DISSED IN THE DEPARTMENT: WOMEN OF COLOR GRADUATE STUDENTS TALK ABOUT INTEGRATING SOCIOLOGY

Eric Margolis and Mary Romero

INTRODUCTION

Like other large businesses and public institutions in the United States, sociology departments must confront historical inequalities of training, hiring, and promotional policies. Previous policies and practices produced today's under representation of sociologists and professors of color. Departments, colleges and universities are subject to civil rights legislation, but, because we are the discipline that studies inequality, sociology manifests a powerful desire "to do the right thing." Formal and informal policies have been implemented in many departments and by the American Sociological Association[1] to redress the inequalities of past practices and structural discrimination. However, unlike other organizations, sociology departments must confront racism and discrimination along another dimension as well. Precisely because our business is the study of society, the study of race needs to have a central position in the theoretical, methodological, and concrete empirical work of the discipline. Since the professorate takes full responsibility for the graduate training of future sociologists, race needs to figure prom-inently in teaching as well. Thus what appear analytically as two areas, the integration of the faculty and integration of the content of sociology, are in reality inseparable. They are inseparable for three reasons: first, because sociological findings have been the basis for legal decisions and legislation countering social practices of discrimination in other peoples' businesses–schools, government, and the world of commerce–, second, because our business is subject to those same legal requirements and moral imperatives but, third and most important because

unresolved issues of values and the position of the observer lie at the very heart of our theory and methods.

The role of values (or value-freedom) and the position of the observer in sociological research continue as central epistemological concerns for the discipline. Even the most hardened positivist recognizes values as central in the formulation of hypotheses and the selection of appropriate areas for investigation. Those who are more historically particularist and ideographic, Weber for instance, argue that the notion of value-free sociology is itself dependent upon a basic human orientation toward values (Hewa 1993:66). Marx gave full weight to the material circumstances that produce social science and social scientists: "Life is not determined by consciousness, but consciousness by life. In the first method of approach the starting-point is consciousness taken as the living individual; in the second it is the real living individuals themselves, as they are in actual life, and consciousness is considered solely as *their* consciousness" (in Fromm 1961:198). Ethnographers and other field workers have long noted that both what can be observed and how subjects choose to present themselves is intimately connected to the observer (for a recent description of this issue see Behar 1997). Jean Paul Sartre and others (Goldman 1976-77:201) went further in emphasizing the centrality of Heisenberg's uncertainty principle in all scientific endeavors: "The only theory of knowledge which can be valid today is one which is founded on that truth of microphysics: the experimenter is a part of the experimental system" (Sartre 1963:32n). Most recently a lively dispute over the concept of "standpoint" arose in reaction to the feminist methodologies of Dorothy Smith (1987, 1990) and Sandra Harding (1991). Questions of standpoint and positionality were similarly raised by Patricia Hill Collins' (1991) work on Black feminism and Kimberly Crenshaw's (1995) legal writings on the intersection of race and gender. Additional voices from the margins in the form of queer

theory and postcolonial discourse have joined the chorus in conceptualizing the social in new ways and suggesting areas of investigation not previously undertaken or even perceived.

It is clear from a century of discussion that far from being tangential, issues of heterogeneity and inclusion of diverse perspectives lie at the core of sociology (and the other social sciences). The incorporation of students and faculty with different racial/ethnic, cultural, class, gender and sexual experiences into departments, and the inclusion of their perspectives in the theoretical, methodological and empirical work of the discipline are essential in the control of sources of bias including racism, sexism, ethnocentrism, and heterosexism. Sociology will only become more objective by incorporating the diverse perspectives which have been faint or silent in the past.

History and Background of the Study

In the 1960s and 1970s a deluge of new ideas and voices challenged sociological theories, methodologies, and the structure of the discipline itself. Sociologists developed and explored new paradigms, ideologies, and utopias. European Marxism, feminism, ecology, postmodernism and phenomenology joined with renewed interest in historical, anthropological, and literary methods. As the civil rights movement and the women's movement grew powerful politically, they were successful in forcing the inclusion of women and people of color in graduate programs. This in turn strengthened the intellectual power of the new movements and faculty members became powerful critics of existing sociology and advocates of new paradigms and research agendas. Sociology was seen as a heterogeneous discipline open to ideas, people, and voices new to academia. Simultaneously, sociology faculty members became central figures in forming interdisciplinary programs in women's studies, African American, Chicano, Asian American and

American Indian Studies. Sociologists helped fight the academic battles that won resources for fledgling programs and institutes, created new lines, and in some cases helped establish entire departments. During this period of intellectual and political ferment many women sociologists and sociologists of color made homes for themselves in academic departments outside sociology.

After the turmoil of the past decades the authors became interested in the current state of our discipline. This paper examines the situation encountered 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 the two intertwined dimensions: 1) whether race is supported as a major concentration and area of study and 2) the status of minority scholars, faculty and students in the discipline.

Little attention has been paid, however, to the everyday experience of race in doctoral programs in sociology. Most discussions of professional identity assume a white, middle-class, heterosexual, male professional identity (Aisenberg and Harrington 1988; Granfield 1992; Gilkes 1982). Attention to gender issues has addressed ways that professional socialization impacts white women in graduate school but has not specifically examined women of color (Orlans and Wallace 1994; Gordon 1990). Two sociology journals devoted special issues to graduate education; however, neither included an article devoted to issues of race.[2] 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). There have been

few studies conducted on the status of sociologists of color since Blackwell and Janowitz's 1974 book on African American sociologists. An exception is the 1999 article in *Sociological Perspectives* by Misra, Kennelly and Karides. The research concluded that "...disadvantages are beginning to level off but they still exist for European-American women, minority men, and most especially minority women."

In sum, while quantitative analysis continues to document discrepancies for minorities and women and the literature on the sociology of sociology has analyzed processes and structures that allow for the reproduction of mainstream sociology, rarely have researchers attended to the actual circumstances encountered in sociology departments by students, faculty or scholars of color. It seems a critical lack that sociologists have not examined the actual practices of affirmative action in our discipline, nor the concrete everyday experiences of graduate students and junior faculty of color. Some of the vituperative outpouring by sociologists resisting the inclusion of minority scholars through affirmative action programs were published in 1971 and 1980 as letters to the editor of *Footnotes*. This anti-affirmative action sentiment was summarized by Jackson (1981:130) and quoted in Misra, Kennelly and Karides (1999:216):

> "...claims that affirmative action and related activities are reverse discrimination; preferential treatment; sociological and academic apartheid; violations of the value of equality of opportunity, the principle of merit, of the U.S. Constitution; unjust to new white male Ph.D.s; conspiracies to deprive white males of their constitutional rights; just plain unfair; and that these activities stigmatize minorities as inferior and cheat them out of a good education."

Misra, Kennelly and Karides examined the sentiments of these white sociologists to see what the effect

of affirmative action programs has been on hiring, rank, and prestige. They found "no evidence to support the idea that European-American men are disadvantaged in the academic labor market in sociology" (Misra, Kennelly and Karides 1999:241) and concluded that the attacks on affirmative action had no merit. In our work (Margolis and Romero 1998; Romero and Margolis 1999) we have looked at the actual experiences of women of color graduate students and faculty members in the setting of the department.[3] The treatment of race was analyzed along three dimensions: 1) in terms of the gender and racial ethnic composition of faculty and students in sociology doctoral programs, 2) as a subject matter in the discipline, and 3) as race relations between and among faculty and graduate students. Given the comments from letters to *Footnotes* (above) we wondered about the climate that students encountered in their graduate training and whether they perceived themselves as experiencing overt or covert racism. At a time when affirmative action programs are being dismantled and ethnic studies programs are under attack, understanding the everyday role of race in doctoral programs will be important in structuring the training of future sociologists.

Methods

In 1991 telephone interviews were conducted with twenty-six women of color graduate students in sociology. The twenty-six women had been selected from a sample of sixty-six women graduate students of color who had completed a questionnaire in 1989. The original sample was constructed from the ASA's list of minority fellows and augmented with additional names received in response to our inquires to each of the graduate programs listed in the ASA's *Guide to Graduate Programs.* One hundred and sixty-five questionnaires were mailed out in 1989. A return rate of 40 percent resulted in a sample of sixty-six women graduate

students of color. One of the items on the questionnaire asked the respondents if they would be willing to participate further in the study by being interviewed. We were able to locate twenty-six of these respondents in 1991. Table 1 compares the two samples by race/ethnicity, those who filled out the questionnaire and those who agreed to be interviewed.[4]

TABLE I
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLES

RACE/ETHNICITY	QUESTIONNAIRE	INTERVIEW
Asian American	29%	19%
African American	35%	42%
Native American	11%	8%
Latina	20%	31%
Other	5%	--

The convenience sample was primarily shaped by the respondents' willingness to be interviewed and consisted of two Native Americans, eleven African Americans, five Asian Americans, and eight Latinas.[5] Three women identified themselves as international students. All the women were enrolled in graduate programs in the United States: ten were sociology programs on the West Coast, ten on the East Coast, four in the South, and two in the Midwest. The women ranged in age from 25 to 65 years, although half of the women were between 25 and 35 years old. Similarly, the women were in various stages of their graduate career: three were engaged in course work, seven were completing comprehensive exams, fourteen were working on their dissertations, and two had recently graduated. The sample included graduate students in both private and public institutions; however, the majority were enrolled in public

institutions.[6]

Open-ended interviews were conducted on the telephone. Discussions ranged from 45 to 90 minutes, exploring components of the graduate experience that included: formal and informal social structures of graduate programs, financial and mentoring support, relationships with faculty and other graduate students, research, publishing, teaching opportunities, and other experiences which influenced decisions, choices, and career plans. The interview questions were broad and general to leave space for the women to define their experiences in graduate sociology programs. The last question asked for recommendations to improve race relations in the discipline and department. Interviews were tape recorded, transcribed and then coded into general categories such as mentoring, financial aid, networking, relationships with faculty, professional opportunities, and issues identified as barriers.

In order to obtain a broad picture of course offerings and the rank of faculty members of color in doctoral programs in sociology departments, in 1992 we mailed a separate questionnaire to each of the one hundred and twenty-six Ph.D. programs in the United States that were listed in the 1990 ASA's *Guide to Graduate Programs.* Ninety-two departments responded (73 percent), 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. Five additional questions were 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 is the course 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?

The Race and Ethnic Composition of Faculty in Ph.D. Departments

While there are more faculty of color than 25 years ago, the situation is far from equitable.[7] Based on the data collected from the 92 departments responding to our survey, 38 departments (41 percent) reported less than two faculty members of color. Thirty-two departments had two or three faculty members of color. Only twenty-two departments (24 percent) had four or more faculty members of color. As expected, we did find a positive correlation between the number of faculty members of color and the size of the department $r = .4232$ $p<.001$). The total number of full-time faculty is normally distributed but the number of full-time minority faculty is not. About 18 percent ($r^2 = .1791$) of the total variation in the number of full-time minority faculty can be accounted for by its linear association with the total number of full-time faculty. All six departments with thirty or more faculty had at least one faculty member of color. Out of the remaining eighty-six departments with thirty or fewer faculty members, twenty-two departments reported 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.[8] Twenty-nine percent of departments had only one African American faculty member; twenty-nine percent had one Asian American faculty member, and seventeen percent 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. Women of color were more likely than men to bear the burden of not only being the only one of their race in a department but being the only women of color. In other words, in departments with two African American professors, it was twice as likely that they were both males than that one was female.

When rank is examined, questions related to affirmative action and diversity loom larger. In many professions one would expect a large pool of workers at the entry level and a gradual thinning out as rank increases. However, sociology (like many other academic disciplines) is "top heavy" with Full Professors.[9] In our sample, about 45 percent of all faculty members were Full Professors, 33 percent were Associate Professors, and only 20 percent were at the Assistant level. An additional 2.4 percent were Instructors.[10] The distribution of Euro-Americans through the ranks reflected the overall discipline structure. Faculty members of color, however, were much more likely to be Assistant Professors and much less likely to be Full Professors. Thus nearly half of Euro-American sociologists (49 percent) were Full Professors, a third (33 percent) were Associates and only 18 percent were Assistant Professors; whereas, among African American academics 28 percent were full Professors, 37 percent were Associates and 36 percent were Assistants. Similar patterns exist for other faculty members of color (see Table II).

A very strong relationship was revealed when faculty members of color were compared with Euro-American faculty on rank: 49 percent of Euro-American faculty members were Full Professors compared with only 27 percent of faculty members of color. Conversely, only 18 percent of Euro American faculty were Assistant Professors while 38 percent of faculty of color held the 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 significant barriers in training, hiring, and promotion, is an important research question that is beyond the scope of this project.

Similarly, gender differences remain a reality in Ph.D. graduate programs as well (see Table III). Three-quarters of the total full-time faculty, excluding instructors, were male. Fifty-three percent of males were Full Professors, while only twenty-eight percent of females held that rank. As was the case with faculty of color, women were under-represented at the Full Professor level and over-represented at the Assistant level. Thirty-seven percent of women were Assistant Professors while only fourteen percent of males held that rank (X^2 = 134.16 df = 2 p<.0001).

There were far more male faculty members of color in sociology departments than female. Sixty-five percent of African American faculty in our study were men, as were seventy-one percent of Asian American faculty, and seventy-four percent of Mexican American faculty. There was clearly an interaction effect between race and gender (see Table III). A cross table (Table IV) was constructed of rank by race/ethnicity, controlling for sex, for females x^2 = 12.04, df = 2p = .0024. This was slightly lower than for males, X^2 = 52.29 df=2p<.0001. The trend appears to be that male faculty members of color are more likely than females to have attained higher rank.

Within ranks, gender difference was similar for Euro-American faculty members and faculty members of color. Eighty-eight percent of Euro-American male faculty members but only sixty-seven percent of Euro-American female faculty members had attained the rank of Full Professor or Associate. Among African Americans, 72 percent of male faculty members but only 41 percent of the female faculty members were at the rank of Full Professor or

TABLE II
SOCIOLOGY FACULTY 1992
RANK BY RACE

RACE ETHNICITY	FULL PROFFESOR	ASSOCIATE PROFFESOR	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
EURO AMERICAN	746 (49%)	499 (33%)	268 (18%)	1511
COLUMN TOTAL	806 (47%)	575 (33%)	352 (20%)	1733
TOTAL FACUALTY OF COLOR	60 (27%)	78 (35%)	84 (38%)	222

Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding

TABLE III
SOCIOLOGY FACULTY 1992
RANK BY GENDER

GENDER	FULL PROFESSOR	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR
MALE	677 (53%)	418 (33%)	181 (14%)
FEMALE	129 (28%)	159 (35%)	171 (37%)

Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding

TABLE IV
SOCIOLOGY FACULTY 1992
MALE FACULTY: RANK BY RACE/ETHNICITY

RACE/ETHNIC	FULL PROFESSOR	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR
EURO-AMERICAN	631 (56%)	357 (32%)	136 (12%)
FACULTY OF COLOR	46 (30%)	61 (40%)	47 (31%)

FEMALE FACULTY: RANK BY RACE/ETHNICITY

RACE/ETHNIC	FULL PROFESSOR	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR
EURO-AMERICAN	115 (30%)	142 (37%)	132 (34%)
FACULTY OF COLOR	14 (20%)	17 (24%)	39 (56%)

Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding

Associate. For Mexican American male faculty members, 66 percent had attained the rank of Full Professor or Associate while only 40 percent of female faculty were ranked above Assistant Professor. Only among Asian American faculty members did the pattern appear somewhat equalized: 63 percent of Asian American male faculty members held the rank of Full Professor or Associate compared with 58 percent of the female faculty.

TABLE V
SOCIOLOGY FACULTY 1992
RANK BY RACE BY GENDER
FULL PROFESSORS

GENDER	EURO AMERI -CAN	AFRICAN AMERI- CAN	ASIAN AMERI- CAN	MEXICAN AMERI- CAN	PUERTO RICAN	NATIVE AMERI- CAN
MALE	93%	3.4%	1.3%	.9%	.2%	<0>
FEMALE	89.1%	4.7%	2.3%	1.6%	.8%	<1>

ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS

GENDER	EURO AMERI -CAN	AFRICAN AMERI- CAN	ASIAN AMERI- CAN	MEXICAN AMERI- CAN	PUERTO RICAN	NATIVE AMERI- CAN
MALE	85.5%	6.7%	2.4%	3.1%	.5%	<2>
FEMALE	9.3%	5.7%	2.5%	1.3%	.6%	<0>

ASSISTANT PROFESSORS

GENDER	EURO AMER- CAN	AFRICAN AMERI- CAN	ASIAN AMERI- CAN	MEXICAN AMERI- CAN	PUERTO RICAN	NATIVE AMERI- CAN
MALE	75.1%	8.8%	6.1%	5%	1.1%	.6%
FEMALE	77.2%	12.3%	2.9%	3.5%	1.8%	.6%

Percentages may not add up to 100% due to < > = number of cases

The percentage of racial and ethnic groups of each gender in each rank indicate that race and gender interacted to the detriment of people of color.

As Table V shows, less than five percent of female Full Professors and less than four percent of male Full Professors were African American. Only about two percent of female Full Professors were Asian American and less than two percent of each of the other categories of Full Professor were persons of color.[11] Less than six percent of female and less than seven percent of male Associate Professors were African American. Approximately 2.5 percent of either female or male Associate Professors were Asian American. Only about one percent of female and three percent of male Associate Professors were Mexican American, and less than one percent of females or males were Puerto Rican. There were no Native American women and only two male Native American Associate Professors teaching in Ph.D. programs. The situation in the lowest rank was more representative with approximately 12 percent of female and nine percent of male Assistant Professors being African American, nearly three percent of females and 6 percent of males were Asian American, and 3.5 percent of females and 5 percent of males were Mexican American.[12]

The over-representation of Euro-American faculty in the rank of Full Professor and Associate Professor and the under-representation of faculty of color contribute to a kind of social loneliness or isolation different from the "lone scholar" pattern previously identified by sociologists (e.g., Becker 1982; Hood 1985). Many scholars work in the quiet isolation of the office or the laboratory, but this is very different from being the "only one of your kind" in the social setting of a department. Today's graduate students of color are facing the same situation as previous generations of sociologists; that is, they are likely to be the only person of color in the department and they are unlikely to work in an environment where there is a person of the same ethnic

group. As one African American explained:

> "I'm like the first Black student, I guess that they've had in the past eleven years now. They do get a lot of foreign students but not Americans (students of color). In fact as far as American minority students go–as far as I can tell there are none other than me. I never see them (women of color) and I never talk to them. They're just not around at all. I think they had such a horrible experience that they just stay off campus and come in only when necessary."

Women graduate students of color rarely have the opportunity to work closely with faculty of color. The description offered by a Black ABD student enrolled in a small eastern university highlights the symbolic message conveyed in the racial composition of faculty and their rank:

> "The department had about between forty to forty-five 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 and very Euro-American and very old and very conservative."

The disparities in rank mean that when graduate students of color do find faculty of color to work with they tend to be non-tenured Assistant Professors. Assistant Professors, however, are not in the best position to be mentoring graduate students given the demands they face in publishing and developing their own careers. In addition, junior faculty are generally not as effective as mentors because they do not typically have access to the range of network contacts that senior faculty have developed.

Students were not surprised by the under-representation of faculty of color in graduate departments; they were more disturbed by the marginalization of those few that had "made it." Several women of color graduate

students recalled accepting the offer to attend a particular program because of the presence of one or two faculty members of color. However, they discovered that these faculty members lacked power, influence, or resources, and more specifically were not teaching the required courses in the graduate program. Instead the students felt that they were confronted with white males espousing narrow and traditional views of sociology. Women of color graduate students reported that Euro-American faculty dominated as instructors in the required graduate courses, as committee members allocating teaching and research assistantships, and on qualifying examination committees.

Race in the Curriculum

Interestingly, 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 forty-five departments that claimed race and ethnicity as a specialty, nine had no faculty of color, and six 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 suggesting that Euro-American 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 Euro-Americans. We can hardly imagine a graduate program offering a specialty in gender where all the courses are taught by men.

Data from the 92 sociology departments suggests that race and ethnicity is not the primary focus of research and teaching in most Ph.D. graduate programs in the U.S. Only 20 percent of all faculty in graduate programs were identified as conducting research or teaching in the area. The programs

we sampled listed a total of 139 graduate courses on race of which 26 were seminars. Less than one-quarter (23 percent) of the departments included the study of race in required theory courses. Twenty-six departments did not offer a single graduate course on race (curiously, six of these departments that offered no race classes claimed a specialty in the area). Fourteen other departments claimed a specialty in the area but listed only a single graduate course on race and ethnicity. Only ten of the forty-five departments that identified a race/ethnicity specialty offered three or more graduate courses. The thinness of the course offerings surprised us; a department would not advertise a concentration in say, stratification, with less than three courses. Paucity of courses was only part of the issue; many listed classes were rarely if ever offered.

The graduate students we interviewed recounted their efforts in choosing a graduate school. They sought information about special programs and areas of concentration in graduate programs by reading brochures, examining course listings and talking to department chairs. However, their accounts indicated that it was not always easy to get an accurate assessment of departments that they were interested in. The 1990 ASA *Guide to Graduate Programs* listed nine programs in the U.S. with special programs in and seventy-five programs with a specialty in race/ethnicity/minority relations. Departmental bulletins went further in describing programs and specialties and were important sources of information for students shopping graduate programs in sociology. Unfortunately, although the ASA and many departments listed race and gender as areas offered in the program, upon arrival students frequently discovered that the claim was not supported by faculty or graduate courses. An African American student in a major Eastern University summarized the situation succinctly: "The department looks a lot better on paper than it is in reality." A Latina finishing her dissertation when we

interviewed her remembered reviewing course offerings in the program but later realized that she had made a mistake by assuming that the courses on race/ethnicity listed in the catalog actually existed:

> "They have some courses listed in the catalog but they just don't offer them. So when you look at it you're sort of deceived. You have to actually look at what they have been offering."[13]

During recruitment, women of color graduate students were led to believe that their research interests in race and ethnicity were supported. Interviewee' complaints about the lack of graduate courses in race relations were consistent with data we collected on the frequency of course offerings. The paucity or infrequency of course offerings in the area of race and ethnicity was alarming. Only about half (54 percent) of the courses listed in the specialty had been offered in the previous year.

When race/ethnicity courses exist, and are actually offered, it becomes interesting to look at the content of the curriculum. The wide range of titles for courses in the race/ethnicity specialty raises issues about how the study of race is perceived in academic sociology. Department listings include: Political Economy of Women, Problems in Emerging Countries, World Historical Study of Stratification, Poverty, Women and Third World Development, 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. More than ten percent of all courses listed under a race/ethnicity specialty dealt with international topics. Where the sociology of race is not "internationalized" it tends to be subsumed under broader

structural concerns such as demography and organizations, or, and this is most common, race is a component of social problems. Nearly a century ago, Du Bois' (1903:1) question, "How does it feel to be a problem?" criticized the conflation of the study of race with the social problems approach. But that approach is still current today. Eleven percent of race specialty courses had titles indicating subsumation under fields of study such as social inequality, poverty, social stratification and social organization, rather than making race the central focus of analysis.

Not only has the subject matter of race/ethnicity not been given full weight as a sociological field of study, but non-white scholars tend to be ignored.[14] Students reported that faculty did not generally assign books or articles written by African Americans, Chicanas/os and other domestic sociologists of color. Graduate students working in the area of race and ethnicity were even more unsatisfied with the intellectual support they received. They were appalled by graduate training emphasizing classic Euro-American theories of ethnicity which celebrated assimilation rather than including critical perspectives developed in recent research and writings by scholars of color. The following examples point to tensions resulting from such exclusions. A Puerto Rican finishing up in a large Midwest university recalled her discomfort in one class where the Euro-American professor utilized culturally determinist models to explain the social situation of Puerto Ricans. Another Latina who was just taking prelims in the East recalled attempts made to inform a professor of the ethnocentric perspective embedded in the required textbook and suggested alternative views of the material. The professor objected to the student's critique and refused to incorporate other perspectives. Another incident involved a teaching assistant who suggested to the Euro-American female faculty member that materials on women of color be included in 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 did not incorporate the articles in the course readings.

Due in part to graduate programs' lack of course offerings, graduate students frequently have to go outside to get training in areas of race, gender and European and post-colonial sociology. Interdisciplinary programs including women studies, ethnic studies and international programs play an important role in providing courses in these areas. In some universities critical approaches are provided in schools of education, justice studies, or law. Many of the women interviewed relied on visiting faculty of color to provide important training in the area of race and gender. Even though the women we interviewed reported that most of their exposure to the empirical and theoretical writings of scholars of color in the U.S. and Third World took place in graduate programs other than sociology, training outside the sociology department was not always an option. In our survey we found that seven of the twenty universities with an all Euro-American sociology faculty did not have ethnic studies programs.

While 39 percent of the women identified curriculum as a strength in their department, another 30 percent identified the curriculum as the major weakness of the program. Apparently the infusion of sociological perspectives and sociologists into women's and ethnic studies was a one-way flow. Only 10 percent of women surveyed identified their departments as interdisciplinary or incorporating courses from women's studies or ethnic studies. Thus it is probable that the creation of ethnic studies and women's studies departments had a "cooling out" function, reducing pressure to transform traditional graduate sociology curricula to be inclusive or to incorporate interdisciplinary interests. Because the new departments seldom offer advanced degrees, promising young graduates

from these programs go on to graduate school in sociology where they encounter a mainstream sociological perspective they view as at best out of date and at worst racist and sexist. Frequently required courses that emphasize Durkheim, Weber and Marx are referred to as DWM "Dead White Men." One student discussed her frustration and the lack of impact that faculty of color have had in redefining departmental requirements to include race and ethnicity as a central theme:

> "The problem is that there's real difference between who actually teaches the courses and who actually recruits the students. The people who teach the core courses, and there's only four quarters of them, so the first two quarters you are here you pretty much finish the required core courses, are pretty traditional, male academics....And so it was really frustrating to have sent in this statement of purpose saying what I was interested in, being real clear about what I was interested in. And then entering a program where for the first year or two there really wasn't any room to do what I was interested in because the people who taught the introductory courses were unreceptive and unaware and uninterested even to the point of saying this wasn't real scholarship."

Since race was not treated as central to the graduate program, students felt they took a risk in their career by expressing an interest in the area. About a quarter of the students noted that it was common for Euro-American faculty to advise graduate students of color not to do research in their own communities because they might "lose their objectivity." One African American student pointed out how contradictory it was that faculty do not make similar comments to recent immigrants or international students who wish to conduct research in their country of origin:

> "They (faculty) were telling me that it (the study of African Americans) was subjective and I should learn

> and do more things and be more objective and cover a broader area, and write about other people in other groups rather than just African Americans. But I never once have heard one of the foreign students who were doing their country ever told that. And they were doing the same thing as I was doing. So it was like okay for them to do it. And I really felt a little prejudice there."

Students expressed concern that they ran the risk of not being taken seriously by faculty if they studied racial communities. As one Latina 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."

Students perceived that research in the area of race had negative repercussions including reduced access to mentoring and teaching or 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 backgrounds and interests (Roth 1955; Kleinman 1983; Plutzer 1991; Egan 1989). A powerful example of paying the price was provided by a Native American woman who recalled an Anglo faculty member saying the following on the way to her comp exam:

> "'You know I finally figured out what's wrong with you...' And I was kind of stunned. And I said, 'Oh, well what?' And he said, 'You are too much like an Indian and not enough like a sociologist.' Well my jaw dropped and I was speechless. And he went on to say 'and if you don't straighten up you know what's going to happen? We're not going to allow you to teach sociology. We're going to put you down in Ethnic Studies or Indian Studies or something like

that for the rest of your life...' Isn't this interesting that this is my exam in race relations and this is the first question or remark that I faced?"

The accounts that these women provided suggest a central contradiction for the discipline. We who study every other organization's racial profiles and practices have not subjected ourselves to the same scrutiny. Sociologists have not investigated the everyday experiences of graduate students and faculty of color in our doctoral programs, despite the fact that the experiences and practices of doctoral programs are central events in the training of these future sociologists. The racialized and racializing experiences described above significantly influence White, Anglo American, and male students–albeit in different ways–but we know little about these processes.

Even while the student body is becoming increasingly racially and ethnically diverse, less than one-quarter of departments offer a meaningful opportunity to study race/ethnicity in the United States. We conclude from the paucity of courses and specialties offered that it is the norm for a student to earn a Ph.D. in sociology without ever taking an advanced class in racial and ethnic relations in the U.S. These are the Ph.Ds who will be teaching sociology at the university level, yet are ill-trained and ill-prepared for the diverse student body of the 21st 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 identifies a significant failing on the part of the discipline; second, the lack affects both graduate students of color and Euro-American students who are not being 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.

Race Relations in the Department

Descriptions of social interactions between students of color and faculty offer an important window into the everyday interactions and practices that shape race relations in graduate programs. Women of color students perceived race relations in the department as an important component of the training and education provided in their graduate programs. Yet overall they described faculty as resistant to any discussion of race relations in the department. Many told us that sociology faculty seemed to be uncomfortable discussing race relations in the classroom and department. An Asian American woman summed up the situation with the observation that: "There's still this sense that you're being sort of rude if you bring up race, issues of race. You know, you shouldn't be talking about these things." She also found this attitude prevalent among graduate students, "Even amongst graduate students, it was rude to bring up the topic of racial discrimination or what to do about race or what to do about the high attrition rate. I mean, it was just—it was really (considered) irrel-evant."

Being treated as an "affirmative action case" was another common theme emerging from our interviews. The following description from a Native American woman captures the level of objectification experienced from staff, faculty and students:

> "Coming in as a woman of color there was always that stigma you were an affirmative action student; that you got it because they LET you in, that you did not GET in....'This is OUR Indian student.' And it's like even some of the secretaries and some of the other people would refer to me as OUR Indian student."

Students were particularly offended by the implied inferiority that the label "affirmative action case" carried. One woman who was finishing up her dissertation at a major

West Coast university summarized the attitude as follows:

> "Somebody told me once, 'Well, if foreign students are the cream of the crop you know and they're getting the best students from these other countries, with these minority students here in this country, they feel they're getting the worst of the lot.'"

Even when students of color were not referred to as "affirmative action cases," the women we interviewed described race as a determining factor in their relationships with faculty members. A few students described relationships with Euro-American faculty that never developed beyond stereotypes:

> "My main frustration with her (mentor) is that she just really doesn't know who I am...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."

Some faculty members apparently feel it is their "civic duty" to support minority graduate students. Others adopt minority students because it helps their "liberal" image with students and faculty. Unlike other graduate students, women of color felt they were less likely to be mentored by a faculty member as a result of their shared research interest but rather as a result of the faculty's liberal self-perception (Pruitt and Isaac 1985).

The paternalistic and hostile environment that many students of color face in graduate programs creates an atmosphere of suspicion and distrust that penetrates to the core of graduate education itself–the assessment and evaluation of a student's work. Several of the women that

we interviewed felt that faculty limited their comments on papers to the student's writing and never addressed content. Perhaps this was because white faculty were afraid of being accused of being insensitive or racist. As an African American student from the Midwest recalled: "In general they're either correcting your spelling errors, 'your margins aren't wide enough' or they are not understanding what you are writing about." Several students concluded that some faculty graded according to their race and ethnicity:

> "Sometimes I'd get grades I was so shocked at. I'd work twice as hard as my colleagues but I'd end up with a B. I mean it was like I got B's all the way through and sometimes I'd work twice as hard. It's like I got labeled I was a minority student and therefore I was probably not as well-prepared, or I got in probably because I was the affirmative action person, you know, the minority. And no matter how hard I worked, I'd always get B's."[15]

A Native American graduate student 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:

- "Francois was seen as the European and the very bright student and I was seen as the Indian 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 they absolutely hated, but she (Asian American student) could do no wrong."

It may be that Francois was the better student, but without integrated curricula or faculties, everyday practices and rituals between faculty and students are interpreted through racialized lenses.

The absence of race and ethnicity in the curriculum conveys negative messages to graduate students and affects social relationships in the department. The following comment illustrates the animosity created by the department's lack of support and attention to the area of race and ethnicity:

> "I mean it was like saying that all the thinking in the world comes from Europe. People from other parts of 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."

Neglect of race issues throughout the curriculum results in students of color questioning their departments' commitment to issues of diversity.

In many cases increasing the pool of graduate students and faculty of color in the department and enriching course offerings in the area of race was the result of students' demands. Female students of color described efforts that they made to enhance their graduate training in the area of race including serving on committees to hire faculty to teach courses, and lobbying to bring scholars as speakers to campus. However, political involvement and lobbying in their department was extra work and took students away from their studies. Sometimes political activism produced a backlash from faculty and Euro-American graduate students. One woman regretted 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 (Euro-American graduate students) 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 comes the minorities, you know, the point is to really change."

While students of color were expected and to some degree forced to speak out, when they did so they were marked as trouble makers or people you have to "watch out for." This makes it very difficult to find support in the department because faculty are not anxious to get involved in working with trouble makers. An African American described the personal cost of taking a political position on issues in affirmative action and diversifying the curriculum:

> "First of all, I was sticking my neck out and telling people things they didn't want to hear. I mean, I think the whole topic of race is very, very touchy. And I was later told a couple weeks after I'd given the talk, in a one-to-one conversation with a white male that basically all white males were afraid to say anything....I felt frustrated even after the fact, because I felt like, you know, I'm glad you're coming and tell me this but that's no solution either for you all just to decide to, 'we're going to pout and sulk and we're not going to say anything.'"

There are even dangers for women of color graduate students who speak out at professional meetings or on panels. They get the reputation for having a "chip" on their shoulder. Faculty feel guilty and uncomfortable interacting with these students and therefore avoid them in class, in the department, and they even limit their responses in terms of comments on papers. For example, a few years ago one of the students that we interviewed spoke out during a SWS session on the experiences of women of color graduate students. Her advisor was present during the session and punished the student for her participation by not working with her for six months afterwards. Her advisor said that she felt attacked and that she resented the student talking about the department in a negative light.

DISCUSSION

In the early 1970s when the authors entered graduate school they were part of the largest cohort of sociology Ph.D. students ever admitted. Most of the students were white, although by the mid-1970s affirmative action programs made it possible for increasing numbers of women and students of color to attend graduate school. In those years all the women of color sociologists could have gone out for dinner and sat at one table. Even as diverse newcomers struggled into graduate programs, few were asking what this portended for curriculum, race relations, and the development of the discipline.

It was a time of social ferment and sociology classes were filled to overflow. The Vietnam war raged on. Martin Luther King had been assassinated, urban riots had replaced non-violence and the civil rights movement had morphed into Black power, Brown power, Red power. Nixon invaded Cambodia, more than 400 universities in the U.S. went on strike in 1970, and four students were gunned down at Kent State. Black students in a women's dormitory at Jackson State were killed in a hail of police bullets. More than ten thousand people marched in the Chicano moratorium. Meanwhile back in graduate school, alongside required doses of Weber, Durkheim and Talcott Parson, sociology students were reading *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* and *The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology.* We read Marx, Marcuse, Fanon, Sartre's *Search for a Method,* Paulo Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed,* and Shulamith Firestone's *The Dialectic of Sex: The Case for Feminist Revolution.*

Sociology was a hot house of intellectual ferment. Maybe there were not quite a thousand flowers blooming and a hundred schools of thought contending–but damn near. Functionalist models seemed bankrupt–growth and equilibrium did not seem to fit America of the 1970s. A

renewed interest in Marx, and the visible social conflict, forced everyone, even structural functionalists, to reconsider issues of power and conflict, economic class and imperialism. Neo-Marxists had contradictions in the obvious failures of communism as well as challenges from women and racial and ethnic groups. At first the turmoil seemed to be like the period of crisis that T. S. Kuhn described as leading to a scientific revolution. Many expected a new sociology to emerge that would be more unified and better able to solve the anomalies of multiple explanations for the same phenomena. Instead, the discipline became more diverse and fragmented as methodological and theoretical strategies proliferated. As sociology spun like a fiery nebula, controversial theories, avenues of research, and scholars few off to aid in the creation of other programs and disciplines that examine aspects of the social including: women's studies and ethnic studies, communications, justice studies, environmental and cultural studies.

Many sociologists continued to support the notion of a core discipline unified by methodology and theory. They advocated a monistic "mainstream sociology" that exists as a standard and norm that it is the goal of training in the graduate department to reproduce. The core sociology was the same regardless of race, class, or gender. From this perspective graduate students and faculty members of color were expected to become mainstream sociologists in "whiteface" no different in their professional work than, for instance, tall or short sociologists. In this model, integration of the department simply meant overcoming past discrimination and barriers, and
encouraging women and people of color to enter in numbers similar to their proportion in the general population.

Others understood "race" (and gender and class origin) as a constellation of profoundly different life experiences that affected how one defines and studies the social, and even what constitutes a logical argument or proof.

For these sociologists, "integration" would be a profoundly different process, one that transformed the discipline and departments to their core. In analyzing student and faculty interaction described in the interviews, one recurring theme is the perception by women of color that integration means the inclusion of their racial and ethnic experience in the intellectual and social culture of the department. Their accounts reveal expectations that diversity means more than the presence of people of various skin tones. An African American from a small Eastern university recalled a conversation that she and another woman of color had with the department chair:

> "In the same discussion of racial equality within the department he kind of listened to us go on and then he rolled back in his chair and he said 'You really can't expect the faculty to change you know. We're all kind of old and we're set in our ways and we're not going to–you just can't expect us to–change and start...having the classroom be an equal classroom.'"

Our research suggests that students *do* expect the faculty to change. We found that students' definitions of affirmative action incorporated both the hiring of faculty of color and the integration of the graduate curriculum. They expected race and ethnicity to be treated as serious and legitimate areas of graduate study. Furthermore, they expected all courses to be integrated, including theory and methods courses. They even expected that graduate courses and seminars in race and ethnicity would be offered on a regular basis and would be part of the required curriculum–in much the same way that "diversity classes" are required for undergraduates.

Faculty and administrators, however, do not necessarily share the same definitions of integration held by women of color graduate students. Many departments implemented affirmative action as a process for building applicant pools but, given recent votes and court cases against affirmative action, limit their efforts to not openly

discriminating against student and faculty applicants. They do not generally perceive curriculum issues as related. In a sort of cognitive dissonance, sociology departments frequently separate the following issues that students viewed as interrelated and inseparable: 1) recruiting graduate students of color; 2) hiring, promoting and tenuring faculty of color; 3) integrating the curriculum; 4) offering a race/ethnicity specialty and selecting reading materials. The treatment of each as mutually exclusive requires that race be understood and treated in the most biological sense: that is, diversity in student and faculty populations in terms of skin color but not life experiences, research interests, paradigms or culture.

Failing to see the need for integration writ large is short-sighted for a number of reasons. 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 which is becoming markedly less white.[16] Simultaneous with the browning of the student body, a general rise in the cost of higher education is being exacerbated by a shift from socialization of costs strategies that provided scholarships for poor and under-represented minorities to a market strategy that requires students to borrow extensively. Recent attacks on women's studies and ethnic studies by some of the same forces that have been attacking affirmative action may drive more women and students of color into sociology–but only if they find the curriculum relevant and the climate hospitable.

Graduate programs that limit the definition of integration create problems of alienation, anomie, and anger for students who are not from the "mainstream." A central aspect of the experience of the women graduate students of color that we interviewed was the feeling that they did not fit into programs designed for an "ideal type," perceived as a Euro-American, male, heterosexual, from a middle class

background. One student, who acknowledged she did not have the same undergraduate training as other first year graduate students, voiced her frustration with trying to seek the extra assistance she needed with her advisor: "She just doesn't know how to deal with people that don't come in already perfect." From the students' perspective, problems in race relations were attributed to either the faculty's misunderstanding about differences or the desire to exclude nonwhites:

> "I don't think faculty think about the differences in our experiences and what that means in terms of our academic program–what makes a viable graduate experience for us. I don't think a lot of thought has been given to how to make it a more open community. How are we going to make this work for everybody? And on some level of course there's no interest in making it work for everybody because we don't want everybody."

Ph.D. programs in sociology are becoming less relevant because they have not incorporated transformation projects similar to the ones that have diversified undergraduate curricula and implemented multicultural requirements. Graduate programs must adequately prepare the next generation of sociologists to teach and do research in a multicultural America. To fulfill this mission, graduate training needs to include: required race relations courses, the integration of race throughout the curriculum, inclusion of scholarship by scholars of color, and the creation of practical experiences for Anglo Americans, and persons of color to work, study and do research together.

NOTES

1. The American Sociological Association (ASA) established a Minority Fellowship Program in 1974. The ASA Committee on the Status of Women in the

Profession issued a number of publications on the topic: "Guidelines for Incorporating Women Faculty into Sociology During the Eighties" (1984), "Equity Issues for Women Faculty in Sociology Departments" (1985a), "The Treatment of Gender in Sociology (1985b), and "Recommendations on the Recruitment and Retention of Women Sociologists" (1986). The Pacific Sociological Association (PSA) similarly conducted surveys and produced reports on the status of women in the region (Kulis et al. 1986, Araji et al. 1988). John Stanfield (1988) edited a special issue of *The American Sociologist* on "Racial Diversity in Becoming a Sociologist." Sociological associations have addressed issues of affirmative action and inclusion through the development of minority graduate student fellowships, summer research institutes, race and ethnic sections, and councils.

2. Special issues were published by *The American Sociologist (1988)* and *Teaching Sociology* (1991).
3. Our research on these questions began while Dr. Romero was serving on the Social Issues Committee of Sociologists for Women in Society (SWS) in 1988.
4. It is highly likely that the sample volunteering to be interviewed showed significant sample bias. These women of color graduate students, specifically interested in race and majoring in sociology, have almost certainly given more thought to issues of race and ethnicity than the average graduate student. As qualitative researchers we sought 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, however we 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.

5. Our sample was fairly consistent with the national data on women of color receiving doctorate degrees 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:40*, 1995).
6. Since there are so few women of color graduate students in sociology, in order to assure anonymity, a further break-down of sample characteristics is not possible. All names and places have been changed or deleted.
7. Like other institutions in American society, Academia has a significant history of discrimination to overcome. Despite the ASA, SSSP, SWS, and other sociological associations' commitment to affirmative action and diversity, there continues to be a marked absence of faculty of color in Ph.D. programs. If sociology graduate faculty were to represent the composition of the U.S. population, then sociologists of color would be 22 percent of the faculty rather than the current 13 percent.
8. For further discussion of the experiences of "tokens" and "role models," see Linda S. Greene's (1990-91) article on African American female law professors and Mary Romero's article on Mexican American female faculty (1997).
9. The *Chronicle of Higher Education* (1995) provided comparable figures for all full-time faculty in the ranks of Full, Associate, Assistant, and Instructor as follows: Full Professors are 33.1 per-cent, Associate Professors are 26.0 percent, Assistant Professors are 26.9 percent, and Instructors are 13.8 percent. Thus sociology appears particularly top heavy.

10. Instructors were dropped from the analysis because they were such a small percentage of the sample.
11. Only 1.6 percent of Full Professors are "other."
12. Less than one percent of either Associate or Assistant Professors are "other."
13. Faculty members will certainly object to this characterization, noting that departments may take three to five years to change catalogues or restructure from the loss of prominent faculty. However, this graduate student's comment captures the importance of published material, including the ASA *Guide to Graduate Programs*, in the undergraduate's selection of a Ph.D. program in sociology. It may be that this issue is cleared up by technology. Department web pages can be more easily updated than published catalogues, and have become repositories for faculty vitae and course syllabi that provide much more information for the potential student.
14. In her article on Black women sociologists in academe, Gloria Jones-Johnson (1988:315) drew attention to the relation between faculty background, assumptions, and behavior, and the impact of these standpoints on the discipline.
15. We have no way of knowing if this student was correct in her perception that she was being graded unfairly. And in fact that is not the issue. The issue is that a level of racial tension exists in which this perception is quite common. Schooling in the United States is highly segregated by race and class yet is governed by standardized tests applied to students who do not receive standardized educational experiences. Problems raised by these structures of inequality make grading across racial and ethnic boundaries a painful process for all concerned.
16. Between 1976 and 1995 the percentage of white students in higher education declined from 82.6

percent to 72.3 percent of the student body. During this period minority students (defined as: Blacks, Asian/Pacific Islanders, American Indian/ Alaska Native, Hispanic and non-resident aliens) increased from 15.4 percent to 24.5 percent of the student body (U.S. Department of Education, 1997). 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 Census projects that Hispanic and Asian/Pacific Islander populations will increase from 14 percent of the population in 1996 to 24 percent of the population by 2025 (U.S. Department of Commerce Economics and Statistics Administration-Bureau of the Census, 1996).

REFERENCES

Aisenberg, Nadya and Mona Harrington. 1988. *Women of Academe: Outsiders in the Sacred Grove*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

American Sociological Association. 1990. *Guide to Graduate Departments.* Washington, D.C.: American Sociological Association.

_____. 1986. "Recommendations on the Recruitment and Retention of Women Sociologists." Washington, D.C.: American Sociological Association.

_____. 1985a. "Equity Issues for Women Faculty in Sociology Departments." Washington, D.C.: American Sociological Association.

_____. 1985b. "The Treatment of Gender in Research." Committee on the Status of Women in Sociology. Washington, D.C.: American Sociological Association.

_____. 1984. "Guidelines for

Incorporating Women Faculty into Sociology during the Eighties." Washington, D.C.: American Sociological Association.

Araji, Sharon K. and Marilyn Ihinger-Tallman. 1988. "The Status of Women in the Pacific Sociological Association Region." A Report from the Status of Women Committee. Presented at the Pacific Sociological Workshop, Las Vegas, Nevada.

Becker, Howard S. 1982. *Art Worlds.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Behar, Ruth. 1997. *The Vulnerable Observer: Anthropology That Breaks Your Heart.* New York: Beacon Press.

Blackwell, James E. 1983. *Networking and Mentoring: A Study of Cross-Generational Experiences of Blacks in Graduate and Professional Schools.* Atlanta: Southern Education Foundation.

_____. and Morris Janowitz (Eds.). 1974. *Black Sociologists: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 1991. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment.* New York: Unwin Press.

Chronicle of Higher Education. 1995. "The Almanac of Higher Education." Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Crenshaw, Kimberle Williams. 1995. "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color." Pp. 357-383 in Kimberle Crenshaw, Neil Gotanda, Gary Peller, and Kendall Thomas (Eds.) *Critical Race Theory: The Key Writings that Formed the Movement.* New York: The New Press.

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.* NewYork: 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.

Eitzen, D. Stanley. 1989. "The Introduction of Graduate Students to the Profession of Sociology." *Teaching Sociology* 16:279-283.

Fromm, Erich. 1961. *Marx's Concept of Man.* New York: Frederick Ungar.

Greene, Linda S. 1990-91. "Tokens, Role Models, and Pedagogical Politics: Lamentations of an African American Female Law Professor." *Berkeley Women's Law Journal* 6:81-92.

Gilkes, Cheryl Townsend. 1982. "Successful Rebellious Professions: The Black Woman's Professional Identity and Community Commitment." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 6 (3):289-311.

Goldmann, Lucien. 1976-77 [1967]. "The Epistemology of Sociology." *Telos* 30 (Winter):201-210.

Gordon, Lynn D. 1990. *Gender and Higher Education in the Progressive Era.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Granfield, Robert. 1992. *Making Elite Lawyers: Visions of Law at Harvard and Beyond.* New York: Routledge.

Harding, Sandra. 1991. *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge? Thinking from Women's Lives.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Hewa, Soma. 1993. "Sociology and Public Policy: The Debate on Value-Free Social Science." *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy* 13 (½):64-81.

Hood, Jane. 1985. "The Lone Scholar Myth." Pp. 111-124 in Mary Frank Fox (Ed.) *Scholarly Writing & Publishing: Issues, Problems and Solutions.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Jackson, Michael. 1981. "An Interpretative Note: Status of Minorities and Women in Sociology." *Pacific Sociological Review* 24:129-132.

Jones-Johnson, Gloria. 1988. "The Victim-Blind Dilemma of Black Female Sociologists in Academe." *The American Sociologist* 19 (4):312-322.

Kleinman, Sherryl. 1983. "Collective Matters as Individual Concerns, Peer Culture Among Graduate Students." *Urban Life* 12 (2):203-225.

Kulis, Stephen and Karen A. Miller. 1988. "Are Minority Women Sociologists in Double Jeopardy?" *The American Sociologist* (Winter):323-339.

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):1-32.

McKee, James B. 1993. *Sociology and the Race Problem: The Failure of a Perspective.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Misra, Joya, Ivy Kennelly and Marina Karides. 1999. "Employment Chances in the Academic Market in Sociology: Do Race and Gender Matter." *Sociological Perspectives* 42 (2):215-248.

Orlans, Kathryn P. and Ruth A. Wallace (Eds.). 1994. *Gender and the Academic Experience: Berkeley Women Sociologists.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Pavalko, M. Ronald and John Holley. 1974. "Determinants of a Professional Self-Concept Among Graduate Students." *Social Science Quarterly* 55 (2):462-477.

Plutzer, Eric. 1991. "The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Academia: An Essay on Graduate Education." *Teaching Sociology* 19:302-307.

Pruitt, Anne S. and Paul D. Isaac. 1985. "Discrimination in Recruitment, Admission, and Retention of Minority

Graduate Students." *Journal of Negro Education* 54 (4):526-536.

Romero, Mary. 1997. "Class-Based, Gendered and Racialized Institution of Higher Education: Everyday Life of Academia From the View of Chicana Faculty." *Race, Gender & Class, Latina/o American Voices* 4 (2):151-173.

_____. Forthcoming. "Learning to Think and Teach about Race and Gender Despite Graduate School: Obstacles Women of Color Graduate Students Face in Sociology." In Center for Advanced Feminist Studies at the University of Minnesota. *Is Academic Feminism Dead? Theory in Practice.* New York: NYU Press.

Roth, Julius A. 1955. "A Faculty Conception of Success in Graduate Study." *Journal of Higher Education* 26 (7):50-56, 398.

Sartre, Jean P. 1963. *Search for a Method.* Trans. Hazel E. Barnes. New York: Vintage Books.

Smith, Dorothy. 1987. *The Everyday World as Problematic: A Feminist Sociology.* Boston: Northeastern University Press.

_____. 1990. *Texts, Facts and Femininity: Exploring the Relations of Ruling.* London: Routledge.

Stanfield, John. 1988. "Not Quite in the Club." *The American Sociologist* 19 (4):291-300.

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."

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Digest of Higher Statistics (based on the IPEDS/HEGIS "Fall Enrollment" survey). 1997.

Young, T.R. 1974. "Transforming Sociology: The Graduate Student." *The American Sociologist* 9:135-139.