Reimagining University Leadership through the Everyday Resistance of Faculty of Color

Katherine N. Quinteros
Rebecca Covarrubias
Department of Psychology, University of California Santa Cruz

Author Note

Katherine Quinteros [ID] https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4144-3767

Rebecca Covarrubias [ID] https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9943-8496

We have no known conflict of interest to disclose.

Please address correspondence to Katherine Quinteros, Department of Psychology, University of California, Santa Cruz, 1156 High Street, Santa Cruz, CA 95064, or email knquinte@ucsc.edu.

How to cite:

Abstract

FOC engage in important diversity, equity, and inclusion leadership central to a mission of servingness in Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs) – a commitment to serving the holistic needs of growing numbers of racially- and economically-diverse students (Garcia, 2016). Yet, when engaging in leadership structures (e.g., policies, practices), FOC confront racism and sexism. Such systemic barriers for FOC have been documented extensively in predominantly White institutions (PWIs). No work has examined the barriers in leadership for FOC in a research-intensive HSI context and how they engage in everyday resistance strategies – covert forms of resistance (Casado Pérez, 2019) – in response to these barriers. The current research aimed to do this. Specifically, semi-structured individual interviews with 16 FOC were conducted to examine the specific resistance responses participants employed to navigate barriers in university leadership. Using latent thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006), five themes were constructed to reflect specific responses to overlapping forms of systemic oppression. These acts included prioritizing self-love to resist invisible labor, refusing to take on leadership roles to combat tokenization, being resourceful to maneuver limited resources, pursuing pathways outside of formal leadership to enact change, and preparing the next generation of scholars to counter systemic gatekeeping. Documenting such resistance sheds light on the everyday institutional harms that FOC confront and also highlights a commitment among FOC to eliminate oppression within the academy for minoritized groups.

Keywords: Faculty of Color, everyday resistance, university leadership, race and racism, Hispanic Serving Institution

Reimagining University Leadership through the Everyday Resistance of Faculty of Color

Faculty of Color (FOC) are underrepresented in formal leadership positions (Davis & Fry, 2019; Freeman et al., 2019; Jackson & O'Callaghan, 2011). This stems from a variety of systemic factors, such as a lack of formal mentoring (Freeman et al., 2019), heavy engagement in invisible labor that leaves little time for such roles (Brown-Glaude, 2009; Duncan, 2014; Griffin, 2013; Guillaume & Apodaca, 2020; Shalaby et al., 2020), and limited tenure and promotion incentives for participating in leadership (Baez, 2000; Freeman et al., 2019). This is consequential as FOC engage in important diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) leadership central to serving students holistically (Baez, 2000; Brown-Glaude, 2009; Duncan, 2014; Hirshfield & Joseph, 2012). A mission of servingness - shifting from enrolling minoritized students to holistically attending to their needs - is central to many institutions serving increasing numbers of this demographic (Garcia, 2016; Garcia et al., 2019).

In response to these structural barriers, FOC engage in covert actions known as everyday resistance (Rosales & Langhout, 2020). Such covert forms enable FOC to continuously push back against oppression without jeopardizing potential for advancement. The scarce existing work documenting everyday resistance is focused on the experiences of FOC in Predominantly White Institutions (PWIs) (Casado Pérez, 2019; Casado Pérez et al., 2021). No work has empirically examined the barriers FOC encounter when navigating leadership and how they transform such barriers into sites of resistance in a more diverse institutional context, like a Hispanic Serving Institution serving at least 25% of Latinx students (Laden, 2004). This is the aim of the current work. To do this, we utilize a Critical Race Theory (CRT) perspective (Delgado et al., 2017; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 2017; Solórzano & Yosso, 2002) to understand how race and racism, and other systems of oppression, contribute to barriers for FOC.

Critical Race Theory: A Perspective for Understanding Barriers in Leadership for FOC

CRT as a perspective centers the experiences of minoritized groups by calling attention to the pervasiveness of race and racism in everyday society (Allen, 2006; Bell, 1995; Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 2017; Salter & Adams, 2013). Specifically, White supremacy and racism are embedded within systems (e.g., healthcare, media, legal system, education) and the everyday realities of people (Bonilla-Silva 2009; Crenshaw, 1991). Scholars using CRT acknowledge the importance of intersectionality, including understanding how multiple intersecting identities impact how people experience interlocking systems of oppression (Cole, 2009; Crenshaw, 1991; Collins & Bilge, 2016; Harris & Patton, 2019; Rosenthal, 2016). Intersectionality sheds light on how social and political identities and positions influence experiences of discrimination or privilege in a given setting (Crenshaw, 1991).

Take the context of higher education as an example. Patton (2016) argued that because White supremacy and racism are so entrenched in the history and structure of higher education, inequities persists that disproportionately impact minoritized groups, like FOC (see also Freeman et al., 2019; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 2017). For example, formal leadership structures (e.g., policies, practices, decision-making processes) have been characterized as power-centered (i.e., few can access power), hierarchal (i.e., the top has the most authority and status), and authoritarian (i.e., those lower in the hierarchy must fall in line) (Bensimon & Neuman, 1993;

Freeman et al., 2019; Morgan, 1997). Such structures create barriers for FOC in leadership, including but not limited to: epistemological racism or the privileging of White Euro-centric knowledges over the knowledges of people of color (POC) (Córdova, 1998; Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002; Kubota, 2019; Pérez-Huber, 2009); burnout from invisible labor (Baez, 2000; Diggs et al., 2009; Duncan, 2014; Padilla, 1994; Hirshfield & Joseph, 2012); and a lack of institutional support (Corneille et al., 2019; Freeman et al., 2019).

The Problem of Epistemological Racism

Epistemological racism reflects a racial hierarchy that privileges the ways of knowing of White dominant groups over those of POC (Bulhan, 2015; Córdova, 1998; Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002; Dupree & Boykin, 2021; Lachaud, 2020; Pérez-Huber, 2009; Stanley 2006). The most valued knowledge is one that is objective (i.e., without bias) and removed from the consideration of race (e.g., a color-blind approach) (Solórzano, 1997). For example, pervasive positivist approaches to research describe a process of uncovering some "absolute truth" in the world as an unbiased observer (Scotland, 2012). Knowledge is considered objective as it is free from bias and from historical or sociocultural influences. Yet, objectivity as the golden standard undervalues perspectives rooted in lived experiences. As such, FOC often face criticism when employing methods (e.g., testimonios) or efforts that rely on the lived knowledges of minoritized people (Pérez-Huber, 2009). Such work is often viewed as lacking academic girth (Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002; Duncan, 2014). Preferences for objectivity also impact who is selected for leadership (Ledesma & Burciaga, 2015). FOC reported that when a POC is chosen to take on a formal role, they are often chosen for their neutral, objective stance on issues affecting minoritized communities (Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002).

Epistemological racism creates obstacles for FOC in tenure and promotion, as decision-making in these processes reflect cultural priorities of institutions. Universities were traditionally established for middle-class White groups and, as such, reflect their cultural norms (Patton, 2016; Stephens et al., 2012). An example includes the privileging of independence (e.g., individual achievement) over norms of interdependence or collaboration (Casado Pérez, 2021; Covarrubias et al., 2019). Such norms are evident in tenure and promotion decision-making. For example, markers of individual achievement in research are highly valued, and less preference and recognition are given to collective efforts, especially in areas of leadership, service, and teaching (Baez, 2000; Tippeconnic Fox, 2009).

Yet, many FOC engage in and commit to work that supports the collective well-being and success of minoritized groups, often in the realms of leadership, service, teaching, and advising (Antonio et al., 2000; Baez, 2000; Casado Pérez et al, 2021; Duncan, 2014; Griffin et al., 2013; 2015; Ledesma & Burciaga, 2015). This commitment to social justice is grounded in the aim to alleviate the subordination of minoritized groups (Solórzano,1997). Because higher education structures center whiteness, FOC encounter a tension of committing to DEI work essential for social change often at the expense of their own advancement. In this way, epistemological racism explains the delegitimization of the contributions of FOC (Duncan, 2014; Han & Leonard, 2017).

The Problem of Burnout

The commitment to social justice often means that FOC disproportionately lead most of the DEI work needed by universities to further institutional change (Baez, 2000; Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002; Diggs et al., 2009; Duncan, 2014; Hirshfield & Joseph, 2012; Padilla, 1994; Stanley 2006). Hirshfield and Joseph (2012) coined the term "identity taxation" - building on Padilla's (1994) "cultural taxation" work – to draw attention to the extra burden of service and DEI work placed on FOC due to their race/ethnicity and other minoritized identities. An intersectional lens further highlights the gendered racism as it relates to this taxation (Essed, 2001; Solórzano, 1997). For example, Women of Color are particularly likely to engage in heavy service work, including being mentors or nurturing "mother" figures for students (Duncan; 2014; Griffin, 2013; Guardino & Borden, 2017; Hirshfield & Joseph, 2012; Shalaby et al., 2020).

A consequence of identity taxation is that FOC engage in heavy invisible labor (Baez, 2000; Duncan, 2014; Hirshfield & Joseph 2012; Padilla, 1994; Shalaby et al., 2020). This term refers to work that is unpaid, unrecognized, and unacknowledged (Daniel, 1987). The invisibility of this labor stems from two issues. First, when this work is recognized, it is seen as service (Baez, 2000). Yet, institutional service continues to be valued less than research and teaching efforts (Antonio, 2000; Baez, 2000; Stanley, 2006). Second, even particular forms of scholarship of FOC, especially those at the intersection of leadership, mentoring, community activism and research, are often reduced to labels of service. In this way, review criteria do not adequately capture the wide-ranging and diverse contributions of FOC. Consequently, FOC often must fight for recognition of their labor (Casado Pérez et al., 2021; Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002). The lack of institutional recognition (e.g., incentives, resources) for the varied contributions and labor of FOC means that they are left to manage the double shift alone. They balance DEI work with review requirements, resulting in heavy burnout (Garrison-Wade et al., 2011).

The Problem of Institutional Support

FOC report a lack of support for engaging in leadership, including a lack of institutional mentoring (Duncan, 2014; Freeman et al., 2019, Corneille et al., 2019). For example, in one qualitative study conducted with tenured FOC from a research institution, participants reported that the lack of mentors made it difficult to access leadership positions (Freeman et al., 2019). They did not have guidance on understanding expectations for leadership roles, how to apply for such roles, and how to navigate institutional politics associated with the role.

This lack of knowledge and guidance can also impact access to funding and resources for DEI-related leadership (Corneille et al., 2019; Garrison-Wade et al., 2011; Turner et al., 2011). For example, FOC may develop new initiatives for addressing social inequities, yet such initiatives often receive little to no monetary support despite general institutional approval. Through focus group interviews, FOC reported that institutions often fail to explicitly share pathways for accessing resources for such DEI efforts and programming (Garrison-Wade et al., 2012; Turner et al., 2011). This can be especially difficult for Women of Color who are siloed into specific networks of communication and are left out of networks where this knowledge-sharing is taking place (e.g., among White senior faculty) (Turner et al., 2011). This racialized gendered exclusion can lead to disparity in who receives resources and who does not. This lack

of support leaves FOC questioning if they want to pursue more responsibility in formal spaces, as securing resources is dependent on gatekeeping practices (Corneille et al., 2019; Turner et al., 2011).

Lack of Motivation or Resistance?

In addition to these barriers, one study cited a lack of motivation among FOC as a barrier toward attaining a leadership role (Freeman et al., 2019). Interview research with FOC revealed that their perception of formal leadership as a "White boys club" meant that they saw formal leadership as serving and protecting White male interests. In response, many participants felt uneasy pursuing leadership and chose not to participate, despite believing that diversifying leadership spaces was essential for furthering opportunities for other FOC. The authors framed this disinterest as a lack of motivation to participate.

This framing is similar to the concept of self-defeating resistance (Solórzano & Delgado, 2001). This refers to a resistant act that may be motivated by a critique of the system (e.g., FOC view leadership as not valuing the needs of minoritized groups) yet the act is self-defeating in that it does not effectively bring about direct transformational change (Solórzano & Delgado, 2001). Other scholars have made a distinction between "effective" and "non-effective" resistance. According to Robinson and Ward (1991), resistance for survival among Black community members is less effective because it serves the short-term interest of individuals in an oppressive environment (e.g., a high schooler dropping out because teachers mistreat them). They argue that this type of resistance is often done in isolation and disconnected from the Black community. Resistance for liberation, however, is viewed as a more mature resistant strategy that consciously challenges power structures through a critical lens (e.g., collective protests grounded in an understanding of the history of Black oppression). The authors argue that resistance for survival can be self-sabotaging and that educating oppressed groups to practice resistance for liberation is one way to bring empowerment and transformational change.

There are several concerns with this framing. First, the binary view of resistance as effective or ineffective places blame on those resisting oppression rather than the system that is being resisted. The conversation shifts from understanding what power dynamics have caused this form of resistance to take place to assessing the effectiveness of individual resistors. Second, scholars have critiqued the claim that resistance is only effective when it brings about direct change (Johansson & Vinthagen, 2014; Rosales & Langhout, 2020; Ryan, 2015; Vinthagen & Johannsson, 2012). This view dismisses how minoritized groups practice everyday covert or hidden acts of resistance (Johansson & Vinthagen, 2014; Rosales & Langhout, 2020; Ryan, 2015; Vinthagen & Johannsson, 2012). For example, everyday resistance might be a culturally-identifiable way of challenging power among POC even if the oppressor does not readily recognize it (Johansson & Vinthagen, 2014; Rosales & Langhout, 2020; Ryan, 2015).

Everyday Resistance in Higher Education

When studying structural oppression, attending to resistance is critical (Rosales & Langhout, 2020; Rosenthal, 2016). The study of resistance counters deficit narratives about minoritized people as passive agents (hooks, 1990; Rosales & Langhout, 2020; Rosenthal, 2016;

Ryan, 2016). Much of the literature agrees that resistance is an oppositional act, an action that involves both agency and a pushing back against oppressive power (Johansson & Vinthagen, 2014). Resistance is also often understood as a conscious action that is recognizable (e.g., marches, strikes, Rubin, 1996; Solórzano & Delgado, 2001). However, privileging conscious and visible forms of resistance ignores the importance of covert, everyday resistance strategies that allow minoritized groups to maneuver through tight spaces. Tight spaces are those marked by domination, creating a setting that is constricting and difficult to navigate (Rosales & Langhout, 2020). In such spaces, going against the status quo can result in severe consequences, which makes overt forms critical for pushing back (Cruz, 2014, 2016; Lugones, 2003; Ryan, 2015).

To understand everyday resistance, Johansson and Vinthagen (2014) offered four key assumptions. First, everyday resistance is a practice that pushes back against power and domination in an ongoing dialogue that might not be as visible as other forms of resistance, such as protests or demands for change (Rosales & Langhout, 2020). Second, understanding that everyday resistance is intertwined with power highlights the ongoing historical relationship between the oppressors and the oppressed (Johansson & Vinthagen, 2014; Vinthagen & Johannsson, 2012). Third, power is not singular but informed by many factors. Differing social locations and positions impacts one's relationship to power and resistance (Johansson & Vinthagen, 2014). Finally, allowing the practices and purpose of everyday resistance to be flexible and changing allows for a deeper sensitivity to the shifting context that minoritized groups find themselves in and the strategies they use to survive (Vinthagen & Johannsson, 2012). These assumptions serve as guiding tools for exploring how POC use everyday resistance to push against oppressive systems, such as leadership structures.

However, such resistant strategies among faculty, in general, have scarcely been documented (Hinchey, 2010; Lutz et al., 2013), with even less attention to FOC (Casado Pérez, 2019). Casado Pérez (2019) documented, with in-depth interviews, the everyday resistance of six FOC in Counselor Education across multiple PWIs. For example, in response to unappreciated invisible labor, FOC engaged in self-love as a form of boundary setting, limiting the time they dedicated to institutional activities. This was an act of radical well-being, understanding that one's time mattered. Participants also engaged in mentoring as a method to change the institution. This meant passing down generational knowledge to early-career scholars as a way of preparing them for barriers but also a strategy for not maintaining the status quo.

These strategies are likely influenced by the institutional context, as organizational structures and policies inform the tight spaces FOC have to navigate. This means there are important questions to explore in other institutional contexts that are different from PWIs. For example, what barriers might FOC experience in a research-intensive (R1) HSI, where there are more minoritized students to serve than at PWIs and where pressures for research productivity are high? Indeed, empirical work documenting the barriers and everyday resistance of FOC in HSI contexts is sparse (Ledesma & Burciago, 2015; Petrov & Garcia, 2021). Yet, HSIs are a unique setting given the public mission to servingness while still maintaining structures that are rooted in whiteness and White supremacy (Brunsma et al., 2013; Cabrera et al., 2017; Ledesma & Burciaga, 2015; Nelson Laird et al., 2007). Given the scarcity of work focused on this issue, we drew from in-depth, semi-structured individual interviews with 16 FOC to examine how structures of power related to university leadership - especially those unique to R1 HSIs -

informed the barriers and resistance strategies FOC reported. Our goal was to understand the dynamic nature of these responses; that is, what specific resistance responses did FOC employ to the tight spaces they described navigating in this context.

Method

University Setting

All participants were FOC at a four-year public R1 university. The institution became eligible for HSI designation in 2012, when they began enrolling at least 25% Latinx undergraduate students. This university is one of 17 HSIs nationwide that is also a R1 institution (HACU, 2020). This context is important when considering that no prior research has examined how FOC engage in everyday resistance at an HSI, where there is an explicit commitment to serving the needs of minoritized students.

The campus serves approximately 19,494 undergraduate and graduate students. The undergraduate population included: 32% White, 26% Asian, 24% Latinx, 11% International, 4% Black, 2% Unknown, and 1% Native. Yet, the racial/ethnic background of the faculty is not as diverse as the student body. The majority of faculty identified as White (67%), followed by 14% Asian and/or Pacific Islander, 9% Latinx, 6% Other or Unknown, 3% Black, and 1% Native. The gender breakdown of faculty includes 55% men and 45% women.

Participants

In Fall 2019, participants were recruited through two methods. First, we partnered with the chairs of four different racial/ethnic affinity groups for FOC (i.e., Asian, Black, Latinx, Native) on campus. These affinity groups were formed to support minoritized faculty on campus, especially around issues of DEI. Chairs of the group developed a list of all FOC on campus and created a listserv for each affinity group. Each current chair sent an email recruitment via the listerv, which included a survey link to a pre-screening for eligibility (e.g., identify as FOC, be ladder-rank tenure-track faculty) and to questions regarding demographic background (e.g., gender, year at the institution). In total, 10 participants were recruited using this method. Our second recruitment method was through snowballing sampling, in which participants recommended other FOC. Six participants were recruited this way, for a total sample of 16 participants.

To protect the identities of our participants, we use broad descriptive categories for reporting demographics. Nine faculty were Latinx, three were Asian, two were multi-racial, one was Black, and one was Indigenous. A majority of the sample identified as female (n=10), with five identifying as male and one as non-conforming. A total of four of the five academic divisions at the university were represented, including Social Sciences, Humanities, Physical and Biological Sciences, and Engineering; there were no faculty from the Arts. In terms of academic positions, our sample was mixed with 8 full professors, 4 associate professors, and 4 assistant professors. Their time at the university ranged from 1.5 years to 30 years (*Mean* = 14.5 years).

Procedure

Participants were part of a broader study that focused on experiences with formal leadership. The faculty principal investigator (PI) and graduate student researcher (GSR), both

affiliated with the target university, conducted all study procedures. They utilized in-depth, semi-structured interviews to allow for consistency in topics across all interviews and also flexibility for the conversation to flow in an informal, generative manner (Josselson, 2004). Indeed, the PI disclosed her identities and goals for the project at the start of the conversation to engage in a more transparent and authentic dialogue.

We developed an initial draft of the protocol using knowledge from past literature on FOC leadership and from the PI's own experiences in leadership. The draft was then shared with two research consultants from different departments — one faculty who identities as White and non-binary and another who identified as a Latino man. Combined, they held 35 years of experience and extensive leadership, which offered a wealth of knowledge to the project. They provided feedback on various parts (e.g., on length, framing of questions). After revisions were discussed and made, the researchers shared the protocol with a FOC affinity group leader (woman of color) to make further adjustments. The PI then conducted a pilot interview with a participant (Latino man), who offered final suggestions on any aspects that were still missing. After integrating changes and finalizing the protocol, the PI conducted the rest of the interviews.

All interviews with participants lasted 60-90 minutes and were conducted in Winter and Spring 2020. To allow maximum flexibility, we offered an online (via Zoom) or in-person interview option; all but one participant chose an online interview. We audio-recorded all interviews, either through the Zoom recording function or a physical audio recorder. The recordings were uploaded to a secure, password-protected TEMI account - an online transcription service - where the GSR did extensive listening and cleaning of the data before beginning analyses. The Institutional Review Board approved all procedures.

Data Analysis

The larger project was guided by phenomenology, as the intent was to learn about the unique and shared leadership experiences of a group of FOC at an HSI from their own subjective interpretations (Creswell & Poth, 2016). The PI and GSR adopted a constructivist approach; we acknowledged that our own experiences with and knowledge of the phenomenon influenced our own interpretation of the data and construction of central themes (Charmaz, 2008; Yin, 2003).

For example, as the PI, I was first drawn to the research to better understand my own leadership experiences at the university and those of similar others. As a Mexican-American woman from a low-income, first-generation background, I engaged in heavy leadership prior to earning tenure. Although the work brought immense joy and purpose, I experienced burnout shortly after tenure. Although I felt my work was acknowledged, the sheer volume of work was overwhelming; I received disproportionate requests to engage in various university activities that served minoritized students while also managing my own research, teaching, and service commitments. This prompted me to explore how other FOC experienced leadership, especially within an HSI context where there are few FOC, and what strategies FOC used to navigate their experiences. To support the project, I invited the GSR, and first author of the paper, who identifies as Salvadoran-American from a low-income background. She is a first-generation college student with research interests in educational equity, with a focus on the lived

experiences of students of color in higher education. This first-hand experience and engagement with relevant literature provided important insight into the phenomenon under investigation.

Since our aim was not to generate theory from the data (see grounded theory, Charmaz, 2008; Strauss & Corbin, 1994) but rather understand patterns in the data more broadly, we used latent thematic analysis (TA) (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Latent TA aligns with a constructivist paradigm in that it seeks to theorize how sociocultural contexts and structural conditions - like experiences of racism or sexism - inform the meaning of what participants share (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The development of themes requires interpretive work by the research team, making the process a co-construction of reality. As such, we engaged in reflexive work throughout the coding process in order to discuss what we were learning from the interviews and to share our sense-making of what participants were sharing (Smith & Luke, 2021).

In our approach to latent TA, we incorporated both deductive (i.e., codes informed by literature) and inductive (i.e., codes constructed from the data) coding methods (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Using both methods allowed us to acknowledge our prior engagement with the literature and to remain open in coding to ensure that patterns we constructed represented the data well. To start this process, we became familiar with the data. First, we noted our thoughts and feelings and discussed these observations in an ongoing process while conducting interviews and listening to audio files during the transcribing and cleaning process. We documented our impressions and notes from our discussion about what stood out on a shared Google Sheet. Second, we expanded on our notes by reading two transcripts and adding to or refining our impressions. We then met over three months to read through all the interviews and to develop codes by pasting relevant data extracts into our Google Sheet and talking through these extracts.

Once we coded all the data, we began organizing codes into larger themes. Here, our conversations shifted to interpretative analysis of the data. We started to draw larger connections between the codes. We reflected on how participants were responding to barriers in creative, resourceful ways; such reflection changed the way we thought about the codes (Smith & Luke, 2021). Part of our organizing at this stage was relating the barriers with responses in a way that reflected the everyday resistance framework. In linking these elements, we started to name and define the themes. For example, we combined the individual codes of Wanting a Work-life Balance and Learning to Set Boundaries into a larger theme of Prioritizing Self-love to Resist Invisible Labor. We then worked to refine these working themes by comparing them back to the data extracts and then more broadly back to the larger dataset. In an ongoing manner, even during the writing process, we kept refining our definitions of the themes. This comparison process gave us some confidence that the themes fit the data well and that they were distinct elements that spoke to different - although related - facets of everyday resistance.

Trustworthiness

To enhance the trustworthiness of our work, we employed two recommended practices with qualitative approaches: investigator triangulation and reflexivity (Archibold, 2016; Merriam, 1998). We triangulated our perspectives as independent readers of the data (Merriam, 1998). In our discussions, we engaged in systematic comparison of our perspectives by independently reading the data and then engaging in thorough discussions of our meaning-

making, noting instances where our interpretations overlapped or diverged (Merriam, 1998). We then compared our perspectives with data extracts in a continuous manner with the aim to build a more holistic understanding of the data (Merriam, 1998). We relied on our reflexive process to clarify our assumptions and to discuss how our own positionalities might have shaped our understanding of the data (Merriam, 1998). Part of the strength of our reflexive process was that we collaborated on all elements of the project, including research design, data collection, and data analysis. From the beginning of the project, we explicitly shared our intentions for the work and were mindful of our different and shared social positions (Merriam, 1998). Because our own experiences and knowledge of the topic influence our interpretations, we remained vigilant to instances where the data contradicted our assumptions. We took extensive notes on a shared Google Sheet to document these occurrences. We then supplemented our discussions and reflections with reading of more academic literature, which helped us revisit the data in a focused way and helped us to challenge our assumptions further (Smith & Luke, 2021).

Findings

Prioritizing Self-Love to Resist Invisible Labor

Almost all participants experienced heavy invisible labor. The structural (i.e., demographic) diversity of the HSI makes it so that minoritized students disproportionately seek out connection and guidance from the few FOC present in the institution (Turner et al., 2008). Dr. G described this different type of labor for FOC, "We are asked to do a lot more. We deal with students who are most vulnerable and really struggling… so many of the kinds of issues that are abstract for our colleagues are very intimate and lived [for us]." This centrality of lived experience - a feature of CRT - informs how FOC connect with and acknowledge the schooling realities of minoritized students (Baez, 2000; Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002). For example, Dr. G felt called to work on issues that were personally connected to her own lived experiences as a POC. However, she also acknowledged the heavy emotional toll that stems from this work, especially when institutional structures that privilege whiteness do not formally recognize this as a strength or contribution (Foste & Irwin, 2020; McLaren, 1997).

This structural ignoring of the efforts of FOC impacts their career advancement. Epistemological racism within tenure and promotion review processes undervalues the scholarly and leadership contributions of FOC (Delgado Bernal & Villapando, 2002). The gendered racism that Women of Color experience is rooted in both "racist and ethnicist perceptions of gender roles" (Essed, 2001, p. 31) and reflects how Women of Color are expected to engage in heavy service work. This expectation further harms them in the review process, as service is the least valued criterion (Duncan, 2014; Hirshfield, 2012; Schuster & Finklestein, 2006). Dr. J explicitly named the intersections of racism and sexism that exist within the promotion process:

> People of color, women especially … they may not even be in an official role as committee member or director of this or that in their program, but they're the ones who are actually doing all this work to make sure that these initiatives get followed through on...which means they just can't get to full professor….

While participants can share in this experience because of their shared racial/ethnic identities as students, the gendered racism points to disproportionate taxation on Women of Color (Duncan, 2014; Essed, 2001; Griffin et al, 2013; Hirshfield & Joseph, 2012; Ponjuan et al., 2011). Dr. G, for example, noted how students felt comfortable seeking her out which created feelings of responsibility to help them. This felt responsibility was reflected in Dr. E's response when describing her decision to take on a leadership role, "Me toca a mi [It's my turn]". Dr. E described that this responsibility stems from viewing her department as functioning as "familia [family]". In this model, everyone has a role to play to support one another.

As a form of everyday resistance, participants engaged in boundary setting as a method of self-love (Casado Pérez, 2019). FOC described caretaking practices (e.g., hobbies) they enjoyed and would not give up. Dr. P, a tenured professor, spoke about how, "if I have time… to take care of the things in my life that I want to do, then I'm in a good place." Dr. P participated in heavy leadership responsibilities and, for them[1], self-love was crucial to continue leading a healthy and balanced life. Still, even in working toward work-life balance, some participants questioned if they were doing enough. Dr. G shared, "Am I cutting corners because I still have my life? I'm not working twenty-four seven. I have a social life." The deep commitment and responsibility to serving students often made it difficult for participants, especially those identified as women, to step away when they felt overwhelmed. For example, after describing her heavy leadership work, Dr. G shared that "none of it is going to count for anything when I go up for tenure". Still, she remained committed to the work noting, "this is actually the stuff that makes everything else feel meaningful. So, I'm willing to take the hit."

In these cases, boundary setting needed to be initiated by later-career FOC, who had more protection. Dr. B, for example, explained a cultural shift that needed to take place in her department after an external review found that their assistant professors were burnt out and at risk of leaving the department. She, along with other later-career faculty, realized they needed "to be willing to give up something for the younger generations". This shift meant actively protecting the time of early-career faculty. Dr. F echoed this belief. Now, as a tenured faculty member, they felt more protection as a full professor, so could take a more active role in pushing back, a task they would never put on "somebody who was untenured".

Part of pushing back, for Dr. L, included fighting epistemological racism - and structurally acknowledging invisible labor - within the review process. In a formal leadership role, Dr. L tried to expand how the academy views DEI work, yet met opposition because "people are still stuck on kind of evaluating personnel actions in a way that they've always been done before…often [only through] scholarly work". They challenged this process by arguing that DEI leadership can be "integrated" into many areas such as research, service, and teaching. For Dr. L, expanding how DEI is evaluated allows for the work of FOC to be better recognized.

Refusing to Exemplify the "Spirit of the Institution" in Response to Tokenization

---

[1] When gender is not central to the analysis, we use "they/them/their" pronouns to identify FOC in order to further protect their identities.

Most participants reported experiencing formal leadership as a space that tokenized their efforts (Freeman et al., 2019; Diggs et al., 2009; Kanter, 1977; Shim, 2020). This included identifying participants as both representatives for minoritized groups and as responsible for diversifying the field, while still expecting FOC to adhere to institutional rules and restrictions (Kanter, 1977; Shim; 2020). This tension reflects an institutional reality where the public mission of the HSI is rooted in DEI and servingness meanwhile the underlying structures and policies remain unchanged and rooted in whiteness (Brunsma et al., 2013; Cabrera et al., 2017; Ledesma & Burciago, 2015; Nelson Laird et al., 2007). This barrier often created a hesitancy to go beyond the minimum required for leadership, as Dr. O explained:

> I'm not interested in being a dean or chancellor or anything…. [P]aradoxically if you're higher up in the administration at our campus, you are more in a position to be told what you have to do … by higher-ups.

Dr. O used the example of a graduate student strike focused on a wage increase to meet the high cost of living. She witnessed the demands the administration made on faculty on how to respond to students. This response confirmed that Dr. O did not want "be in a position where I am required to do something that is against my principles", such as going against a student strike.

Dr. K also noted restrictions that came with tokenizing leadership roles. They reflected on previous successes in diversifying their department, such as through programs for undergraduates. They shared, "I think I was used as a kind of the token [FOC] of the division". Such successes limited their freedom to acquire additional support:

> I had conversations, which were kind of incredibly insulting. [Administrative leaders told] me that the only way that they were going to give me extra support and recognize my work on diversity was if I helped others in the division for diversity. And I'm like, well, I'm not like this [FOC] Messiah that came from the heavens.

For Dr. K, these DEI-related successes led to greater responsibility from administration to create similar change in other departments. Dr. K expressed deep dissatisfaction from this outcome, as it limited the advocacy work they felt called to do.

Because of these restrictions, participants actively decided not to participate in formal leadership. Participants used their agency to step away entirely from these restricting, tight spaces and instead pursued other avenues to make an impact. Dr. D described this as being reluctant to take on "the spirit of the institution". Although participants shared in their frustration with tokenization, gendered norms influenced responses to this frustration. On the one hand, as illustrated in the first theme, participants who self-identified as women were more likely to adopt self-care strategies to find work-life balance, allowing them to maintain their commitments to their leadership and to themselves. Self-identified men, on the other hand, were more likely to decide to not participate altogether. For example, Dr. A stated that though he had "high respect for bureaucracies", he felt these positions were limiting and did not allow him to have academic "freedom". He stated that "if at any point I feel like someone is no longer allowing me to do what I need, what I want to do, what I feel is what I should do, I quit. I'll move on to something else."

This was also the case for Dr. C, a male-identifying FOC. When Dr. C participated in a working group with a heavy workload early in his time at the university, he made the decision not to return to the group. This tied to his thoughts about leadership as something that you "[sink] a lot of time into something that isn't required… and that I'm not incentivized to do." The freedom to say "no" might be tied to institutional sexism; indeed, saying "no" can garner less criticism from colleagues for FOC who self-identify as men than as women (Pyke, 2011).

Meaningful Impact Despite Formal Leadership Spaces

Because of the commitment to maintain the status quo, participants noted how formal leadership structures had little potential to create meaningful impact for minoritized groups. Resistance to change within the university was salient for participants who self-identified as women. As Women of Color shoulder more responsibilities of institution care-taking (Hirshfield & Joseph, 2012), they may also confront the brunt of institutional resistance. Dr. O, who identified as a woman, expressed doubt that even "the chancellor" could make necessary changes due to the "top-down dynamic" in administration. Such top-down approaches fail to create a space free of retaliation and a space which values on-the-ground leadership efforts (Bensimon & Neumann, 1993; Casado Pérez et al., 2021; Kezar 2011). This model of leadership discouraged participants from advocating for institutional change. Dr. O found it disheartening to "pour your heart and soul into helping this institution you love get better and then have [your efforts] go nowhere."

In these ways, top-down leadership systems can feel impersonal and detached (Morgan, 1997). Many participants, like Dr. F, viewed formal leadership as slow and lacking the immediate impact that comes with working in more informal spaces, such as advising students. They explained that in informal spaces "students [leave] feeling better about what they do or [how faculty] shape their learning", whereas in their committee role, "it feels really distant even when it's about such important stuff." Though Dr. F viewed both spaces as important, they felt the informal routes allowed for more meaningful impact among students.

Participation in informal spaces illustrated a form of everyday resistance heavily practiced among all participants who were committed to equity. Dr. L highlighted what drives them to want to see an impact in their own department: "I want my field… to be more inclusive and diverse. I want it to be welcoming and I want to stop seeing students selectively leaving along demographic lines." In a White- and male-dominated discipline, they witnessed the exodus of minoritized students because of a lack of support and understanding. In order to address this issue, they started a program designed to serve diverse populations of students, explaining that these efforts came from a desire to "want to be in a room full of people that look different". Participants, like Dr. L, used their power and agency, outside of formal roles, to push for change.

Being Creative and Resourceful to Maneuver Limited Institutional Resources

Though participants invested in efforts of servingness, many reported difficulty securing resources for this leadership work (Baez, 2000; Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002; Duncan, 2014; Freeman et al., 2019). Dr. D reported that the problem of a lack of resources stemmed from a lack of "structural commitment" from the university. DEI initiatives without careful

thought and investment produce little, often superficial-level change (Ahmed, 2012; Williams & Clowney, 2007). A structural commitment to servingness entails investment of resources (Garcia, 2018; Petrov & Garcia, 2021). To illustrate this barrier, Dr. D remembered, while being provost of a residential college, asking for resources to improve the ratio of advisors for first-generation and underrepresented students. She explained the college had a high turnover rate and was understaffed. Yet, the administrative leaders refused her request, explaining that they "couldn't treat this residential college in a super special way", and instead told Dr. D to use any remaining budget from the provost role. She noted the contradiction between being expected to engage in servingness with no actual resource commitments to do the work. Indeed, scholars have documented the structural underfunding of public, R1 institutions serving larger numbers of racially- and economically-minoritized students (Hamilton & Nielsen, 2021).

Some participants responded in creative and resourceful ways, including acquiring their own means of funding (Ryan, 2015; Turner et al., 2011). Gendered norms and institutional experience influenced the use of this strategy. In the early stages of their careers, faculty report being highly motivated, idealistic, and willing to put in long hours of hard work (Boice, 1992; Olsen, 1993; Rice et al., 2000). Hostile and unchanging work climates in academia relate to higher dissatisfaction over time with one's profession (Rice et al., 2000). This structural disconnect between the goals of FOC and the institutional climate might explain differential responses among early- and later-career FOC. That is, finding creative ways to enact change among early-career FOC might be related to not yet being "disillusioned with administration", as Dr. B described. Racialized gender expectations from colleagues to "take care of the academic family" might create a setting where early-career FOC who self-identify as women might be particularly influenced to adapt creatively when resources are limited (Guardino & Borden, 2017; Hirshfield & Joseph, 2012). Dr. N applied for and received a large-scale grant in order to make change in her department that struggled with structural diversity. She recalled the freedom that securing her own money gave her to make decisions, "[Now] when I say [or] like I threatened to pay out of my pocket…like I could do it because I have money, they can't ignore me." The power to leverage her own funds enabled Dr. N to make decisions more freely and in collaboration with her team.

Preparing the Next Generation of Scholars to Counter Gatekeeping Practices

Though participants creatively navigated structural barriers within the institution (Turner et al., 2011; Yosso, 2005), heavy gatekeeping kept them from top-rank positions that provide power to create larger change. Gatekeeping was a method used for exclusion, often by withholding critical information or resources for navigating university leadership (Freeman et al., 2019; Settles et al., 2020; Turner et al., 2011). One major form of gatekeeping that participants reported was a lack of institutional mentorship (Freeman et al., 2019). Dr. H compared her experience to a close friend at another institution who is enrolled in a higher education leadership training program specifically for Women of Color. They can network and learn "about budgets one week, then they learn about hiring and the laws". Such formal programs are critical for unmasking the hidden rules of university leadership and for addressing sexism within leadership structures (Whitford, 2020). Dr. B explained sexist interactions within leadership, "Often because you're a woman, when there's a restroom or a bathroom break, all of the men who are

usually in these leadership positions will go and chat away about things. By the time you come back to the meeting, the decision has been made."

As CRT outlines, racism and sexism within institutional structures can be so pervasive that it goes unnoticed (Ledesma & Burciaga, 2015; Patton, 2016). Dr. I participated in a top-level position within her department and still was kept out of many important meetings with no explanation. When reflecting back, Dr. I explained this type of behavior is acceptable because "there's no sort of pushback." She noted that it is easy and common for the campus to appoint White faculty as leaders, yet it is often difficult "to give experience of a higher administrative leadership position to [FOC]", because people are not "primed" to see FOC in that manner. Echoing this sentiment, Dr. O offered this type of racist and sexist exclusion as a reason for not wanting to be a part of the "good old boys' network".

As a refusal to continue the legacy of gatekeeping, participants reported devoting their time to preparing future generations of scholars. Their goal was to make explicit the hidden rules of academia for the next generation. This preparation occurred through classwork that challenged students to think critically about the world, advising students about future career paths, or through heavy mentoring of students (Casado Pérez, 2019, Casado Pérez et al., 2021). Dr. I participated in advising students as provost and also created opportunities in classrooms for students from "different backgrounds to work on an action project in our undergraduate classes". These projects revolved around "the housing crisis" or "immigration" but allowed students to think critically about these issues in a supportive yet challenging environment. As an example of the importance of mentoring, Dr. B explained, "for me the most important thing about mentoring is helping a person move forward and hopefully move beyond me." Dr. B understood that POC maneuvered tight spaces and that she could act as a buffer. Her hopes were that students could eventually surpass her in what they can accomplish and reach. So, while participants encountered heavy gatekeeping, they used their leadership to both prevent students from facing the same pitfalls they encountered and to work towards creating a more equitable system.

Discussion

No work has examined the "tight spaces" or everyday acts of resistance for FOC at a R1 HSI. Thus, the current findings contribute a novel understanding of how this context uniquely informs experiences of racism and sexism in leadership structures for FOC. Past work has documented similar challenges in leadership reported in this study for FOC, especially in PWIs. These included: the burden of invisible labor due to epistemological racism (Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002; Duncan, 2014; Hirshfield & Joseph, 2012; Settles et al., 2020); experiences of tokenization (Duncan, 2014; Hirshfield & Joseph, 2012; Padilla, 1994); institutional resistance to change (Freeman et al., 2019); limited resources (Baez, 2000; Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002; Duncan, 2014); and heavy gatekeeping (Freeman et al., 2019). Yet, if we consider the institutional site in which the current study was conducted, we can understand the underlying structures that uniquely inform these tight spaces for FOC at this institution.

For example, the target R1 HSI aims to increase access to research opportunities for and represent the state's demographic of growing numbers of racially- and economically-minoritized students. Indeed, the campus has explicitly adopted a mission of servingness and commitment to

building a racially-just campus. Yet, participants' accounts in the current interviews demonstrated that the underlying structures still remain rooted in historical and ongoing practices of whiteness. Different from literature on PWIs, these findings demonstrated how a commitment to serving larger numbers of minoritized students places disproportionate invisible labor on FOC - especially those identified as women - while remaining committed to the status quo. This commitment to the status quo is also reflected in unshifting racist and sexist tenure and promotion review processes that undermine the full contributions of FOC, and in the limited resources and institutional support (e.g., gatekeeping) offered to FOC for their contributions to DEI-related leadership. So although these barriers might overlap with those documented in prior work at PWIs, the specific organizational structure of a R1 HSI uniquely informs how FOC experience different forms of racism and sexism in leadership structures.

Given these unique tight spaces, participants reported practicing particular forms of everyday resistance. These included prioritizing self-love, refusing to take part in formal leadership, being resourceful, creating change through informal routes, and preparing the next generation of scholars. The pervasiveness of racism made it so all participants had to adopt some or all of these strategies for maneuvering through tight spaces in leadership in order to push back against oppression. Through the lens of some resistance frameworks, these strategies may be seen as "non-effective" for creating transformational change (Robinson & Ward, 1991). Yet, when guided by the theory of everyday resistance, we are able to capture the meaning behind how these covert forms of resistance serve as a mechanism for how FOC survive and thrive in academia. These strategies speak to how our participants choose to practice their agency, understanding the different power dynamics in which they are situated (Cruz, 2014; Johansson & Vinthagen, 2014; Rosales & Langhout, 2020; Vinthagen & Johannsson, 2012).

Their everyday resistance responses speak to the ongoing relationship between power and privilege as they navigated different tight spaces within academia (Johansson & Vinthagen, 2014; Rosales & Langhout, 2020). For example, gendered racism informed points of privilege and discrimination among participants. Experiences with sexism created differential responses to refusing to take on the "spirit of the institution" or to invisible labor. Participants who identified as women more often engaged in boundary setting to take care of themselves and their time, while still maintaining their obligations and commitments to DEI leadership. This boundary setting may be in response to cultural stereotypes and expectations of women of color to act as "nurturers" and "mother figures" and to advocate for the needs of minoritized groups, even at the expense of their research and career goals (Griffin, 2013; Griffin et al, 2013; Hirshfield & Joseph, 2012). Boundary setting may serve to resist this form of gendered racism; at the same time, this type of boundary setting may also serve as a way to further prevent future requests for this particular labor that disproportionately affect FOC who identify as women. Participants who identified as men, conversely, were more likely to leave the space altogether, reflecting more freedom and privilege to say "no" for this group (Hirshfield & Joseph, 2012).

Moreover, though creating change through informal roles and preparing the next generation of scholars have been documented strategies in PWIs among FOC (Casado-Perez, 2019), again the institutional context sheds light on these responses within an R1 HSI setting. As an institution with underlying structures still rooted in whiteness, FOC had to find alternative pathways for enacting change, especially as existing structures felt unchanging. The larger

numbers of racially- and economically–minoritized students made this maneuvering especially critical, as gatekeeping structures limited how much change participants could enact. The informal pathways enabled participants to leverage their own lived experiences in order to better prepare the next generations of more diverse scholars in their own navigation of the university. In these varied ways, everyday resistance reflected the agency and power of FOC working to make change to existing structures and daily lived realities for minoritized groups. Participants worked to balance challenging power dynamics with an awareness of how these power dynamics impacted their own lives, including their own advancement, goals, and well-being (Casado Pérez, 2019).

Future Directions

Drawing from in-depth interviews, we brought attention to the ways race, racism, and sexism impacted experiences of and everyday responses to discrimination and privilege with leadership structures at a public R1 HSI. Scholars should utilize quantitative methods to further explore how FOC practice everyday resistance not only in response to the barriers faced in relation to formal leadership, but also other domains of faculty life. Quantitative methods can further strengthen these findings by documenting patterns among larger groups of FOC and by establishing correlational links between the barriers they face and the everyday resistance practices in which they engage. Future quantitative analyses can also further test how intersections of race, gender, and academic position impact the experiences of faculty, more generally, within a R1 HSI setting. Exploring barriers and everyday resistance experiences using multiple methods can offer guidance on how to address tight spaces more systematically.

The current work also only included voices of FOC. While intentional, it would be critical to understand how those in power also make decisions about leadership. The responsibility to disrupt racism and sexism within leadership structures - and all structures within the university more broadly - lies with all members of the institution, but particularly those with the most power (Owen, 2007; Petrov & Garcia, 2021). Researchers should consider conducting interviews with top-level administrators to understand the barriers in formal leadership from their perspective and how they do or do not work to undo problematic structures. This would offer an important lens on how oppression is reinforced or disrupted in everyday decision-making among administrators, offering another avenue for potential intervention and policy change.

Finally, the study was conducted during a difficult time globally, at the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic. As many critical scholars have highlighted, this pandemic brought to light the many ways social class, race/ethnicity, location, and gender are impacted by oppression and domination (Baker, 2021; Duncan et al., 2021; Tevis, 2021). Racially- and economically-minoritized people globally suffered disproportionately compared to their counterparts (CDC, 2022); this was also true for students in higher education (Molock & Parchem, 2020). These disproportionate impacts were worsened by increased national attention to racial civil unrest and police state violence (Molock & Parchem, 2020). Witnessing and managing national crises not only impacts the personal lived experiences of FOC but also adds to the invisible labor when having to support minoritized students in the academy. FOC, especially those identified as women, already spend significant time mentoring and caring for minoritized students; these events exacerbated that need (Anwer, 2020).

As such, spaces within higher education, especially in this socio-political context - can be incredibly anxiety-provoking and uncomfortable (Duncan et al., 2021). Perhaps, during this time, FOC practiced new forms of agency and resistance (e.g., being creative) along with other well-documented forms (e.g., boundary setting). For example, on the one hand, meeting virtually might have made it easier for some FOC to remove themselves from tense spaces and to control particular features of their engagement. On the other hand, the presence of virtual meetings might have created more burdens and invisible labor for FOC, as meetings were easier to schedule (see Zoom fatigue, Njoku & Evans, 2022). As we transition into a new stage of the pandemic, understanding how formal leadership practices shifted and changed as a response to a virtual environment is needed, especially shifts that helped to affirm the work of FOC or reduce barriers to navigating leadership spaces. Understanding whether or not FOC practiced new forms of resistance in such a setting is critical to continuing to reimagine what formal spaces can look like. Indeed, scholars call to use these shifting experiences to reimagine traditional systems in a new light, one where norms can be broken (Duncan et al., 2021).

Implications & Conclusions

Interviews with FOC navigating tight spaces within a R1 HSI spotlight a need for change. They have initiated this process through everyday covert acts of resistance. These acts reveal several important implications for what it means to dismantle institutional oppression, especially within an HSI context aiming to work toward racial and economic justice (Laden, 2001; Garcia, 2018; Ledesma & Burciago, 2015; Petrov & Garcia, 2021). A connecting feature among many of the themes is the notion that FOC disproportionately engage in invisible forms of labor in the name of institutional servingness (Brown-Glaude, 2009; Duncan, 2014; Griffin, 2013; Guillaume & Apodaca, 2020; Hirshfield & Joseph 2012; Padilla, 1994; Shalaby et al., 2020). Though FOC employed creative ways to maneuver this invisibility, a structural response requires a rethinking of promotion and tenure review processes (Settles et al., 2020). In R1 HSI contexts, research productivity remains the most valued criterion (Baez, 2000; Tippeconnic Fox, 2009). Expanding definitions of what counts as rigorous research - to include scholarship that centers marginalized voices or employs community-engaged approaches - is one way to confront epistemological racism and question practices of objectivity (Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002; Ledesma & Burciaga, 2015; Ozer et al., 2021; Quinn-Szcesuil, 2019; Settles et al., 2020). Simultaneously, shifting department and campus conversations in ways that value teaching, mentoring, and service more also serves to undo invisible labor. FOC engage in heavy mentoring that sustains a diverse student population, including supporting students through their own gatekeeping points in their trajectories. Concretely highlighting the importance of such efforts helps to rethink traditional review structures in ways that better recognize the varied contributions, labor, and cultural wealth of minoritized groups (Yosso, 2005).

Another connecting feature across the themes was lack of institutional support for DEI leadership. This ranged from experiencing gatekeeping practices that prevented access to leadership positions, feeling limited in terms of resources and opportunities to enact change through formal leadership positions, and feeling tokenized in those same positions. There must be meaningful investment in supporting the development of leaders in these contexts if institutions are to work toward racial justice (Petrov & Garcia, 2021). Though hiring more FOC is one step toward representing student demography on campus and toward reducing

tokenization (Ledesma & Burciago, 2015), other systemic shifts should supplement this work. For example, campus should provide critical resources (e.g., course releases, funding, staffing) when supporting the work of leaders, especially those engaged in DEI-related efforts and initiatives (Tate & Bagguley, 2017). Access to resources not only communicates the value of such efforts but it also provides the foundation for being able to meaningfully execute efforts that tie directly to servingness.

Campuses can also be more intentional in how they train and select leaders for important campus positions that have implications for institutional policies and practices (e.g., chairs, associate deans, provosts). Strengthening selection criteria that prioritizes individuals who have demonstrated evidence of anti-racist, collaborative approaches in past leadership or of efforts that have advanced a mission of servingness in concrete ways are direct ways to counter whiteness. Such criteria directly honors skills, talents, and contributions that center goals of racial equity. At the same time, for those interested in developing their skills as leaders, institutions should provide opportunities for robust training (Freeman et al., 2019; Turner et al., 2011). Such training is critical for FOC and non-FOC alike, as the burden of institutional work should not fall solely on those who are most minoritized in the academy (Garcia & Ramirez, 2018; Reguerín et al., 2020).

Rethinking structures of leadership requires multiple points of intervention, ranging from large-scale investments (e.g., hiring more FOC, reimagine promotion and tenure process) to smaller, but still meaningful, shifts (e.g., expanding definitions of review criteria, training chairs how to advocate for anti-racist and anti-sexist practices in department discussions). Without these investments, the institution will continue to communicate its own resistance to change and resistance to acknowledge how structures that reward whiteness will continue to burn out and push out essential leaders and undermine efforts of servingeness. Indeed, FOC are left with the responsibility of maneuvering tight spaces in the absence of real structural change. In this study, FOC participants shared that they prioritized self-love, said no, were resourceful, pursued informal pathways for change, and prepared the next generation of scholars – to carry out their own commitment to social justice and to model the agency, courage, and effort it takes to build a racially- and economically-just institution. Universities survive off the labor, cultural wealth, and love of FOC. Documenting the everyday resistance of FOC not only points out the everyday institutional harms that FOC confront but it also highlights a praxis of and commitment to love among FOC for minoritized peoples within the academy. These everyday acts of resistance - everyday acts of love, really - *are* servingness. Institutions must follow the lead of FOC to reckon with their own shortcomings in this work and to commit to eliminating oppression and subordination of all members of the institution. Only then can a mission of servingness manifest.

References

Ahmed, S. (2012). *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life*. Duke University Press. https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822395324

Allen, R. 2006. The race problem in the critical pedagogy community. In C. A. Rossatto, R. L. Allen, and M. Pruyn (eds.), *Reinventing Critical Pedagogy: Widening the Circle of Anti-Oppression Education*, 3–20. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Antonio, A. L. & Astin, H. S. & Cress, C. M. (2000). Community service in higher education: A look at the nation's faculty. *The Review of Higher Education 23*(4), 373-397. https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2000.0015.

Anwer, M. (2020). Academic labor and the global pandemic: Revisiting life-work balance under COVID-19. *Susan Bulkeley Butler Center for Leadership Excellence and Advance Working Paper Serie*s, *3*(1), 5-13.

Archibald, M. M. (2016). Investigator triangulation: A collaborative strategy with potential for mixed methods research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 10(3), 228–250. https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689815570092

Baez, B. (2000). Race-related service and faculty of color: Conceptualizing critical agency in academe. *Higher Education*, *39*(3), 363–391. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1003972214943

Baker, C. (2021). Amplification of structural inequalities: Research sabbaticals during COVID-19. *The ADVANCE Journal, 2*(2).

Bell, D. (1995). Who's afraid of critical race theory? *University of Illinois Law Review*, *1995*(4), 893–910.

Bensimon, E. M., & Neumann, A. (1993). *Redesigning Collegiate Leadership: Teams and Teamwork in Higher Education*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Boice, J. R. (1992). *The New Faculty Member*. San Francis, CA: Jossey Bass.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2009). *Racism without Racists: Color-blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in the United States*. Rowman & Littlefield

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Brown-Glaude, W. R. (2009). *Doing diversity in higher education: Faculty leaders share challenges and strategies*. New Brunswick, NJ, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Brunsma, D. L., Brown, E. S., & Placier, P. (2013). Teaching race at historically White colleges and universities: Identifying and dismantling the walls of whiteness. *Critical Sociology*, 39(5), 717-738. https://doi.org/10.1177/0896920512446759

Bulhan, H. A. (2015). Stages of colonialism in Africa: From occupation of land to occupation of being. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, *3*(1), 239–256. https://doi.org/10.5964/jspp.v3i1.143

Cabrera, N. L., Franklin, J. D., & Watson, J. S. (2017). *Whiteness in Higher Education: The Invisible Missing Link in Diversity and Racial Analyses: ASHE Higher Education Report*, Volume 42, Number 6. John Wiley & Sons.

Casado Pérez, J. F. (2019). Everyday resistance strategies by minoritized faculty. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *12*(2), 170–179. https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000090

Casado Pérez, J. F., Roundtree, S. M., & Pérez, D. C. (2021). Motivation and meaning in everyday resistance by minoritized faculty. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*. Advance online publication. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000269

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2022, January 25). *Health equity considerations and racial and ethnic minority groups*. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/health-equity/race-ethnicity.html

Charmaz, K. (2008). In Biber, S. H., Hesse-Biber, S. N., & Leavy, P. (Eds.), *Handbook of Emergent Methods*, Grounded theory as an emergent method (pp.155 - 172). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Cole, E. R. (2009). Intersectionality and research in psychology. *American psychologist*, 64(3), 170. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014564

Collins, P & Bilge, S. 2016. *Intersectionality*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Córdova, T. 1998. Power and knowledge: Colonialism in the academy. In *Living Chicana theory,* ed. C. Trujillo, 17–45. Berkeley, CA: Third Woman Press.

Corneille, M., Lee, A., Allen, S., Cannady, J., & Guess, A. (2019). Barriers to the advancement of Women of Color faculty in STEM. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, *38*(3), 328–348. https://doi.org/10.1108/edi-09-2017-0199

Covarrubias, R., Valle, I., Laiduc, G., & Azmitia, M. (2019). "You never become fully independent": Family roles and independence in first-generation college students. *Journal of Adolescent Research,* 34(4), 381-410. https://doi.org/10.1177/0743558418788402

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against Women of Colour." *Stanford Law Review* 43 (6): 1241.

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2016). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Sage publications.

Cruz, C. (2014). In E. Tuck, & K. W. Yang (Eds.), LGBTQ street youth doing resistance in infrapolitical worlds, In *Youth resistance research and theories of change* (pp. 209–217). New York, NY: Routledge.

Cruz, C. (2016). When does resistance begin? Queer immigrant and U.S. born Latina/o youth, identity, and the infrapolitics of the street. In G. Q. Conchas, & B. M. Hinga (Eds.), *Cracks in the schoolyard: Confronting Latino educational inequality* (pp. 131–143). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Daniels, A. K. (1987). Invisible work. *Social Problems 34*(5), 403–415. https://doi.org/10.1525/sp.1987.34.5.03a00020

Davis, L., & Fry, R. (2019, July 31). *College faculty have become more racially and ethnically diverse, but remain far less so than students*. Pew Research Center. https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/07/31/us-college-faculty-student-diversity/

Delgado, R., Stefancic, J., & Harris, A. P. (2017). *Critical Race Theory: An Introduction*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Delgado Bernal, D., & Villalpando, O. (2002). An apartheid of knowledge in academia: The struggle over the "legitimate" knowledge of faculty of color. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *35*(2), 169–180. https://doi.org/10.1080/713845282

Diggs, G. A., Garrison-Wade, D. F., Estrada, D., & Galindo, R. (2009). Smiling faces and colored spaces: The experiences of faculty of color pursuing tenure in the academy. *The Urban Review, 41,* 312–333. http:// dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11256-008-0113-y

Duncan, P. (2014). Hot commodities, cheap labor: Women of Color in the academy. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*, *35*(3), 39–63. https://doi.org/10.5250/fronjwomestud.35.3.0039

Duncan, P., Dutt-Ballerstadt, R., & Lo, M. (2021). Women of Color faculty reimagining institutional spaces during the COVID-19 pandemic. *ADVANCE Journal*, *2*(3). https://doi.org/10.5399/osu/advjrnl.2.3.13

Dupree, C. H., & Boykin, C. M. (2021). Racial inequality in academia: Systemic origins, modern challenges, and policy recommendations. *Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *8*(1), 11–18. https://doi.org/10.1177/2372732220984183

Essed, P. (1991). *Understanding everyday racism: An interdisciplinary theory* (Vol. 2). Sage Publications.

Foste, Z., & Irwin, L. (2020). Applying critical whiteness studies in college student development theory and research. *Journal of College Student Development*, 61(4), 439-455. Chicago. https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2020.0050

Freeman Jr, S., Krier, K., Al-Asfour, A., & Thacker., R. (2019). An examination of the barriers to leadership for Faculty of Color at U.S. universities. *Issues in Informing Science and Information Technology*, *16*, 361–376. https://doi.org/10.28945/4373

Garcia, G. A. (2016). Complicating a Latina/o-serving identity at a Hispanic serving institution. *The Review of Higher Education*, 40(1), 117-143. https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2016.0040

Garcia, G. A. (2018). Decolonizing Hispanic-serving institutions: A framework for organizing. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 17(2), 132-147. https://doi.org/10.1177/1538192717734289

Garcia, G. A., Núñez, A. M., & Sansone, V. A. (2019). Toward a multidimensional conceptual framework for understanding "servingness" in Hispanic-serving institutions: A synthesis of the research. *Review of Educational Research*, 89(5), 745-784. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654319864591

Garcia, G. A., & Ramirez, J. J. (2018). Institutional agents at a Hispanic Serving institution (HSI): Using social capital to empower students. *Urban Education*, 53(3), 355–381. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085915623341

Garrison-Wade, D. F., Diggs, G. A., Estrada, D., & Galindo, R. (2012). Lift every voice and sing: Faculty of color face the challenges of the tenure track. *The Urban Review*, 44(1), 90-112. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-011-0182-1

Griffin, K. A. (2013). Voices of the "Othermothers": Reconsidering Black professors' relationships with Black students as a form of social exchange. *The Journal of Negro Education*, *82*(2), 169–183. https://doi.org/10.7709/jnegroeducation.82.2.0169

Griffin, K. A., Bennett, J. C., & Harris, J. (2013). Marginalizing merit? Gender differences in Black faculty D/discourses on tenure, advancement, and professional success. *Review of Higher Education*, *36*(4), 489–512. https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2013.0040

Guarino, C., & Borden, V. (2017). Faculty service loads and gender: Are women taking care of the academic family? *Research in Higher Education*, *58*(6), 672–694. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-017-9454-2

Guillaume, R. & Apodaca, E. (2020). Early career faculty of color and promotion and tenure: the intersection of advancement in the academy and cultural taxation. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2020.1718084

HACU List of Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs). Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities - HSIs. (2020). https://www.hacu.net/hacu/HSIs.asp.

Han, K. T., & Leonard, J. (2017). Why diversity matters in rural America: Women Faculty of Color challenging whiteness. *The Urban Review*, *49*(1), 112–139. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-016-0384-7

Hinchey, P. (2010). Rethinking agendas: Social reproduction and resistance. *Counterpoints, 24,* 93–110.

Hirshfield, L. E., & Joseph, T. D. (2012). 'We need a woman, we need a black woman': Gender, race, and identity taxation in the academy. *Gender and Education*, *24* (2), 213-227.

hooks, b. (1990). Marginality as a site of resistance. In R. Ferguson, M. Gever, T. Minh-ha, & C. West (Eds.), *Out There: Marginalization and Contemporary Cultures* (pp. 341–343). MIT Press.

Jackson, J. F. L., & O'Callaghan, E. M. (2011) Understanding employment disparities using glass ceiling effects criteria: An examination of race/ethnicity and senior-level position attainment across the academic workforce. *Journal of the Professoriate*, 5 (2), 67-99.

Johansson, A., & Vinthagen, S. (2014). Dimensions of everyday resistance: An analytical framework. *Critical Sociology*, *42*(3), 417–435. https://doi.org/10.1177/0896920514524604

Josselson, R. (2004). The hermeneutics of faith and the hermeneutics of suspicion. *Narrative Inquiry*, 14 (1), 1–28. https://doi.org/10.1075/ni.14.1.01jos

Kanter, R. M. (1977). Some effects of proportions on group life: Skewed sec ratios and responses to token women. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82(5), 965–990.

Kezar, A. (2011). Grassroots leadership: Encounters with power dynamics and oppression. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 24(4), 471–500. https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2010.529848

Kubota, R. (2019). Confronting epistemological racism, decolonizing scholarly knowledge: Race and gender in applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics*, *41*(5), 712–732. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amz033

Lachaud, Q. (2020). Combatting epistemological racism: Critical race participatory action research toward the promotion of faculty critical race conscience and transformative pedagogy. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Pittsburgh. (Unpublished)

Laden, B. V. (2001). Hispanic-serving institutions: Myths and realities. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 76(1), 73-92. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327930PJE7601_05

Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. F. (2017). Toward a critical race theory of education. In *Critical Race Theory in Education* (1st ed., pp. 10–31). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315709796-2

Ledesma, M. C., & Burciaga, R. (2015). Faculty governance at Hispanic-serving institutions through the lens of critical race theory. *Hispanic-serving institutions in American higher education: Their origin, and present and future challenges*, 40-57.

Lugones, M. (2003). *Pilgrimages/Peregrinajes: theorizing coalition against multiple oppressions*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Lutz, K. F., Hassouneh, D., Akeroyd, J., & Beckett, A. K. (2013). Balancing survival and resistance: Experiences of faculty of color in predominantly Euro American schools of nursing. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 6,* 127–146. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0032364

McLaren, P. (1997). Decentering whiteness. *Multicultural Education*, 5, 4-11.

Molock, S. D., & Parchem, B. (2020). The impact of COVID-19 on college students from communities of color. *Journal of American College Health*, 1-7. https://doi.org/10.1080/07448481.2020.1865380

Morgan, G. *Images of Organization.* Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage, 1997.

Nelson Laird, T. F., Bridges, B. K., Morelon-Quainoo, C. L., Williams, J. M., & Holmes, M. S. (2007). African American and Hispanic student engagement at minority serving and predominantly White institutions. *Journal of College Student Development*, 48(1), 39-56. https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2007.0005

Njoku, A., & Evans, M. (2022). Black women faculty and administrators navigating COVID-19, social unrest, and academia: Challenges and strategies. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(4), 2220. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19042220

Olsen D. (1993). Work satisfaction and stress in the first and third year of academic appointment. *Journal of Higher Education*, *64*(4), 453-471.

Owen, D.S. (2007). Towards a critical theory of whiteness. *Philosophy & Social Criticism, 33*(2), 203–222. https://doi.org/10.1177/0191453707074139

Ozer, E. J., Langhout, R. D., & Weinstein, R. S. (2021). Promoting institutional change to support public psychology: Innovations and challenges at the University of California. *American Psychologist*, 76(8), 1293–1306. https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000877

Padilla, A. M. (1994). Ethnic minority scholars, research, and mentoring: Current and future issues. *Educational Researcher*, *23*(4), 24. https://doi.org/10.2307/1176259

Patton, L. D. (2016). Disrupting postsecondary prose: Toward a critical race theory of higher education. *Urban Education*, 5(3), 315- 342. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085915602542

Pérez-Huber, L. (2009). Disrupting apartheid of knowledge: Testimonios methodology in Latina/o critical race research in education. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *22*(6), 639–654. https://doi.org/10.1080/09518390903333863

Petrov, L. A., & Garcia, G. A. (2021). Becoming a racially just Hispanic-serving institution (HSI): Leveraging HSI grants for organizational identity change. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 14(4), 463–467. https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000356

Ponjuan, L., Conley, V. M., & Trower, C. (2011). Career stage differences in pre-tenure track faculty perceptions of professional and personal relationships with colleagues. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *82*(3), 319–346. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2011.11777204

Pyke, K. (2011). Service and gender inequity among faculty. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, *44*(01), 85–87. https://doi.org/10.1017/s1049096510001927

Quinn-Szcesuil, J. (2019, April 29). *A new approach to recognizing faculty contributions*. WPI: Beyond these towers. https://www.wpi.edu/news/new-approach-recognizing-faculty-contributions

Reguerín, P. G., Poblete, J., Cooper, C. R., Sánchez Ordaz, A., & Moreno, R. (2020). Becoming a racially just Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI). *Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs) in practice: Defining "Servingness" at HSIs*, 41-59.

Rice, R. E., Sorcinelli, M. D., & Austin, A. E. (2000). Heeding new voices: academic careers for a new generation. New pathways working paper series, Inquiry #7. Washington, DC: *American Association for Higher Education*. http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED451740.pdf

Robinson, T., & Ward, J. (1991). "A belief in self far greater than anyone's disbelief": Cultivating resistance among African American female adolescents. In C. Gilligan, A. Rogers, & D. Tolman (Eds.), *Women, girls and psychotherapy: Reframing resistance* (pp. 87-103). New York: Haworth.

Rosales, C & Langhout, R. D. (2020). Just because we don't see it, doesn't mean it's not there: Everyday resistance in psychology. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *14*(1), n/a–n/a. https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12508

Rosenthal, L. (2016). Incorporating intersectionality into psychology: An opportunity to promote social justice and equity. *American Psychologist*, *71*(6), 474–485. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0040323

Rubin, J. W. (1996). Defining resistance: Contested interpretations of everyday acts. *Studies in Law, Politics, and Society*, *15*(1), 237–60.

Ryan, C. (2015). Everyday resilience as resistance: Palestinian women practicing sumud. *International Political Sociology*, *9*(4), 299–315. https://doi.org/10.1111/ips.12099

Salter, P., & Adams, G. (2013). Toward a critical race psychology. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 7*(11), 781–793. https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12068

Schuster, J., & Finkelstein, M. (2006). *The American faculty: The restructuring of academic work and careers*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press

Scotland, J. (2012). Exploring the philosophical underpinnings of research: Relating ontology and epistemology to the methodology and methods of the scientific, interpretive, and critical research paradigms. *English Language Teaching*, *5*(9). https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n9p9

Settles, I. H., Jones, M. K., Buchanan, N. T., & Dotson, K. (2020). Epistemic exclusion: scholar(ly) devaluation that marginalizes faculty of color. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000174

Shalaby, M., Allam, N., & Buttorff, G. (2021). *Inside Higher Ed*. The increasingly disproportionate service burden female faculty bear will have negative career consequences (opinion). https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2020/12/18/increasingly-disproportionate-service-burden-female-faculty-bear-will-have.

Shim, J. (2020). Token fatigue: tolls of marginalization in White male spaces. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *44*(7), 1115–1134. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2020.1779947

Smith, E. B., & Luke, M. M. (2021). A call for radical reflexivity in counseling qualitative research. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *60*(2), 164-172. https://doi.org/10.1002/ceas.12201

Solórzano, D. G. (1997). Images and words that wound: Critical race theory, racial stereotyping, and teacher education. *Teacher education quarterly*, 5-19.

Solórzano, D. G., & Delgado-Bernal, D. (2001). Examining transformational resistance through a critical race and LatCrit theory framework: Chicana and Chicano students in an urban context. *Urban Education*, *36*(3), 308-342. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085901363002

Solórzano, D., & Yosso, Y. (2002). Critical race methodology: Counter-storytelling as an analytical framework for education research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 8(1), 23–44. https://doi.org/10.1177/107780040200800103

Stanley, C. A. (2006). Coloring the academic landscape: Faculty of Color breaking the silence in predominantly White colleges and universities. *American Educational Research Journal*, *43*(4), 701–736. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312043004701

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1994). Grounded theory methodology: An overview.

Stephens, N. M., Fryberg, S. A., Markus, H. R., Johnson, C. S., & Covarrubias, R. (2012). Unseen disadvantage: How American universities' focus on independence undermines the

academic performance of first-generation college students. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *102*(6), 1178–1197. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0027143

Tate, S. A., & Bagguley, P. (2017). Building the anti-racist university: Next steps. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 20(3), 289-299. https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2016.1260227

Tevis, T. (2021). By obligation and by choice: Taking on extra responsibilities during COVID-19 and the Black Lives Matter Movement. *The ADVANCE Journal, 2*(2).

Tippeconnic Fox, M. (2009). American Indian women in academia: The joys and challenges. *NASPA Journal About Women in Higher Education*, *1*(1), 204–223. https://doi.org/10.2202/1940-7890.1011

Turner, C. S. V., González, J. C., & Wood, J. L. (2008). Faculty of color in academe: What 20 years of literature tells us. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 1(3), 139–168. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012837

Turner, C. S. V., González, J. C., & Wong (Lau), K. (2011). Faculty Women of Color: The critical nexus of race and gender. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 4(4), 199–211. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024630

Vinthagen, S., & Johansson, A. (2012). Everyday resistance: Exploration of a concept and its theories. *Resistance Studies Magazine*, 1(1), 1–46.

Whitford, E. (2020). Report details gaps for women and minority professionals in higher ed. https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2020/05/06/report-details-gaps-women-and-minority-professionals-higher-ed.

Williams, D. A., & Clowney, C. (2007). Strategic planning for diversity and organizational change. *Effective practices for academic leaders*, 2(3), 1-16.

Yin, R. K. (2003). Designing case studies. *Qualitative research methods*, 5(14), 359-386.

Yosso, Y. (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.