Liberating our Writing:

Critical Narratives and Systemic Changes in Education and the Social Sciences

We outline here our evolution as sociologists of education employing a social justice lens while studying transitions to college among youth of color. During our graduate training and early academic careers, we felt pushed to center "mainstream" theories of college transitions, which often failed to account for the power struggles and intersectional oppression our empirical investigations uncovered. Though we navigated distinct journeys through tenure, we shared similar pressures to de-center critical, liberatory frameworks in academic writing to publish and keep our jobs. Our experiences taught us that we would be compared to peers using "mainstream" frameworks and would face rejections, publication delays, and other risks.

As we wrote, published, and established careers, we engaged more directly with critical theories to explain *why* transitions to college among students of color vary in complex and intersectional ways. Specifically, we engaged critical frameworks in distinction to "frameworks that reproduce inequities, normalize oppression, and denigrate historically disenfranchised communities" (Salazar & Rios, 2016, p. 7). Sociology—the discipline that connects us—is especially well-positioned to address structural, systemic challenges in education and academia, including racial, class, and gender inequities. Yet, critical frameworks centering social justice and equity remain at its margins. We share our writing and publishing processes using *critical* and *intersectionality frameworks* across distinct studies with multiple quantitative and qualitative methodologies. Seeking academic jobs and tenure based on scholarly publications during recessions and crises created additional stresses. These pressures initially disciplined our writing and invalidated our ideas. Over time, through the power of collective, supportive writing spaces, we began to undiscipline and liberate our writing.

Our narratives illustrate individual experiences situated within the academic system and the disciplinary and institutional structures therein. To liberate academia—and ourselves—from intergenerationally reproducing often hidden pressures and traumas, we close by offering systemic solutions. We cut below the surface-level, easily visible challenges in academic writing, bringing to light anti-racist, systems-level change and liberatory writing (Stroh, 2015; Welton et al, 2018).

Disciplining our Writing During and After Graduate School

We encountered scholars and mentors who offered critiques through peer reviews of our work and — we felt – our very personhood. As vulnerable graduate students and early career scholars bright with energy and potential, our writing and ideas were disciplined. Even well-intentioned disciplining at times dimmed our courage, muddling our clarity. We look back on our experiences to identify turning points and opportunities for reflection, rethinking our mentoring of junior scholars—particularly those marginalized in the academy—and our own critical work.

Lara: Looking back at my purpose statements and essays from graduate school, my voice and resolve rang clear. I aimed to tell the stories of students from underserved communities used to being shown as negative statistics and uncover mechanisms to explain how these students could indeed break through. I wanted to understand this process to effect systemic change. This is why I chose to attend graduate school and sought to be a faculty member rather than working at a high school like my mother wanted, or a physician specializing in adolescents like I thought I wanted. Throughout my education leading up to graduate school, I trained my scientific skills alongside my writing, confident I had a valuable perspective to offer.

Like many, the first term of my Ph.D. program challenged that assumption. Specifically, a final paper I thought I had aced resulted in a C. While I saw value in integrating hip hop lyrics

and contemporary texts into an analysis of the challenges facing youth, our revered instructor did not, and did not hold back in chastising the limitations of this perhaps overly creative and post-modern approach. My undergraduate classmate took a similar approach to the hallowed halls of Broadway to generate a renowned Tony-award winning classic, but this was academia. Its halls felt narrower and colder. Meanwhile, the only other Puerto Rican student in my large cohort was expelled at the end of the term. This and the final grade welcomed me back to the chill of winter and a chastened humility to go along with the weather.

While among the first in my cohort to complete the Ph.D. and secure a tenure-track faculty position, I continued to feel this and other stings as my writing progressed. Similar chilling out processes happen to many underrepresented scholars of color during graduate school (Gildersleeve et al., 2011). Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) scholars are underrepresented among doctoral graduates (NCSES, 2021) and represent an even smaller share of the professoriate, especially at research-intensive institutions where most graduate faculty earn their terminal degrees (Nelson, 2017).

In my early career, I struggled with doubt emerging from isolating experiences. I felt alone on a deep journey with a narrow topic, managing requests to justify decisions which seemed clear to me but not necessarily to mentors or blind reviewers. This included being told in front of others to write an explanation with citations on why I chose to use “Latino” rather than “Hispanic” in my academic writing, despite my identity and research to date, because many senior (generally White) scholars still used “Hispanic.” The memory continues to feel humiliating now as it was in the moment. Similarly, key mentors strongly dismissed my first dissertation idea before my pitch was finished, even when reattempted. I learned that my voice and opinion mattered conditionally, and needed to be earned, apparently by going through the

traditional paces first before exercising agency.

Such disciplining of my ideas and decisions carried over into citations. Specifically, I was steered away from "less rigorous" critical work. Instead, I was encouraged to cite senior psychological and sociological scholars whom senior faculty regarded highly, rather than emergent scholars I was reading and was interested in centering. These scholars included critical and highly relevant scholars of color whose writing inspires today's graduate students (e.g., Solórzano & Villalpando, 1998; Yosso, 2005)[1]. This matters beyond my own story, as citation counts and networks matter immensely for decisions to tenure and promotion, which are economic and professional recognitions less commonly or quickly awarded to BIPOC faculty and women (Li & Koedel, 2017).

Melanie: As an Asian American, I had experienced racism, such as being called a "gook" in high school, and I entered a sociology Ph.D. program with broad interests in studying racism in schooling. I was also interested in *intersectionality*, although at the time I did not name that as my interest or understand it as a "knowledge project…[with] attentiveness to power relations and social inequalities" (Collins, 2015, p. 3). Ultimately, I was interested in advancing social justice in education, but, again, I did not know what that meant or how to pursue those efforts while obtaining a Sociology Ph.D. I had little knowledge of what graduate school would entail, whether and how to pursue an academic career, let alone a career involving social justice and academic writing. I was unfamiliar with academic writing as a profession and needed coaching. This problem is widespread, but faculty members have little institutional incentives and support to provide this mentoring, especially to students of color and first-generation college students (Calarco, 2020).

---

[1] These adaptations to feedback were complicated by an interdisciplinary research focus and studying student and life transitions to and through college and career through multiple methodologies.

In graduate school, I developed my research interests but struggled with theoretical frameworks. My dissertation examined racial and class-based constraints in how Black students navigate college options and counseling channels in a racially stratified high school. After completing my dissertation, I submitted a manuscript to a top sociology journal, and I was on the academic job market. That article engaged with prominent sociology of education theories and analyzed the roles of race and class in how Black students approached educators for college support. When I received a major Revise and Resubmit decision, I struggled to develop the article's theoretical contributions. I eventually received a rejection for that re-submission and three later rejections from mainstream education journals for different versions of that article.

My graduate training in sociology of education centered "mainstream" theoretical frameworks and empirical work. My exam lists had few pieces employing intersectionality and critical race frameworks. I remember being pushed to engage with mainstream literature on class stratification and older debates on the significance of race vs. class, which effectively signaled valued frameworks at that time. I was subtly pushed to downplay the significance of racism in my work even though my research was on racism and intersectional forms of oppression. At one conference, a senior faculty questioned my interpretations on racism and how working-class Black students felt discounted by teachers who expected them to do extra credit. Senior faculty asked, "Maybe they just don't want to do extra credit?"— implying that Black students' apparent "lack of motivation and effort" was the answer, not racism. These responses by senior sociologists invoked colorblind racism – a dominant American racial ideology surrounding principles of equal opportunity and assumptions that racism and systemic racial inequities are things of the past, "naturally occurring" issues, or problems relegated to individual choices and behaviors (Bonilla-Silva, 2017).

These colorblind messages served to de-center and dismiss critical perspectives on racism and to discipline my academic voice and writing. I felt pressured to prioritize mainstream theories in sociology of education to have my work recognized and valued. However, those theories did not entirely fit my findings, analysis, and academic perspective. These colorblind messages affected my experiences with imposter syndrome and marginalization while I sought to develop my academic identity and publish on the tenure track. Balancing teaching, research, parenthood, and developing an academic "fit," as well as heavy mentoring and service work, produced stress and anxiety and stunted my spirit in academic writing (see Joseph & Hirshfield, 2011; Zambrana et al., 2021).

Sarah: I began graduate studies after three years teaching seventh grade in Oakland, California, and I was miserable. Seventh graders are notoriously challenging, but it was not the kids that wore me down so much as the sense that I was able to make only incremental differences. With a sociology Ph.D., I thought, I could influence big ideas and policy changes.

Unfortunately, I felt I had few ideas of my own. It seemed everyone else was clear about their topic, while I was floundering in the dark. Moreover, I struggled to write sociologically. It stung when a senior scholar described my draft as "journalistic." I was terrified by the expectation to produce wholly new ideas—multiple times. The best way to attain writerly authority, I reasoned, would be to utilize established theories, and arrange my contributions on top, like candles on a store-bought cake. At various times in writing my dissertation, a longitudinal interview study investigating gender differences in the transition to college among Latinx youth, I considered "extending" status attainment theory, "building on" assimilation theory, and "fully testing" oppositional culture theory. I spent months considering and discarding "mainstream" theories to describe the phenomena I observed: Latinx girls and boys with equal

ambition, experiencing unequal college enrollment that differed not only by gender, but also in the *meanings* attached to their educational goals. My training had largely taught me to see gender as a variable, and I had few theoretical tools in my skill set to investigate gender and racialization dynamics analytically, let alone simultaneously. I had not yet read Critical Race Theory, nor anything naming an intersectional lens, despite these critical theories having existed since the 1970s. My limitations remain visible in my earliest publications. I wrote using tools I'd been handed, and well-intentioned feedback from established scholars pushed me to remain "legible" to the academy. This meant engaging with "mainstream" theories, though their shortcomings in describing the differences I found were impossible to ignore.

Eventually, I developed an intersectionality and family-culture framework, despite some committee members' reservations that the gender-race distinction I uncovered was "probably just additive." Some mentors pushed me to "control" for identities like race/ethnicity and gender, but I could not do that because people do not consider facets of their identities as separate variables to be turned on or off at will. I completed my dissertation during my three-year-old's part-time preschool hours, my two-month-old strapped to my chest, pushing past my uncertainty and others' skepticism.

Liberating and Authenticizing our Writing

Sarah: I celebrated graduation with an infant on my hip, having accepted a tenure-track job at Virginia Tech. My intersectional lens fit their advertised "sociology of diversity" position. I moved across the country with my spouse—who was able to keep his job—our kids, and elderly dog. Within that first year, I sent a chapter of my dissertation to a top sociology journal. It was swiftly rejected, but the reviews suggested promise. That paper was eventually published at *Gender & Society*, after reworking the framework by giving myself a crash course in feminist,

critical, interpretive, and intersectionality theories. I wrote and read and wrote more, two hours each night at the dining table after my kids' bedtime, for eight weeks straight.

I found the tenure-track writing process more daunting than graduate school, with what felt like my entire family's future hanging in the balance. Some colleagues, though supportive, had more conservative views than my graduate school mentors on what publications "counted" as valuable, and prized solo-authorship. My pre-tenure review period further disciplined my writing. I focused narrowly on journals I thought would legitimize my scholarship to colleagues who would judge my worthiness to remain employed. I applied for grants at a frenetic pace, compounding my tendency to seek external validation of my scholarship, which was increasingly tied to my sense of self-worth. I now see how unhealthy my situation was, particularly as a parent of young children. My dream job uprooted us from the community we had built in California, and carried us far from family support. I got sick frequently and developed insomnia. My spouse and I buried ourselves in work and our relationship suffered. I signed a somewhat unfavorable book contract in a desperate bid to get a solo-authored monograph published in time to "count" for tenure. I set aside pushing big ideas and focused on pushing out big publications.

Melanie: As an Assistant Professor, I increased my collaborations and conversations with other critical sociologists engaged in literature on classism, sexism, and racism, and I read deeply and engrossed myself in critical work on racialization, youth assets and repertoires, and intersectionality. Discussions with trusted support networks and writing with coauthors helped me to develop a stronger voice as an academic writer and to approach academic writing beyond the production of "a commodity to be produced, distributed, and consumed" as part of the neoliberal model of education and academic knowledge (Cervantes-Soon, 2016, p. 2010). I now realize how writing to publish – a goal early scholars are pressured to follow to survive in

academia – was difficult to balance with my goals of speaking truth about racism and intersectional social injustices.

At DePaul University, I participated in a faculty development program designed to help diverse faculty navigate various constraints and pressures and align research and writing goals. Through that program, I learned how to protect writing time and develop supportive accountability groups, mainly with other women and scholars of color. In graduate school, I participated in writing groups, but I did not realize the importance of academic writing for my job, advancing my career, and social-justice efforts. It took years, but I learned to develop my academic voice and to navigate academic peer review and sociology and interdisciplinary journals publishing critical work on racism and oppression.

Lara: During and after graduate school, I was fortunate to find communities of similarly motivated academic writers. The structured support and accountability offered by peer writing groups can be critical for scholars from marginalized communities (Rockquemore & Laszloffy, 2008), perhaps especially if writing for social justice is the organizing frame (Salazar & Rios, 2016). After seeing peers competing against one another (and ultimately win) a major national fellowship, I sought out a small group of cohort mates who became accountability dissertation proposal writing partners. After coursework ended, collaborating and sharing paper drafts reconnected us to each other and the writing process over meals. In the liminal space between coursework and dissertation defense, structure and community were vital. We each won fellowships to support our work and remained in academic research and writing, most of us as faculty. I engaged in writing and support groups off and on prior to becoming faculty.

When such a community did not materialize as an early career faculty member with one and then another toddler, I found writing collaboration and community with my graduate student

collaborators. Like many BIPOC faculty, and women of color in particular, I struggled in early career with the absence of peer collaborators and mentors as regular members of my writing community (see Kelly & McCann, 2014). Once that began to change, my writing, well-being, and productivity all improved.

Three changes occurred in tandem between 2015 and 2017, which helped me reclaim my writing motivation and voice. First, my children became more independent and healthier, allowing for fewer interruptions. Second, I found community in a group of women STEM researchers in the field of Higher Education, who welcomed me in their group and conference panels. A professional society's retreat allowed us to deepen ties and discuss future collaborations, such as a special issue with a colleague who is also highly engaged in research and training on equity in faculty development. Third, two mid-career colleagues – a scholar of Black composition and rhetoric and a scholar on Black faculty and graduate socialization – garnered seed funding for an institutional initiative connecting faculty of color, including a Scholarly Writing Accountability Group (SWAG). Even when not actively involved in the group, this network and subsequent connections reenergized my writing, helped me feel valued, and helped me reconnect with peers and purpose. Even though I typically choose to write at a quiet desk with an additional monitor, periodically taking time to connect to other writers who have walked similar paths sparked a transformation that allowed me the space and ability to let go of external voices, and more efficiently find the strong, quiet motivational voice that allowed me to keep going, writing, and moving through and beyond tenure.

Re-Centering Equity While Liberating Our Academic Writing

We detailed above our experiences in developing academic writing using critical perspectives in sociology of education. Our narratives collectively represent a call to action for

social scientists to center critical approaches that push our students and ourselves to speak truth to power. With our reflections, we seek to present advice for institutions and early-career scholars navigating academic pressures to advance academic writing for social justice.

We now train future scholars, policymakers, and practitioners tasked with increasing access and equity in educational pathways. Through our research, experiences, and preparation of the next generation of researchers, we argue for centering critical and intersectionality frameworks to analyze micro- and macro-level social forces influencing the educational experiences, agency, and possibilities of youth of color. These and other critical frameworks should be centralized in graduate student training for research and academic writing, as well as ongoing professional resources for faculty during and beyond early career stages.

Melanie*:* After five years at DePaul, I moved institutions and essentially re-started my tenure clock in 2016. At both institutions, I mentored more graduate students than my White male colleagues. I have confronted colleagues about the need for inclusive, equitable mentoring and centering critical perspectives in reading lists for graduate students. I also work on department inclusivity committees and cultivate communal and supportive spaces for academics of color and marginalized positions, necessary for survival, productivity, and affirming aspects of academic writing (Dobbs & Leider, 2021).

Academic writing accountability and support groups and friendships with like-minded social-justice-oriented scholars, mainly women and scholars of color, have empowered my work and confidence in employing critical frameworks as a social-justice scholar. Those people have heard, encouraged, and uplifted my academic voice and helped me navigate burnout. Simultaneously, I seek to uplift their well-being and academic voices, as well as those of my mentees.

Sarah: Post-tenure, I resolved to avoid the trap I feared was looming ahead. Knowing that women are more likely to get "stuck" as associate professors, I set myself up to succeed—so I thought—by committing to multiple new research projects with deadlines that would keep me from exiting the full professor fast-track. What I accomplished was setting myself on a course for self-destruction. I persisted for a year post-tenure in this way, working the way I always had, with my previous goals: top-ranked journal publications and another book, plus added service and leadership responsibilities attached to my associate rank.

A confluence of personal and family crises, coupled with unmistakable signs of burnout, caused me to reconsider my role in the academy, why I wrote, and how I chose to work with colleagues and graduate students. With additional counseling and mentoring, I began to ask myself what *I* valued. A pivotal conversation with a mentor, a senior scholar of color, challenged me to form new guiding questions: What is the freedom I have now, post-tenure? How can I broaden my reach beyond academic journals? How can I engage with audiences beyond the academy? A sabbatical, coincidentally timed with the COVID-19 pandemic, helped me refocus. Now, I collaborate with a broader network of scholars pushing for on-the-ground educational reforms for historically marginalized students. I published an essay on the history of newsletters in the *Washington Post*, purely for fun and to bring attention to alternative online communities. I changed my ambition from *get promoted ASAP* to *do work that matters.* My mentor's advice, written on a sticky note on my monitor, guides my daily writing practice.

Lara. My perceived talent as a writer has ebbed and flowed, too often moderated by the reviews of others (both blinded and known identities). Indeed, much of my work has centered on self-beliefs and the contexts they were embedded in, and the effects of these beliefs on students' capacity to forge past society's expectations for them (e.g., Perez-Felkner, 2015). As writers, and

as scholars, we are motivated by problems we want to address. The interventions described above helped me work through career challenges. But I also found healing through the act of researching, reading, and writing about entrenched demographic disparities, with attention to (1) individuals' capacity to change their beliefs and their outcomes, and, more importantly, (2) the potential to *change the contexts* in which harmful messages are transmitted. I pursued an academic career to work on systemic issues in education rather than the repeated individual crises my mother encountered with hundreds of students in the South Bronx and working-class exurbs. In turn, the possibility for change through writing and its dissemination feels critical, necessary, and indeed liberatory.

When applying to graduate schools, I recall walking by the window of an Ivy League sociology department's brag bookshelf, where every book included the words "Inequality" or "Stratification," and nearly every cover was dark with foreboding images that signaled an oppressive weight of stagnation. Such a small thing, a trophy shelf of recent books on a single given day. But now I think about how to frame problems and puzzles to audiences to engage them to keep investing in the possibility of change.

Tenure is a double-edged sword. The high stakes of winning a rare assistant professor position, and keeping it, found me and others contorting ourselves when we felt monitored, gaslighted, and precariously positioned. However, I can now selectively choose opportunities to invest in and say yes to projects that bring joy, center equity, and bring challenge of another kind. As a scholar in a national critical quantitative methodologies institute, I continue to train alongside early- and mid-career scholars pushing themselves deeper into robust, critical approaches. Reflection recalled my first (middle school) research paper, which forayed into an intersectional social justice lens. I continue to value and center my work on the intersections of

gender, race, and class in educational contexts. Practicing reflection, coupled with meditative and spiritual practice, improves my writing and productivity. The question remains: how do we honor and sustain this in a system that demands ever-increased manufacturing of writing, advising, service, and administrative management?

Implications

Faculty and students of color or other marginalized positions often feel isolated and invisible in academia; those employing critical perspectives experience multiple forms of disciplining and marginalization (Dobbs & Leider, 2021). These graduate students and early-career scholars need access to counterspaces with social-justice-oriented scholars empowering and liberating others in academic writing (Patrón et al., 2021; Patterson-Stephens & Hernández, 2018). Writing time and support – and opportunities for reflection with those with shared interests and identities – also should be part of initiatives supporting retention and promotion of faculty of color and faculty writ large (Griffin, 2020).

Universities should support collaborative, communal writing spaces, both within and across disciplines, through funded fellowship programs and writing retreats, accountability and support groups, and coaching programs. Transdisciplinary grant, workshop, and network opportunities can also fuel collaborative counterspaces. Faculty mentors should consider the diverse ways mentees develop their academic writing and perspectives. Departments should rethink how they value and mentor academic writing, especially collaborative and critical writing, rather than maintaining the historical valuing of “mainstream” journals and solo-authorship during hiring, tenure, and promotion processes. These practices effectively limit scholars who use critical or innovative frameworks, as well as scholars in marginalized positions seeking collaborative writing spaces.

In sociology, journals and grant agencies often require strict word-count limits and organizational structures. Social justice-oriented academic writing involves dismantling and critiquing systems of oppression: a type of writing that requires critical framing and analysis, sometimes involving complex, multifaceted frameworks and transformative calls to action (see Salazar & Rios, 2016). Mainstream outlets and professional associations can also discipline the voices of BIPOC scholars and those critiquing "mainstream" theories through peer review (e.g., Watkins Liu, 2018). Scholars of color are often overburdened within their universities or excluded from journal networks, affecting how they can participate as volunteer peer reviewers (Joseph & Hirshfield, 2011). Universities and editorial boards need to support and credit the work of BIPOC scholars and others forging new or critical disciplinary paths. Ultimately, liberating academic writing involves supporting the well-being and freedom of those in marginalized positions. Institutions, academic leaders, and mentors thus have pivotal roles to play in uplifting the voices of marginalized scholars.

References

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2017). *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in America*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Calarco, J. M. (2020). *A field guide to grad school: Uncovering the hidden curriculum*. Princeton University Press.

Cervantes-Soon, C. G. (2016). Mujeres truchas: urban girls redefining smartness in a dystopic global south. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *19*(6), 1209-1222. https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2016.1168543

Collins, P. H. (2015). Intersectionality's Definitional Dilemmas. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *41*(1), 1-20. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-073014-112142

Dobbs, C. L., & Leider, C. M. (2021). "Does this happen to everyone?": Women professors of color reflect on experiences in the academy. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2021.1930255

Gildersleeve, R. E., Croom, N. N., & Vasquez, P. L. (2011). "Am I going crazy?!": A Critical Race Analysis of Doctoral Education. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *44*(1), 93-114. https://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2011.539472

Griffin, K. A. (2020). Institutional Barriers, Strategies, and Benefits to Increasing the Representation of Women and Men of Color in the Professoriate. In L. W. Perna (Ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research: Volume 35* (pp. 1-73). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-11743-6_4-1

Joseph, T. D., & Hirshfield, L. E. (2011). 'Why don't you get somebody new to do it?' Race and cultural taxation in the academy. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *34*(1), 121-141. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2010.496489

Kelly, B. T., & McCann, K. I. (2014). Women Faculty of Color: Stories Behind the Statistics. *The Urban Review*, *46*(4), 681-702. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-014-0275-8

Li, D., & Koedel, C. (2017). Representation and Salary Gaps by Race-Ethnicity and Gender at Selective Public Universities. *Educational Researcher*, *46*(7), 343-354. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X17726535

National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics (NCSES). (2021). *Survey of Earned Doctorates Data Tables: Field and Demographic Characteristics of Doctorate Recipients*. National Science Foundation. https://ncses.nsf.gov/pubs/nsf22300/data-tables#group3

Nelson, D. J. (2017). Diversity of Science and Engineering Faculty at Research Universities. In *Diversity in the Scientific Community Volume 1: Quantifying Diversity and Formulating Success* (Vol. 1255, pp. 15-86). American Chemical Society. https://doi.org/doi:10.1021/bk-2017-1255.ch002

Patrón, O. E., Flores, O. J., & Medina, Ø. (2021). The (unspoken) pact: a composite counternarrative of Latino males' compañerismo in a doctoral program at a predominantly white institution in the midwest. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *34*(4), 295-314. https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2020.1754490

Patterson-Stephens, S., & Hernández, E. (2018). Hermandad: Sista' Scholar Bonds for Black and Chicana Women in Doctoral Study. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *51*(3-4), 396-415. https://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2018.1546150

Perez-Felkner, L. (2015). Perceptions and Resilience in Underrepresented Students' Pathways to College. *Teachers College Record*, *117*(8), 1-60. http://www.tcrecord.org/ExecSummary.asp?contentid=17996

Rockquemore, K., & Laszloffy, T. A. (2008). *The Black academic's guide to winning tenure--without losing your soul*. Lynne Rienner Publishers Boulder, CO.

Salazar, M. d. C., & Rios, F. (2016). Just Scholarship! Publishing Academic Research with a Social Justice Focus. *Multicultural Perspectives*, *18*(1), 3-11. https://doi.org/10.1080/15210960.2016.1127073

Solórzano, D. G., & Villalpando, O. (1998). Critical race theory, marginality, and the experience of students of color in higher education. In T. R. M. Carlos Alberto Torres (Ed.), *Sociology of education: Emerging perspectives* (pp. 211-222). State University of New York Press.

Stroh, D. P. (2015). *Systems thinking for social change: A practical guide to solving complex problems, avoiding unintended consequences, and achieving lasting results*. Chelsea Green Publishing.

Watkins Liu, C. (2017). The anti-oppressive value of critical race theory and intersectionality in social movement study. *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity*, *4*(3), 306-321. https://doi.org/10.1177/2332649217743771

Welton, A. D., Owens, D. R., & Zamani-Gallaher, E. M. (2018). Anti-racist change: A conceptual framework for educational institutions to take systemic action. *Teachers College Record*, *120*(14), 1-22. https://doi.org/10.1177/016146811812001402

Yosso, T. J. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *8*(1), 69-91. https://doi.org/10.1080/1361332052000341006

Zambrana, R. E., Valdez, R. B., Pittman, C. T., Bartko, T., Weber, L., & Parra-Medina, D. (2021). Workplace stress and discrimination effects on the physical and depressive

symptoms of underrepresented minority faculty. *Stress and Health*, *37*(1), 175-185. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/smi.2983