

Frances **Henry** | Enakshi **Dua** |
Carl E. **James** | Audrey **Kobayashi** | Peter **Li** |
Howard **Ramos** | Malinda S. **Smith**

The Equity Myth

Racialization and Indigeneity at
Canadian Universities



UBCPress · Vancouver · Toronto

Sample Material © UBC Press 2017

© UBC Press 2017

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without prior written permission of the publisher.

Library and Archives Canada Cataloguing in Publication

Henry, Frances, author

The equity myth: racialization and indigeneity at Canadian universities /
Frances Henry, Enakshi Dua, Carl E. James, Audrey Kobayashi, Peter Li,
Howard Ramos, Malinda S. Smith.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

Issued in print and electronic formats.

ISBN 978-0-7748-3488-9 (hardcover). – ISBN 9-780-7748-3489-6 (pbk.).

ISBN 978-0-7748-3490-2 (PDF). – ISBN 978-0-7748-3491-9 (EPUB).

ISBN 978-0-7748-3492-6 (Kindle)

1. Indian college teachers – Canada. 2. Discrimination in employment – Canada.
3. Discrimination in higher education – Canada. 4. Race discrimination – Canada.
5. Universities and colleges – Canada. 6. Equality – Canada. I. Enakshi, Dua, author
II. James, Carl, author III. Kobayashi, Audrey, author IV. Li, Peter S., author
V. Ramos, Howard, author VI. Smith, Malinda Sharon, author VII. Title.

LC212.43.C3H46 2017

331.6'397071

C2017-901732-2

C2017-901733-0

Canada

UBC Press gratefully acknowledges the financial support for our publishing program of the Government of Canada (through the Canada Book Fund), the Canada Council for the Arts, and the British Columbia Arts Council.

This book has been published with the help of a grant from the Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences, through the Awards to Scholarly Publications Program, using funds provided by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

UBC Press

The University of British Columbia

2029 West Mall

Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z2

www.ubcpress.ca

Sample Material © UBC Press 2017

Contents

Figures and Tables | ix

Preface and Acknowledgments | xiii

- 1 Introduction: Setting the Context | 3
- 2 Representational Analysis: Comparing Canada, the United States, the United Kingdom, and Australia | 24
- 3 Differences in Representation and Employment Income of Racialized University Professors in Canada | 46
- 4 Academic Production, Reward, and Perceptions of Racialized Faculty Members | 65
- 5 “Would Never Be Hired These Days”: The Precarious Work Situation of Racialized and Indigenous Faculty Members | 84
- 6 The Everyday World of Racialized and Indigenous Faculty Members in Canadian Universities | 115
- 7 “You Know Why You Were Hired, Don’t You?” Expectations and Challenges in University Appointments | 155
- 8 Shifting Terrains: A Picture of the Institutionalization of Equity in Canadian Universities | 171
- 9 Mechanisms to Address Inequities in Canadian Universities: The Performativity of Ineffectiveness | 206
- 10 Disciplinary Silences: Race, Indigeneity, and Gender in the Social Sciences | 239
- 11 A Dirty Dozen: Unconscious Race and Gender Biases in the Academy | 263
- 12 Conclusion: Challenging the Myth | 297

Sample Material © UBC Press 2017

Appendix: List of Canadian Universities Reviewed | 317

Notes | 319

References | 328

About the Authors | 356

Index | 359

Figures and Tables

Figures

- 2.1 Percentage of full-time instructional faculty members whose race/ethnicity was known in degree-granting postsecondary institutions, by academic rank, selected race/ethnicity, and gender, fall 2011 | 40
- 3.1 Comparison across censuses (1991, 1996, 2001, 2006) of percentage point difference between % of university professors and % of population | 53
- 3.2 Comparison across censuses (1991, 1996, 2001, 2006) of percentage point difference between % of university professors and % of those with doctorates | 54
- 3.3 Comparison across censuses (1991, 1996, 2001, 2006) of percentage point difference between % of those with doctorates working as university professors and % of those with doctorates | 55
- 4.1 Mean differences in professional output | 72
- 4.2 Mean differences in professional outcomes | 73

Tables

- 1.1 The interview sample by selected characteristics | 19
- 2.1 Visible minority faculty members in Canadian universities compared with the available Canadian workforce | 25
- 2.2 Representation of racialized faculty members in selected Canadian universities of different sizes | 28
- 2.3 Racialized faculty members in various faculties in five Canadian universities | 29
- 2.4 Ethnic minority staff in the United Kingdom, 2012–13 | 32

Sample Material © UBC Press 2017

- 2.5 Employment and ethnic minority status of British university academic staff, 2013–14 | 33
- 2.6 Racialized faculty members in US postsecondary institutions, 2011 | 39
- 2.7 Programs and level of distribution of racialized faculty members in US degree-granting postsecondary institutions | 41
- 3.1 Education and occupation of visible minorities in Canada, 2006 Census of Canada | 50
- 3.2 Gross and net employment income of university professors, all age groups | 57
- 3.3 Gross and net employment income of university professors under thirty-two years of age | 61
- 4.1 Racialized and nonracialized faculty members by gender and immigration status | 69
- 4.2 Racialized and nonracialized faculty members by field | 70
- 4.3 Factors affecting tenure, as seen by racialized and nonracialized faculty members | 74
- 4.4 Factors affecting promotion, as seen by racialized and nonracialized faculty members | 76
- 4.5 Factors affecting administrative and committee appointments, as seen by racialized and nonracialized faculty members | 77
- 4.6 Factors affecting hiring, as seen by racialized and nonracialized faculty members | 79
- 4.7 Teaching load and administrative duties, as seen by racialized and nonracialized faculty members | 80
- 8.1 Frameworks for administering equity in a sample of Canadian universities | 177
- 8.2 Types and number of human resources/equity/diversity offices | 180
- 8.3 Universities without an equity office | 182
- 8.4 Universities by number of staff dealing with equity | 183
- 8.5 Reporting structures for equity offices | 186
- 8.6 Equity offices in different faculties/schools | 190
- 8.7 Types of services in faculties with equity offices | 191
- 8.8 Shifts from equity frameworks in universities | 192

- 9.1 Investigative bodies dealing with equity complaints in universities | 211
- 9.2 Institutional authorities responsible for decision making in equity complaints | 212
- 9.3 Administrative/senior advisory committees in universities, 2011–14 | 228
- 10.1 Tenured and tenure-track racialized and Indigenous scholars in political science in Western Canada, 2014 | 249
- 10.2 Racialized and Indigenous scholars by professorial rank in political science in Western Canada, 2014 | 252
- 10.3 Courses on race, Indigenous, and gender themes in political science in Western Canada, 2015 | 254
- 10.4 Percentage and number of articles with race, Indigenous, and gender themes in selected political science journals, 2007–14 | 259

Preface and Acknowledgments

This book is a collaborative effort by a team of seven Canadian critical race and social justice scholars. As part of our initial research planning, each of us elected to pursue an area of particular concentration. For example, Enakshi Dua's interest in equity policies and practices led her to study university equity offices; Howard Ramos and Peter Li chose to study income disparities and measures of achievement; Frances Henry, Carl James, Audrey Kobayashi (and, in an earlier phase, Carol Tator) conducted dozens of face-to-face interviews with racialized and Indigenous faculty; and Malinda Smith researched social science disciplines and the role of unconscious or implicit bias.

After a presentation on the then recently released *Racism in the Canadian University: Demanding Social Justice, Inclusion and Equity* (Henry and Tator 2009a) at the Congress of the Humanities and Social Sciences, we had an animated discussion about the need for a national study, because of the scarcity of data on the number of racialized and Indigenous faculty in universities, pay equity structures, curriculum, climate, or incidents of discrimination, harassment, and bullying. For example, neither Statistics Canada nor the Canadian census publishes data on the percentages of racialized minorities in Canadian universities, either as faculty, staff, or students. While provincial governments publish data on student enrollment in universities by gender, and some based on Indigenous status, none of these governments publishes data for racialized minorities. Further, there are no data on the effectiveness of mechanisms, such as employment equity, affirmative action, and anti-discrimination policies. Thus, we felt that a large-scale national study was needed, and this book brings together four years of research on racism, racialization, and Indigeneity in the university.

Reflecting the interdisciplinary field of critical race and Indigenous studies, our research team is composed of senior scholars from the disciplines of anthropology, education studies, geography, political science,

Sample Material © UBC Press 2017

and women's studies. Our team members also encompass the geographic breadth of Canada, from the East Coast to the West. Team members are based at the University of Alberta in Edmonton (Malinda S. Smith); University of Saskatchewan in Saskatoon (Peter Li); York University in Toronto (Frances Henry, Enakshi Dua, and Carl James); Queen's University in Kingston (Audrey Kobayashi); and Dalhousie University in Halifax (Howard Ramos). We kept in close touch with each other through email and meetings, and most of us participated at national and several international conferences, presenting initial findings of our study as it progressed. This final book project benefited from probing questions, feedback, and insights garnered during the presentation of early research findings at conferences in Canada, the United States, and the United Kingdom.¹

Graduate students at each of the universities brought exemplary research talents to the project and collaborated as co-authors on research previously published from this project as well as found in this book. They include Nael Bhanji and Selom Chapman-Nyaho (York), Andrea Choi (Queen's), Kimberly Gamarro and Mansharn Toor (Alberta), and Rochelle Wijesingha (McMaster).

When it finally came to analysis and writing, each of us wrote an initial draft of two chapters and sent them around for criticism and comment. Several drafts of each chapter were produced and final chapters were read and commented on by at least two other team members. Audrey Kobayashi took on the role of main editor of the final manuscript along with Frances Henry, who, as principal investigator, managed the project through every stage. We all owe a great debt of gratitude for Audrey's huge undertaking, as she not only copy-edited and formatted the text and checked references but also undertook very substantial re-writing. Audrey spent untold hours finalizing the manuscript.

We also wish to thank the Centre for Feminist Research at York University, which administered this project with Enakshi Dua's supervision; the York Centre for Education and Community (YCEC), directed by Carl James, for providing research support; Susanne Cliff-Jungling at Queen's University; Tianna Henry, then at Ryerson University, for long hours of transcription; and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada for funding this collaborative project.

THE EQUITY MYTH

1 Introduction: Setting the Context

In this book we examine the university as a site for studying racism in Canadian society. We analyze the university because it represents a bastion of liberal democracy that enjoys a popular image of an institution free in the pursuit of knowledge, avant-garde in thinking, and fair in practice. Such beliefs support widespread denial that racism exists. But scholars who are racialized as non-White, as well as Indigenous scholars, tell a different story, in which the denial of racism is also the denial of equity. Notwithstanding the promise of equity, the university is a racialized site that still excludes and marginalizes non-White people, in subtle, complex, sophisticated, and ironic ways, from everyday interactions with colleagues to institutional practices that at best are ineffective and at worst perpetuate structural racism. To deconstruct the intricacy of race and racism in Canadian universities we assembled a group of some of the leading scholars in the field, who tell those stories using many types of evidence and comparative analysis.

We have called our book *The Equity Myth* to signal that the goal of achieving social justice by creating equitable institutions has been consistently promised but persistently denied for racialized and Indigenous scholars. The subtitle, *Racialization and Indigeneity at Canadian Universities*, indicates the subjects of our research – racialized and Indigenous scholars whose lives are affected by their experiences of “race.” This term underpins our theoretical conceptions. There is general consensus

Sample Material © UBC Press 2017

among scientists that race is not a useful form of classification of human differences as there are more similarities between so-called races than there are differences. Race therefore has no significant biological reality but is a social construction that depends for validation on the agreement and acceptance of social groups within societies. Thus, the idea of race has important social consequences, the chief of which involves constructing a set of beliefs, assumptions, and actions based on an ideology of the inherent superiority of one racial group over another. The concept of race is discursively deployed to mark, separate, and marginalize others, and to inhibit and deny their full and equitable participation in the academy.

The concept of “racialization” was defined by Miles (1989, 76) as “a dialectical process by which meaning is attributed to particular biological features of human beings.” Using this definition as a basis, Omi and Winant (1994, 55–56) identified racial formation as “the socio-historical process by which racial categories are created, inhabited, transformed, and destroyed ... Race is a matter of both social structure and cultural representation.” Both definitions draw from Frantz Fanon’s insistence (1963, 1968) that racialization is a logical product of European colonialism that involves the creation of both powerful dominant ideologies and emotional responses. Today the term “racialization” is generally used to identify the process by which ethno-racial groups are among those racialized, created, categorized, inferiorized, and marginalized as “others.” For Goldberg (1993), the dialectical power of racialization requires a complex and multilayered analysis of the ways in which power and knowledge are fused in the process of bodily as well as institutional suppression. Racialization practices are employed to categorize the ways in which race is attributed to particular social practices and discourses, such as, for example, the racialization of crime. Processes of racialization occur across a spectrum of discursive practices, from the individual to the institutional to the state level. Racialization thus refers to a set of relationships strengthened by the intersection of social practices that re-enact and reinforce its credence.

Recognizing that the process of racialization is the *modus operandi* of racism, we are concerned that, like race, it not be reduced in our analysis to a given, a tacit assumption of the inevitable outcomes of colonial history. Like Barot and Bird (2001), we use the term with the caveat that any attempt to analyze contemporary situations needs to remain

cautious about concretizing the very structures that we seek to destabilize. As this book progresses, therefore, we delve deeper into the processes of racialization that operate in the university with the clear understanding that the terms we work with – racialized and Indigenous scholars – are the result of powerful discourses of categorization.

Over the past thirty years, Canada's population has become increasingly diverse ethnically and racially. Indigenous peoples – First Nations, Métis, and Inuit – are the fastest-growing population group (Malenfant and Morency 2011). Almost one in five Canadians is racialized as non-White; those of South Asian, Chinese, and Black origins constitute two-thirds of this diverse group (Statistics Canada 2012). Many universities, particularly those in major cities, now have a very varied student body; however, diversity is poorly reflected at the level of the professoriate, especially in the social sciences and humanities. Both racialized and Indigenous peoples are largely underrepresented in the country's major institutions, and little is known about their experiences. The underrepresentation of racialized women scholars continues to be acute, with their numbers in the academy only marginally increasing over the past several decades (Kobayashi 2002b). The available data on members of "visible minority" groups who hold doctoral degrees are dated but still suggestive: in 2001, they held 18.7 percent of all doctoral degrees in Canada but only 12 percent of faculty positions (Kobayashi 2009, 60). In a study of the ethno-racial origins of Canadian university administrators, including presidents, vice presidents, and deans from 1951 to 2001, Nakhaie (2004) concluded that there was a "gross underrepresentation" of racialized faculty members in leadership positions. Yet paradoxically, since the 1980s, employment equity policies have proliferated (Agócs 2002, 2014; Mentzer 2002; Jain and Lawler 2004; Rayside and Hunt 2007; Grundy and Smith 2011; Osborne 2012) in universities and many colleges, and the "Canadian model" of employment equity has even spread to other jurisdictions, such as Ireland and South Africa (Osborne 1992; Agócs and Osborne 2009). In Canada, as well, administrative structures and senior administrative positions have been created, and some universities make strong claims to advancing "diversity" and flaunt their "best diversity employers" awards.

Our study is the first of its kind to examine such claims systematically, and to investigate the status, representation, and everyday lived experiences of racialized and Indigenous scholars in English-speaking

Canadian universities. There is no comprehensive source of data or demographic profiles of the professoriate and no institutional efforts to generate knowledge about the everyday lived experiences of racialized and Indigenous scholars in the academy. In a 2007 equity review, the Canadian Association of University Teachers (2007) noted: “While we know anecdotally that many equity-seeking groups remain seriously underrepresented in Canadian colleges and universities, the lack of consistent and reliable data makes it very difficult to determine the full extent of this problem.” The CAUT review goes on to say that the absence of reliable data or other sources of knowledge about equity in the academy makes it difficult for university “decision makers, administrators and academic staff associations to develop the most effective and appropriate tools to ensure equity.”

A study of racialization, Indigeneity, and the university requires a focus beyond the numbers and beyond achieving numerical representation. Indeed, the lack of representation is often tied to other dimensions of discrimination, such as everyday experiences with racism, the ways in which institutions produce polished images of themselves as diverse, an expansive or narrow conception of what equity is, and the effectiveness of mechanisms to address inequities. Given the multiple and inter-related ways in which racialization and Indigeneity take place, we analyze a variety of data in several areas. First, we examine representational or compositional diversity, including the hiring, tenure, and promotion practices of the academy. Second, we examine institutional and organizational factors, including obstacles, barriers, and biases that affect access and success. Third, we review the mechanisms for inclusion of racialized and Indigenous scholars, such as the policies and practices that universities have put in place in an attempt to ensure equitable outcomes. Finally, throughout our study, we examine discourses of equity and the social construction of knowledge about equity and the rationale used by the institution to project itself as diverse and equitable.

Intimately tied to questions of representation, both under- and over-representation, are questions of curriculum, which is often not Indigenous, international, or inclusive (Cannon and Sunseri 2011; Dei and McDermott 2014). The narrowness of many, although by no means all, university curricula presents several challenges that disproportionately affect racialized and Indigenous scholars and scholarship. One challenge

relates to disciplinary silences and exclusions. Systemic exclusion and discrimination take place through the canons and the pedagogical and methodological paradigms of most disciplines, which tend to marginalize certain knowledges, epistemologies, and scholars. Such academic contexts also make it difficult to create sustainable scholarly communities and to find role models and mentors (Luther, Whitmore, and Moreau 2003; Mahtani 2006; Monture 2010; Smith 2010). Another way in which systemic exclusions occur is in the availability of courses, or in finding faculty who are available to teach with authority about the issues and concerns that are fundamental to racialized and Indigenous peoples. They and their stories, particularly those of racialized and Indigenous women, are often written out of the curriculum, knowledge production, and dissemination (Bannerji 1991; Graveline 1994). The question of representation is therefore loosely tied to the importance of transforming academic knowledge and structures (James 2009). Many scholars have also pointed to the ways in which racialization and marginality are constituted through institutional cultures that are resistant to change. Some racialized and Indigenous scholars report facing micro-aggressions, chilly and “inhospitable” climates, and resentment from other faculty members, which in turn contribute to feelings of self-doubt and tokenism (Henry 2006).

We address the knowledge gap on racialized and Indigenous scholars in the academy. Over the past several decades a significant body of research and scholarship on equity and diversity in higher education has documented the persistence of systemic barriers and implicit biases faced by members of equity-seeking groups – women, racialized minorities, Aboriginal peoples, and persons with disabilities (Carty 1991; Mukherjee 1994; Monture-Angus 1995, 2001). There is, however, a lacuna in this research. Despite the expanding body of scholarship on equity and higher education, analyses of racism, racialization, and Indigeneity in the academy are most notable for their absence. Moreover, no major scholarly body – whether representing universities, presidents, deans, or university teachers – has ever given priority to a study of the implications of social heterogeneity for higher education, and none has undertaken a study of the status and everyday lived experiences of racialized scholars and their scholarship in the academy. We examine what universities have done and question the effectiveness of their equity programs. We also set out the experiences of those faculty

members across Canada for whom such strong claims of equal opportunity have not really changed their everyday working conditions in the academy. For many racialized and Indigenous faculty, whose numbers have increased only slightly over the past three decades, the policies and diversity initiatives are only a foil to deflect criticism of a system that is doing little to change itself. Our aim is to report these untold facts.

Recent scholarship points to the lack of adequate mechanisms in most Canadian universities to address racism, racial harassment, and bullying, or the inhospitable climate faced by racialized and Indigenous scholars. Many of the “new” forms of racism are discursive and these expressions are articulated through a wide spectrum of representations. Neoliberal principles have become the ideological framework and discourse through which racialized beliefs and exclusions are enabled, reinforced, and defended (Giroux and Giroux 2004; Moose-Mitha 2005). Scholars also note that our universities continue to be powerful sites where race knowledge is produced, organized, and regulated (Dei and Calliste 2000; Dei and McDermott 2014). In universities, as in other societal institutions, discourses of liberalism, meritocracy, neutrality, and objectivity, and the presence of employment equity or affirmative action policies, mask the stubborn persistence of inequity and unacknowledged biases (Dlamini 2002; Green 2003; James 2009; Kobayashi 2009).

Our research suggests that for many in universities, to talk about racism, racialization, and the equitable representation of “visible” or racialized minorities is unacceptable. Their reluctance is evident in the general silence on the underrepresentation in the professoriate and university leadership; the silences around the lack of mainstream equity research and institutional policies; the limited institutional efforts to collect relevant data and to monitor the status of racialized and Indigenous faculty members; and the absence of specific institutional initiatives to recruit, welcome, retain, or advance racialized and Indigenous scholars. These silences and invisibilities exist despite the equity and diversity statements routinely added at the end of academic and administrative job ads in Canada and in the vision statements and mandates of universities (James 2011).

There are many challenges to teaching, researching, and talking about systemic racism and racial biases. As Gillborn (2015, 277) notes, “any

attempt to place race and racism on the agenda, let alone at the *center* of debate, is deeply unpopular. In the academy we are often told that we are being too crude and simplistic, that things are more complicated than that, that we're being essentialist and missing the *real* problem – of social class." It is permissible to engage almost any dimension of social difference – class, gender, gender identity, sexuality, disabilities – but race remains unmentionable despite all the evidence of its continuing salience. It was only five years ago, in October 2010, that *University Affairs* published a cover story titled "Racism in the Academy" (Eisenkraft 2010), which addressed a pressing question: "Universities are considered to be among the most liberal institutions in society, yet many non-Caucasian scholars say they still feel excluded or denied opportunities. How does this happen?"

Another challenge with tackling racism in the university is the tendency to associate the phenomenon with its overt forms, and elitist claims that it occurs only among the ignorant, the young, or the poor and working classes. Elite bias leads to the hypervisibility of overt forms of racism and racial outbursts, such as seen in sports hooliganism, among disenfranchised youth in white supremacist groups, or in xenophobic violence against migrants and refugees in times of austerity. University professors may readily distance themselves from such attitudes and actions, but distancing and disavowal render invisible the broader historical and cultural contexts in which racism is learned and consciously or unconsciously reproduced. Our research suggests that covert and more subtle forms of racism, racial bias, racial harassment, and bullying have become more prevalent. As well, affective politics often prevent serious discussions of racism. "What, you're calling me a racist?" (Srivastava 2005; see also Nicoll 2004; Joyce 2015) usually leads to a range of strong emotional responses, including anger, hurt, denial, rationalization, as well as efforts to find alternative explanations. Thus while many people are shocked to hear that racism exists at universities that critics of anti-racism see as bastions of "progressives," it is often because they conceive of racism in its overt or explicit forms, as prejudice or as mistaken attitudes rather than as institutional or a part of an organizational culture that is resistant to change (Das Gupta et al. 2007; Henry and Tator 2010). This blindness to what actually constitutes racialization, placing the "blame" on the racialized, also silences their voices.

Employment Equity: What Does It (Not) Make Possible?

We are now witnessing a shift from equity as understood under postwar liberalism and the welfare state to equity and diversity as practised by neoliberal governmentality (Smith 2010; Brown 2015). Under liberalism, discussions about representational or compositional diversity were often anchored in ethical principles about “doing the right thing” as well as broad political and institutional commitments to citizenship equality protections, conceptions of equity as fairness, and the desire to transform a history of structural, including state-sanctioned, inequities. A good example of the liberal approach is the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms (1982, section 15-1), which guarantees equality on the grounds of race, ethnicity, and colour, and states: “Every individual is equal before and under the law and has the right to the equal protection and equal benefit of the law without discrimination and, in particular, without discrimination based on race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, sex, age, or mental or physical disability.”

For several decades, the shared policy environment for universities in Canada has been shaped by employment equity, a made-in-Canada concept that was introduced by Judge Rosalie Silberman Abella (1984) in her final report for the Royal Commission on Equality in Employment and, more specifically, the Federal Contractors Program, which extended federal equity policy to Canadian universities. Abella understood achieving equity as a holistic approach to both workplace and social conditions. The use of the term “equity” was meant to distinguish the Canadian approach from the controversies surrounding affirmative action policies in the United States. It was meant to signal a substantive conceptual difference between equality as sameness and equity as requiring interventions to level the playing field and to ensure just outcomes in employment practices. The Abella Commission and subsequent employment equity legislation identified four “designated groups” as facing the most inequitable or unfair working conditions in Canadian society: women, Aboriginal peoples, members of “visible minorities,” and persons with disabilities. In contrast to the myth that equity is inconsistent with notions of merit or excellence, Abella (1985) argued that members of the designated groups are not inherently unable to achieve equally; the issue is about removing barriers to their equal

participation, which will not occur without enforceable and systemic intervention.

In many universities, employment equity and affirmative action programs were established to remove structural barriers, change institutional cultures, and uncover hidden biases that hinder the recruitment, hiring, tenure, and promotion of Indigenous, racialized, and other equity-seeking groups.¹ This expressed commitment is marked by the equity and diversity statements that foreground vision and mandate statements of many universities and are routinely found at the end of almost all university job advertisements in Canada.

Within the context of slowly developing employment equity infrastructure, universities began in the 1990s to establish offices and various policies, programs, and personnel both to respond to the demands of activists and advocates and to meet the rather minimal requirements of the Federal Contractors Program, by tying eligibility for contracts to requirements to file reports and set targets on equity hiring. Compliance was uneven from the beginning, and these requirements have become increasingly elastic over time, especially as unregulated discretion was left to the universities. Nonetheless, as our research shows, different infrastructures have been established within many postsecondary institutions. We evaluate the design and effectiveness of these changes.

Theoretical and Conceptual Influences

Our study was largely shaped by the voices and lived experiences of racialized and Indigenous scholars who shared their stories of life in the Canadian academy through interviews and survey data. It also builds on our earlier collaborative work and an extensive review of scholarship on equity, and more specifically on racialization and Indigeneity in the academy. The theoretical and conceptual influences on this book include equity and human rights studies, Indigenous studies, and critical race and whiteness theories, all of which give attention to intersectionality. This examination of racialization and Indigeneity in the academy is taking place at a time when neoliberalism and the politics of austerity inextricably shape the horizon of the possible. In what follows, we briefly discuss how the principles of neoliberalism, critical race theory,

and whiteness operate to structure the ways in which universities respond to the perceived needs for equity programs.

NEOLIBERALISM AND THE CONTEMPORARY UNIVERSITY

Neoliberalism, the dominant governing rationality of the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, has taken many turns in its short history. Rooted in the monetarist policy of the Thatcher/Reagan era, and upheld in Canada since the Mulroney government, it has touted market values, radical individualism, entrepreneurialism, the shrinking of the state, and the rollback of government spending on social programs and policies. In Canada, the effects of neoliberalism are widespread and have shaped the limited funding and even defunding of key programs such as the Office of the Coordinator, Status of Women, and the shift away from substantive policies around employment equity and multiculturalism, as well as immigration and refugee resettlement. The effects can also be seen in the withdrawal of governmental support for most forms of anti-oppression, including anti-racism, social research, and community engagement; the reduction, indeed the demonization, of the third sector; and the defunding of grassroots and nongovernmental organizations, including those engaged with Indigenous, environmentalist, and social justice issues (e.g., NARCC 2006; Rolbin-Ghanie 2010; Gergin 2011; Wood 2011; Barrera 2015; CBC News 2015; Hamandi 2015).

These policy shifts, from the social to a radical individualism, also suggest that diversity is experienced individually. It is located in the bodies of individuals rather than constitutive of institutions, and it masks the structural dimensions of racism and sexism (Johnson and Enomoto 2007; Ahmed 2012). And everywhere the emphasis on accountability has meant more performance indicators and matrices, and more auditing and reporting. Central to neoliberalism's disciplinary technologies is the shifting of resources to those groups and entities that best conform to the neoliberal ethos.

Wendy Brown (2015, 21) analyzes how contemporary political life is saturated by neoliberal rationality, which has reconfigured persons and states alike "on the model of the contemporary firm." As Brown elaborates, "neoliberalism is a governing rationality through which everything is 'economized' and in a very specific way: human beings become market actors and nothing but, every field of activity is seen as a market, and

every entity (whether public or private, whether person, business, or state) is governed as a firm.” In this market citizenship model, “both persons and states are expected to comport themselves in ways that maximize their capital value ... and both persons and states do so through practices of entrepreneurialism, self-investment, and/or attracting investors” (Brown 2015, 22). Within universities, academics are expected to comport themselves according to market logic, which privileges individual competitiveness, business and audit culture, performance indicators, and metrics. Universities, faculty members, and students alike are “incentivized” to focus on hyperproductivity and high returns on investment, and to minimize risk (*ibid.*, 23). In its most recent iterations, neoliberalism has stressed government austerity, further reducing the state’s role in addressing inequality. The increasingly neoliberal university has also witnessed shifts in teaching from producing critical thinkers and social citizens to more instrumental notions of education focused on job-specific training for professions and industries (Slaughter and Rhoades 2000; Barkawi 2013). As well, there has been a noticeable shift in research priorities and funding towards provision of support to private business; withdrawal of support from research focused on social issues, the environment, and climate change; and shifting of university resources from supporting the social sciences, humanities, and curiosity-driven research to creating larger accounting and professional departments with ever stronger audit requirements.

Research on equity in higher education indicates that over the past four decades, the shift in the diversity of university faculty members corresponds with a shift to the neoliberal university and the pervasiveness of neoliberal rationality in society as a whole. The question that arises is how this shift affects racialized and Indigenous scholars, and diversity initiatives.

CRITICAL RACE THEORY, WHITENESS, AND INTERSECTIONALITY

Our research draws on a constellation of critical social theories that provide a useful lens through which to examine racialization and Indigeneity and how racism is normalized and embedded in institutional cultures, policies, procedures, and practices. In this context, and despite all the empirical and experiential evidence to the contrary, the myths of “racelessness” and “colour blindness” serve as alibis for the persistence of inequality and racialized and gendered social hierarchies. According to

Eduardo Bonilla-Silva (2006, 2–3), “color blind racism articulates elements from the free market ideology and culturally based arguments to justify the contemporary racial order ... by explaining racial matters and even whites’ racially based choices (e.g., residential or mate choices) as the product of (nonracial) market dynamics.” Bonilla-Silva goes on to argue that, “although color blindness sounds progressive, its themes, style, and storylines are used to explain and justify racial inequality.” Whether colour-blind racism or “neoliberal racism,” as Henry A. Giroux (2006, 161) terms it, “the relentless spirit of self-interest within neoliberal racism offers an apology for a narrow market-based notion of freedom”; moreover, neoliberal ideology functions to conceal “the effects of power, politics and racial injustice” (ibid., 166). This ideology enables neoliberals to advance their specific notions of equal opportunity, objectivity, neutrality, and merit.

Critical race theory (CRT) explores how the taken-for-granted notions based on Whiteness as a universal norm fuel the discourses, stereotypes, assumptions, and biases that develop in the collective psyche of members of institutions, become embedded in institutional cultures, reinforce unconscious biases, and justify the exclusion of racialized minorities from full participation in society and its institutions. CRT and its various iterations, such as critical race feminism, tribal critical theory, and the like, emerged out of critical legal studies in the 1980s and stressed that law should apply to real societal conditions (Crenshaw 1989, 1991, 2015). Founding scholars of the theory and movement such as Derrick Bell, Richard Delgado, Charles Lawrence, Mari Matsuda, and Patricia J. Williams (see Williams 1991; Delgado 1995; Delgado and Stefancic 2001; in Canada, see Aylward 2003; Razack et al. 2010) were especially critical of liberal legal models, which de-emphasize the historical and social context of law. Pioneering CRT work stressed that the systemic oppression of racialized and Indigenous peoples in the United States, Canada, and elsewhere in the world cannot be understood without reference to social forces such as colonialism, capitalism, and the free market economy, which operate to maintain the political status quo, conserve exclusionary institutions, and obscure the persistence of White privilege (P.J. Williams 1991; Bell 1992; Henry and Tator 2009b).

CRT scholars highlight the social construction of race, the ordinariness of racism, everyday racism, how the processes of racialization vary

temporally, spatially, and for differently racialized groups, and the psychic and material implications of racial hierarchies that buttress hegemonic Whiteness. CRT deconstructs the normativity of hegemonic Whiteness and the implicit assumption of its universality, which forms the foundation for White privilege and social dominance. Another important contribution of critical race theorists is their emphasis on the role of narrative/storytelling to analyze the nature, dynamics, and impact of racism. Critical race theorists argue that (victims') stories provide the necessary context for understanding feelings and experiences, interpreting myths and misconceptions, deconstructing beliefs and common-sense understandings regarding race, and unpacking the dehistoricized and acontextual nature of law and other "sciences" that render the voices of marginalized group members mute. The role of "voice" is therefore central to a critical race approach.

Closely affiliated with critical race frameworks is critical Whiteness studies, a field that focuses on unsettling the normativity of Whiteness and on how white skin confers privilege systemically, structurally, and even unintentionally on those socially constructed as White, while denying or excluding others from the benefits of society (see Frankenberg 1993; Roediger 2001; Boucher, Carey, and Ellinghaus 2009). It recognizes that the category of "White" is socially constructed, and takes "Whiteness" to be "a set of assumptions, beliefs, and practices that place the interests and perspectives of White people at the centre of what is considered normal and everyday" (Gillborn 2015, 278). Whiteness serves to maintain the conditions of systemic inequality where the world views and interests of the dominant group are entrenched and normalized as unstated stands against which "Otherness," including Indigenous and non-Western peoples and cultures, is marked as different (McIntyre 2000, 162). Within this context, the discourses, ideologies, and practices of the institution leave many racialized, Indigenous, and minoritized students and faculty members "feeling isolated and like unbidden guests at the table" (Stewart 2009, 71). It is often a challenge to resist and survive the sheer weight of Whiteness within the academy (Black 2004).

INTERSECTIONALITY

Intersectionality is also a key conceptual reference for this study. Initially animated by debates on the exclusion of Black women's histories and experiences from mainstream feminism, the concept's use has expanded.

Building on Black feminist scholarship on race, gender, and class, critical legal theorist Kimberlé Crenshaw coined the concept and explained its genealogy as follows: “Intersectionality is an analytic sensibility, a way of thinking about identity and its relationship to power. Originally articulated on behalf of black women, the term brought to light the invisibility of many constituents within groups that claim them as members, but often fail to represent them” (Crenshaw 2015). Crenshaw goes on to explain how intersectionality as a metaphor and a practice has shifted in ways that now highlight erasures and silences across diverse identities and relations of power: “People of color within LGBTQ movements; girls of color in the fight against the school-to-prison pipeline; women within immigration movements; trans women within feminist movements; and people with disabilities fighting police abuse – all face vulnerabilities that reflect the intersections of racism, sexism, class oppression, transphobia, able-ism and more.”

Similar to other critical race scholars, we accept the idea that intersectionality is used as a metaphor, and has an empirical, a methodological, and an activist component. It is a tool for analysis of related forms of oppression with the aim of also resisting and challenging the status quo constituted by racialized and gendered social hierarchies. This does not mean that all single-variable analyses are without merit. There is also, as Delgado notes, a fear that “intersectionality can easily paralyze progressive work and thought because of the realization that whatever unit you choose to work with, someone many come along and point out that you forgot something” (Delgado cited in Gillborn 2015, 279). On the other hand, another concern is with what Sirma Bilge (2013) draws attention to – the “depoliticization” and “whitening of intersectionality” under neoliberalism, which in turn erases or obscures the interventions of Black, racialized, and queer feminist contributions.

In this study, we foreground race, racialization, Indigeneity, and racism. Our main focus is to understand how racism affects the positions and experiences of racialized and Indigenous faculty members. Accordingly, we emphasize the primacy of socially constructed race and how it affects the lives of racialized faculty members. Our focus is the product of how little attention race has received; however, drawing on an intersectional framework, when the data allow we also highlight the intersections of gender, gender identity, disability, and class. As with other research in equity, we found access to data on disability and social class,

particularly as they relate to the precariat, uneven at best or not readily available for most universities in Canada.

Methodology

Our study's focus on racialization, Indigeneity, and racism in English-speaking Canadian universities underscores the proportional representation of racialized and Indigenous faculty as well as the interrelated dimensions of policies, institutional culture, mechanisms, practices, and discourses through which racialization and racism operate. One of our goals was to compile existing data and to collect new data in order to report on the increases or decreases in faculty representation, their variation in salaries, and the precariousness of Indigenous and racialized faculty members' work situations using their own assessments from in-depth interviews. Also, we studied the process of racialization itself, examining the ways in which everyday events in the university have created racial difference and oppression.

We used a multifaceted methodology, which included policy and document analysis, statistical investigation of censuses, survey data, and individual and group interviews with racialized and Indigenous faculty members as well as a few who were in administrative and equity and diversity directorship positions. Statistical analysis of comparative salaries used the Public Use Micro Files as well as Research Data Centres raw data for the whole country. To assess the range of equity mechanisms deployed across Canadian campuses and to estimate representation, we surveyed the websites of all universities in Canada, with follow-up interviews in ten cases. A quantitative survey was administered to eight universities, generating over two thousand online responses. Personal interviews were conducted in thirteen universities. Each of these methodologies is elaborated in separate chapters.

The universities were selected on the basis of size, region (including rural/urban), significance in research and teaching, and kinds of equity policies and programs. We did not necessarily use the same universities for each of the methods, but because the sample sizes were small we have avoided identifying specific institutions in the analysis that follows. To obtain interviews, we used purposive sampling: we used our personal contacts and networks to find interviewees initially, and then the snowball technique to increase our sample size. Interviews were guided by a

series of standard questions and were conducted informally. Confidentiality was ensured. Participants discussed their perceptions and experiences of the university climate, how they are positioned in that climate, and how it opens up and/or limits scholarly research, teaching, and service opportunities and possibilities for them. We had very few refusals other than from individuals who were away during the times of our visits. Faculty members were eager to speak openly of their experiences, and for many the conversations were cathartic since they rarely discussed sensitive issues such as racism with colleagues.

We encountered important challenges and identified new methodological issues in the study of racialization in the academy. First, particularly for data on numerical representation, pay structures, and equity mechanisms, the sources of the disaggregated data, when available, employed different terminologies to refer to those racialized as minorities. For example, the federal government refers to racialized groups as “visible minorities.” Some universities follow this terminology while others employ the term “racialized” minorities. Given the momentous task of collecting this breadth of data, we were unable to consistently generate disaggregated data according to gender, sexual and gender identities, ability, and different kinds of racialization. Disaggregating data according to different faculties within the university was also a challenge, particularly because the patterns of racism in faculties of science, engineering, and medicine vary from those in faculties of arts, humanities, and education. We were unable to disaggregate some of our data without identifying the universities, and thereby our interviewees. While the data are not systematically disaggregated, therefore, our research does point to important patterns.

Qualitative interviews were personally conducted at thirteen universities with racialized and Indigenous faculty who had previously been contacted and agreed to be interviewed. The sample of eighty-nine individuals was achieved primarily through a snowball technique of asking each respondent for more names. We also searched faculty listings on the websites of universities. As well, many names were already known to our eight-person research team, an inevitable fact given the size of the racialized and Indigenous communities in Canadian universities. Interviews were conducted in 2011–12 by four members of the team. Fifteen of the individuals contacted indicated that they were either on sabbatical, travelling out of the country, or ill. Of these, thirteen asked

TABLE 1.1 The interview sample by selected characteristics

Race/ethnicity	N	Gender	N	Rank	N	Discipline	N
South Asian	20	Female	45	Full	26	Social Sciences	24
East Asian	20	Male	43	Associate	17	Education	11
Black	19	Unassigned	1	Assistant	16	Engineering	10
Indigenous	16			Other/unknown	30	Medicine/Health	6
Middle Eastern	6					Science	6
White	6					Indigenous Studies	4
Mixed	1					Law	3
						Other/unknown	25
<i>Total</i>	89		89		89		89

Source: Reproduced from Henry and Tator (2012).

that they be contacted again. The interview was refused by only five people. This small number of refusals indicates a very high level of interest in the project and a great willingness to participate.

Table 1.1 lists the respondents' characteristics. Our respondents were guaranteed as complete confidentiality as possible. Even the names of their universities or the regions where they are located have been omitted. In a few instances, minor changes were made in the quotations and stories attributed to anonymous respondents, again in order to maintain confidentiality. It is regrettable that we are not able to offer more than descriptive summaries of the major themes that our respondents discussed with us, but to go beyond this level and even to cross-check a number of variables might enable recognition of an individual. As well, some of our cells contain small numbers, which do not allow for more nuanced analysis.

During the interviews with racialized and Indigenous individual faculty members and a few who had become administrators, a large proportion of respondents told us that this interview was the first time in their university career histories that they were able to freely and frankly discuss issues of racism, indicating to us the importance and value of this exercise. Moreover, many expressed their thanks and gratitude as the interviews provided them with an opportunity to speak normally about things that are not spoken. They were concerned about how they would be judged, both by their colleagues and by administrators who held power over tenure and promotion or funding. Some felt that in an

already racialized workplace they would be further marginalized; others simply felt that their experiences would not be understood. Lifting the burden of silence from many who had felt unable to speak or to be understood was a very rewarding aspect of the research, and we feel it a privilege to be able to transmit their voices through these pages.

The inability of racialized and Indigenous scholars to express their concerns in the normal academic setting raises both policy and methodological issues. Anti-racism policies, to the extent that they exist in Canadian universities, are geared towards overt racism, or at least to that which can be shown empirically to have systemic effects. Those effects must be demonstrated individually in grievance cases, and even in programs to address chilly-climate issues; the effect must be brought into the open in order to be understood. When racialized and Indigenous scholars cannot speak, or when they cannot be recognized or understood, there is a policy impasse. When their issues go unspoken, not only by themselves but by their colleagues and by administrators alike, they are easily dismissed. This situation reflects the “diversity trap,” whereby race is e-raced as a mechanism of oppression and becomes simply a manifestation of difference. To encourage policy makers to recognize that the unspeakable issues are part of an overall culture of Whiteness is therefore extremely difficult. To get policy makers to actually understand such issues is even more difficult; to ask them to consider their own positionality in creating a culture of Whiteness – and indeed to consider a policy to destroy the culture of Whiteness – is daunting indeed.

In carrying out our work, we faced at least two important methodological challenges. The first was establishing trust so that people would be willing to speak that which could not be spoken, and to believe that we would understand when they did. The researchers are all very experienced interviewers with extensive publications in their fields, and most of us are racialized individuals. Many of those we interviewed already knew us by reputation or personally. At times those who did not know us would challenge us to show our understanding of the issues before they would speak. Overall, we relied on establishing mutual respect, collegiality, and a deep commitment to overcoming racism, and people opened up to us in remarkable ways, telling stories never before told.

A second methodological issue is establishing credibility with the wider community. Frankly, if all racialized and Indigenous faculty face questions of recognition, credibility, and respect on a daily basis, why

should we who are writing this book be any different? Indeed, when Frances Henry was engaged as a consultant to write a report on the situation at Queen's University in 2003–04, her finding that the university has an overwhelming culture of Whiteness (based on focus group discussion with racialized faculty) was vigorously rejected by many in the administration on the grounds that the small sample size made it methodologically flawed. Given the small numbers of racialized faculty, however, how could the sample be anything but small? The effect, nonetheless, was to challenge her professional credibility, ignore the concerns of the faculty members in question, and reinforce a notion that those responsible for the report had transgressed an imaginary line in the sand that made these unspeakable issues off limits.

A related issue concerns our own confidence in what “the data” tell us. The transcripts contain silences, omissions, euphemisms, and sometimes outright denials. They are often filtered by deep emotional responses. How are we to interpret the things that are not said, or said differently, about that which normally cannot be said anyway? Of course, we can develop codes to flag such issues when they appear, or rather when they fail to appear, but doing so leaves us in the position of having to *interpret* silence. We followed Philomena Essed's path-breaking work (1991) on everyday racism, which emphasizes the need to understand conversations in context. Her heuristic relies upon both researcher and researched placing racist events and experiences in context, asking whether interpretations fit within the parameters of other experiences and are part of a larger structure of racist oppression that has both macro and micro dimensions. This is a dialogical process through which that which cannot be spoken gains recognition.

The Project

We began by reaching out to our colleagues across the nation, giving recognition to their experiences, puzzling with them over why equity gains in the academy have been so few. The following chapters report what we found. We begin by setting the numerical context that shows that notwithstanding legal and policy initiatives, racialized and Indigenous faculty in Canadian universities remain poorly represented, but that they share many of the issues that researchers have found in other countries. In Chapter 3, we focus on the representation question, and also

show that racialized and Indigenous faculty members receive salaries below those of their White counterparts, an indication that neither they nor their work are as highly valued in an environment of Whiteness. In Chapters 4, 5, 6, and 7, we narrate the actual experiences of racialized and Indigenous scholars, first with the results of the large online survey, and then in three chapters that tell their stories based on interviews. We then turn to a series of chapters based on institutional analysis. In Chapter 8, we examine equity policies in universities, attempting to shed light on the hows and whys of policies and practices. Chapter 9 sets those policies in the neoliberal context of today's universities. Chapter 10 is a case study of one discipline, illustrating the mechanisms through which scholars are sorted at the disciplinary level. Chapter 11 details the "dirty dozen" ways in which racialization occurs in the academy. Our conclusion, Chapter 12, includes a discussion of how universities might proceed to address racialization.

A Note on Language

Of course, all discourses around the topics addressed in this book are fraught with the nuances and implications of the language we choose, and we are well aware of the ways in which our language opens and closes such discourses, both through what is said and through what is not said. We wish, however, to highlight two language issues that run throughout this volume. First, we use the term "racialized minorities" to refer to those people who are socially constructed as non-White. This term is in contrast to "visible minorities," which is the official term of the Canadian government, and which is used in most reporting and in most policy statements. Because much of our data come from such official sources, however, we use "visible minorities" whenever we are referring to such official sources, including in the case of demographic data that derive from the Census of Canada or other statistical sources. As outlined in Chapter 2, we also use other terms as appropriate in an international context.

Second, after much deliberation, we chose the term "Indigenous" to refer to first peoples, that is, from First Nations, Inuit, and Métis backgrounds. We chose this term over "Aboriginal," recognizing that the choice is not completely clear. The Canadian government uses "Aboriginal" in both demographic reports and official policy, and in those