Citation:

Forthcoming. Price-Williams, Shelly R. and Florence Maätita. "Critical Examination of Tokenism and Demands of Organizational Citizenship Behavior among Faculty Women of Color." ***Navigating Micro-Aggressions toward Women in Higher Education*****, edited by U. Thomas.**

Critical Examination of Tokenism and Demands of Organizational Citizenship Behavior among Faculty Women of Color

Women of color in academia are a double minority who face extreme challenges in attaining tenure and promotion. Common challenges faculty of color experience encompass characterization as inferior and expectations of work products that are often undefined or higher than their peers. Faculty of color face challenges, such as exposure to tokenism and denial of access to power or authority. Tokenism is psychologically, physically, and professionally taxing and damaging, and is marked by microaggressions. Examples of microaggressions include comments regarding qualifications, undervaluing scholarship or an over-display of a minority faculty person. These markers deny the intelligence and merit of the individual's work. Faculty of color become just a number or a box to be checked. These challenges produce a hostile work environment; in which faculty of color must constantly defend their competence and capabilities to no avail.

Faculty of color are often excessively recruited or assigned to institutional committees and projects because of their minority membership, and are also frequently sought out by students and peers of color for mentoring. Taking time for such assignments taxes their availability and capability to fulfill pedagogical and research requirements. These forms of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) often go unnoticed and can be undervalued in promotional proceedings.

With continued exposure to microaggressions, such as tokenism and an environment that is hostile, how do faculty women of color positively engage and experience OCB? This dynamic flux results in an excessive taxation of human capital among women faculty of color. In addition to the issue of excessive taxation, this chapter critically examines how women of color experience tokenism in academia. Academic tokenism manifests through unrealistic demands and undervaluing organizational citizenship behavior.

What is Tokenism?

Theoretical Approaches to Tokenism

This section reviews theoretical approaches to tokenism and how that characterizes the professional experiences of faculty women of color. Since the passage of landmark civil rights legislation in the 1960s, scholars from a variety of disciplines have examined the workplace experiences of underrepresented groups. Rosabeth Moss Kanter is often described as opening the door for women in this line of inquiry. In the groundbreaking book *Men and Women of the Corporation*, Kanter (1977) defined tokenism as the negative experiences that women managers face in a Fortune 500 Company. Kanter saw the organizational structure of the workplace causing women's negative experiences at work, which resulted from tokenism—which she recognized in organizations where women comprise less than 15% of their respective work groups—in corporate positions. Her work inspired more attention to the effects of numbers and proportions in the overall workforce on workers' experiences and job satisfaction.

To Kanter, men in an industry with a small proportion of women workers construct and maintain an organizational culture that is hostile to these women. This ethos yields three primary negative experiences that underrepresented women typically confront:

- First, despite the low numbers of token women in this business setting, they face great visibility, which often corresponds with male colleagues using greater and different standards to evaluate women's work than they used to evaluate men's job performances.
- Second, tokens reported feelings of social isolation, which contributed to difficulties connecting with their male colleagues.
- Third, men frequently consigned their token coworkers to roles that paralleled gender stereotypes (Kanter, 1977; Young & James, 2002; King et al., 2010).

Although Kanter did not use the language of "microaggressions," the negative experiences she outlined correspond with subtle and blatant attempts to punish tokens that challenge the behaviors and roles that others expect of them (Harris & Gonzalez, 2012). This literature tends to focus on the negative conditions associated with tokenism has prompted academics to consider other possible explanations for tokenism besides numerical representation.

Looking beyond the Numbers

Some researchers maintain that tokenism is a result of social status in concert with numerical (under)representation (Yoder 1994, Niemann & Dovidio, 1998). Sociologists typically consider social status a person's ranking with respect to some socially important characteristic such as race, gender, or level of education (Sauder, Lynn, & Polodny, 2012). In our society, we grant higher status to masculinity and whiteness than we grant to femininity and that which is not white. We associate high status with competence and value, while low status correlates with inadequacy and flaws. Thus, scholarship suggests that men tokens do not have the kinds of negative experiences women tokens do merely because men have a higher social status relative to women (Budig, 2002; McDonald, Toussaint, & Schweiger, 2004).

Other research maintains that statuses affect tokens in various and complex ways, as in studies that examine the intersections of statuses (Niemann & Dovidio, 1998) and the arrangements of statuses in context-specific status hierarchies (Yoder 1991). For example, research on psychology faculty maintained that racial-ethnic and solo statuses (whether the faculty member was the only racial-ethnic minority in a department) and consequential feelings of distinctiveness affected African American psychology faculty more so than they affected white women psychology faculty (Niemann & Dovidio, 1998).

More recently, scholars have begun to address the need to look beyond numbers and status to understand the experiences of tokens (Turco 2010). As these scholars warn, it is possible that "the low-status minority group often has different experiences in different contexts" as "the experiences of different low-status minority groups often differ within the same occupation" (Turco, 2010, p. 895). Thus, it is imperative to question the local cultural context in which tokens' experiences take place. Essentially, we need to consider how cultural context varies within and between (rather than just between) industries.

Furthermore, scholars suggest that the local cultural context influences who/what constitutes "the ideal worker" (Acker, 1990; Turco, 2010). As a shared cultural schema, the ideal worker is an image of the qualifications and behaviors that led to professional success in the past. Yet, there is evidence to suggest that employees and employers do not define the ideal worker based on a worker's competencies, but on whether that worker is culturally similar to the other workers, the employer and the firm (Rivera 2012). To extend this perspective, tokens might not necessarily be culturally similar to most other employees in a particular work setting. Despite—or because of—cultural dissimilarities, the negative experiences that Kanter (1977) outlined and related microaggressions continue to characterize the work environment for tokens. We expand on this point below.

Tokenism, Gender and Race

It is difficult to discuss cultural dis/similarities without addressing gender, race-ethnicity, and the intersectionalities between the two in the research we outlined. While Kanter (1977) was central for the development of research on tokenism, her gender-neutral assessment of the organization structure is troublesome for many scholars who argue that she assessed tokens and non-tokens as if they were devoid of gender and immune to the effects of sexism and gender inequality (Zimmer, 1977; Acker, 1990; Yoder, 1994). Meanwhile, her critics pointed out that gender is positioned within (rather than outside of) the organizational structure, which necessitates attention to the salience of gender status and the gender-appropriateness of certain occupations (Acker 1990).

Kanter (1977) also discussed organizational structure as race-neutral, though numerous scholars have written on the significance of race-ethnicity and racism in affecting tokens' experiences (Niemann, 1999; Ross & Edwards, 2016; Martinez, Chang, & Welton, 2017). Much of the work that highlights race in work settings treats tokenism as a form of covert racism, such that racist ideologies manifest themselves in subtle and easily disguised practices that reinforce a structure in which we collectively privilege whiteness.

Some scholarship has indicated that certain statuses might be more valuable in some contexts than other statuses, thus acknowledging a multitude of statuses, while treating them as separate and easily separable. Niemann and Dovidio (1998) provide an example of this approach in their examination of social statuses and job satisfaction among psychology faculty. Their analysis suggested that race-ethnicity and solo status had a greater effect on African American faculty than on white women faculty. Hence, their work suggests that racial-ethnic status may have a deeper effect than gender status on workers' experiences.

Extant literature addresses tokenism and the intersectionalities of race-ethnicity and gender. This scholarship maintains that workers—tokens and non-tokens—are affected by a matrix of domination (Collins 1990), interlocking systems of oppression, including race-ethnicity and gender, that characterize our experiences at work, at school and at home. We examine this literature more closely in the following sections.

Intersectionality

Intersectionality became prominent in higher education in the 1990s (Collins & Bilge, 2016), although the core ideas of the concept evolved from the social movements of four decades earlier. These ideas were expressed through political work, artistic outlets, and other creative avenues. As a construct, intersectionality rose from unmet and unaddressed needs of African American women in social movements of the 1960s and 1970s focused upon anti-racism, feminism, and the rights of workers. For scholars from a variety of disciplines, intersectionality theory focuses on various cultural identities, points out the difficulties in prioritizing and separating these identities and addresses how institutional arrangements (institutional oppression) yield social inequalities (Chan, Erby, & Ford, 2017; Chan, Cor, & Band, 2018). Collins and Bilge (2016) more recently defined intersectionality as "a way of understanding and analyzing the complexity in the world, in people, and in human experiences" (p. 1).

Sojourner Truth, an abolitionist and women's rights activist best known for her speech on racial inequalities, was one of the first to address intersectionality, publicly and conceptually, in the context of gender and race (Truth, 1851). In her revolutionary speech, Truth questioned how acknowledgment of race differs from societal recognition of gender in terms of whiteness. The

Combahee River Collective's (CRC) (1977) “A Black Feminist Statement” magnified the interworking of racism, patriarchy, and capitalism. Interestingly, the authors identified tokenism as a pathway in education and employment for combatting oppression. Collins and Bilge (2016) characterized this work as far-reaching compared to the speech of Sojourner Truth to a limited audience of white women. In addition, influential, Chicana feminism grew in the 1970s and early 1980s. Collins and Bilge highlighted the work of Moraga and Anzaldúa in *This Bridge Called my Back* as important in bringing the experiences of women of color from different ethnicities into the movement.

Crenshaw (1989) is credited with coining of the term intersectionality. Until Crenshaw, different words and concepts represented intersectionality. For example, double –jeopardy or triple-jeopardy described multiple forms of identity and the associated implications. Within her analysis of three legal cases, Crenshaw magnified the implications of treating race and gender as two different and exclusive constructs. She maintained this deconstruction of identity holds implications in law, theory, and politics. Crenshaw argued intersectionality is key to the context in which the marginalization of Black women originates and emphasized how women may experience discrimination differently from white women and black men. This experience is not the sum of two equal parts, but rather, experience of the intersection of race and gender (Crenshaw, 1989).

Similar to the ideologies of Crenshaw, Lorde (1984) remarked, “black feminism is not white feminism in blackface” (p. 60), while differentiating the needs of and issues experienced by black women. Lorde characterized the women’s movement as a focus on the oppression of white women, rather than recognition of differences of race, sexual identity, class, and age. Speaking to intersectionality, Lorde (1984) emphasized how white women define womanhood through their own lens, while women of color are “outsiders” (p. 117). In extending this narrative, Collins and Bilge (2016) discussed race, class, gender, sexuality, dis/ability, ethnicity, nation, religion, and age in terms of power relations that expand four domains: interpersonal, disciplinary, cultural, and structural. While the authors do not qualify social justice as a requirement for intersectionality, they pointed how power relations are often overlooked in academia purporting to focus on intersectionalities. Collins and Bilge remarked it is not enough just to examine and identify intersections. We must extend further to examine intersections across power domains that may be structural, disciplinary, cultural, and interpersonal. As such, tokenism in academia is an area in which differential across power domains manifests.

Tokenism in Academia

Research on tokenism in academia typically highlights issues that stem from the numerical representation—or lack thereof—of certain minority groups; such scholarship addresses tokenism among students and faculty. For instance, 56% of students enrolled in degree-granting postsecondary institutions in 2014 were female (National Center for Education Statistics 2017). As the National Center for Education Statistics (2017) reported, 17% of college students in the US are Hispanic, 7% are Asian/Pacific Islander, 14% are Black and 0.8% are Native American. These numbers suggest that students of color are more visible on US colleges and universities now than they were 40 years ago, although some groups have grown more than other groups. These changes in the college student population are due to a number of factors such as the increasing racial-ethnic minority population in the US and programs and legislation designed to provide more opportunities in higher education for students of color. Institutions of higher education will have to contend with a decline in the overall population of people of ‘traditional’ college age in the coming years, and this demographic shift will affect the overall racial and ethnic composition of these students.

Similar to the racial-ethnic composition of the college/university student population, there is evidence of greater racial-ethnic diversity among professors today than years past. In 2005, 7.5% of full-time faculty were of Asian descent, compared to 5.5% who were Black and 3.5% who were Hispanic (Turner, Gonzalez, & Wood, 2008). Recent data, however, suggest that:

> In fall 2015, of all full-time faculty at degree-granting postsecondary institutions, 42% were white males, 35% were white females, 6% were Asian/Pacific Islander males, 4% were Asian/Pacific Islander females, 3% each were Black females and Black males, and 2% each were Hispanic males and Hispanic females (National Center for Education Statistics 2017).

These figures indicate that white women, Black men and women, and Hispanic men and women are underrepresented in the professoriate in comparison to the overall population (National Center for Health Statistics 2012). Hence, they continue to be tokens in the professoriate (Niemann, 2016).

Given the increasing presence of diverse bodies on US campuses, a casual observer might conclude that work conditions have improved for underrepresented groups, especially among faculty. Scholars who focus on numerical representation maintain that increasing the proportions of women and racial-ethnic minorities in a work group should ultimately reduce the negative processes of tokenism (Kanter, 1977). Another perspective holds that the growing number of historically disadvantaged groups will prompt work settings to reduce or eliminate gender and racial discrimination, which will then improve perceptions of low-status groups and enhance the levels of job satisfaction that tokens hold (Yoder, 1994). Essentially, such perceived improvements rest on an assumption that when tokens make up a “critical mass” of workers, which refers to around 30% of the workforce (Greed, 2000), they will become influential actors in affecting policies in their profession. There is some evidence to suggest, however, that achieving a critical mass is insufficient for change (Hillard et al., 2014), although some researchers advocate for more research on its effects (Garces & Jayakumar, 2014).

While the numerical representation of faculty of color might signify progress, it does not reveal continued tokenism and inequality in higher education, which is evident in recent writings. One edited volume, *Presumed Incompetent* (2012), features accounts about the ongoing negative experiences and microaggressions that women of color faculty face in predominantly white institutions (PWIs) at all stages of the academic career, from hiring and recruitment to promotion and tenure. Overall, these reports highlight prevalent difficulties at the interpersonal, cultural and structural levels. It is possible to connect these experiences with the negative processes that Kanter (1977) outlined, in addition to other processes that she did not identify. Below we outline these experiences.

Enhanced Visibility among Faculty Women of Color

Tokens experience enhanced visibility in their work environments (Kanter 1977). Despite their low numbers, tokens—whether they are women and/or racial-ethnic minorities—become more visible than non-tokens. This heightened visibility leads non-tokens to demand more from tokens, oftentimes using different or more intense standards than those that apply to non-tokens. Extant literature suggests that faculty women of color continue to manage enhanced visibility in PWIs, which results in a variety of practices. For example, faculty women of color report that non-tokens often undervalue or question their research (Niemann, 1999; Martinez et al., 2017), departments frequently require that they teach lower-level classes (Essien, 2003) and departments expect tokens to take on excessive committee assignments, which non-tokens often trivialize and overlook during tenure and promotion decisions (Essien, 2003; Ross & Edwards, 2016).

These experiences are reminiscent of what McKay called a double-edged sword, "simultaneously a perverse visibility and a convenient invisibility" (1983, 145). This double-edged sword is marked in the following anecdote Niemann recounts:

> For instance, one senior faculty member stopped me in the hall one day and asked, regarding a graduate student fellowship being offered by the ethnic studies program, "If one of our students accepts that fellowship, will they have to do Mexican shit or can they do real research?" I replied that research on Mexican Americans was real research—period! Then I simply turned and walked away (1999, 121).

Essentially, this exchange illustrates that the visibility of faculty women of color allows departments and schools to claim diversity, while ignoring, stifling and discounting such diverse voices. As one academic described, "Literally and figuratively, the academy does not make space for multiple perspectives" (Balderrama, Texeira, & Valdez, 2004, p. 143).

Social Isolation among Faculty Women of Color

According to Kanter (1977), the second consequence of tokenism is social isolation, which prevents faculty women of color from connecting with non-tokens. For academics from PWIs, both race and gender work to promote feelings of rejection and detachment from white and male colleagues. Numerous barriers within departments and universities reinforce social isolation for tokens. These barriers include lack of mentoring (Ross & Edwards, 2016; Martinez et al., 2017), difficulties getting work published (Martinez et al., 2017) and little guidance for the promotion and tenure process overall (Ross & Edwards, 2016). In sum, these practices correspond with “institutional isolation” (Smith & Calasanti, 2005), which maintains that tokens who are excluded from the inner circle are consequently denied access to unwritten rules and the decision-making process.

Tokens have developed various strategies for managing social isolation. For instance, in her account about navigating the academy, Võ (2012) discussed how important it was for her to find a support group of other junior women of color faculty on her campus. This group, which included women from a variety of disciplines, served as a professional, institutional and social network. Also, Essien (2003) recounts how Black law professors at PWIs established parallel institutions to challenge tokenism, marginalization and isolation. (Recently, Black faculty at our own institution established a Black Faculty Union, which provides a context for challenging isolation, racism and tokenism on our campus.) Such collectives also provide an avenue for scholars to promote their own scholarship, which PWIs may not do.

Constrained Expectations and Social Roles among Faculty Women of Color

Kanter (1977) discussed how tokens felt compelled to abide by gender-specific expectations non-tokens had of them. Accounts by women of color faculty address how they experience and manage gender- and race-related beliefs that their colleagues at PWIs have. Assumptions about women of color are evident in how non-tokens evaluate them in hiring and promotion decisions, such as when the “qualified candidate” is the one who is “spectacular but nonthreatening” (Shields, 21012, p. 37). Also, non-tokens and students are likely to evaluate faculty women of color as hypersexual, angry, or weak (Martinez et al., 2017), stereotypes that are typically associated with women of color. In fact, faculty receive these kinds of assessments even when they are acting in “nonthreatening” ways.

Gender- and race-specific expectations also persist in the kinds of service women of color faculty do. In their review of literature on faculty of color, Turner et al. (2008) detail the additional service responsibilities non-tokens expect of tokens, as those duties typically correspond with their racial-ethnic background. Such service includes administrative tasks and expectations to mentor racial-ethnic minority students. That overburdening of certain types of service that faculty of color experience parallels Padilla's (1994) notion of "cultural taxation." Although faculty women of color might enjoy the service they perform for their students, their departments, their schools and their disciplines, the service expectations become challenging when they offer few opportunities for leadership (Ross & Edwards, 2016). Taking up and demonstrating leadership in service is critical in decisions on tenure and promotion.

Enduring Tokenism among Faculty Women of Color

Ongoing negative experiences for faculty women of color at PWIs are evidence of persistent and serious problems with the organizational structure, status hierarchies, and local cultural context throughout US colleges and universities. These narratives also indicate that gender, race, and the intersections of these two systems of stratification are pervasive in the structure of academia. Increasing numbers of faculty women of color have not necessarily reduced the magnitude of negative experiences for tokens, and the question remains as to whether and to what extent the academy actively works to reduce or eliminate race or gender inequality for their professors.

Actually, structural arrangements within universities and colleges contribute to trends that adversely affect faculty women of color (and tokens, in general). First, research shows significant differences in academic rank, as faculty of color are especially present in the lowest academic ranks, and their meager numbers among tenured/tenure-track faculty diminish the higher the rank (Wingfield, 2016). Second, faculty women of color are overrepresented among contingent faculty, who are not on the tenure track and thus do not have the job security that tenure (or the potential for it) affords (Cottom, 2017). Finally, social status corresponds with salaries such that white male faculty tend to have high average salaries and faculty women of color tend to have the lowest average salaries (Balderrama, et al., 2004). All of these trends combined “place and keep women of color in economic and scholarly ghettos” (Balderrama et al., 2004, p. 135). These trends reveal a need for continued research and action concerning the programs and policies at PWIs to address inequality at the structural/department level.

Scholars typically argue that diversity in the professoriate is beneficial for college and university students in the US. As they maintain, exposure to faculty from a variety of racial, ethnic, linguistic, sexual, gender and cultural backgrounds will help students prepare for the proverbial real world (Martinez et al., 2017). Yet, the question remains: how has academia demonstrated a real commitment to preparing our students by including faculty women of color into the inner circle? Specifically, how has higher education actively worked to increase numbers and proportional representation, to change status expectations and to transform the local cultural context? Moreover, is it possible to understand tokenism and its potential relationship to organizational citizenship behavior? Let us now turn our attention to what scholars have written about organizational citizenship behavior.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Early formation of the concept of organizational involvement as an extra-role behavior can be attributed to the work of Katz (1964), who discussed the influence of motivation on organizational behavior. The term “extra-role” represents organizational behavior that falls outside the domain of one’s job description or role within an organization and is also often referred to as prosocial behavior (Smith et al., 1983). Examples might be aid to another employee, mentoring students, punctuality, volunteerism, or cooperation in organizational decision-making (Farh, Poksakoff, & Organ, 1990). Smith, Organ, and Near (1983) interpreted from Katz three essential components necessary for a functioning organization: inducement of its members to engage and remain, dependability of role execution, and engagement that falls outside of what is prescribed of one's role.

A more concrete definition of this phenomenon evolved from the work of Organ (1988) who stated, "OCB represents individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system" (p. 4). Typically, this engagement is a matter of personal choice and is not enforceable by the organization, but may be highly encouraged in conjunction with one's work role. Organ (1988) conceptually constructed five domains of OCB continuously explored by others in research and literature that followed its inception.

Altruism was conceptualized by Organ (1988) as a helping behavior that is action directed at a different person than oneself. Organ stated this action can increase efficiency in an organization as it progressively enables things to be accomplished and for the organization to increase resources. Organ also went so far as to purport altruistic behaviors can draw affinity from external constituents as the organization exemplifies cohesiveness to those on the outside looking in.

In contrast to engagement targeted a particular person as in Altruism, contribution or sacrifice of an individual beyond their prescribed role was defined as *Conscientiousness* by Organ (1988). In this case, an individual in the organization will follow through on a commitment as a contribution to and benefit of the organization rather than a specific person. This sets this domain apart from altruistic behaviors. In Smith et al. (1983), this was referred to as compliance behavior. Due to the negative implication of obedience associated with the term compliance that, in conjunction, evades the construct of free will, Organ vacated the inclusion of this term in his characterization. While there can be some overlap between Altruism and Conscientiousness behavior, a member of the organization may exhibit one or the other.

The next three domains of OCB as depicted by Organ (1988) reside within the individual's character and cognitive processes. *Sportsmanship* was defined by Organ as a positivist approach to engagement that "maximizes stamina" (p. 12), wherein; the individual avoids complaining and submission of small grievances. In contrast to Sportsmanship, the individual may resist chronically all policies and procedures of the organization and may seek opportunities to aggrieve any issue or concern. The effect of unsportsmanlike behavior on the organization can result in a diversion of organizational resources from effective strategic performance (Organ, 1988). An organization in disarray will be reactive and consumed with addressing members' concerns rather than focusing resources on organizational development.

Courtesy was defined by Organ (1988) as intentional sharing and consultation with others within the organization. This differs from altruistic behavior targeted at a specific person. Courtesy prevents problems and conflict within the organization as members work across boundaries and divisions to share knowledge, practices, and policies that may impact their area or the organization as a whole. *Civic Virtue* differs from Courtesy as it centers on the individual's efforts to maintain an awareness of organizational issues and to express themselves in relation (Organ, 1988). Examples of Civic Virtue might be reading organizational email, sharing one's opinion on organizational matters in public forums, and attending organizational meetings not otherwise mandated by one's department or unit.

Later, authors worked to expand upon the work of Organ (1988) or redefine OCB. For example, Van Dyne, Graham, and Dienesch (1994) examined obedience, loyalty, and participation as constructs of OCB and defined organizational citizenship as a “multidimensional construct” (p. 767). LePine, Erez, and Johnson (2002) highlighted inconsistencies in terminology describing OCB through an evaluation of the phenomenon and its “dimensionality” (p.52). Many researchers suggested that organizational citizenship behavior directed toward individuals (OCBI) is distinct from organizational citizenship behavior directed toward the organization (OCBO) (Deckop, McClendon, & Harris-Pereles, 1993; LePine, et al., 2002; Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff, & Blume, 2009; Williams & Anderson, 1991). Other researchers (Lawrence et al., 2012; Williams & Anderson, 1991) extended the research in examination of organizational commitment (OC) as a facet of OCB.

In the literature, many authors highlighted the benefits or outcomes of organizational citizenship behavior. Bolino, Turnley, and Bloodgood (2002) positioned service as a benefit to the organization through development of social capital. Desselle and Semsick (2016) maintained OCB enhances organizations and will result in greater rewards from superiors. Finally, Organ (1988) stated OCB underpins “effective functioning” (p.4) of an organization. To truly understand the influence of engagement of faculty in the organization and the levers that influence the decision to engage, one must consider antecedents, mediating factors, and latent impact of OCB. This knowledge could be useful to organizational leadership in shaping an environment conducive to OCB and in establishing a reward system for this activity.

Antecedents of OCB

The rationale or motivation for engagement among faculty can vary based on the environment and the individual. Even further, behaviors related to one’s formal role may differ from factors that influence the decision to engage in extra-role activities. In fact, Williams and Anderson (1991) found different antecedents for in-role behaviors versus OCB in their study.

Lin, Hung, and Chiu (2008) examined individual factors such as cooperativeness, and organizational factors such as distributive justice, in relation to OCB. Lin et al. (2008) identified antecedents to OCB as perception of fairness and commitment to the organization. Job satisfaction can be influential on engagement decision-making (Lin et al., 2008; Smith et al., 1982). Commitment on the part of the organization to the employee is also an important consideration as a precursor to engagement (Brown & Roloff, 2015). Lawrence et al. (2012) identified organizational socialization, such as mentoring and socializing with colleagues, as having a role in shaping OCB. In addition, relations with department chairs strengthened "perceptions of procedural justice and social support" (Lawrence et al., 2012, p. 331). In relation, Macfarlane (2005) concluded, from findings in his study of the disengaged academic, community is a precursor to the realization of engagement in the organization.

Antecedents of extra-role or prosocial behavior that originate within the individual were found in research to be mood and individual attributes or characteristics (Smith et al., 1982). LePine et al. (2002) stated OCB is a manifestation of willingness to cooperate and be helpful in organizations. The authors called attention for a need to more thoroughly assess predictors of OCB and hypothesized unwillingness of individuals to contribute to the organization based on fairness, climate, and sense of belonging.

Justice and fairness. Fair treatment and procedures can impact day-to-day performance and engagement in OCB (Lin et al., 2008; Organ, 1988; Organ & Konovsky, 1989). Farh et al. (1990) found fairness to be more prevailing on engagement than job satisfaction. In his early work, Organ (1988) discussed OCB within the frame of two types of justice- distributive and procedural. Organ defined the former as allocation of resources and necessities to individuals or groups. Procedural justice, on the other hand, relates to how these resources are distributed, especially according to status, seniority, effort, or need. Mooreman (1991) distinguished between the two constructs as fairness of outcomes versus fairness of procedures. Organ characterized distributive justice as more dominant over procedural justice. This denies value of effort one might expend, especially at the lower level of faculty rank. For example, lower level faculty are often under a surmountable amount of pressure to maintain a level of teaching and service, while they engage in research and produce publications. At the same time, this population is subject to higher demands for service, while tenured peers are able to decline such demands.

Organ recognized issues regarding procedural justice that could manifest when civil liberties are involved or called into question. In considering justice, one must to some extent compare “outcomes or circumstances with those of others” (Organ, 1988, p.67). Perceived fairness is influential on the extent to which individuals will engage with the organization. Individuals in organizations naturally assess fairness through a lens of “fairness rules” (Organ, 1988, p. 78) as they scan both the internal and external environments.

When an individual perceives unfairness, Organ stated they are less likely to reduce their productivity to avoid loss of income, or even their job. However, the individual may reduce some form of their OCB. How might this manifest? The individual may be less helpful to others, experience a decline in Sportsmanship, and will grow to view Civic Virtue as a waste of time. All this may occur while the primary functions of one’s job remains in tact. Organ emphasized how a cyclical pattern can evolve, wherein; diminished OCB results in changes in relationships and escalating inequity. Both reduction in relationships and escalating inequity further decrease OCB and compromise the overall efficiency of the organization.

Organ and Konovsky (1989) discussed trust and fairness through a social exchange framework. Trust, in the long-term fairness of the organization, is central to OCB and enables the member the latitude to engage in OCB beyond their contractual or economic relationship with the organization (Organ & Konovsky, 1989). However, when trust is broken or unfairness is detected, the member may disengage and retreat primarily to the economic confines of the relationship and may only give as much as is received. This is identified in the literature as quid pro quo (Brown & Roloff, 2015; Organ & Konovsky, 1989).

"A chronic sense of unfairness moves one to redefine the implicit social contract one has with the organization" (Organ, 1988, p. 78). One must consider how tokenism and hidden expectations of faculty women of color limit their ability to decrease OCB or disinvest in the organization. Organ (1988) characterized individuals who continue to contribute despite their circumstances as "suffering servants" (p. 78).

Through structural equation modeling, Moorman (1991) assessed perceptions of justice and OCB within a framework of equity theory and social exchange. Moorman (1991) found a relationship between perceptions of procedural justice and several dimensions of citizenship, but not when evaluating distributive justice. When measured separately, the author did not find a relationship of satisfaction with citizenship, but did find a causal relationship between organizational justice and OCB (Moorman, 1991). An individual's decision to engage and participate in the organization may be a function of the extent to which that person believes their treatment is just and fair. Interestingly, interactional justice, which is the perception of the employee of fair treatment on the part of the supervisor, was the only dimension to significantly relate to OCB (Moorman, 1991). The same was not found for distributive or procedural justice.

This finding focuses upon the actions of the supervisor and characterizes the impact of this interpersonal relationship as most influential.

Job satisfaction. Organ (1988) maintained job satisfaction and OCB are interwoven. However, numerous studies failed to determine which is the cause for the other. Certainly, the chicken before the egg dilemma is relative and a metaphor to consider. Organ maintained the overlap between OCB and job satisfaction is more of a reflection of cognitive assessment then mood state. OCB “varies positively” (Organ, 1988, p. 61) when the individual believes fairness exists in their organization. In congruence, Moorman (1991) encouraged an evaluation of satisfaction through a lens of justice. This approach may allow for some distinction in underlying principles of satisfaction to determine a clear relationship of this construct with OCB.

Organ and Konovsky (1989) maintained satisfaction should be broken down and examined cognitively and affectively. One or the other has the potential to influence what attitudes a person may hold and what behaviors might be pursued. The authors pointed that satisfaction is dominated cognitively. The authors surmised cognitions drive OCB rather than affect of the individual. More specifically, Organ and Konovsky found prosocial behaviors to be predicated by individual appraisals of job outcomes.

Farh et al. (1990) examined leader behavior and task characteristics as influential on OCB and satisfaction. Task characteristics were measured as variety in the work role, feedback, autonomy, significance of work role, and task identity. Through survey data, the authors captured employees’ perceptions of leader fairness in regards to positive feedback, praise, leader consideration of social welfare and human dignity, and value of employee’s voice in decision-making. They found OCB and satisfaction to be correlated, but did not find causation in respect to satisfaction as an antecedent to Altruism or Conscientiousness. It was found leader fairness contributed to the Altruism dimension, but not in regards to Conscientiousness as the authors expected.

Mediating factors of OCB

While a satisfied faculty member may initially perceive the environment as fair and just, there are mediating experiences to consider as influential factors on the decision to continue OCB. Katz (1964) questioned how an organization attracts and retains its members, but allows for innovation in the same context. Intrinsic job satisfaction, defined as expression of abilities, a sense of accomplishment, and the exercise of free will, results in high productivity (Katz, 1964). However, the organizational environment or mediating factors can prevent or inhibit the ability of its members to realize success in this intrinsic way.

Mediating factors influence whether faculty will opt to engage in OCB. For example, Lawrence, et al. (2012) found the impact of race on organizational citizenship of faculty was influenced by socialization experiences in the work environment specific to fair treatment, responsiveness of administration, research support, and opportunities for advancement. Lin et al. (2008) found loyalty, service delivery, participation, social network ties, and organizational commitment to be mediating variables. In some part, these factors also serve as antecedents to engagement and continue to be salient through one's experience in the organization.

Similarly, Brown and Roloff (2015) examined OCB in relation to burnout of high school teachers and found that organizational support, where value of employees was communicated, prevented burnout of individuals in the study. When congruence is optimized, internalization of organization goals bleeds into one's personal goals and values resulting in a realization of safety and security (Katz, 1964). Williams and Anderson (1991) found extrinsic job cognitions, such as perceptions of manager and co-worker behaviors, opportunities for advancement, and working conditions to be strongly related to OCB. Van Dyne et al. (1994) found loyalty, defined as "identification with the organization and an allegiance to it as whole" (p. 789) to be intermediary between OCB and personal factors.

Latent impact of OCB

As described above, there are antecedent factors and intermediary factors to consider when assessing or advancing OCB. One must go beyond this point and consider possible negative outcomes of excessive demands of service outside of one's primary role. Brown and Roloff (2015) hypothesized OCB would relate to employee perception of employer obligations and to burnout, especially among those who report little organizational support and believe the organization did not live up to its psychological contract. All of their hypotheses were supported. The authors defined burnout as emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and diminished personal accomplishment. Brown and Roloff identified rewards as well as communication of value and appreciation as buffers to burnout. In relation, excessive amounts of service can also lead to lower performance in one's main work role, job dissatisfaction, and stress from involvement in organizational politics (Brown & Roloff, 2015). Excessive amounts of service can also compromise the faculty's ability to meet the research and publication requirements for promotion and tenure.

OCB in Higher Education

Research on citizenship in higher education beyond Organ (1988) is scarce (Deckop et al., 1993; Desselle & Semsick, 2016; Lawrence et al., 2012; Macfarlane, 2005). Even further, we found no research on OCB in relation to tokenism. As one of the earliest to study OCB in higher education, Deckop et al. (1993) examined the relationship of union membership of faculty with OCB. The authors examined effects of union membership on job performance as it related to service. The authors identified OCBI, behaviors that benefit an individual directly and the organization indirectly, as more relative to university faculty. This is instead of OCBO, which are behaviors that solely benefit the organization. Deckop et al. (1993) found little effect on OCB based on union membership of faculty members in the study.

Lawrence et al. (2012) questioned why faculty may be disengaging from service and how this disengagement relates to teaching, research, and service. Lawrence et al. (2012) is one of few to isolate the experiences and commitment of nondominant faculty members. The authors explored how individual attributes and job characteristics, socialization experiences, and exchanges between faculty and campus groups influenced professors' organizational commitment and to what extent that commitment mediated the effects of other antecedent variables to OCB. Lawrence et al. (2012) utilized a theoretical framework of organizational attachment and OCB and focused upon the psychosocial processes through which faculty invest themselves in the organization.

More specifically, Lawrence et al. (2012) explored interconnections among faculty members' personal work role values; beliefs about institutionally valued faculty activities; perceptions of organizational climate and exchanges with the campus; commitment to the university; and involvement in institutional service. Interestingly, respondents in the study who identified with an underrepresented minority group were less likely than Whites to exude a commitment to the university, reported receipt of less career advice, and "had to work harder to be recognized as legitimate scholars" (Lawrence et al., 2012, p. 344). The authors' found social exchanges and experiences of women and underrepresented faculty revolved around fair treatment, responsiveness of administration, opportunities for advancement, and support for research, and all were found to be intermediary influences on OCB.

Desselle and Semsick (2012) depicted OCB in their study as a “manifestation” of collegiality and an integral part of a collegial environment. While they attributed collegiality to effectiveness of faculty, the authors failed to define how this is to be measured and factored into tenure and promotion. Desselle and Semsick (2012) identified social capital as a creation of citizenship, implying engagement in citizenship behavior would increase the value of the individual in the organization. This assumption overrides the possibility of leadership demands for service, especially on faculty of color, and the lack of value that service may hold in tenure processes.

Service- The Fourth Bucket

While both men and women spend the same amount of time on service to the profession, women are more likely than men to engage in service to the University (Misra, Lundquist, Holmes, & Agiomavritis, 2011). On average, men spend more time on their research than women, in tandem with service obligations. Yet, the authors pointed to the devaluing of what they deem “institutional housekeeping” critical to the academy and stated these activities are less likely to result in professional recognition or elevation. Deckop et al. (1992) identified the complications in simply identifying discretionary engagement and assignments often not assessed in the formal reward systems of higher education. Misra et al. (2011) called for universities to acknowledge service work, especially in the tenure and promotion process.

Faculty of color are often overburdened with service as they are offered or encouraged to take on more opportunities because of their visibility, representation of diverse perspectives, and ability to mentor students of color (Baez, 2000). Baez (2000) described this construct is typified as “cultural taxation” (p. 367) by Tierney and Bensimon (1996) described this as “commodification of race or ethnicity” (p. 117) with the goal to make the organization appear more diverse and inclusive. Within their qualitative examination, Baez (2000) found participants felt a burden by their service, but felt compelled to engage in race-related service to benefit their personal communities. This engagement provided a cultural outlet, helped to combat racial isolation, enabled faculty with a sense of agency and advocacy, and gave faculty an opportunity to benefit the racial communities on campus.

Even when faculty of color cannot be criticized for their scholarship, service, and teaching, they can be characterized as non-collegial by their peers, which is identified by Riva-Holly (2012) as the “fourth bucket”. While the construct of collegiality falls outside the bounds of this chapter, it is important to recognize that often faculty view their service efforts as conforming, participatory, and collegial. This mysterious fourth bucket of collegiality warrants more attention in relation to perceptions of OCB among faculty of color within the academic organization.

Conclusion

Scholarship on tokenism has been prevalent for four decades (Kanter, 1977), but continued discourse about the sources of tokenism are ongoing. This dialog addresses, among other factors, organizational structure, status expectations and local cultural context. Moreover, this literature pays specific attention to the centrality of gender, race and the intersections of the two for affecting how workers in a variety of fields experience tokenism. We certainly agree that scholarship is necessary to highlight the enduring hardships that especially faculty women of color experience. These writings not only uncover persistent and serious shortcomings in the structures and cultures within and throughout higher education, but they also provide token faculty a vehicle to have their voices heard and validated.

Yet, in this review, we advocate for another lens for examining tokenism: organizational citizenship behavior. As we mentioned above, literature on OCB in higher education is scant, and we have yet to identify any research that directly addresses the relationship between tokenism and OCB. In some ways, literature specific to tokenism and OCB occupy two parallel spaces. Yet, similarities between each warrant our further attention to specifically examine how these phenomena intersect within organizational structures of higher education. In each domain of literature, we find a common discussion of “cultural taxation” (Baez, 2000; Padilla, 1994) accentuating an excessive demand of service among some faculty due to visibility as a minority, representation of diverse perspectives, and ability to mentor students of color. Yet, current literature focused upon OCB in higher education denies mediating and latent impact of excessive demands for organizational service.

Most certainly, the five domains of OCB that Organ (1988) identified—altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy and civic virtue—are potentially useful for exploring the professional careers of faculty women of color, especially as they pertain to the types of service opportunities they accept and reject. More important, we must query how OCB is established and maintained among the professoriate with regard to race, gender and the intersections of the two. Additionally, if the rationale or motivation for engagement among faculty can vary based on the environment and the individual, it is logical to question how race and gender also figure into these motivations.

Unfortunately, without empirical evidence behind us, we cannot say precisely how tokenism and OCB are connected. Perhaps it is the case that OCB presents another set of factors that contribute to tokenism for faculty women of color. It is also possible that tokenism affects how and to what extent faculty engage in OCB. Further, the relationship between the two could be more complex and multidirectional. It is quite possible such an examination may help us realize how each relates to job satisfaction and retention of faculty women of color in academe. The goal of future research is to assess this relationship fully.

References

Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, jobs and bodies: A theory of gendered organizations. *Gender and Society, 4*(2), 139-1.

Baez, B. (2000). Race-related service and faculty of color: Conceptualizing critical agency in academe. *Higher Education, 39*, 363-391.

Balderrama, M., Texeira, M. T., & Valdez, E. (2004). Una lucha de fronteras (a struggle for borders): Women of color in the academy. *Race, Class and Gender*, *11*(4), 135-154.

Bolino, M.C., Turnley, W.H., Bloodgood, J.M. (2002). Citizenship behavior and the creation of social capital in organizations. *Academy of Management Review,* 27(4), 505-522.

Brown, L.A., & Roloff, M.E. (2015). Organizational citizenship behavior, organizational communication, and burnout: The buffering role of perceived organizational support and psychological contracts. *Communication Quarterly*, *63*(4), 384-404.

Budig, M. J. (2002). Male advantage and the gender composition of jobs: Who rides the glass escalator? *Social Problems*, *49*(2), 258-277.

Chan, C. D., Cor, D. N., & Band, M. P. (2018). Privilege and oppression in counselor education: An intersectionality framework. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development* , *46*, 58-73.

Chan, C. D., Erby, A. N., & Ford, D. J. (2017). Intersectionality in practice: Moving a social justice paradigm to action in higher education. In J. Moon Johnson, & G. Javier (Eds.), *Queer People of Color in Higher Education* (pp. 9-29). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Collins, P. H. (1990). *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness and the Politics of Empowerment.* Boston, MA: Unwin Hyman.

Collins, P.H. & Bilge, S. (2016). *Intersectionality.* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Combahee-River-Collective. (1995 [1977]). “A Black Feminist Statement,” in B. Guy-Sheftall (ed.), *Words of Fire: An Anthology of African-American Feminist Thought*. New York: The New Press, pp. 232 − 40.

Cottom, T. M. (2017). *Lower Ed: The Troubling Rise of For-Profits.* New York, NY: The New Press.

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, *Vol. 1989 (1),* Article 8.

Deckop, J.R., McClendon, J.A., & Harris-Pereles, K.L. (1993). The effect of strike militancy intentions and general union attitudes on the organizational citizenship behavior of university faculty. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 6(2), 85-97.

Desselle, S.P. & Semsick, G.R. (2016). Identification and development of items comprising organizational citizenship behaviors among pharmacy faculty. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, *80*(10), 1-12.

Dyne, L., Graham, W., & Dienesch, R, M. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*. 37, 765-802.

Essien, V. (2003). Visible and invisible barriers to the incorporation of faculty of color in predominantly white law schools. *Journal of Black Studies*, *34*(1), 63-71.

Farh, J., Podsakoff, P. M. & Organ, D. W. (1990). Accounting for Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Leader Fairness and Task Scope Versus Satisfaction, *Journal of Management*, 16, 705–722.

Garces, L. M., & Jayakumar, U. M. (2014). Dynamic diversity: Toward a contextual understanding of critical mass. *Educational Researcher*, *43* (3), 114-124.

Greed, C. (2000). Women in the construction professions: Achieving critical mass. *Gender, Work and Organization, 7*(3), 181-196.

Gutierrez y Muhs, G., Niemann, Y. F., Gonzalez, C. G., & Harris, A. P. (Eds.). (2012). *Presumed Incompetent: The Intersections of Race and Class for Women in Academia.* Boulder, CO: University Press of Colorado.

Harris, A. P., & Gonzalez, C. G. (2012). Introduction. In G. Gutierrez y Muhs, Y. F. Niemann, C. G. Gonzalez, & A. P. Harris (Eds.), *Presumed Incompetent: The Intersections of Race and Class for Women in Academia* (pp. 1-14). Boulder, CO: University Press of Colorado.

Hillard, A. L., Schneider, T. R., Jackson, S. M., & LaHuis, D. (2014). Critical mass or incremental change? The effects of faculty gender composition in STEM. *Gender Transformations in the Academy , 19*, 355-374.

Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and Women of the Corporation.* New York, NY: Basic Books.

Katz, D. (1964). The motivational basis of organizational behavior. *Behavioral Science*, *9*, 131-133.

King, E. B., Hebl, M. R., George, J. M., & Matusik, S. F. (2010). Understanding tokenism: Antecedents and consequences of a psychological climate of gender inequity. *Journal of Management*, *36*(2), 482-510.

Lawrence, J., Ott, M., & Bell, A. (2012). Faculty organizational commitment and citizenship. *Research in Higher Education, 53*, 325-352.

LePine, J. A., Erez, A., & Johnson, D. (2002). The nature and dimensionality of organizational citizenship behavior: A critical review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 52–65.

Lin, C., Hung, W., & Chiu, C. (2008). Being good citizens: Understanding a mediating mechanism of organizational commitment and social network ties in OCBs. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 81, 561–578.

Lorde, A. (1984). *Sister outsider: Essays and speeches by Audre Lorde*. New York: Random House, Inc.

Macfarlane, B. (2005). The disengaged academic: The retreat from citizenship. *Higher Education Quarterly, 59* (4) 296-312.

Martinez, M. A., Chang, A., & Welton, A. D. (2017). Assistant professors of color confront the inequitable terrain of academia: A community cultural wealth perspective. *Race, Ethnicity and Education, 20*(5), 696-710.

McDonald, T. W., Toussaint, L. L., & Schweiger, J. A. (2004). The influence of social status on token women leaders' expectations about leading male-dominated groups. *Sex Roles, 50*(5-6), 401-409.

McKay, N. (1983). Black woman professor--White university. *Women's Studies International Forum, 6*(2), 143-147.

Misra, J., Lundquist, J., Holmes, E., & Agiomavritis, J. (2011). The ivory ceiling of service work. *Academe*, 97(1), 22–28.

Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship Between Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: Do Fairness Perceptions Influence Employee Citizenship, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(6), 845–855.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2017). *Fast Facts: Enrollment.* Retrieved from

National Center for Education Statistics: https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=98

National Center for Education Statistics. (2017). *Fast Facts: Race/ethnicity of college faculty.* Retrieved from National Center for Education Systems: https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=61

National Center for Health Statistics. (2012). *Table 1. Resident population, by age, sex, race and Hispanic origin: United States, selected years 1950-2012.* Retrieved from Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/hus/2012/001.pdf.

Niemann, Y. F. (1999). The making of a token: A case study of stereotype threat, stigma, racism and tokenism in academe. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women's Studies*, *20*(1), 111-134.

Niemann, Y. F., & Dovidio, J. F. (1998). Relationship of solo status, academic rank and perceived distinctiveness to job satisfaction of racial/ethnic minorities. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *83*(1), 55-71.

Niemann, Y.F. (2012). The making of a token. In Gabriela, G.M., Niemann, Y.F., Gonzalez, C.G. & Harris, A.P (Eds.), *Presumed incompetent: The intersections of race and class for women in academia.* Utah State University Press. Boulder, CO. an imprint of the University Press of Colorado.

Niemann, Y. F. (2016). The social ecology of tokenism in higher education. *Peace Review: A Journal of Social Justice*, *28*, 451-458.

Organ, D.W. (1988). Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome. Lexington, MA, England: Lexington Books/D. C.

Organ, D.W. & Konovsky, M. (1989). Cognitive versus affective determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*, 157-164.

Padilla, A. M. (1994). Ethnic minority scholars, research and mentoring: Current and future issues. *Educational Researcher*, *23*(4), 24-27.

Podsakoff, N.P., Whiting, S.W., Podsakoff, P.M., Blume, B.D. (2009). Individual-and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(1), 122-141.

Riva-Holly, F.D. (2012). Igualadas. In Gutierrez y Muhs, G., Niemann, Y. F., Gonzalez, C.G., & Harris, A.P. (Eds.), *Presumed incompetent: The intersections of race and class for women in academia.* Utah State University Press. Boulder, CO. an imprint of the University Press of Colorado.

Rivera, L. A. (2012). Hiring as cultural matching: The case of elite professional service firms. *American Sociological Review, 77*(6), 999-1022.

Ross, H. H., & Edwards, W. J. (2016). African American faculty expressing concerns: breaking the silence at predominantly white research oriented universities. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 19*(3), 461-479.

Sauder, M., Lynn, F., & Polodny, J. M. (2012). Status: Insights from organizational sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology, 38*, 267-283.

Shields, S. A. (2012). Waking up to privilege: Intersectionality and opportunity. In G. Gutierrez y Muhs, Y. F. Niemann, C. G. Gonzalez, & A. P. Harris (Eds.), *Presumed Incompetent* (pp. 29-39). Boulder, CO: University Press of Colorado.

Smith, C.A., Organ, D.W., Near, J.P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, *68*(4), 653-663.

Smith, J. W., & Calasanti, T. (2005). The influences of gender, race and ethnicity on workplace experiences of institutional and social isolation: An exploratory study of university faculty. *Sociological Spectrum, 25*(3), 307-334.

Tierney, W.G. & Bensimon, E.M. (1996). *Promotion and tenure: Community and socialization in academe*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Truth, S. (1851, May). *Ain't I a woman?* Presented at the Women's Convention, Akron, Ohio.

Turco, C. J. (2010). Cultural foundations of tokenism: Evidence from the leveraged buyout industry. *American Sociological Review, 75*(6), 894-913.

Turner, C. S., Gonzalez, J. C., & Wood, J. L. (2008). Faculty of color in academe: What 20 years of literature tells us. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 1*(3), 139-168.

Vô, L. T. (2012). Navigating the academic terrain: The racial and gender politics of elusive belonging. In G. Gutierrez y Muhs, Y. F. Niemann, C. G. Gonzalez, & A. P. Harris (Eds.), *Presumed Incompetent* (pp. 93-109). Boulder, CO: University Press of Colorado.

Williams, L.J. & Anderson, S.E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17, 601-617.

Wilson, S. (2012). They forgot mommy had a brain. In Gutierrez y Muhs, G., Niemann, Y. F., Gonzalez, C.G., & Harris, A.P. (Eds.), *Presumed incompetent: The intersections of race and class for women in academia.* Utah State University Press. Boulder, CO. an imprint of the University Press of Colorado.

Wingfield, A. H. (2016, September 9). *Faculty of Color and the Changing University.* Retrieved from Inside Higher Ed: https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2016/09/09/more-faculty-color-can-and-should-be-top-ranks-universities-essay

Yoder, J. D. (1991). Rethinking tokenism: Looking beyond numbers. *Gender and Society, 5*(2), 178-192.

Yoder, J. D. (1994). Looking beyond numbers: The effects of gender status, job prestige and occupational gender-typing on tokenism processes. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 57*(2), 150-159.

Young, J. L., & James, E. H. (2002). Token majority: The work attitudes of male flight attendants. *Sex Roles, 45*(5/6), 299-319.

Zimmer, L. (1977). Tokenism and women in the workplace: The limits of gender-neutral theory. *Social Problems, 35*(1), 64-77.