

# INTEGRATING SOCIOLOGY: OBSERVATIONS ON RACE AND GENDER RELATIONS IN SOCIOLOGY GRADUATE PROGRAMS

MARY ROMERO\*

*School of Justice Studies, Arizona State University*

ERIC MARGOLIS

*Division of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies,  
College of Education, Arizona State University*

**ABSTRACT:** *Issues related to the integration of race within sociology doctoral programs were explored. Two sets of data were analyzed: open-ended interviews with 26 women of color graduate students and 92 questionnaires completed by Ph.D. programs on faculty, graduate courses, and expertise in race. Quantitative data show that faculty of color are likely to be the one member of their race in the department. EuroAmerican faculty are over-represented in the rank of Full Professor and Associate Professor and faculty of color are under-represented in the tenured ranks. Less than a quarter of departments included the study of race in required theory courses. Departments listing race and ethnicity as a specialty in the area did not always offer graduate courses in the field and courses that were offered did not necessarily focus specifically on U.S. race/ethnic/minority relations, but included international studies and broad topics in social organizations and stratification. Comments by a sample of women of color graduate students point out a number of critical issues: curricula that are outdated, ignore race, are monocultural, and look better in the catalog than in the classroom; faculty that are top-heavy with older White males; students discouraged from pursuing what attracted them to the academy in the first place; and students in conflicts with racial overtones over scarce resources and favors. Qualitative results*

---

*\*Direct all correspondence to: Mary Romero, Arizona State University, School of Justice Studies, P.O. Box 870403, Tempe, AZ 85287-0403.*

---

**RACE & SOCIETY, Volume 2, Number 1, pages 1-24.**

Copyright © 2000 by Elsevier Science Inc.

All rights of reproduction in any form reserved.

ISSN: 1090-9524.

Sociological associations have addressed issues of affirmative action and inclusion through the development of such programs as minority graduate student fellowships, summer research institutes, race and ethnic sections, and councils.

There have been few studies on the status of sociologists of color since Blackwell and Janowitz's (1974) book on African American sociologists published a quarter of a century ago. The growing literature on the sociology of sociology recognizes processes and structures that contribute to the reproduction of mainstream sociology, but rarely do researchers attend to the implications for students, faculty, or scholars of color. Most discussions of professional identity assume a White, middle-class, heterosexual, male professional identity (Aisenberg and Harrington, 1988; Gilkes, 1982; Granfield, 1992). Recently, two sociology journals devoted special issues to graduate education; however, neither included an article devoted to issues of race.<sup>3</sup> Attention to gender issues has addressed ways that professional socialization affects White women in graduate school and in the profession (Bernard, 1990; Gordon, 1990; Orlans and Wallace, 1994), but not students or faculty of color, particularly women of color. The special issue of *Teaching Sociology* on graduate training included a discussion on the status of women and minorities in the profession, but did not address practical issues of how to handle racism and sexism as a graduate student or later as a faculty member, nor was there a discussion of how to socialize White students to work and learn in a diverse workplace (Eitzen, 1989).

Little attention has been paid to concrete experiences reported by students in doctoral programs in sociology. Researchers have not critically analyzed the actual practices of affirmative action or the concrete everyday experiences of graduate students and faculty of color in sociology departments, despite the fact that racialized experiences and practices of doctoral programs are central events in the training of future sociologists. Numerous studies have recommended the following practices for multicultural training: the requirement of a race relations course; the integration of race throughout the curriculum and reading material; inclusion of scholarship by scholars of color in all fields; and the practical experience of learning to work, study and do research with students and faculty of color (James and Farmer, 1993; Lopez, 1993; Spring, 1995; Thompson and Tyagi, 1993). On the brink of the twenty-first century, graduate programs in sociology need to prepare the next generation to teach and do research in a multicultural America.<sup>4</sup> How well is the discipline accomplishing these tasks?

This paper addresses the situation faced by women of color graduate students and faculty of color in sociology departments in the U.S. and explores the organizational limitations of integrating race and "sociology of race" into graduate training and thus the discipline. We attempt to shed light on two intertwined and interconnected dimensions: 1) whether women of color graduate students perceive that the study of race is supported as a major concentration and area of study in Ph.D. programs in sociology; and 2) their perceptions of the status of scholars, faculty and students of color in the discipline. To pose the question another way, do women of color graduate students in sociology perceive that the persistent realities of racism in our society are reflected in U.S. American Sociology?

Drawing on data from both qualitative and quantitative studies, we report findings on the treatment of race in sociology graduate departments in the United States. The treatment of race was analyzed along three dimensions: 1) as a subject matter in the

color face in graduate sociology programs. General questions asked interviewees included: Describe the department and university you currently attend? Why did you select this program? How much guidance have you gotten in course work? Describe the kind of financial support received in graduate school, including teaching and research assistantships; and describe the process for obtaining assistantship. Describe any mentoring relationships you have had in graduate school. What recommendations do you have about your program or about sociology to be more inclusive of women of color as students and scholars? What are your recommendations for improving race relations in the discipline and sociology departments. Interviews were transcribed and then coded in general categories, for example: mentoring, financial assistance, networking, criteria for selection of graduate programs, relationships with faculty and students, teaching and publishing opportunities, and issues they identified as barriers.

It is highly likely that the sample volunteering to be interviewed showed significant selection bias. They had very strong feelings about race. This cuts two ways. It may be that the women of color graduate students that we interviewed hold opinions different from the norm for sociology graduate students of color. Conversely, it may be the case that because they are graduate students specifically interested in race and majoring in sociology they have given more thought to, and are able to articulate better, issues that are extremely widespread. Survey research is well-suited to discovering dominant perspectives and average opinions; survey findings are typically generalizable, but lack specificity. Qualitative research on the other hand is less generalizable; researchers seek articulate spokespersons for particular positions and the findings are specific to time and place. We make no claims that the experiences or viewpoints of the women who talked to us are "typical" of graduate students of color. We do assert that 26 women of color graduate students in sociology were given the space to discuss their experiences and viewpoints and that we did our best to fairly represent their words.

To obtain a broader picture of the course offerings and the status of faculty members of color in doctoral programs in sociology departments, we sent a separate questionnaire in 1992 to all of the 126 Ph.D. programs in the United States that were listed in the 1990 ASA's *Guide to Graduate Programs* (ASA, 1990). Ninety-two departments responded (73%), reporting data on a total of 1,769 full-time faculty as well as a number of faculty with joint appointments. We asked departments to provide the following data: the number of graduate courses their department offered in the area of race and ethnicity; the rank, gender, race, and ethnicity of faculty members; and the number of faculty members teaching or doing research in the area of race. In addition, we asked: 1) Is race and ethnicity an area of specialty in the program? 2) Does your department offer graduate level courses in the area of race and ethnicity? 3) If so, how often are the courses offered? When was it last offered? And what is the course? 4) Is the study of race included in the required theory courses in your department? And 5) Is there an ethnic studies program at your university?

### **Integration of Race in the Graduate Curriculum**

Although not all of the women of color graduate students that we interviewed were developing race as their area of concentration, they all voiced a desire for increased course offerings, curriculum integration, and guest speakers. They argued that the study of race

Whereas faculty members may defend departments, noting that it may take 3 to 5 years to change catalogs or restructure from the losses of prominent faculty, these graduate students' comments capture the importance of published material, including the ASA Guide to Graduate Programs, in undergraduate decision making that goes into applying to a Ph.D. program in sociology.<sup>8</sup>

Graduate courses identified by departments as part of their major or specialty in race tend to be subsumed under international studies or broader structural concerns, such as demography, stratification, and organizations. Sometimes race is still included as a component of social problems courses. The wide range of titles for courses in the race/ethnic specialty in graduate programs suggests the marginal location of race in mainstream sociology: Problems in Emerging Countries, World Historical Study of Stratification, Poverty, Women and Third World Development, Political Economy of Women, Seminar on Social Organization, Latin American Society, Selected Topics in Sociology of East Asia, Japanese Society, Sociology of Evil, Sociology of Latin American Legal Systems, Development and Underdevelopment, Social Thought in Latin America, Peasants, Seminar on Problems of Modernization in Latin America and Cuban Revolution. Although more than 10% of all courses listed under a race/ethnic specialty dealt with international topics, courses focusing on international issues do not necessarily address race and ethnicity in the U.S. nor provide students with training in the sociology of race relations. Eleven percent of the courses listed under the specialty had titles indicating other fields of study such as social inequality, poverty, social stratification, and social organization, rather than race as the central focus of analysis.

Although we agree that race needs to be discussed across the curriculum, the lack of specific courses on race and ethnicity in the U.S. does not prepare graduate students to meet the teaching needs of higher education. In the fall of 1994, eight states and the District of Columbia had 30% or more college students who were minority-group members; and an additional nine states have between 20 and 29% minority-group students (Chronicle of Higher Education, 1996). Curriculum reform over the last two decades has occurred primarily in the establishment of cultural diversity requirements for the undergraduate degree and the transformation of curriculum within traditional disciplines. Undergraduate curricula changes and diversifying populations have produced student bodies with a much more sophisticated analysis, and expecting a more profound integration of race and ethnicity in graduate education. Such integration will increasingly be necessary to prepare future teachers and researchers (Hu-DeHart, 1993).

Women of color graduate students recognized faculty members' lack of expertise in the area of race and ethnicity and were sharply critical of what they perceived as their departments' resistance to improving course offerings or integrating course content. For instance, a Latina student completing her dissertation in a large university in the west questioned the practice of bringing in speakers who represented theoretical perspectives and areas similar to the department's own faculty:

*The colloquiums all tend to be pretty much mainstream sociology. Which is really funny—they spend all this money bringing in all these people and graduate students are generally pretty bored with the one's they do bring in. The kind of stuff we want to hear are the controversial issues, people that are doing things on feminist theory, issues that pertain to minorities and so forth. But they tend to bring in the same kinds of speakers all the time. And*

graduate students surveyed identified their graduate departments as interdisciplinary or including courses in ethnic studies.

The lack of sociology offerings frequently forces graduate students to turn to other departments; Interdisciplinary Studies, Women's Studies, Ethnic Studies and International programs play important roles in providing training in the area of race, but not necessarily from a sociological perspective. Furthermore, most of their exposure to the empirical and theoretical writings of scholars of color in the U.S. and in the Third World took place in graduate programs other than sociology. Unfortunately, graduate training outside the sociology department was not always an option. Many ethnic studies programs do not offer advanced degrees. Only one ethnic studies department in the U.S. offers a Ph.D. In our survey we found that 7 of the 20 universities with an all EuroAmerican sociology faculty did not have an ethnic studies program.

### The Race and Ethnic Composition of Sociology Departments

The absence of scholars of color was not only apparent in perspectives, curriculum and assigned readings, but also in the demographics of faculty. In our survey of Ph.D. programs, we found that the number of faculty members of color did not seem to be related to whether the department identified race as a specialty. Of the 45 departments that offered race and ethnicity as a specialty, 9 had no faculty of color, and 6 departments had only one faculty member of color. In other words, one-third of all departments advertising race and ethnicity as a specialty had one or fewer faculty members of color. We are not of course arguing that EuroAmerican faculty should not teach race/ethnicity courses, but it seems disingenuous to recruit graduate students to study in the area of sociology of race (a major attraction for students of color) when the classes will **only** be taught by EuroAmericans. We can hardly imagine a graduate program offering a specialty in gender where all the courses are taught by men.

Although there are more faculty of color today than 25 years ago, the situation is far from equitable.<sup>9</sup> Of the 92 departments responding to the survey, 41% of the departments reported only one faculty member of color; 38% had two or three; and 24% had four or more faculty members of color. There is a positive correlation between the number of faculty members of color and the size of the department ( $r = 0.4232$   $p < .001$ ). All six departments with 30 or more faculty had at least one faculty member of color. Of the remaining 86 departments with 30 or less faculty members, 26% had only one faculty member of color.

Being the only one of your race in a department setting is one of the peculiar burdens faculty of color must bear.<sup>10</sup> Twenty-nine percent of departments had only one African American faculty member; 29% had one Asian-American faculty member, and 17% had only one Mexican American. African Americans were more likely than any other faculty member of color to be in a department with another member of their ethnic group. Thirty departments had two or more African American faculty members. Six departments had two or more Asian Americans. Eight departments had two or more Mexican Americans. Three departments had two or more Puerto Ricans. When more than one faculty of color of the same ethnicity resided in a department, they were more likely to be both men than women.<sup>11</sup>

Graduate student life is usually characterized by intense concentration on course work,

**TABLE 2**  
Sociology Faculty 1992—Rank by Race

Race/Ethnicity	Full Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Total N
African American	29 (28%)	37 (37%)	37 (36%)	103
Asian American	12 (29%)	14 (33%)	16 (38%)	42
Mexican American	8 (21%)	15 (39%)	15 (39%)	38
Native American	1 (20%)	2 (40%)	2 (40%)	5
Puerto Rican	4 (33%)	3 (25%)	5 (42%)	12
Others of Color	6 (27%)	7 (32%)	9 (41%)	22
EuroAmerican	746 (49%)	499 (33%)	9 (41%)	22
EuroAmerican	746 (49%)	499 (33%)	268 (18%)	1511
Column Total	806 (47%)	575 (33%)	352 (20%)	1733
Total Faculty of Color	60 (27%)	78 (35%)	84 (38%)	222

Percentages may not add up to 100% because of rounding.

rank of Assistant. ( $X^2 = 59.60$ ;  $df. = 2$ ;  $p < .0001$ ). Whether this persistent inequality reflects the fact that sociologists of color have only begun to gain admission to the halls of academia, or testifies to the continued existence of barriers to career advancement, the significant differences between faculty members of color and EuroAmerican faculty suggests ongoing problems in the training, hiring and promotional policies within the discipline. In these days of the waning of affirmative action, increasing tuition, and declining student aid packages, the dearth of faculty of color may be exacerbated by shrinking pools of graduate students of color. It is beyond the scope of this paper to suggest solutions to a complex issue that involves improving education for minority students at every level, as well as improving recruitment and retention of minority graduate students. However, in an earlier article (Margolis and Romero, 1998) we drew attention to certain elements of the hidden curriculum in graduate school that hinder and discourage students of color or actually drive them out of the program: stigmatization, blaming the victim, cooling-out functions, stereotyping, absence, exclusion, and deafening silences. White faculty especially, but all faculty can examine their graduate programs to see if these elements are present and if they influence retention and completion rates for students of color. Once made visible, issues like these that involve professionalization and socialization to the discipline can frequently be addressed in a positive manner.

Ethnic and racial demographic composition is further complicated by the difference in rank between EuroAmerican faculty and faculty of color. The location of faculty of color within the hierarchical structure of Ph.D. programs is a strong statement to graduate students about race relations in the department and the discipline. The following description of a graduate department by a Black ABD student enrolled in a small eastern university captures the symbolic message reflected in the racial composition of the faculty and their rank:

*The department has about between 40 and 45 graduate students and about ten to fifteen faculty persons. It's a very conservative department. . . . Only one tenured female faculty. One junior faculty who's Black. One minority woman who is on leave and she's a junior faculty. So the power structure of the department is very male, very white, very old, and very conservative.*

the world don't have any ideas. Your experience as a person of color isn't really reflected in what you study and what you learn."

Resistance to incorporating the writings of scholars of color into required readings for courses and qualifying exams similarly created racial divisions. For instance, traditional readings on race and ethnicity were seen as presenting a "blaming the victim" perspective. A Puerto Rican student completing her coursework at a large urban university discussed her discomfort in one class where the EuroAmerican professor used a cultural determinist model to explain the plight of Puerto Ricans: "We're not comfortable with that course. We don't like to be insulted that way." Another Latina completing her preliminary examinations at an eastern university recalled attempts she and other students made to inform a professor of the ethnocentric perspective embedded in the required methods text. They suggested alternative views of the material, but the professor rejected the critique and refused to consider other perspectives. Another incident demonstrating the lack of commitment to the integration of race was relayed by a teaching assistant who suggested to the EuroAmerican female faculty member that materials on women of color be incorporated into her packet on "Women and Work." In response to her suggestion the professor asked her to find the materials; however, even after the student did the additional work of collecting them, the professor never included the articles in the course readings. The graduate student concluded that the professor did not consider the writings by women of color social scientists to be either important or scholarly.

It appeared to many of the interviewees that the study of race relations in the U.S. and research by scholars of color was devalued. Consequently, these students of color often felt they took a risk in their career if they expressed an interest in the area. As one Latina completing her dissertation in the West noted "If you're interested in communities or ethnic studies then you're going to be ghettoized and you're going to be perceived in a certain way." Several students felt that their experiences in graduate school were clouded by their interest in race. Another Latina graduate student at a west coast university described the way that students of color on her campus felt about their interests in race and ethnicity:

*They (students of color) thought they were jeopardized and placed in a whole different category because their work wasn't understood. Whenever it had to do with race or ethnicity then it wasn't seen as valuable or as important.*

Students interested in areas of race and ethnicity expressed dissatisfaction with the intellectual support they received. They worried about finding faculty members willing to work with them. They said they ran the risk of not being taken seriously. Students perceived that research in the area of race had negative repercussions, including reduced access to mentoring, teaching, and research assistantships. Previous research on graduate training supports these women's concern about mentoring and success (Blackwell, 1983). There is no formal structure to socialize students into the profession (Crothers, 1991; Pavalko and Holley, 1974) and faculty are less likely to mentor students who do not share similar background and interests (Egan, 1989; Kleinman, 1983; Plutzer, 1991; Roth, 1955).

About a fourth of the students that we interviewed noted that it was common for EuroAmerican faculty to advise graduate students of color *not* to do research in their own

*in this country, they (EuroAmerican faculty and students) feel they're getting the worst of the lot.*

Even when students of color were not referred to as "affirmative action cases," they experienced race as a determining factor in their relationships with faculty members. An ABD Asian American completing her dissertation at a West coast university described relationships with EuroAmerican faculty that never developed beyond stereotypes:

*My main frustration with her (mentor) is that she just really doesn't know who I am. I mean for someone who like works with her for so many years it's like she has no idea who I am. Personally she makes a lot of assumptions about me that I find insulting, like maybe I'm destined to teach at a community college instead of a university. She always is the one that takes on a woman of color as an advisee and it doesn't matter what your interests are. Our joke is that basically we're her colonized people because I mean it's like she doesn't really know who we are. But she has us and it's sort of like little badges on her shoulders that she works with students of color.*

Many faculty members apparently feel, as one student put it, that it is their "civic duty" to support minority graduate students. Others adopt students of color as "trophy students" because it helps their "liberal" image with students and faculty. The women of color that we interviewed felt they were less likely to be mentored by a faculty member as a result of their shared research interest and more likely because of the faculty's liberal self-perception.

### **Speaking Out**

Changes in departmental procedure to increase the pool of graduate students and faculty of color, as well as to increase the number of course offerings in the area of race, were typical of student demands. Women who we interviewed described efforts to enhance their graduate training in the area of race; they volunteered to serve on search committees, to revise curricula, and to bring scholars of color as speakers to campus.<sup>14</sup> However, political involvement and lobbying in their department was extra work that took students away from their studies, and sometimes political activism produced a backlash from EuroAmerican faculty and graduate students. The ABD Pacific Islander enrolled in a small eastern university described the costs of the additional burden:

*I often felt very tired and very alienated and very resentful that: "Here we go again, I have to be the one to say something." I didn't feel like I got a lot of support from immediate peers. I think they saw it as, "Well, this is her way of sort of getting attention," and, you know, I felt that rather than getting any benefit psychologically or otherwise from speaking up, people became very careful around me. And again, I felt like this is not right – the point is not for you to be careful around me. . . because here come the minorities, you know, the point is to really change.*

Although they were expected to and to some degree felt forced to speak out, when they did so students were sometimes marked as troublemakers or someone with a "chip on their shoulder." This double bind sometimes makes it difficult to find support in the department. Faculty may feel guilty or uncomfortable interacting with these students and avoid

carries meanings of enmity, power, and discrimination and the kind of ethnocentric awkwardness exhibited by the professor in question. In most cases, we are not discussing individual racist attitudes. On the other hand, the lack of integration of race in the graduate curriculum, alongside the absence of faculty and students of color, fostered a perceived paternalistic and hostile environment and contributed to an atmosphere of suspicion and distrust felt by everyone. More importantly these structural inequalities, which may well be considered institutional racism, convey perceived meanings that poison the well by directly affecting the education process. For example, several students felt that faculty limited their comments on papers to the student's writing and never addressed the content of their work:

*In general they're either correcting their (graduate students of color) spelling errors, "Your margins aren't wide enough" or they're not understanding what you are writing about.*

—ABD African American student enrolled in a Midwest university

Given the level of racial tension, some EuroAmerican faculty may indeed fear giving students of color critical feedback on their work because they do not want to be accused of being insensitive or racist, but the result has created an atmosphere of differential grading and has supported criticisms of discrimination.<sup>15</sup>

Another woman graduate student of color completing her dissertation at a university in the Pacific Northwest recalled taking a statistics course along with a good friend who was French. Even though they did their assignments together, she consistently received a lower grade.

*Françoise was seen as the European and the very bright student and I was seen as the Mexican and the very dumb student. And that was the issue that other students of color had in a cohort previous to mine. They had friends who were White and we would all be working on things. They would turn papers in—except for the Asian students, and see there's that stereotype of the model minority, which (Asian American student in the program) absolutely hated, but she (Asian American student) could do no wrong.*

It may well be that the French woman was a better student, but without integrated curricula or faculties, everyday practices and rituals between faculty and students were interpreted through racialized lenses.

Also emerging from the accounts of the women were problems created by the failure to distinguish between U.S. minority racial/ethnic groups and international students who may share certain phenotypical, racial, or ethnic qualities but have had extremely different historical experiences and often come from different (e.g., higher) class backgrounds. This is exacerbated by conflicts of interest and struggles over scarce resources between groups defined in terms of diversification and internationalization. Diversification, meaning inclusion of historically discriminated against American minority groups, and internationalization meaning the inclusion of foreign students, are not the same even though both are laudable goals. But frequently, departments have conflated these two missions: first, by counting them all in their diversity statistics; and second, by drawing from the same pool of resources, creating competition for scarce resources and divisiveness among students and faculty.

diversity held by these women of color graduate students. Many departments implemented affirmative action as a process for reviewing candidates and recruiting graduate students; however, they may not perceive curriculum issues as related. Sociology departments frequently separate issues that students view as interrelated and inseparable: Recruitment is governed by affirmative action legislation (or the lack thereof) and rules and standards set by faculties and admission committees; faculty hiring and promotion while subject to review under civil rights law, is determined by internal standards for promotion and tenure; course material decisions have to do with academic freedom and are typically the provenance of individual faculty members; and, curriculum decisions are made by departmental committees according to democratic and collegial practices.

The treatment of these issues as mutually exclusive reinforces the understanding of race and ethnicity in terms of skin color and not life experiences, research interests, paradigms or culture. It suggests that graduate students and faculty members of color should become mainstream sociologists in "whiteface," adopting the attitudes and values of past generations of EuroAmerican male sociologists. It also suggests that the inclusion of scholars of color will not materially change the discipline itself. However, if our sociological imaginations allow us to perceive that "race/ethnicity" is a different life experience created through structural processes, then we would expect department diversity to be reflected across the curriculum and in all areas. Given the different definitions of the situation, it is not surprising that a Latina beginning course work in a Ph.D. program at a university on the West coast concluded: "I think that the argument could be made that the department is not committed to minorities or to diversity." This exploration of the experiences of women of color graduate students in sociology highlights tensions between the practice of affirmative action in sociology departments, race relations between Whites and minority faculty and graduate students, and the study of sociology of race.

Ph.D. programs in sociology do not appear to have yet been influenced by transformation projects that have been diversifying the curriculum and increasing multicultural requirements in undergraduate education. Rather than responding to demographic and educational changes, the discipline appears to be training the next generation of sociologists without regard to the job market or student population. Less than one-quarter of departments offer a meaningful opportunity to study race/ethnicity in the context of the United States. We conclude from the paucity of courses and specialties offered that sociology departments are not prepared for the diverse student body of the twenty-first century. The problem has three outcomes: first, given the transformation of the United States into a multicultural nation, and the significant issues and tensions raised by this ongoing pattern of social change, this lacunae points to a significant failing on the part of the discipline in terms of areas of investigation; second, the lack affects graduate students of color and EuroAmerican students who are being ill-prepared for the conditions under which they will live and work together; and third, this failure of emphasis by sociology may mean that bright students interested in these issues choose to go elsewhere, directly affecting the discipline's ability to reproduce itself.

We began by asking if the persistent realities of racism in our society are reflected in U.S. American Sociology? Our conclusion is in the affirmative. Sociologists frequently criticize intransigent, fossilized, and ossified social structures in the "real" world, even while maintaining them in the "small" world of academia. We analyze social change writ large, and resist it in our discipline, our departments, our schools. In this paper, we

Blacks, Asian/Pacific Islanders, American Indian/Alaskan Native, Hispanic, and nonresident aliens increased from 15.4% to 24.5% of the student body. (SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1997, Digest of Education Statistics, 1997 (based on the IPEDS/HEGIS "Fall Enrollment" surveys)). This trend is likely to continue as higher percentages of minority youth go to college and as people of color become a larger overall proportion of the American population. The Bureau of the census projects that Hispanic and Asian/Pacific Islander populations will increase from 14% of the population in 1996 to 24% of the population by 2025. (SOURCE: U.S. Department of Commerce Economics and Statistics Administration Bureau of the Census, 1996, Census Brief "Warmer, older, more diverse: State-by-state population changes to 2025" December 1996.

5. The fact that only women of color graduate students were interviewed (and not males and females) is an artifact of the origin of the study. Our research on these questions began while the senior author was serving on the Social Issues Committee of Sociologists for Women in Society (SWS) in 1988. The organization expressed concern that professional organizations were not successful in reaching women of color sociologists. She agreed to conduct a study on the status of women of color in the discipline and to gather data on their experiences as graduate students. The initial aim was to identify problems and barriers, and make recommendations to sociology departments, faculty and professional associations. A preliminary report was presented at the 1990 SWS annual meetings. Since then a number of papers have been drawn from the material (Romero and Storrs, 1994; Romero, 2000; Margolis and Romero, 1998).

6. The sample is fairly consistent with the national data on women of color receiving doctorate degrees across disciplines in 1991-92. Of the 1550 women of color, 53 were Native American, 497 were Asian American, 647 were Black, and 353 were Hispanic (Chronicle of Higher Education, 1995, p. 40).

7. Because there are so few women of color graduate students in sociology, to ensure anonymity, a further break-down of sample characteristics is not possible. All names and places have been changed or deleted.

8. The advent of the World Wide Web is leading to the creation of departmental pages where students can view actual course offerings and even read sample syllabi. Technology might go a long way toward remedying the issues of false advertising and misrepresentation raised by the students. It will also make students more informed consumers and intensify competition between departments.

9. Despite the ASA, SWS, and other sociological associations' commitment to affirmative action and diversity there is still a marked absence of faculty of color in Ph.D. programs. If sociology graduate faculty are to represent the composition of the U.S. population, then sociologists of color would be 22% of the faculty rather than the current 13%.

10. For further discussion of the experience of "tokens" and "role models," see Linda S. Greene's (1990-1) article on an African American female law professor and Mary Romero's (1997) article on Mexican American female faculty.

11. Although in this paper we focus centrally on issues of race, we are well aware that gender is an equally important factor in the diversity and integration of academic departments. Some might argue that there is an interaction effect, we prefer the analysis of James Geschwender (1992), who coined the term "ethgender" to emphasize that identity **always** includes race/ethnicity and gender (among other traits). Thus, a faculty member is always perceived as a White man or a African American woman. This essential connection is emphasized in Spanish and other gendered languages where the terms Latino and Latina already convey the inseparability of gender and ethnicity.

12. Comparable figures for full time faculty in the ranks of Full, Associate, Assistant, and Instructor are as follows: Full Professors are 33.1%, Associate Professors are 26.0%, Assistant Professors are 26.9%, and Instructors are 13.8% (Chronicle of Higher Education, 1995). Thus sociology, appears particularly top heavy.

- Crothers, Charles. 1991. "The Internal Structure of Sociology Departments: The Role of Graduate Students and Other Groups." *Teaching Sociology*, 19: 333-343.
- Du Bois, W.E.B. 1989. (1903). *The Souls of Black Folk*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Egan, Janet Malenchek. 1989. "Graduate School and the Self: A Theoretical View of Some Negative Effects of Professional Socialization." *Teaching Sociology*, 17: 200-208.
- Eitzin, Stanley D. 1989. "The Introduction of Graduate Students to the Profession of Sociology." *Teaching Sociology*, 16: 279-283.
- Geschwender, James. 1992. "Ethgender, Women's Wages Labor, and Economic Mobility." *Social Problems*, 29: 1-16.
- Gilkes, Cheryl Townsend. 1982. "Successful Rebellious Professions: The Black Woman's Professional Identity and Community Commitment." *Psychology of Woman Quarterly*, 6: 289-311.
- Gordon, Lynn D. 1990. *Gender and Higher Education in the Progressive Era*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Granfield, Robert. 1992. *Making Elite Lawyers, Visions of Law at Harvard and Beyond*. New York: Routledge.
- Green, Linda S. 1990-1. "Tokens, Role Models, and Pedagogical Politics: Lamentations of an African American Female Law Professor." *Berkeley Women's Law Journal*, 6: 81-92.
- Hood, Jane. 1985. "The Lone Scholar Myth." Pp. 112-124 in *Scholarly Writing & Publishing: Issues, Problems and Solutions*, edited by Mary Frank Fox, West View Press.
- Hu-DeHart, Evelyn. 1993. "Rethinking America: The Practice and Politics of Multiculturalism in Higher Education." Pp. 3-17 in *Beyond a Dream Deferred, Multicultural Education and the Politics of Excellence*, edited by Becky W. Thompson and Sangeeta Tyagi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- James, Joy and Ruth Farmer. (eds.) 1993. *Spirit, Space & Survival African American Women in (White) Academe*. New York: Routledge.
- Kleinman, Sherryl. 1983. "Collective Matters as Individual Concerns. Peer Culture Among Graduate Students." *Urban Life*, 12: 203-225.
- Kozoi, Jonathan. 1991. *Savage Inequalities: Children in America's Schools*. New York: Crown.
- Kulis, Stephen and Karen A. Miller. 1988. "Are Minority Women Sociologists in Double Jeopardy?" *The American Sociologist*, Winter: 323-339.
- Lopez, Ian Haney. 1993. "Community Ties and Law School Faculty Hiring: The Case for Professors Who Don't Think White." Pp. 100-130 in *Beyond a Dream Deferred, Multicultural Education and the Politics of Excellence*, edited by Becky W. Thompson and Sangeeta Tyagi, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Macedo, Donald. 1994. *Literacies of Power: What Americans Are Not Allowed to Know*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Margolis, Eric and Mary Romero. 1998. "The Department is Very Male, Very White, Very Old, and Very Conservative: The Functioning of the Hidden Curriculum in Graduate Departments." *The Harvard Educational Review*, 68: 1-32.
- Mayrl, William W. and Hans-O. Mauksch. 1987. "The ASA Survey of Graduate Programs: Some Problems with Unproblematic Responses." *The American Sociologist*, 18: 11-18.
- McKee, James B. 1993. *Sociology and the Race Problem: The Failure of a Perspective*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Nigg, J. and M. Axelrod. 1981. "Women and Minorities in the PSA Region. Results of the 1979 Survey." *Pacific Sociological Review*, 24: 107-128.
- Ogbu, John U. 1994. "Racial Stratification and Education in the United States: Why Inequality Persists." *Teachers College Record*, 96: 264-298.
- Orlans, Kathryn P. and Ruth A. Wallace. (eds.) 1994. *Gender and the Academic Experience, Berkeley Women Sociologists*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.