support students of color have instituted systems that actually hinder such support. For example, NTFOCs were often unsure how long they would be at an institution. Yet, many students of color sought them out for long-term support. Participants spoke about serving as an advisor on a thesis committee, offering formal and informal mentoring, and serving as a source from whom students could learn different epistemologies and gain knowledge that fell outside the traditional academic base. Many respondents described students who were upset when they learned the NTFOC was leaving the institution and they (students) could not take additional courses with
that person. In these instances, students, particularly students of color who felt connected to NTFOCs suffered. They lost an advocate and support system.

Similarly, NTFOCs may not always be best positioned to support students, through no fault of their own. Non-tenure-track faculty members may not be knowledgeable about campus policies and institutional procedures or may lack access to the full range of resources due to their exclusion from institutional structures and systems (Gehrke & Kezar, 2015; Kezar & Sam, 2010; Navarro, 2017). When students of color come to them for support, they may not be able to adequately address all their problems, potentially limiting the ways they support students. Thus, without integrating NTFOCs into the broader campus and providing them with sufficient resources, students of color stand to lose out on a range of potential opportunities.

Campus leaders must engage in different practices to remedy such situations. First, administrators and tenured faculty members need to note the invaluable ways that NTFOCs support marginalized students on their campus. From the findings in this study, it is clear that NTFOCs play a major role in supporting the personal and academic success of students of color and other minoritized students. As such, it is imperative that this work be acknowledged and efforts to retain NTFOCs should be made. Second, colleges and universities need to address the hostile racial climate on their campuses. Specifically, historically White colleges and universities need to examine and revise the policies, traditions, and practices that are embedded with protecting whiteness and creating a hostile environment for students and faculty members of color (Patton, 2015). Doing so will create a better environment for students of color.

Additionally, these institutions need to hire more faculty members of color, particularly faculty members of color with long-term contracts and access to significant resources. Faculty members of color provide many benefits to an institution, including being more likely to produce research that challenges dominant Eurocentric epistemologies (Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002; Stanley, 2007; Villalpando & Delgado Bernal, 2002) and using more diverse forms of pedagogy (Umbach, 2006). They also play a major role in supporting students of color and other minoritized students. The reason students of color sought out faculty members of color for support and as mentors was largely due to the hostile racial climate at historically White colleges and universities (Allen, 1992; Beasley, 2011; Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Hurtado, 1992). Faculty members of color are an important source of support for students of color as they navigate historically White colleges and universities (Diggs, Garrison-Wade, Estrada, & Galindo, 2009).
Yet at four-year institutions of higher education, faculty members of color are underrepresented (Myers, 2016). Thus, among many other benefits, hiring more faculty members of color, particularly those that have full access to the institutions resources can create better systems of support for students of color and help them succeed.

**Bearing the Emotional Labor of Others**

The second key finding from this study was that NTFOCs are expected to teach colleagues about race. Several participants described situations in which they were asked by White colleagues to engage in conversations about race and racism. The participants that expressed these sentiments were usually women of color. This finding is consistent with previous research where women of color faculty members are expected to take on nurturing roles not only for students, but for faculty members in their department (Hirshfield & Joseph, 2012). In speaking about the experiences of Black women faculty members, Harley (2008) wrote,

> That is, not only do [Black women faculty members] perform the expected “tasks” and professional responsibilities of the professoriate, they are also the advocates for black issues, translators of black culture, navigators of a patriarchal and racial minefield, community liaison, and conduits of others’ problems (p. 24).

Thus, Black and other women of color faculty members in this study are expected to fulfill all the demands of their work as well as to listen to the problems of others, particularly as those problems relate to race and racism. This is a burden not placed upon their colleagues who identify as men or as White women, reflecting an encumbrance placed upon women NTFOCs because of their race and gender.

While some participants described situations where they actively sought ways to engage in these conversations with their colleagues in order to improve the racial climate in their department and their campuses, for many others, these were not always welcomed conversations. They involved committing emotional labor that NTFOCs were not always ready to give. Again, this is a liability for women of color (Harley, 2014; Hirshfield & Joseph, 2012). In addition, NTFOCs were still trying to understand these issues themselves and were not ready to discuss their feelings with others. Finally, their contingent status made NTFOCs reluctant to engage in arguably uncomfortable discussions for fear of saying something that may offend their colleague and potentially face some sort of retribution. The fact that so many participants shared similar experiences speaks to the prevalence of the problem of White colleagues expecting NTFOCs, and particularly women NTFOCs to be as source of support as they learned about race and
racism. White colleagues were likely unaware of the discomfort they inflicted upon NTFOCs and did not recognize the personal investment that went into such conversations. Because participants were not in tenure-track positions, they did not feel comfortable revealing their true feelings to their colleagues. Yet, they found it difficult to extract themselves from such conversation; thus, they had to engage to some degree with their colleagues.

Several steps can be done to help remedy these issues. First, White tenured and tenure-track faculty members must recognize the potential discomfort they are wreaking on NTFOCs when asking them to discuss issues of race. Such conversations may be traumatic. They should not assume that NTFOCs want to have these conversations. In order to prevent such impositions, administrators and department chairs can host optional discussions for faculty members to engage in conversations about current and controversial topics. These forums should be created without applying pressure to force faculty members to attend, particularly non-tenure-track faculty members who may not feel comfortable participating in such dialogues. However, these kinds of discussions could be useful for individuals who wish to have these larger conversations and can learn from other colleagues who also willingly engage in them. In this way, pressure is not placed upon largely women NTFOCs to serve as emotional support systems for their tenured and tenure-track White colleagues. Secondly, department chairs need to meet with NTFOCs to better understand their realities. Some NTFOCs may want to be invited to spaces to share their knowledge and play a major role in creating a better environment with their departments and colleagues. Others may want to do this work, but only when they feel comfortable to do so. It is important for department chairs to better understand how NTFOCs feel about performing this type of work and the consequences of it. By engaging NTFOCs in these discussions, department chairs can work to create an environment that better supports NTFOCs’ professional success and personal well-being (Kezar, 2013a).

**Feeling Pressured to Do Committee Work**

The third way that NTFOCs experienced cultural taxation was through additional committee work. NTFOCs were often assigned to committees as a result of their racial identity. This is consistent with the research about tenured and tenure-track faculty members (Baez, 2000; Johnson, Kuykendall & Laird, 2005; Joseph & Hirshfield, 2011). For women NTFOCs, this onus is particularly burdensome, as they were assigned committee as a result of their race and gender. Women faculty members of color face a “double-bind syndrome” (Stanley, 2006b),
where they must perform work related to their race and gender (Turner, 2002). This additional committee work took a great deal of time. Consistent with previous research, the findings of this study show that faculty members of color are devoting significant hours to service (Johnson, Kuykendall, & Laird, 2005; Wood, Hilton, & Nevarez, 2015). However, for these participants the intersection of their contingent status, and racial and gender identities brought additional dimensions to this work.

Although they were overburdened, participants often felt they could not say no when asked to perform various service functions. This was particularly true for participants who hoped to land tenure-track positions at their current institution. They were frequently told by mentors to say no when asked to sit on committees, but for many this was not an option as they thought it would undermine their chance of securing more permanent employment status. They believed that upsetting someone by declining a service assignment could result in not getting a tenure-track position, so they did not believe they were in a position to speak out. These circumstances placed NTFOCs, and in particular women NTFOCs who are faced with a double-bind (Stanley, 2006b), in potentially exploitative situations where they could continue to be assigned service and felt they had to accept those assignments. Given that women of color already face exploitation through their overrepresentation in non-tenure-track positions (Navarro, 2017), assuming a disproportionate amount of service only increases their mistreatment in the academy.

The additional committee work places an unfair burden upon NTFOCs that administrators and department chairs must attempt to remedy. Administrative leaders must begin to consider the burdens they ask women NTFOCs to assume. They need to develop protocols and policies for limiting service work of NTFOCs. One participant suggested that non-tenure-track faculty members should be limited to serving on one committee. Given that many women NTFOCs are underpaid and are in vulnerable positions due to the short-term nature of their contracts, being on too many committees could result in an exploitative situation. Secondly, administrators and faculty members, when creating committees, need to think about the contributions of faculty members of color beyond their race. Participants mentioned they would be willing to serve on committees, but want to be selected because of the valuable contributions they could make rather than simply because of their racial or ethnic background. Finally, White faculty members need to take on greater service responsibilities, particularly those
responsibilities that relate to diversity. Administrators need to think about diversity not simply in terms of racial and ethnic categories and be willing to assign more White faculty members to sit on these committees. Such an approach can be the first step to minimizing the sheer volume of committee work conducted by NTFOCs.

**Underpaid and Unrecognized**

The data revealed two additional trends throughout each of the themes that merit attention in this discussion. The first is being underpaid and unrecognized for their labor. The participants in this study spent significant time supporting and mentoring students of color, teaching colleagues about race, and sitting on committees. This is consistent with the experiences of tenured and tenure-track faculty members of color (Griffin & Reddick, 2011; Johnson, Kuykendall & Laird, 2005; Joseph & Hirshfield, 2011; Umbach, 2006). However, the implications differ for NTFOCs in two key ways. Many NTFOCs, particularly adjuncts and those who are compensated based on the number of courses or credit hours they teach, may not be paid for this work. Marisól’s situation is a perfect example: she can only teach two classes per semester and work no more than 19 hours per week. She and other part-time faculty members of color in similar situations are not compensated for the additional work with students that they assume. Even NTFOCs who work full-time and may be expected to advise and mentor students and sit on committees are paid less than their tenure-track and tenured colleagues who perform similar functions (Shulman et al., 2017; United States Government Accountability Office, 2017). As Kezar (2013b) noted, many contingent faculty members may be working extra hours on things like scholarship in order to remain competitive on the job market. Thus, NTFOCs who mentor students sacrifice time they could spend on research or other aspects of their work that might advance their career.

This is especially troubling for women NTFOCs. While all participants spoke about engaging in additional work, the largest share of this burden fell on women NTFOCs. There are certain assumptions about women faculty members of color when it comes to service (Allen, 1990). In particular, they are thought to serve as role models for other women of color. However, such work minimizes their intellectual contributions to a university (Allen, 1990). This service work infrequently leads to promotion or more secure contracts (Baez, 2002; Duncan, 2014) and marginalizes women NTFOCs (Garcia, 2005). Given that women NTFOCs
are overrepresented in non-tenure-track positions relative to men of color faculty members, women NTFOCs operate in a system that significantly burdens their financial well-being.

In addition to not being paid or being underpaid for service work, NTFOCs are often not recognized for this work. While some participants were expected to perform various forms of service work and had avenues for promotion where service was a factor, many NTFOCs had no mechanism to receive recognition or acknowledgement for their service work. As several participants noted, by not being on the tenure-track and if there was no avenue for promotion, there was no space to acknowledge this work. This work did not count towards meeting their current job responsibilities, and would not help them secure a better position. As such, the work of NTFOCs can be ignored.

Administrators need to create situations that prevent the work of NTFOCs from being underpaid and unrecognized. First, they need to offer better salaries that reflect the true work of NTFOCs. The results of this study indicate that NTFOCs are making valuable contributions to the campus community inside and outside of the classroom. Their pay should reflect all this work. Second, administrators need to create mechanisms that acknowledge the work of NTFOCs. This can start by speaking with NTFOCs, better understanding the additional labor they perform, and creating rewards for such work, rather than ignoring these extraordinary efforts.

**Need to Invest in NTFOCs**

The second trend that emerged across themes was the need to invest in NTFOCs, or the clear need for institutions to make efforts to retain NTFOCs by offering them tenure-track or long-term contracts and ensuring they have full access to all the university’s resources. The findings were compelling: participants made invaluable contributions to their college and university campuses by mentoring and supporting marginalized students, teaching their colleagues about race, and serving on university committees. In addition to this work, participants revealed that they had received teaching awards, had produced publications and other forms of research, and had received national recognition in their fields. They were very accomplished. As such, colleges and universities should want to retain these individuals who have done so much at their institutions and should reward them for their contributions by offering them longer term contracts and better conditions. Most participants indicated a desire for a tenure-track position, with some preferring a teaching-based tenure-track position. For
others, long-term contracts were the goal. All participants sought job security. Providing more secure employment status should help to alleviate concerns about job security for NTFOCs, create situations where they can be a more permanent presence on campuses to support students, and honor and reward the work they have done. This also serves institutional interests, as creating an environment that supports the economic and job security of faculty helps institutions to best succeed in meeting their educational mission (Shulman et al., 2016). Thus, investing in NTFOCs benefits all campus constituents.

**Implications for Research**

This study examined the experiences of NTFOCs and in particular the ways they faced a cultural taxation in their work. In general, more studies should be conducted about the experiences of NTFOCs. First, research should be done that examines the amount of time NTFOCs are engaged in service related activities and if this work takes away from additional professional and personal responsibilities.

Second, further research could examine how the experiences of NTFOCs differ by gender. In particular, researchers could examine what gender differences exist in the types of service NTFOCs perform and how they respond to various service demands.

Finally, this study examined the experiences of NTFOCs who worked under different contractual conditions. Future studies should examine the conditions of NTFOCs who occupy specific roles and responsibilities – including adjuncts, lecturers, instructors, and visiting assistant professors – to determine how these experiences may differ by category. Such research would give a clearer picture about how NTFOCs experience cultural taxation based upon their responsibilities.

**Conclusion**

NTFOCs are disadvantaged in terms of their salaries and work conditions. This study revealed that they face cultural taxation by engaging in additional types of service due to their race. This additional service is one more disadvantage that they must endure. Additionally, it can impact the professional and personal well-being of NTFOCs. This also has the potential to impact the types of support and learning students receive. Administrators and campus leaders need to recognize the impact that cultural taxation has on NTFOCs and create better systems that acknowledge and reward this work. Failing to address such concerns simply perpetuates the inequity reflected in the working conditions and experiences of NTFOCs.
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Greetings,

My name is Ryan Rideau and I am a Ph.D. Candidate in the Higher Education program at Virginia Tech. I am currently working on my dissertation that examines the experiences of non-tenure track faculty members of color at predominantly White, doctoral research universities. I am contacting your organization in hopes of soliciting your support for this project, particularly in helping identify participants. I am wondering if you would be able to send out the attached Call for Participants (attached) to your listserv? I believe your support of this project will help to further highlight the working conditions for non-tenure-track faculty members and hopefully reveal ways to improve those conditions.

My dissertation is a qualitative study that uses Critical race theory to examine the experiences of non-tenure-track faculty members of color. I have three primary research questions: (1) How do non-tenure-track faculty members of color experience racism on college campuses?; (2) How does the intersection of one’s social identities (e.g. race, gender, etc.) shape the working experiences of non-tenure-track faculty members of color?; and (3) How do NTFOC negotiate their experiences with racism and other oppressive systems on their campus? I have gained approval for this study from my university’s Institutional Review Board (see attached letter).

The results from this study will be submitted for publication. I hope the findings will be used to further conversations about the experiences of non-tenure-track faculty members, particularly those from underrepresented racial groups, as well as to shape institutional policies regarding the support for non-tenure-track faculty members.

The Call for Participants contains additional information such as the criteria for participation. Given that many of your members are likely to have spent time thinking about their experiences as a non-tenure-track faculty member, I believe they would make a substantial contribution to this study. I am willing to share the findings from the study with your organization. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me. I also would be happy to provide you with any additional information you might require. Thank you in advance for your consideration of this request.
Sincerely,

Ryan Rideau  
Ph.D. Candidate, Higher Education Program  
Virginia Tech  
rrideau@vt.edu  
(310) 293-3716
APPENDIX B
Call for Participants

Greetings,

My name is Ryan Rideau and I am a Ph.D. Candidate in the Higher Education program at Virginia Tech. I am currently working on my dissertation that examines the experiences of non-tenure track faculty members of color at predominantly White institutions of higher education. I am seeking participants for this study. Participation in this study requires individuals to meet all eligibility requirements and take part in one 90-minute interview over Skype, Google Hangout, or FaceTime. Interview questions will center on your experiences as a non-tenure-track faculty member of color. To be eligible for this study you must meet the following criteria:

1. Identify with one of the following groups: American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian or Asian American, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latinx, Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian, or Two or More Races;
2. Work at a four-year, predominantly White, doctoral research, institution of higher education;
3. Currently not eligible for tenure;
4. Have current responsibilities that primarily involve instruction;
5. Be in at least your second academic term at your institution; and
6. Be seeking a more permanent academic contract or tenure-track position.

If you are interested in participating in this study, I ask that you please complete this short survey (5 minutes) (Qualtrics Link).

Once you complete it, you will be contacted about potentially setting up a time for a formal interview. Participation in the study is voluntary. All identification will be kept confidential. The results of this study may be published but if so, your identity will be protected. No identifying information will be shared with anyone other than the researcher.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at rrideau@vt.edu. I would like to thank you in advance for your help and I look forward to hearing from you.
Sincerely,

Ryan Rideau
Ph.D. Candidate, Higher Education Program
Virginia Tech
rrideau@vt.edu
Questions

1. At how many institutions of higher education do you currently work? (1, 2, 3, 4)
2. What is/are the name(s) of the institution(s)?
   a. What is your primary institution of employment?
3. City/state where primary institution of employment is located:
4. Current title in primary job:
5. Is this position full time? (Y/N)
6. Are you eligible for tenure in this position? (Y/N)
7. Are you eligible for promotion in this position? (Y/N)
8. How long have you been a faculty member at this institution (excluding experiences as a graduate teaching experience)? (1yr, 2yr, 3yr, 4yr, 5+yr)
9. What is your field of expertise?
10. What are your research interests?
11. Do you have a terminal degree in this field? (Y/N)
12. From what institution did you receive your most recent degree?
13. Is teaching your primary job responsibility?
14. In what department do you teach?
15. What courses do you teach?
16. How many courses do you typically teach each term (semester or quarter)? (1, 2, 3, 4, 5+)
17. What is the length of your current contract? (semester/quarter, 1yr, 2yr, 3yr, Other – please list)
18. Is this contract renewable? (Y/N)
19. Are you seeking a more stable faculty position such as a tenure-track position? (Y/N)
20. Name
21. Race
22. Gender
23. Are you a parent (Y/N)
   a. If so, please list the age of each child?
24. Email
25. Phone Number
26. Is it ok to leave a phone message? (Y/N)
27. Do you prefer to communicate via Google Hangout, Skype, or FaceTime (check preference)

Thank you for your response. I will follow up with you regarding this survey within three to five business days.

Sincerely,
Ryan Rideau
Ph.D. Candidate, Higher Education Program
Virginia Tech
rrideau@vt.edu
Dear [Title and Name],

I would like to thank you for expressing interest in participating in my research about the experiences of non-tenure-track faculty members of color. I know your time is valuable. An overwhelming number of individuals expressed interest in participating in the study. Due to this high level of interest, I was unable to include every respondent. Unfortunately, I am not able to include you in the study at this time. I would like to thank you again for your expressed interest and wish you all the best in your future endeavors.

Sincerely,

Ryan Rideau
Ph.D. Candidate, Higher Education Program
Virginia Tech
rrideau@vt.edu
APPENDIX E
Phone Call Protocol

Step 1: Thank you for expressing interest in this study. The purpose of this call is to verify information from the online screening tool and to learn a bit more about you.

Step 2: Verify information from online screening tool

Step 3: Questions

1. Can you tell me a bit about your path to a career in academia?
2. Why do you want to participate in this study?
3. What do you hope to gain by participating in this study?

Step 4: May I schedule a time for interview (if they meet all criteria, and are able to provide rich information to the questions)

Date of Interview:
Time of Interview:
Preferred chat service (Google Hangout, Skype, or FaceTime)
APPENDIX F
Interview Questions

(Prompt: In a several of the questions, I use the term social identities. I use the term to refer to personal characteristics such as your race, gender, ethnicity, class, sexual orientation, religion, ability, etc).

Section 1: Background Questions
1. What motivated you to pursue a career in academia?
2. How did you end up working in your current position?

Section 2: Interactions with Students
3. What are some of the things that you enjoy most about teaching?
4. What are some of the things that you do not enjoy about teaching?
5. As a (name race and gender) non-tenure-track faculty member, can you tell me about your interactions with students? (RQ1; RQ2)
6. Can you tell me about one or two examples you have had when students’ perception of your race (and gender) impacted your teaching? (RQ2)
7. Can you tell me about a time when students’ perception of any other of your social identities impacted your teaching? (RQ2)
   a. Are students aware of your non-tenure-track status?
      i. If yes, how do they respond to this?
8. Can you tell me about an experience you’ve had with racism or another form of oppression in your interactions with students? (RQ3)
   a. How did you respond to this situation?
   b. Do you think you would you have responded differently if you were in a more permanent position? If yes, how so?

Section 3: Department Experiences
9. What are some of the things that you enjoy most about working in your department?
10. What are some of the things that you enjoy least about working in your department?
11. Can you tell me about a time when your race and/or gender shaped your interactions in your department? (RQ1; RQ2)
12. Can you tell me about a time when any other of your social identities shaped your interactions in your department? (RQ2)
   a. How do they treat you relative to your tenure-track colleagues?
13. Can you tell me about one or two examples of times when your departmental colleagues’ perceptions of your race (and gender) impacted your ability to perform your job? (RQ1; RQ2)
14. Can you tell me about one or two examples of times when your departmental colleagues’ perceptions of any of your other social identities impacted your ability to perform your job? (RQ1; RQ2)
15. Can you tell me about an experience you’ve had with racism or another form of oppression in in your interactions with faculty and staff members in your department? (RQ3)?
   a. Would you have responded differently if you were in a more permanent position? If yes, how so? (RQ3)
   b. How have you responded to incidents of racism in non-work environments?

Section 4: Summative Questions

16. In the online survey, you noted that you are seeking a more stable or tenure-track faculty position. How does your current position help and/or hinder you from achieving that goal?
17. If given the opportunity, what suggestions would you offer to your faculty colleagues or department head or other administrative leaders that would improve your situation? (RQ3)
18. Is there anything else you would like to tell me that was not covered in this interview?
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IRB Approval Letter
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TO: Claire Kathleen Robbins, Ryan Rideau, Joan B Hirt
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APPENDIX H
Consent Form

Please read this consent agreement carefully before you decide to participate in the study.

Purpose of the research study: The purpose of the study is to examine the experiences of non-tenure-track faculty members of color at predominantly White institutions of higher education.

What you will do in the study: Participants will be interviewed over Skype, Google Hangout, or FaceTime and the interview will be recorded.

Time required: The interview will require about 90 minutes of your time.

Risks: There may be some risk related to psychological difficulty in speaking about experiences with racism, sexism, and other systematic inequities.

Benefits: Your feedback could be used to generate recommendations to improve the experiences of non-tenure-track faculty members of color working at predominantly White Institutions of Higher Education.

Confidentiality: The information that you provide in the study will be handled confidentially. When the study is completed and the data have been analyzed, your interview recording will be destroyed. Your name will not be used in any report. The information that you give in the study will be confidential. Your name will not be linked to the data. The transcripts and other data will be kept for three years, at which point they will be destroyed.

Voluntary participation: Your participation in the study is completely voluntary.

Right to withdraw from the study: You have the right to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. The audio recording and transcription of your interview will be destroyed should you decide to withdraw.

How to withdraw from the study:
If you want to withdraw from the study, please tell the interviewer to stop the discussion. There is no penalty for withdrawing. If you would like to withdraw after your interview, please contact Ryan Rideau at rrideau@vt.edu.

Payment: You will receive no payment for participating in the study.

If you have questions about the study, contact:
Ryan Rideau
Ph.D. Candidate
Higher Education Program
rrideau@vt.edu
(310) 293-3716
If you have questions about your rights as a human participant in this research, contact:

Joan B. Hirt, Professor       David M. Moore, Chair
Higher Education Program     Virginia Tech Institutional Review
School of Education (0302)   Board for the Protection of Human Subjects
1750 Kraft Dr.               Office of Research Compliance
Blacksburg, VA 24060         Telephone: (540) 231-4991
Email: jbhirt@vt.edu         Email: moored@vt.edu

Claire K. Robbins, Assistant Professor
Higher Education Program
School of Education (0302)
1750 Kraft Dr.
Blacksburg, VA 24060
Email: robbinss@vt.edu

Agreement:
I agree to participate in the research study described above.

☐ Yes
☐ No

Name: _________________________________

Date: _________________________________
APPENDIX I

Contact Summary Form

Participant Alias:

Date of Interview:

Interview Platform:

Today’s Date:

1. What were the main issues that emerged from this interview?

2. Summarize the information you received for each research question.
   a. RQ1
   b. RQ2
   c. RQ3

3. Any other important or interesting points?

4. Would you change anything for subsequent interviews?