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ABSTRACT

This narrative study explored how a select a group of Latina, Chicana, and Puerto Rican faculty members identifying as lesbian, gay, bisexual and / or queer (LGBQ) in higher education institutions in the United States and Puerto Rico learned to succeed as university faculty members as they learned their institutional culture. The theoretical framework included intersectionality and experiential learning from lived experiences. Narrative analysis (Reissman, 2008), thematic analysis (Braun and Clarke, 2006) and cultural comparison (Postlethwaite, 1988) guided the data analysis. In this study, I present negotiations of space and the implications of the universality of binarism within the academic institutional context for LGBQ Latina, Chicana, and Puerto Rican faculty members.

The findings indicate an overlapping of themes between two cultures: United States and Puerto Rico. Similar themes between the two cultures were: memory, turning-point, ally, emotional intelligence, and learning. However, distinctions appeared these themes were culturally performed. First, memories expressed by the U.S. participants highlighted experiences of class, tokenism, family culture, value of education, and socio-culture/ethnicity, while memory for participants in Puerto Rico dealt with silence, invisibility, and normative social pressures. Second, turning points for participants in the U.S. meant realizing they could become professors, whereas for participants in Puerto Rico, turning points were related to visibility. Third, common themes between cultures were being allies and using emotional intelligence to negotiate space as faculty members. Fourth, exemplary institutional citizenship distinguished LGBQ–Latina, Chicana faculty members from non-LGBQ faculty members. Fifth, implications of the universality of binarism and negotiating space were evidenced in the lived experience of LGBQ
Latina and Chicana faculty members.

This research contributes to the field of women’s studies, adult education and comparative and international education as groundwork for future studies focused on queer Latinas, Chicanas, and Puerto Rican who learned success in their field despite the conditions, actions and perceptions experienced by a selected group of participants amidst a specific culture. Queer Latinas, Chicanas and Puerto Ricans are the subject of the research. More research highlighting their learning as much as their accomplishments are needed to expand the research literature.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Coming to the Question

As a Puerto Rican lesbian doctoral student, my socio-cultural experiences living in the United States were challenging. I did not see myself reflected in the curriculum, nor with the racial/ethnic composition of the faculty. Diversity was better represented within student colleagues; however, I was one of two Latinas in the program, and the only Latina lesbian. I also came to realize—for better or worse—my experience at my academic institution was not unique. Latinas, especially Latina lesbian students in a Ph.D. program learn to navigate the academic system or flounder.

Working with a campus climate consultation firm, I have met sexual minority faculty of color. These faculty members shared issues of legitimacy, homophobia, lack of partner benefits, silence and invisibility in their academic institution. Listening to their stories and seeing the minimal representation of faculty members attending the focus groups made me realize there was a lack of LGBQ Latina faculty members.

Gender, racial, queer, and postcolonial readings deepened my awareness of those living in the margins and the dynamics of power between cultures, societies and individuals. While taking a course about gender in the history of the United States, I reflected on my relationship with the academic culture in the United States. Between the lack of racial presence in my department, minimal representation of Latina lesbians in focus groups and learning to navigate academia I arrived at the question: How do a group of Latina, Chicana, and Puerto Rican faculty
members in higher education institutions in the United States and Puerto Rico learn to succeed as university faculty?

Although academic institutions in the United States have taken steps to become more inclusive and welcoming to racial and sexual minority populations by including statements in their policies regarding sexual orientation, integrating LGBT content in their curriculums, developing LGBT courses and offering benefits for same-sex partners (Holley, 2011; Sears, 2002) I was missing role models to identify with. The main reason given to me was, “You are in central Pennsylvania, what do you expect?” My expectation was to belong in a community of scholars. My assumption was that an academic community was open to differences and progressive. I was not expecting academia to see me through stereotypes, classifying me by my Spanish accent or skin color. What should I expect as faculty member?

Statement of the Problem

Hispanic/Latino enrollment in universities has increased (Krogstad, 2016) (Figure 1.1). However, retention and completion rates do not follow this trend (ibid.) (Figure 1.2). Although U.S. academic institutions continue to develop inclusion programs to promote multiculturalism and diversity, the cultural composition of their faculty does not reflect these demographic changes. In other words, the increase of the Hispanic population does not correlate to a growth in tenured Hispanic faculty members.
Most faculty members are composed of white males (43%) followed by white females (35%). Black male and females make up six percent of faculty members. Hispanic males and
females constitute four percent. The total Asian-Pacific male and female accounts for 10%. This data does not include sexual orientation. Therefore, the percentage of faculty members identifying as sexual minority is unknown. Understanding the distribution of faculty ranks in academic institutions explains the existing white culture or whiteness described by students, faculty, and staff. The focus of this study is on LGBQ–Latina and Chicana faculty members, a population in academia who are understudied (Calvo & Esquibel, 2010). Figure 1.3 illustrates by percentage the professorial composition by gender and race in the United States.

Figure 1.3.

Percentage Distribution of Full-time Instructional Faculty in Degree-granting Postsecondary Institutions, by Academic Rank, Selected Race/Ethnicity, and Sex: Fall 2013 (Source: NCES, 2015)

Bierema’s (2002) call for action argues the need to revise racial composition in higher education institutions:
If you are not a white male in the U.S. workplace, chances are you may have less access to training and development programs, receive fewer promotions, suppress your identity to assimilate to a patriarchal culture, and experience harassment or other mistreatment. If English is not your first language, you are likely to be excluded from developmental programs and may be forced to suppress your cultural or religious heritage—even if you are an English speaker—to keep your job or receive a promotion. Since none of these dynamics fosters learning and development in the workplace, we require new thinking and action to address socio-cultural issues at work. (p. 73)

Few research studies provide the state of sexual orientation and racial minorities in higher education institutions (Rankin, 2005; Renn, 2010). A national campus climate study (Rankin, Weber, Blumenfeld & Frazer, 2010) conducted on 14 university campuses in the United States (n=1,669) indicated 27% LGBT faculty expressed having experienced harassment, 42% lesbian faculty members said they were somewhat likely to experience harassment, while 73% of faculty (undisclosed sexual orientation) described their campus climate as homophobic. The results indicated “LGBT people of color were more likely than white LGBT people to conceal their sexual orientation or gender identity to avoid harassment” (Rankin, 2005, p. 19). Queer faculty members often find themselves in an unwelcoming environment, an environment that privileges heteronormativity and forces LGBT faculty to choose invisibility or silence.

To exacerbate this dilemma of the lack of Latino faculty members in university campuses and minimal research focused on queer Latinas, since 1980 full-time/tenure–track faculty
positions have dropped 26%, while part-time faculty increased 70% (García Mathewson, 2016). This decrease of faculty positions might be significant for future LGBQ–Latina faculty members who aspire to a career as faculty members in higher education institutions. The faculty member evaluation process may in turn become more competitive, privileged, and scrutinized. Departments may base their decisions on tenure and retention on factors other than research, publications and service. These trends in higher education may dissuade LGBQ Latina graduate students from pursuing a faculty position. Becoming a tenured faculty, especially for LGBQ Latina first-generation doctoral students without role models or mentoring, may become the ultimate-unattainable and prestigious rank reserved for the few. When looking at the total percentages of full-time faculty members organized by race (Figure 1.3), I noticed from the two-percent of Hispanic females, the total of LGBQ–Latina faculty members, I can assume they make up less than two-percent. Hence, LGBQ–Latina faculty members in higher education institutions in the United States are a rare and precious gem.

When research on lesbian and gay issues in universities began to emerge, they were steered away from public discussions. Some reasons why this research were not acknowledged were because interested faculty members, regardless of their sexual orientation, feared being labeled by colleagues at their academic institutions as lesbian or gay (D’Augelli, 1989). Due to the limited research towards the end of the 20th century, the LGBQ community in the academy seemed monolithic (LaSala, Jenkins, Wheeler & Fredriksen-Goldsen, 2008). Most LGBT research at the time was based on white males and for the most part the student population. White lesbian faculty members, although belonging to the racial majority in academia, considered themselves second-class citizens in the academic culture (Dolan, 1998). Towards the
end of the 1990’s research on the issues, experiences and perceptions of LGBQ faculty of color was practically non-existent because most research centered around white lesbian and gay faculty members. There is a need for research literature focusing on LGBQ Latinas. This study contributes to the research literature as it is grounded on the experiences of a group of LGBQ–Latina, Chicana, and Puerto Rican faculty members.

Why are LGBQ–Latina, Chicana, and Puerto Rican faculty members minimally studied? Although it is important to inform and understand the status and experiences of racial and sexual orientation minorities in academia, Asencio (2009) described some difficulties she encountered in the recruitment process for a research on migrant Puerto Rican lesbians. Snowball sampling, although a preference method to recruit participants, was described as difficult. Not because of gate-keepers, but as Asencio (2009) states, “this particular population of Puerto Rican lesbians, adult migrants, proved particularly challenging to identify and recruit. Moreover, once recruited, few knew of others like themselves” (p. 6).

Understanding how LGBQ–LX and LGBQ–P.R. faculty members in the academic culture achieve success despite constituting less than two percent of the total of faculty population, being swept under the faculty of color category in present research; it is important. The premise of being an understudied population due to the race/gender composition of full-time faculty members in higher education, not much is known about their perceptions or professorial experiences in navigating and negotiating the academic culture to achieve success as university faculty. Furthermore, cross-cultural comparisons may reveal similarities and differences in how this group of faculty members learn their institutional culture, and the ways in which LGBQ–Latina, Chicana, and Puerto Rican faculty members distinguish themselves from non-LGBQ
faculty members. Comparing LGBT faculty members’ professorial experience cross-culturally may allow us to gain insight into conditions across many countries.

**Purpose of the Study**

Following narrative inquiry (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Riessman, 2008) I explored and compared the stories told by two LGBQ Latina and two Chicana faculty members in the residing in the United States and four LGBQ–P.R. faculty members residing in Puerto Rico about their professorial experience in the academic culture. Participants contain aspects of functional equivalence comparability in the academic systems (Raivola, 1985). Functional equivalence was determined by the tasks and activities carried out as faculty members in the United States and Puerto Rico. The focus of this study is to describe the experiences of these faculty members.

**Focus and Research Question**

In this narrative inquiry (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Riessman, 2008) I explored how LGBQ–LX and LGBQ–P.R. faculty members learned their institutional culture. Through semi-structured interview questions, each participant shared stories of their experience in academia. This study ties to the field of comparative and international education as it compared using conceptual equivalence (learning) from the experiences told by a selected group of LGBQ Latina and Chicana faculty members with those from LGBQ Puerto Rican faculty members (Raivola, 1985).
The overarching question for this study was:

- How did selected Latina, Chicana, and Puerto Rican faculty members in higher education institutions in the United States and Puerto Rico learned to succeed as university faculty?

The sub questions are:

- How did selected LGBQ Latina, Chicana, and Puerto Rican faculty members learn their institutional culture?
- In what way, if any, did LGBQ Latina, Chicana, and Puerto Rican faculty members distinguish themselves from non-LGBQ faculty? How did this shape their learning institutional culture?

**Significance of the Study**

The significance of this study in the field of adult education is present when learning is understood as a process, not by outcomes. A learning process were meaning making is extracted from the lived experiences of a selected group of LGBQ Latina faculty members. In this study, I present negotiations of space and the implications of the universality of binarism within the academic institutional context for LGBQ Latina, Chicana, and Puerto Rican faculty members. As Clandinin & Connelly (2000) state, “When one asks what it means to study education, the answer—in its most general sense—is to study experience” (p. xxiii). In this study, I continue questioning “the extent to which the [academic community] empowers some learners and silences others, according to their race, culture, gender, nationality, physical ability and sexual orientation” (Alfred, 2002, p. 11).
Definition of Terms

- LGBT, abbreviation for Lesbian (L), Gay (G), Bisexual (B), and Transgender (T) community. In this study, the use of ‘LGBT’ represents the LGBT community.

- LGBQ, abbreviation for Lesbian (L), Gay (G), Bisexual (B), and Queer (Q) sexual orientation. In this study, the use of ‘LGBQ’ represents specific members of the ‘LGBT’ community. This study centers of faculty members who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual and / or queer; transgender community members are not included.

- Chicana identified as Mexican-American in the United States is also spelled Xicana. In this study Chicanas / Xicanas is used interchangeably. For this study, I use Xicana in the abbreviation LGBQ–LX, when speaking about the selected group of faculty members who reside in the United States and identifying as Latina (L) and / or Xicana (X).

- LGBQ–LX, abbreviation for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Queer, Latina (L), and Xicana (X) faculty members residing in the United States.

- LGBQ–PR, abbreviation for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Queer, Puerto Rican faculty members residing in Puerto Rico.

- Discourse (with capital “D”): the distinct ways a member engages thinking, acting, interacting, feeling and believing (Gee, 1995).

Organization of the Study

This dissertation is divided into four parts. Chapter two begins with an overview; a brief
historical summary in relationship to Chicanas and Latinas residing in the United States. Then, I explore LGBQ community in Puerto Rico through online newspaper articles from the years 2011 to 2016. Subsequently, through the lens of experiential learning, I examine learning and experience and locate them in relationship to this study. After looking at the relationship of the literature to the study, Chapter three deals with each element of the research design: research questions, recruitment, data collection, participants and data analysis. In this chapter I take a closer look at the methodology I used in doing this research following a narrative inquiry approach. For the data analysis, individual narrative for each participant are presented. Themes are explored within participants followed by lived events compared among and between cultures using quotes as illustrations. Chapter four presents the findings from the data analysis and Chapter five concludes with implications and ideas to further research.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter, I examine the literature relevant to the study of a group of LGBQ Latina and Chicana faculty members residing in universities located in the United States (LGBQ–LX) and LGBQ Puerto Rican faculty members residing in universities situated in Puerto Rico (LGBQ–P.R.). This chapter is divided into two sections. In the first section I present the meanings of Chicana, Latinoness and Puerto Ricannes in ways that are not only categorized by race, but positioning the literature as evidence of performing racial identity. The second section of the literature review draws on intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1989, 1991; MacKinnon, 2013), Latino Critical theory (Hernández-Truyol, 1998) and experiential learning (Fenwick, 2000) to form a theoretical framework guiding this study.

Hispanics, Chicana, Latinoness, and Puerto Ricannes

Hispanic is a categorical term imposed to immigrants of Spanish heritage used in the United States (Oboler, 2008). The problem I find with the term Hispanic is that it homogenizes Central American, Latin American, Spanish-speaking Caribbean and European Spanish populations making their experiences invisible as well as blurring their cultural distinctions. In homogenizing experiences, it fails to recognize countries’ cultural relevance by devaluing race, class, and language. Assimilation and acculturation are also expected from the dominant culture. The binary existing in the conceptualization of inclusion/exclusion and ‘us versus them’ limits the agency of Latino/as, Chicano/as, Puerto Ricans and other Spanish-speaking individuals living in the United States. As Emma Pérez (2003) argues, “a colonial imaginary hovers above us
always as we interpret our past and present” (p. 123) whether the subject is race, gender, class or sexual orientation. Hispanic is, therefore a term imposed by a colonial image of the Latino population. The compounding of racial performativity and ethnic identity.

In the statements collected by the selected group of participants in this study, none of them identified as Hispanic. The four participants residing in the United States identified as Latina. Two of these participants identified as Chicana–Latina. The group of participants residing in Puerto Rico, identified as Puerto Rican. On a personal note, I never identify as Hispanic. I live through my Puerto Rican ethnicity, language, and ways that I perform being Puerto Rican. I don’t know what being Hispanic is. I do not recognize myself under that label, and I assume the participants in this study may share a similar belief. However, during the recruitment process of this study, to cover all bases, I decided to include as part of the criteria “identify as Hispanic”. The fact that all participants at one point or another during their interview mentioned their ethnic/racial identity, reinforced their cultural distinction and valued their race, class language and cultural history altogether.

The history of Chicanas is a history of struggle and redemption. Their past consists of conquests, reduced populations by colonization, racial intermarriage, destierro (driven from their lands), legitimacy, loss of political power by white superiority, and dispossession of land to name a few. For Anzaldúa (1987), slipping in and out of race, spirituality and consciousness is, “a path of knowledge—one of knowing (and of learning) the history of oppression of our raza. It is a way of mitigating duality” (p. 19). Gloria Anzaldúa’s work is situated at the margins of Chicano and North American culture reflecting on consciousness and experience. For example, Nepantla “torn between ways” (Anzaldúa, 2009, p. 310) and counter stance theory of
embodiment are two terms Anzaldúa used to describe what it means to be Chicano. Anzaldúa’s use of metaphor, such as “Nepantla” represents the negotiation of two, sometimes three identities—race, language and sexual orientation (Anzaldúa & Keating, 2002).

For U.S. territories in the Caribbean such is the case of Puerto Rico, “a messy tangle of serial colonialism, multilingualism and interregional migration, create challenges for a geographic understanding of the term ‘Latin@’” (Rodriguez, 2014, p. 147). After 1898, U.S. domination on Puerto Rico shifted sociocultural ideologies that had been shaped by Spanish colonizers (1493-1898). Puerto Rican’s political—cultural vision crisscrossed periods of extreme migration from Africa to Puerto Rico during the Spanish colonization period (1493-1873), and from 1898 after the Spanish–American War. Colonization and migration affected Puerto Ricans cultural tradition as indicated by shifts in language, identity, and space and place.

**Socio-Cultural Conditions in Puerto Rico**

To fully grasp the full picture of a story, contextual information is important. Little might be known about LGBQ Puerto Rican faculty members residing in higher academic institutions in Puerto Rico. Since the 1970’s Puerto Rico has had a series of changing events impacting the LGBT community. Puerto Rico’s two leading newspapers: *El Vocero* and *El Nuevo Día* from 2011 to 2015 portray a picture of political, cultural, resistance and education based on a series of events. Changes in the political sphere begin to be noticed in an article (2011, August) announcing a forum with government officials with members of the LGBT community to ensure protection in the face of prejudice or discriminatory acts based on gender identity and sexual orientation. Educational training for police, public prosecutors and personnel related to hate crimes was going to take effect. In 2012, a newspaper article announced a talk at the LGBT
community center regarding financial security for LGBT couples. The article also revealed an AM radio talk show *Saliendo del Clóset/Coming out of the Closet.* In Que Pasa Gay P.R. (Nemir, 2012) article a meeting described as historic between the LGBT community and the Police Department of Puerto Rico eventually lead to a reform. However, in an article published in 2016, the office of human rights—Amnesty International—reported a lack of following protocols of respect and recognition of human rights for LGBT members.

The year 2013 could be inferred as a year where public conversations regarding sexual orientation in Puerto Rico took place. The Civil Action Party proposed to defend the traditional family by challenging the government and its intent to erode the established family formative conduct and thus remaining vigilant to the education curriculum. Meanwhile, a workforce law prohibiting sexual orientation or gender identity discrimination in the public and private sector was passed. In accordance to this law education training for supervisors and employees expressed was essential for these changes to take place (Bonilla Del Valle, 2013, June). In another article, the presence of LGBT members and the iniquities faced in Puerto Rico was described in colloquial language conflating the national quedadera/stuckness with religious expressions of homophobia and discrimination

*Nuestra quedadera nacional es de tal magnitud que ni en asuntos de fe estamos al día, pues mientras aquí despotrician con promesas de fuego eterno, afuera crecen las voces cristianas contra el discriminación y la homophobia* (2013, Abril). Our national stagnation is of such magnitude not even in matters of faith we are not up to date, while they rave here with promises of eternal fire, outside Christian voices grow against discrimination and
homophobia (2013, April).

Another newspaper opinion column by an LGBT community activist described public censorship regarding LGBT issues in Puerto Rico based on moral depravity as an absurd argument and calling for a constitutional amendment to include rather than exclude (2013, December).

In May 2014, a Puerto Rican newspaper publishing in 19 U.S.-states where DOMA was struck by the Supreme Court indicated the Puerto Rican government would have to face discussing the definition of marriage (Delgado, 2014, May). In October 2014, Judge Juan Perez-Gimenez struck down the federal Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA) upholding the legality of same-sex marriages in Puerto Rico.

Puerto Rico’s LGBT community still experiences police abuse, employment discrimination, hate crimes and a lack of sexual education in schools. Even though women have mostly led the LGBT struggle in Puerto Rico, there is minimal written documentation recognizing those efforts. Current issues for LGBT individuals in Puerto Rico are: childhood adoption, renting/owning property, LGBT violence, and medical insurance coverage. In addition, the LGBT community are still subjects of degrading jokes, and condescending language.

Locating LGBQ–P.R. (Hestres García, 2015), in relation to LGBQ–LX, a context must be provided on both LGBT culture in Puerto Rico and the United States and the role played by individual and collective identity. Such knowledge into the mechanisms generate meaning for a given culture, demonstrating how culture impacts the identity of an individual or a group, in addition to illustrating how representations of a subculture can challenge social foundations.
The Puerto Rican LGBT community has mostly focused its efforts on cultural productions and understanding how culture affects queer identities. Contrasted to the U.S. LGBT movement, which operates predominantly to infiltrate sociopolitical hegemony through activism and education. Multidisciplinary in content and scope, studies of Puerto Rican LGBT culture have examined cultural transvestism (how the Puerto Rican drag queen works to subvert the masculine ideology known as “machismo” [Aponte–Parés & Arroyo, 2007]), spatial negotiations (how the LGBT community copes with social and familial constraints), and ethnonationality (how Puerto Ricans embrace national identity). For Asencio (2009),

Puerto Ricans’ national identity is not constructed in terms of territorial ownership but in terms of the shared values that unify individuals and transcend class, language, and geographic barriers, it has been noted that ethnic identity may have even deeper significance for Puerto Ricans than for other Latinas/os (pp. 2-3).

In general, Puerto Rican ideology has remained in flux since the 1898 shift from Spanish to American colonial rule. Some contested areas include double consciousness and duplicity of identity; negotiations of space linked to games of visibility and invisibility; oppressive language such as “pato”/“pata” (a bird metaphor similar to “faggot”); and the national male-dominated ideology “machismo.”

The United States lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) model influenced the mainland Puerto Rico’s LGBT community activism. Puerto Rican queer movement was largely inspired by the events at Stonewall (1969) in Manhattan, New York City (La Fountain-Stokes,
A large constitute of the members who actively participated in the series of Stonewall riots were of Puerto Rican ethnicity. Stonewall sparked gay pride events in urban centers across the United States including Puerto Rico, where homosexuality discourse was covert and silenced.

**United States Higher Education System**

For faculty members to attain full professor status in the United States higher education system, they must advance through three professorial ranks: assistant professor, associate professor, and full professor. Each level has its set of expectations and related accomplishments in research, teaching, advising and service. Tenure track begins at the level of assistant professor. A dossier is presented before a review board. If the review is successful, he/she is recommended for tenure. Once tenure is achieved, the faculty member may advance to full professor. The tasks of tenured faculty members include teaching, service, chairing committees, and supervision of doctoral graduate students (USDE, 2008). Although the tenure system was restructured and abandoned by some institutions, “it remains the prevailing process for developing academic faculty in U.S. higher education” (USNEI, 2008). It is important to know the responsibilities related to faculty members. Promotion for each professorial rank is enacted by administrative decision-makers, and committee members, in which a discourse of hierarchical distinction consists power distribution, production and value of labor.

Academic institutions have taken steps in becoming welcoming environments and inclusive of racial and sexual orientation minorities. So far, higher education institutions have implemented protection, amended mission statements incorporating racial and sexual orientation, and LGBT topics have been integrated by many faculty members into the curriculum (Holley,
Despite these advancements, the decisions to come out as faculty members may have job-related repercussions such as feelings of isolation, consequences working with students, and risks of jeopardizing professoriate rank promotion (Holley, 2011).

The challenge of conducting LGBT research in academic institutions are to be identified to participate you need to be ‘out’. Sexual orientation is not as evident as gender or race/ethnicity. Being out might still constitute a problem for LGBT faculty members in their work environment (Renn, 2010). Bensimon (1992) indicates homosexuality in the academic culture appears as a public/private dualism “rooted in the ideology of patriarchy” (p. 99) using standpoint feminist epistemology to analyze a life story of a lesbian faculty member and her experience in a higher education institution in the U.S. For Bensimon, the public/private discourse within heterosexual circles affect the sexual minority members in academic institutions. To make matters more complex, Crossley & Broadfoot (1992) described academic “institutions result of complex political struggles [that may resist] implementation of alternative approaches” (p.100).

**Puerto Rico Higher Education System**

The primary source of information for this section was the Council of Higher Education in Puerto Rico (2004). After the end of the Spanish–American War and the Treaty of Paris in 1898, Puerto Rico was transferred from Spain to the United States. With the Jones Act (1917), Puerto Ricans became recognized as U.S. citizens, and in 1952, the Commonwealth political structure allowed Puerto Rico to maintain diverse fiscal and sociocultural autonomy. However, Puerto Rico’s economy and political climate has been continuously impacted by migration and
globalization factors due to the relationship and colonization of Puerto Rico by the United States. In 1900, the Escuela Normal/Normal School is established in the municipality of Fajardo (east of Puerto Rico) with the purpose to provide formal education to teachers from the public education system. In 1903, the Normal School moved to the municipality of San Juan (North, capital of Puerto Rico) as a Land-Grant College provided by the Unites States Congress. From 1912, several higher education institutions were also founded by U.S. missionaries—Interamerican University (1912), Sacred Heart (1935), Catholic University in Ponce (1948)—having a religious component in their academic structure. In 1944, The Polytechnic Institute became the first higher academic institution in Puerto Rico to be accredited by the U.S. Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools. In 1960 higher academic institutions in Puerto Rico begin to geographically expand all over the island. In 1966, an administrative system in the University of Puerto Rico is established. This system consists of an executive president and the Consejo de Educación Superior/Council of Higher Education. The purpose of this council is to oversee both private and public higher education institutions in Puerto Rico and to provide education licenses to postsecondary schools, such as vocational schools, and applied technology. The Council of Higher Education is a separate entity not affiliated to the University of Puerto Rico. The University of Puerto Rico is governed by a board of trustees. The Council of Higher Education is composed by the Secretary of Education of PUERTO RICO, and eight members appointed by the Governor of Puerto Rico. From 1970, further expansions occur in the higher education system of Puerto Rico with new universities and the U.S. economic assistance programs. Puerto Rico’s geographical distribution consists of 78 municipalities. Located in the
north, San Juan is the capital and the urban center of Puerto Rico (See Figure 2.1).

Figure 2.1.

Municipalities of Puerto Rico

Throughout Puerto Rico, there are a total of 46 public higher education institutions and 39 private higher education institutions. From the 39 private institutions, 23 are non-profit, 11 are for-profit institutions and 5 are religious, non-profit institutions—three Catholic, one Protestant and one Adventist. Higher education institutions in Puerto Rico are evaluated in two ways: by the Council of Higher Education (required), and U.S. entities such as the Middle States Commission of higher Education, Accrediting Council for Independent Colleges and Schools. U.S. evaluations are voluntary (Figure 2.2).
The criteria for faculty members in Puerto Rico to achieve tenure and be considered for promotion are: submit a dossier, two-thirds of the dossier is given to enseñanza–aprendizaje/teaching–learning. One-third of the dossier is composed of research, publications, creative work and service related to the discipline. Other criteria include teaching experience, teaching quality, and service to the institution and community (Sarrier Olivera, 2015). The timeline for faculty members to achieve faculty promotion rank are as follows:

- Assistant Professor to Associate Professor (3 years of service)
- Associate Professor to Full Professor (5 years of service)

**Intersectionality and Latino Critical Theory**

This study uses intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1991; MacKinnon, 1991) and Latino Critical
theory (LatCrit) (Hernández–Truyol, 1998; Valdes, 2011) theories as theoretical lens to look at the data collected from a group of LGBQ Latina and Chicana faculty members residing in the United States (LGBQ–LX), and Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Queer Puerto Rican faculty members residing in Puerto Rico (LGBQ–P.R.) learning experiences in academia.

Intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1989, 1991) stemmed from Black women’s experience attending the inequalities and centering on Black women’s multidimensional experiences. The site where intersectionality initially took place was juridical and political (Carbado, 2013; Crenshaw, 1991). "It exposed how single-axis thinking undermines legal thinking, disciplinary knowledge production, and struggles for social justice" (Cho, Crenshaw & McCall, 2013, p. 787). Moving juridical to academic institutions as an analytical approach, intersectionality recognizes and contends race, gender, class and sexual orientation realities, interactions, and distinctive dynamics (MacKinnon, 2013). Intersectionality as a method aims to address where realities of race, gender and class converge (Mackinnon, 1991).

Intersectionality has shown social hierarchy “creates the experiences that produce the categories that intersect” (MacKinnon, 1991, p. 1024). This definition, however, does not include educational factors, missing perspectives that consider learning processes between LGBQ faculty members and the academic culture. Intersectionality in this study helped to further compare themes while using participant’s quotes to illustrate where the themes intersect and where they diverge.

In this study intersectionality is used as a comparative tool by exploring the experiences of the selected group of participants recognizing these faculty members live at the intersection of culturally relevant distinctions of gender, race, class, sexual orientation. Intersectionality
brought to the foreground the experiences of marginalized subjects who had previously been ignored (Nash, 2008). Intersectionality does not leave room for mystification of minority ideologies, speculations, or reconceptualization of socio-cultural generalizations. Crenshaw (1989) argued “Black women are sometimes excluded from feminist theory and antiracist policy discourse because both are predicated on a discrete set of experiences that often does not accurately reflect the interaction of race and gender” (p. 140). Latino Critical theory (LatCrit) (Hernández–Truyol, 1998; Valdes, 2000) saw Black women’s exclusion from feminist theory and policies developing on the realities of race discourse beyond the black/white binary paradigms.

Latino Critical theory recognizes Latinos as a contesting site for normativity (Hernández–Truyol, 1998) validating multidimensional identities addressing realities and experiences with "language, immigration, ethnicity, culture, identity, phenotype, and sexuality" (Hernández-Truyol, 1997). LatCrit recognizes the border culture complexities (Anzaldúa, 1987) the negotiating space and place (i.e. belonging). For example, positing queer Latina, Chicanas, and Puerto Ricans as a group straddling a heteronormative machismo culture within as well as outside the academic culture. LatCrit offered this study a lens in which I could look at the participant’s stories and look for particularities of linguistic expressions, beliefs and lived experiences; acknowledging invisibility, family culture, and comunidad Latina/Latino community. By acknowledging their constituencies, I steer away from conceptualizing intersectionality as a practice consisting of adding variables. Latino Critical theory supports the group of LGBQ–LX and LGBQ–P.R. faculty members who participated in this study recognizing their multidimensional identities, differences, and similarities as faculty members in
academic institutions.

The importance of this study to the overall research literature on female gender, racial and sexual minority faculty members is built upon the premise LGBQ–LX and LGBQ–P.R. faculty members make valuable contributions to society through their service, activities, and research; therefore, is essential to understand who they are, what they do, and what they learned about their lived experiences in the academic culture. LGBQ–Latina, Chicana, and Puerto Rican faculty members may have been included in this discourse assuming they might have experienced or belong to similar diversity. I argue, these experiences may not accurately reflect selected LGBQ Latina, Chicana, and Puerto Rican faculty interactions. Much of the feminist work regarding the LGBQ faculty of color has been focused on troubling white heteronormativity of the academic system. This study contributes to the research literature cross-culturally comparing the learning experiences of two groups of faculty members.

Some have concluded intersectionality as abstract, but MacKinnon sees it as critical stance on how hierarchy works as a process in motion” (MacKinnon, 1991, p.1024). Moving MacKinnon’s conversation of 2007 on genocide of Muslim women to LGBQ faculty members: “It is not their identities that is problematic or problematized but the consequences of how they are socially identified and hence treated” (MacKinnon, 2013, p. 1028) To compare genocide with LGBQ faculty member’s experiences in the academic culture is like comparing apples to oranges. But, what we can learn and apply this knowledge into this study is on the inequalities of LGBQ faculty members and their institutional culture.

In using LatCrit and Intersectionality as a theoretical lens, participants in my study constituted a visible source of resilience, strength and creativity; occupying center position
(unlike margins) of this study. I conduct this study acknowledging the oppressions of gender, racial and sexual orientation among LGBQ Latinas, Chicanas, and Puerto Rican in academic and social culture. Stemming from Rosabal, “Our struggles against interlocking systems of oppression, our personal, political, and social victories, and our survival are equally important aspects of our identity. Just as we grow from refusing to fragment ourselves into single components of our identity, we gain strength and celebration from exploring and presenting a balanced picture of who we are” (1996, p. 19).

Comparison

Comparative and international studies define comparison as an analytical approach of two or more entities brought together and put side by side to look “for similarities and differences between or among them” (Postlethwaite, 1988, p. xvii). This study positions itself in the scope of comparative and international education drawing elements from traditional comparative methodological concepts (Raivola, 1985) such as functional equivalence, “objects have the same role in the functioning of the system” (p. 367). In this study, functional equivalence, the profession in itself—being faculty members—is defined as equivalent because the components such as culture (academia), work tasks (teaching, mentoring, service, and scholarship) correspond to each other. Puerto Rico’s higher education system is connected to the United States’ higher education system. Therefore, comparability rests on the participant’s role as faculty members in the academic culture.

Comparative and international education has been mostly used for systemic data (Bray, 2010) in organizations such as The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
(OECD), World Bank, and The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) whose primary purposes are economic aid, education and reconstruction of less developed countries. The research conducted by these organizations are scientific, statistically and country-based managing large supra-national analyses (Bray, 2010). This study is based on a smaller population in the scope of comparative and international education.

In this study, a comparison was used as an analytical approach post-thematic analysis where I further looked at the two sets of themes (one theme set from the U.S., and one theme set from Puerto Rico) while recognizing the text’s texture represented in the participant’s language use. Following Fairclough (1995) text texture are the form, organization and properties of the narratives that constitute “sensitive indicators of sociocultural processes, relations and change (p. 4). To this definition of text texture, I also want to add learning processes. Because this study is founded on narrative inquiry, I understood language use as a primary component of the text’s texture; more so than language in its socio-cultural context. Fairclough (1995) supported and furthered my understanding of language use in his statement on discourse where:

... language use [is] imbricated in social relations and processes which systematically determine variations in its properties, including the linguistic forms which appear in texts. One aspect of this imbrication in the social which is inherent to the notion of discourse is that language is a material form of ideology, and language is invested by ideology. (p. 73)

To my understanding, when using a comparative approach in which language is the
primary source of data, cultural, ideological, intellectual, perceptual and educational instances are imbricated. Participants use of language and properties of language are defined by their social-institutional culture and/or practices (Fairclough, 1995). I also understand this imbrication occur simultaneously with experience.

**Experiential Learning**

Experience is in everyday life (Dewey, 1938; Lindeman, 1926). As such, it has been central to adult learning theory and practice. Experiential learning distinguishes meaning-making as a dynamic process instead of categorizing educational process in the realms of formal and informal education sites. Experiential learning is as much theoretical as it practical. Drawing Fenwick’s (2003) five orientations of experiential learning—constructivist, situative, psychoanalytic, critical cultural, and complexity theory, I place this study between constructivist theory (Vygotsky, 1978) where knowledge is a construction of socio-cultural interactions, and situated theory (Lave & Wenger, 1991), where individuals are active participants in the culture. I see LGBQ–LX and LGBQ–PR faculty members as active participants in their academic culture, not in the margins. Additionally, learning is imbricated from one meaningful experience to the next. The site(s) where experiential learning occurs are not situated in a specific place/space, for example, a classroom or a workplace; learning is a lifelong process occurring in different spaces. Doing in adult learning involves engagement and on-going sense-making about the lived experiences.

Experiential learning acknowledges the learning process as much as the outcome. It is parallel to activities of meaning-making and social action. That is, social action done by individuals as active participants within community action and culture (Fenwick, 2003). This
study then is tied to adult learning by way of experiential learning contributing to legitimating “people’s experience as significant in their knowledge development” (Fenwick, 2003, p. 3).

To disrupt dominant notions and ways experiential learning has been implemented, Fenwick proposed different alternatives with the intention to open space for dialogue among the adult learning community. Initially, I considered situated learning (Lave & Wenger, 1991) for this study because my assumptions of learning for faculty members occurred in a specified community, such as an academic institution, afforded by tools (discourse) and activities where knowledge emerge from participation (doing) (Lave & Wenger 1991). However, situated learning is done in present time and is not represented as a flowing process, nor does it take into account, a holistic process to learning. What I was looking for was an adult education theoretical perspective informed by racial consciousness, navigating the margins of a dominant culture as minorities of sexual orientation and gender.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I summarized the context of being a LGBQ Latina, Chicana, faculty member in the United States higher education system or LGBQ Puerto Rican faculty member in the Puerto Rico higher education system, respectively. What is certain, other than the Spanish colonial heritage, is that these cultures share histories of colonialism, migration and assimilation and acculturation. I also provided a description of the U.S. and Puerto Rican higher education culture. Then, I discussed the theoretical framework for this study based on Latino Critical theory (Hernández–Truyol, 1998; Valdes, 2011) and experiential learning (Fenwick, 2003). As a reminder, intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1991; MacKinnon, 1991) will be used as a comparative
tool to explore how the two sets of themes (one set for the U.S. and one set for Puerto Rico) revealed by the thematic analysis converge and diverge.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN

This chapter discusses the research methods I used for this study. I begin by providing a rationale for using narrative inquiry. There are two separate kinds of theme sets: one theme set for the U.S. and one theme set for Puerto Rico. Consecutively, there are two thematic analyses—one data analysis for the U.S., and one data analysis for P.R.—demonstrating the analytical process of how I arrived at each theme set.

Research Questions

The following overarching question guided this research:

How did selected Latina, Chicana, and Puerto Rican faculty members in higher education institutions in the United States and Puerto Rico learned to succeed as university faculty?

The sub questions are:

● How did selected LGBQ Latina, Chicana, and Puerto Rican faculty members learn their institutional culture?

● In what way, if any, did LGBQ Latina, Chicana, and Puerto Rican faculty members distinguish themselves from non-LGBQ faculty? How did this shape their learning institutional culture?

Narrative Inquiry

Narrative inquiry is a method of analyzing stories as told by an individual or a group of individuals. The stories are a reconstruction of lived experiences. The author (individual)
organizes and reconstructs their lived experience how they recall and understand events or actions. In this study, I relied on narrative analysis to examine the stories as told by a group of LGBQ Latina and Chicana faculty members located in higher education academic institutions in the United States (LGBQ–LX) and LGBQ Puerto Rican faculty members located in higher education academic institutions in Puerto Rico (LGBQ–P.R.). Clandinin & Connelly (2000) and Riessman (2008) informed my narrative analysis. Riessman invites the researcher to use various sources while remaining close to the data. Similarly, Clandinin and Connelly (2000) approach narrative analysis with flexibility, allowing the content of the data collected to guide the researcher in the analysis process.

Narrative inquiry is best suited to explore the experiences of a given population because characteristics are deemed flexible and shift depending on the situation (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). Narrative research explores how individuals experience and make meaning of the world through their use of language in storytelling (Riessman, 2008). These stories may reveal features of individuals’ identities. Sources of data collection consists of interviews, observation, memorabilia, or biographical documents (such as CVs, blogs, webpages). This study collected such stories by audio recording open-ended interviews of participants.

Narrative inquiry is different from phenomenology, which is driven by a phenomenon experienced within a group of people (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Riessman, 2008). In narrative inquiry, the researcher collects stories and use the narratives as data to search and identify ways people engage in the world (Creswell, 2013). A characteristic of narrative inquiry is for the analysis to be data-driven, meaning, that my chosen role as researcher was to allow the data to drive the analysis (inductive). Following an inductive approach, my initial process of
coding the data was done without fitting to a preexisting theoretical frame. As opposed to the researcher controlling the data having a preconceived theoretical frame. Allowing the analysis to be data-driven, the researcher may consider integrating interdisciplinary sources (Riessman, 2008).

In following a narrative approach, open-ended interview was the main data collection instrument. Interview questions were constructed with a purpose to generate conversation gathering in-depth stories. During the interview, unexpected stories were considered important, especially when a participant shared a lived event in detail. Gee (2005) and Riessman (1993, 2008) understand a major life disruption or turning-point is reconstructed into a detailed story. Likewise, when an individual experiences a genuine discovery, it is usually placed at the end of a story. For example, a genuine discovery may begin when a participant said, “and that’s when I learned . . .” or “and that’s when I discovered . . .”.

An important facet to obtain rich-detailed stories from the participants in an open-ended interview require longer turns at talk (Riessman, 2008, p. 24) compared to modes of ordinary conversation. Generating narrative are open questions aimed to ‘generate’ open answers, detailed accounts, and in-depth information in the form of stories. Appendix F consists of additional questions I prepared as script in case the conversation became stagnant or whenever I needed clarification. From this script (See Appendix F), the questions I used the most during the interviews were:

- Please explain what you meant by __?
- Help me understand what you meant when you said ___?
Can you say more about __? I filled the blanks with the specific topic I needed clarification on.

**Recruitment Criterion**

To have participated in this study participants must have been in tenure-track positions, or have attained tenure or be retired from tenure at a public or private higher education institution in the United States or Puerto Rico who: (a) identify as female; (b) identify as Latina, Chicana, Hispanic, or Puerto Rican; and (c) identify as lesbian, bisexual, queer or gay.

**Data Collection**

Data collection was conducted via open-ended interviews. Snowballing was the best recruitment strategy for the selected population. Initially, seven LGBQ Latina faculty members were contacted via email. These LGBQ Latina faculty members were initially contacted because they are scholars/academics who have published and/or explored their sexual identity openly in the academic world. I received two responses agreeing to participate. I posted the invitation letter on my Facebook page and Facebook groups and it was also sent to various LGBT centers at universities nationwide. Sending to LGBT centers at universities did not result in responses. I decided at the end of the first interview to approach the participant by asking if they knew other LGBQ Latina faculty members who they thought might fit the criteria for this study and if they were willing to share names. India and Sandra (U.S.) were recruited using this strategy. Ruth was
recruited upon a recommendation by a “Facebook friend.” Likewise, Dolores was recruited via a participant’s invitation.

My initial plan was to follow Seidman’s (2013) *Three Interview Series*, a method where researchers and participants settle on three separate 90-minute interviews. However, feedback from a contact person led me to change the criteria: “Se lo mandé como a 20 personas/I sent it to about 20 persons. You might anticipate some hesitancy given the degree of involvement required—three 90-minute phone conversations is a lot! Hopefully the women will contact you anyways and you can explain. Best of luck.” (Email correspondence, September 15, 2016). I eliminated the required three 90-minute structured interviews. To accommodate the hectic schedules of these participants as faculty members, once potential participants showed interest in the study, I asked the participants to determine the interview length that suited them best. I also provided each participant with a choice of answering all interview questions in one interview or scheduling separate interviews for each question. Sylvia chose to do three separate interviews. India and Sandra scheduled two interviews. They opted to answer the second and third interview questions during their second interview. Lolita, Ruth, Olga and Dolores chose to answer all three interview questions in one interview.

Prior to the first interview, all participants were provided with a consent form that included the interview questions (See Appendix D—Consent Form/Interview Questions, English). Participants in Puerto Rico were provided with a Spanish consent form that included the interview questions in Spanish (See Appendix E—Consent Form/Interview Questions, Spanish). Participants were also asked to choose between a phone interview or Facetime interview. All participants preferred phone interviews. Ruth and Olga preferred phone interviews
because at times Internet connections in Puerto Rico may fail. Six participants provided their cell phone number except for Dolores. Dolores used her university office phone number. All seven participants agreed to answer and/or provide clarifications if need be. All participants agreed the interviews be audio-recorded for transcription purposes. I used FaceTime audio to conduct all phone interviews.

To record the interviews, I used Ecamm software for FaceTime. Since Dolores’s office phone number used an extension, her phone interview was recorded using a digital recorder, placed next to my cell phone in speaker mode. At the end of each interview, I exported the audio interview to an .mp3 format, uploaded it to a designated Dropbox folder where a paid transcriber would have access to it. Having this Dropbox folder also served to back-up the .mp3 interview audio file. For me, using Dropbox was more secure than mailing thumb drives containing data (having the potential of getting lost in the mail) or sending the audio file via email.

Following Creswell (2013), Riessman (2008) and Gee (2005), I arranged each interview transcript in a chronological sequence of events, so every interview transcript followed a similar structure. Since the interview questions were open-ended, chronology helped structure the gathered information to give a sense of time (past, present and future). Lolita and Sandra followed a chronological order from graduate school through becoming faculty members. Sylvia began her interview with snapshots of her life, then proceeded to narrate the story of how she was hired at her institution. Ruth, Olga and Dolores were linear as they told their stories moving from a lived event to the next in a time-orderly way.

**Interview Questions**

Participants located in the United States were interviewed in English. Three questions guided
the interview (See Appendix D—Consent Form/Interview Questions, English):

1. Tell me as much as possible about yourself and your journey as an LGBQ Latina faculty member from your beginnings in academia up to your attainment of tenure.

2. Please tell me about your workday. Take me through what you do from the moment you wake up until the time you fall asleep.

3. Given what you have said about your experience in higher education as you attained tenure and given what you have said about your workday, what advice do you have for future LGBQ Latina faculty members entering the tenure process in a higher education institution in the United States?

Sandra was a non-tenured LGBQ–LX faculty member (assistant professor). I adjusted the third interview question to fit her professorial rank:

Given what you have said about your experience in higher education, and given what you have said about your workday, what advice do you have for future LGBQ Latina faculty members entering higher education institutions in the U.S.?

Participants residing in Puerto Rico were interviewed in Spanish. I translated the interview questions from English to Spanish:
1. Hábleme lo más posible sobre usted y su trayectoria como miembro de facultad LGBQ desde sus inicios en el mundo académico hasta lograr la permanencia en su institución académica. Sea lo más explícita posible.

2. Por favor hable acerca de un día laboral, comenzando desde que despierta hasta el momento que se queda dormida.

3. Teniendo en cuenta lo que ha dicho acerca de sus vivencias en la educación superior para lograr la permanencia, y teniendo en cuenta lo que ha dicho acerca de su día de trabajo, qué consejo le daría a futuros miembros de la facultad LGBQ que entran en el proceso de permanencia en una institución de educación superior en Puerto Rico?

Ruth retired from higher education, but still holds a part-time faculty position. As with Sandra, I edited the third question to fit her current position.

Teniendo en cuenta lo que nos ha dicho acerca de sus vivencias en la educación superior y teniendo en cuenta lo que ha dicho acerca de su día de trabajo, qué consejo le daría a futuros miembros de la facultad LGBQ que entran en una institución de educación secundaria en Puerto Rico?

Each interview question was constructed to generate conversation and allow participants to
provide detailed information about themselves in different times (past, present and future. With the first interview question, “Tell me as much as possible about yourself and your journey as an LGBQ Latina faculty member from your beginnings in academia up to your attainment of tenure” I sought to capture as much as possible about the history and/or experiences (past) of each participant within the academic culture.

The second interview question, “Please tell me about your workday. Take me through what you do from the moment you wake up until the time you fall asleep” was constructed to gather as much detail as possible of the participant’s present experiences; knowing their work tasks in their academic institutions.

The third question, “Given what you have said about your lived experience in higher education as you attained tenure and given what you have said about your workday, what advice do you have for future LGBQ Latina faculty members entering the tenure process in a higher education institution in the United States?” intended to capture what the participants have learned from their experiences at their institutional culture.

While the participants were answering the interview question, I took notes for follow-up questions or clarification questions. After the interviews, I wrote observation notes. While I waited to receive the audio-transcriptions from paid transcribers, I listened several times to each interview and wrote reflections (field notes) on their use of language, silences, when pauses were made, or conversation topics that caught my attention. In keeping field notes I felt present, mindful and reflective of the data. Data sources consisted of seven participants, 21 interviews, totaling 6 hours, 14 minutes and 42 seconds of audio.
Participants

Four participants from the United States (Sylvia, India, Lolita and Sandra) were interviewed in English. During the interviews Sylvia and India code switched from Spanish to English. Code switching among Puerto Ricans occur as the blurring of two languages (Hill, 1998 in Duranti, 2009, p. 481); in this study, Sylvia and India code switched using English to Spanish. Because Spanish is the official language in Puerto Rico, LGBQ–P.R. (Ruth, Olga, Dolores) were interviewed in Spanish. Some Puerto Rican participants code-switched several times (Spanish to English).

Table 3.1
Participant Descriptive Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Ethnicity/Race</th>
<th>Sexual Orientation</th>
<th>First-Generation College Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sylvia</td>
<td>U.S. Full-Professor</td>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>U.S. Full-Professor</td>
<td>Latina</td>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lolita</td>
<td>U.S. Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Chicana/Latina</td>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>U.S. Tenure-track</td>
<td>Chicana/Latina</td>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>P.R. Retired</td>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>Undisclosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olga</td>
<td>P.R. Full-Professor</td>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>Undisclosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolores</td>
<td>P.R. Full-Professor</td>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>Undisclosed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assumptions

This study conformed to the Code of Ethics (AERA, 2011) following confidentiality and ethics parameters throughout the research process. To maintain confidentiality for each participant, I used the following measures to treat the data:

- I removed all personal identifiers and replaced them by pseudonyms.
I chose the name pseudonyms for each participant post-interviews based on well-known Latina, Chicana, or Puerto Rican activists and artists.

All cities and states, institution names, department and programs mentioned by the participants during interview were bracketed and replaced with generic names: [City] or [State], [University], [Department], [Center], [Program].

Prior to the interview, I provided each participant with a consent letter explaining the purpose and goal of the study, confidentiality with the information they provide and interview questions. (See Appendix D)

I planned the date and time for the interview(s) with each participant via email. I asked each participant their interview preference—Facetime or phone. All participants chose phone interview.

Data Analysis, LGBQ Latina and Chicana Faculty Members (U.S.)

Familiarizing Myself with the Data

The interviews conducted in English were transcribed by a paid transcriptionist. India at times spoke in Spanish and did code-switching. Her interview was transcribed by a paid transcriptionist fluent in Spanish and English. The interviews conducted with participants located in academic institutions in Puerto Rico were conducted in Spanish. The interviews were transcribed in Spanish by a paid transcriptionist in Puerto Rico.

After receiving each transcription, I listened to the audio recordings to check and correct (if needed) each transcription. After checking the transcriptions along with the interview audio, I
proceeded to change any identifying information such as names, places (universities and cities) with my chosen pseudonyms to retain confidentiality. City names were generalized and bracketed as [City]. In the instances where participants included multiple cities, I used [City A], [City B]. Demographical information, or any other specific information mentioned during the interview that could “out” the participants was bracketed and names as ‘undisclosed’. For example, [undisclosed age] or [undisclosed year]. In the process of writing pseudonyms and bracketing specific information, each transcription was read several times. I also used this time to write down my initial ideas (Braun & Clarke, 2006) and thoughts about the participant’s experience in the academic culture.

I translated each Spanish interview for participants located in Puerto Rico to English for language equivalence in the coding process. To translate, I mainly used Google translate, Linguee as well as Internet websites: dictionary.com, thesaurus.com and the online Diccionario de la Real Academia Española/Dictionary of the Spanish Academy.

Following Reissman (2008), I cleaned the interviews from utterances such as “eh,” “um,” “you know,” “like,” and “right.” Silences and their durations were written as ((2 sec. silence)), while bracketed ellipsis [. . .] were used to demonstrate when the participant made short pauses. Laughs were also kept in the transcriptions as ((laughs)) detailing participant’s emotion. I understood pauses and laughs to add richness and depth to their experiences. Then, each interview was ordered chronologically (Gee, 1999; Riessman, 2008). The act of storytelling depends on recollection of events and how the individual reconstructs the lived experience (i.e. order of events, place, actions, feelings and actors). Although the interview question one was designed to collect the historicity of each participant, during the interview participants may not
follow a strict temporal order events. Therefore, after re-reading various times each transcription, I organized question one to reflect a life history chronology: from beginning experiences in academia (as graduate student or first professorial job), through the present.

I drew on Riessman (2008) and Braun and Clarke (2006) for the data analysis, but I drew mainly on Braun and Clarke’s thematic analysis to analyze my data. Thematic analysis drew on the insights offered by discourse analysis (Fairclough, 2010; Gee, 1995). The analysis considered the stories participants shared related to the research question, the thematic patterns across the interviews, and how participants reconstructed their stories.

The unit of analysis (Boyatzis, 1998) in this study is the academic culture. The results of this study and tables were based on the United States and Puerto Rico academic cultures; that is, within and between two cultures. The unit of coding is experience. Experience was determined as the unit of coding because it provided sufficient opportunities from the information gathered for a “codable moment” (Boyatzis, 1998).

**Generating Initial Codes**

After familiarizing myself by listening to the audio recordings of the interviews, reading and rereading the interview transcriptions, and organizing the interviews chronologically, I generated a list of ideas, events, and particularities of language use for each participant. At this stage of the study, I focused on identifying themes at a semantic level, in which “the themes are identified within the explicit or surface meanings of the data” (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 84). Later, to fulfil the cross-cultural comparison of this study, I drew on a latent approach, which, “goes beyond the semantic approach, and starts to identify or examine underlying ideas, assumptions, and conceptualizations—and ideologies—that are theorized as shaping or
informing the semantic content of the data” (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 84).

I proceeded to do the initial coding following Braun and Clarke’s (2006) phase producing initial codes, “Codes identify a feature of the data that appears interesting to the analyst, and refer to ‘the most basic segment, or element, of the raw data or information that can be assessed in a meaningful way regarding the phenomenon’” (Boyatzis, 1998, p. 63; Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 88). During the initial coding, I looked for stories that related to how each participant experienced their academic culture. I also looked for ways participants talked about their experiences. In other words, as I re-read each transcription several times, I asked myself, “Why was the story told that way?” (Riessman, 1993, p. 2). Then, I pulled out those chunks of narratives I highlighted. Those chunks became “data extracts.” In this analytical process, data extracts were analyzed and collated into short, meaningful segments of data. These were written in the “Coded for” column. The process of moving from the short segments of data to initial codes was performed by further reducing the data (See Figure 3.2 – Braun & Clarke, 2006). I did this for all the participants.

Table 3.2.
Sample, Data Extract, Initial Coding, and Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Extracts</th>
<th>Coded for:</th>
<th>Initial Codes</th>
<th>Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No, the thing is that I came late to academia. [AH: Ok.] You know like I had a Ph.D. and I had written in academic affects and to academic presses but actually don’t have an academic job till in my . . . well into my [undisclosed age]. And by that time some of . . . I mean a lot of my reputation, intellectual reputation,</td>
<td>Scholar reputation preceded the academic appointment</td>
<td>Established academic reputation before academia</td>
<td>Institutional Perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Negotiating space:</em> between Sylvia’s job placement, how</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
was already established. [AH: Ok.] UHMM so it wasn’t something like people learned while I was at the university or had any real weight in the process. I was recruited as a [undisclosed studies] person. In fact, I once saw a survey of white faculty diversity and I was not noted as a lesbian ((laughs)). [AH: Ok.] I was only noted as a Latina. [AH: Ok.] So it’s interesting that on the one hand that’s perhaps because of the way I was recruited and the way the department and the university sees me as a . . . the work that I do on Latinos more generally is what is important to them. So that’s what they see most.

| Categories | In Table 3.3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional actions, tokenism</td>
<td>Institution sees her, and her work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional ideology</td>
<td>Noted as a Latina, not lesbian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional perception</td>
<td>Institution “sees” only her work on Latinos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To create sub-themes from the categories, I copied the “Categories” column (See Table 4.1) from all participants and pasted all columns in an Excel spreadsheet. Then, I sorted (A – Z) the categories (See Table 3.3).

Table 3.3.

Sample, Sorted Categories List

To arrive to the sub-themes, I collated the categories with shared similar words (See Table 3.4). I also created a qualitative codebook of codes “that would be stable and represent the
coding analysis” (Creswell, 2013, p. 254) across the data.

Table 3.4
Example, Collated Categories and Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Collated Categories (Sub-themes)</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional selective perception</td>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution ideology, diversity</td>
<td>Ideology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I sorted the collated categories and themes identified across the data for LGBQ–LX participants. It was helpful at this point in the data analysis to create a visual representation to begin thinking about the different relationships between themes and subthemes regarding the LGBQ Latina and Chicana faculty member’s experiences in the academic culture. I created the following mind map (See Figure 3.5).

Figure 3.5
Initial Thematic Map, Selected LGBQ–LX Faculty Member’s Experience in the United States Academic Culture
Reviewing Themes

After creating the Initial Thematic Map, I read all the collated categories and considered whether they formed a pattern. The instances when not enough data was found relevant across categories to support the sub-themes or themes, they were deemed unfit and problematic and were discarded from further analysis (Braun and Clarke, 2006, p. 91). For other sub-themes and themes, individual data extracts were further collapsed arriving at three candidate themes (See Figure 3.4) that “adequately captured the contours of the data” (ibid.). To have an accurate representation of the data, some sub-themes that were missing in the Initial Thematic Analysis “Discourse, Faculty Member,” “navigate” and “tool” were added to the Developed Thematic Map (See Figure 3.6).

Figure 3.6

Developed Thematic Map, Selected LGBQ–LX Faculty Member’s Experience in the United States Academic Culture
Defining and Naming Themes

For this phase I furthered refined the sub-themes and themes to identify “the essence of what each theme was about” (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 92). I reviewed the categories of each theme and organized them into a coherent and consistent account. In addition to considering the word frequency for each sub-theme and theme, I noticed how subthemes and themes were connected. For example, “Ally” was located within a “contradiction,” or in conjunction to “pay forward,” or as part of their “Discourse as LGBQ faculty members.” These final themes resulted from the process of further refining the sub-themes and themes (See Figure, 3.7).

Figure 3.7

Final Thematic Map, Selected LGBQ–LX Faculty Member’s Experience in United States Academic Culture

Thus, concludes the thematic analysis for LGBQ Latina and Chicana faculty member’s experience in the U.S. academic culture. In the following section, I provide a detailed analysis of the themes and sub-themes supported with participant’s quotes.
Data Analysis, LGBQ Puerto Rican Faculty Members (P.R.)

Generating Initial Codes

To generate the initial codes for participants located in higher education institutions in Puerto Rico (LGBQ–P.R.), I used the same procedure (See pp. 45-48) to “work systematically throughout the entire data set” (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 89). Therefore, I familiarized myself with the data by listening to the audio recordings of the interviews I reread the interview transcriptions, and organizing the interviews chronologically. I generated a list of ideas, events, and particularities of language use for each participant. Then, just as previously done with participants located in the U.S. (p. 26-28), I focused on identifying themes resulting in the following Initial Thematic Map (See Figure 3.8).
Figure 3.8

Initial Thematic Map, Selected LGBQ–PR Faculty Member’s Experience in the Puerto Rican Academic Culture
Reviewing Themes

After I created the Initial Thematic Map, I read all the collated categories and considered whether they formed a pattern. If there was not enough data across the data to support the sub-themes or themes, then they were deemed not fitting and were discarded from further analysis. For other subthemes and themes, they were further collated arriving at three candidate themes; the Developed Thematic Mind Map (See Figure 3.9). To have an accurate representation of the data, I added “Changes: Institutional Culture” and “Changes sociocultural ideology”; Categories missing in the Initial Thematic Analysis.

Figure 3.9

Developed Thematic Map, Selected LGBQ–PR Faculty Member’s Experience in the Puerto Rican Academic Culture
Defining and Naming Themes

Like the thematic analysis for LGBQ–LX, I further refined the subthemes and themes to identify “the essence of what each theme was about” (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 92). I reviewed the categories of each theme and organized them into a coherent and consistent account. In addition, I considered the word frequency and remained working consistently across the data set. The Final Thematic Map (Figure 3.10) resulted from further collating the sub-themes into themes.

Figure 3.10

Final Thematic Map, Selected LGBQ–PR Faculty Member's Experience in the Puerto Rican Academic Culture

Leadership
- exemplary institutional citizen
- visibility

Emotional Intelligence
- negotiation
- empowerment (being ‘out’)

This concludes the thematic analysis for LGBQ Puerto Rican faculty members. In the following section, I provide a detailed analysis of the themes and subthemes with identifying stories by each participant.

Comparison

I compared the theme sets for the United States (See Figures 3.5 – 3.7) and the theme sets
for Puerto Rico (See Figures 3.8 – 3.10). To compare both theme sets, I borrowed MacKinnon’s notion of “thinking intersectionally” (MacKinnon, 2013). I looked for similarities and differences between the LGBQ Latina and Chicana faculty members residing in the United States (LGBQ–LX) and LGBQ Puerto Rican faculty members residing in Puerto Rico (LGBQ–P.R.). Comparison began when I concluded both sets of thematic analysis: U.S. and Puerto Rico. I noticed overlapping themes between both sets of cultures (See Table 3.5). First, I explore how these themes converged, then I show how they differ in each culture.

Table 3.5
Theme Comparison, Selected LGBQ–LX and LGBQ–PR Faculty Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>United States</th>
<th>Similarities</th>
<th>Puerto Rico</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Culture</td>
<td>Memory</td>
<td>Silence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td></td>
<td>Invisibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The Only One”</td>
<td></td>
<td>Social/Professional Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>Socio-cultural practices / Social Pressures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invisibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belonging</td>
<td>Turning-point</td>
<td>Coming out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td>Being out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professoriate “I can be a professor”</td>
<td>Ally (being, becoming, pay forward)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiating space</td>
<td></td>
<td>Transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Closet (empowerment, being out)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse, LGBQ faculty member</td>
<td></td>
<td>Visibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Exemplary Institutional Citizen)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.5 was constructed based on the themes and subthemes that appeared in the
thematic analysis previously discussed. I compared the Initial Thematic Maps (See Figures 3.5 – 3.7 and Figures 3.8 – 3.10) taking into consideration both LGBQ–LX and LGBQ–P.R. faculty members to have a broad and detailed view of the themes and subthemes revealed for each group of participants. I began to check for similar themes (See Table 3.5, middle column). Then, I used the subthemes look for culturally relevant distinctions.

As indicated in Table 3.5, the similarities between the two selected groups of faculty members in the U.S. and P.R. were: “Memory,” “Turning-point,” “Ally (being, becoming and pay forward),” “Emotional Intelligence,” “Learning,” “Exemplary Institutional Citizen,” and “Discourse: LGBQ faculty member.” Although themes “Memory,” “Turning-point,” “Emotional Intelligence,” and “Learning” were shared in both cultures, I noticed a difference in the way these themes were manifested. For example, “Memory” appeared in the Initial Thematic Maps (See Figures 3.5 and 3.8). However, the differences were in the US; the memories expressed by the LGBQ–LX participants highlighted experiences of class, tokenism, family culture, value of education, and socio-culture/ethnicity. While the memories expressed by the selected participants from Puerto Rico were engrained in silence, invisibility, social/professional activities, and socio-cultural practices (social pressures).

**Limitations of the Study**

This study centered on a group of Latina, Chicana, and Puerto Rican faculty members who identified as either lesbian, bisexual, gay or queer. Transgender faculty members were not included in this study or other racial/ethnic minorities such as Black, Asian, and/or Native Americans.

Four LGBQ faculty members from the United States and three participants from Puerto
Rico agreed to participate in this study. Their experiences do not reflect the entire LGBQ–LX and LGBQ–P.R. population. The findings cannot be used to discover a definitive answer. Due to the small sample size, the results of this study cannot be generalized to the entire LGBQ population in both countries. However, insights may be revealed.

The results of this study cannot be replicated. The stories of these faculty members are strictly related to their experiences at their institutional culture. Each faculty member is situated within a sociocultural and academic framework; therefore, experiences may vary.

As a student in adult education, I was interested in exploring how LGBQ Latina, Chicana, and Puerto Rican faculty members learn their institutional culture and what characteristics distinguishes them from non-LGBQ faculty members. Drawing from the narrative research approach (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Riessman, 2008) I aimed to unravel and compare the narrative threads that make up a rich and thick description of LGBQ Latinas, Chicanas, and Puerto Rican faculty member’s experience. Collectively, their narratives provided a rich texture which described the learning process of how a selected group of LGBQ Latina, Chicana, and Puerto Rican faculty members made sense of their experiences.

I decided to do a comparative research study between the United States and Puerto Rico for several reasons. First, I sought to challenge my personal bias form my lived experiences in Puerto Rico in the 1990’s as a Puerto Rican lesbian. In seeking to challenge such bias, I found myself reflected in the stories of the U.S. participants. Second, growing up in Puerto Rico, I was familiar with the Puerto Rico education system. Due to time constraints, I would have needed more time to research education systems from Cuba and the Dominican Republic. My agenda does include the exploration of the education systems and recruitment of LGBQ faculty members.
from Cuba and the Dominican Republic. This agenda, therefore has a possibility to be published in Spanish, beginning in Puerto Rico. Third, if I would have conducted face-to-face interviews with the participants, Puerto Rico was a realistic choice for budgetary reasons.

**Data Validation Strategies**

The validation strategies implemented in this study where “member check,” “rich, thick descriptions” and “triangulation.” I conducted member checks with participants for respondent validation to “solicit participants’ views of the credibility of the findings and interpretations” (Creswell, 2013). Participants were provided with an electronic-copy of the thematic analysis which contained data extracts based on the information they provided in the interview (for context) and interpretations leading to coding and categories. Participants were asked to provide feedback and/or comment on my interpretations. In using thick description details about a theme to “enable the readers to transfer information to other settings and to determine whether the findings can be transferred ‘because of shared characteristics’” (Creswell, 2013, p. 252). I triangulated information locating different theories “to document a code or a theme in different sources of data and providing validity to their findings” (Creswell, 2013, p. 251).

Furthermore, following Creswell’s (2013) suggestions I focused on a selected group of participants. The interviews were designed to generate and collect stories about the participants’ experiences at their academic institutions related to their lives as faculty members. For the data analysis, I developed a chronology connecting “different phases and aspects” (Creswell, 2013, p. 259) from each participant’s story resulting in data extracts. A thematic analysis was conducted where themes derived within each culture unfolded a story which were later compared.
Conclusion

In this chapter, I established and discussed narrative inquiry (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Reissman, 2008) as the research method for this study. The data analysis of this study moved this study onward to work directly with the collected data adopting the researcher/analyst role. Reissman’s (2008) and Clandinin and Connelly’s (2006) approach to narrative inquiry seeks richness in the collected data material. They draw from multiple disciplines to allow the data to guide in every research decision. A research method based on narrative inquiry solidified the exploration of participant’s experience and meaning-making process through language use, story selection, ordering of stories, and reconstruction of events (Gee, 1995). Each piece of the research design: interview questions, recruitment criterion, data collection methods, assumptions and limitations of the study and analytical approach were meticulously chosen and worked for a perfect fit. I also discussed the data analysis of this study.

The collected data was categorized into two cultural sets: U.S. and Puerto Rico. Each set was worked separately. Following Braun & Clarke’s (2006) thematic analysis method was consistently applied to both sets of data. Each analytic step was described. The purpose to provide consistency and clarity was to contribute to the literature of qualitative approach. Braun and Clarke (2006) state, “an absence of clear and concise guidelines around thematic analysis means that the ‘anything goes’ [sic.] critique of qualitative research may well apply in some instances” (p. 78). Thematic maps visually illustrated as the themes and subthemes were collated and furthered refined arriving at the main themes. Thinking intersectionally (MacKinnon, 2013) was my approach to cross-cultural comparison. As a reminder, thinking intersectionally [ibid.] is not a method to intersect categories (Crenshaw, 1991). Intersectionality was a way of thinking
organically: from familiarizing with the data, through the comparative phase. For this study, I allowed the richness of the material to take control of the analysis process revealing a gamut of themes and textures in the collective experiences that otherwise might have been overlooked.
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS – UNITED STATES (LGBQ–LX)

Institutional Culture

Numerous stories and phrases were identified and labeled as institutional culture. Drawing from Fairclough (1995), institutional culture is a space composed by combined ideologies, events and practices; the gravitational pull of a specific set of discourses (i.e. academia), experiences and social practices. For me, institutional culture is dynamic and not static. Having a dynamic characteristic, it has an ability to develop and establish traditions through time (therefore, has a history). Institutional culture can be observed, learned and experienced. Because it can be experienced, during their interview, this group of participants provided their own definition based on their personal experiences as LGBQ–Latina and Chicana faculty members. Within institutional culture, sub-themes “learning,” “perceptions,” “Negotiating space,” “Discourse, LGBQ faculty members” and “practices and ideologies” were common across the data collected from LGBQ Latina and Chicana faculty members experience in the academic culture in U.S. institutions (LGBQ–LX). Next, a selection of quotes illustrates LGBQ Latina and Chicana faculty members experience in the academic culture.

“It’s a Brutal Culture”

Two participants (Sylvia and Lolita) openly described what being in the academic culture has been like for them. Their tone of voice was collected, and keen; I felt these were faculty members who have experienced the academic culture from different perspectives (in the role of teachers, mentors, scholars, and service).
Sylvia described what her first five years at Parsons U was like.

Parsons U was a pretty brutal institutional kind of . . . it had and has a fairly brutal institutional culture. It’s hard to survive if you . . . only the brave survive. [. . .] I was miserable for a couple of reasons. One—it’s a brutal culture. That means that people . . . it’s like that kind of hazing that happens where you’re tested all the time to see if you have what it takes, right? [AH: Correct.] And that’s not only intellectually. That’s also you know people don’t say good morning and people don’t say hello. They, they pretend you’re not there. ((laugh)) [AH: Right.] You know. Things like that I mean that you go through at the beginning and if you can’t handle it you’re going to crumble. And you can’t be there. So, I had ambivalence because I thought it was a rough place. (Sylvia)

Sylvia described her institutional culture as brutal. Her lived experience in her first five years at Parsons U was characterized by a “kind of hazing,” (p. 6) “being tested” (p. 6) intellectually and socially. Those social indicators—saying good morning or hello—serve as symbols of belonging to a culture because your presence is recognized in the group. Sylvia experienced a restriction of these social symbols, and invisibility when “they pretend you’re not there” (Sylvia, Interview, p. 6). Being able to transcend these cultural tests may be implied in Sylvia’s phrase “only the brave survive” (ibid.).

Lolita on the other hand described the academic culture on the productivity level.
I think people have to be fully aware that it’s fucking brutal. [...] It’s a brutal process. It’s not designed for us to succeed. It’s a . . . it’s based on a model of productivity that is essentially for a white English as a first language man who is fully comfortable in the format that most journals like to publish or book publishers like to publish, who has a support system at home who is taking care of most of his life outside of work. So his dinners are being made, his laundry is being done, his personal life is otherwise attended to. And that’s really who tenure is meant for. It . . . the process is designed to support people who have that kind of lifestyle. (Lolita)

For Lolita’s experience in the academic culture, I interpreted her perspective belonging to the academic culture as an outcome of labor. In other words, what may have value in the academic culture is the productivity level such “publishing” afforded by external factors: “dinners are being made” (Lolita, Interview, p. 8), “laundry being done” (ibid.). Those faculty members who adopt these standards and lifestyle may have a greater chance to achieve success, than those who do not.

Perceptions

Participants residing in the United States experienced at different times in their appointments as faculty members at their institutions. These shared experiences connected to the way they were seen or noticed by social groups in the academic institution. I interpreted these experiences as perception. Participants language use depicting those experiences as “the university sees me,” “pretty much she asked me if,” and “professors are supposed to be divorced
from their bodies” (India Interview, p. 9). For me, institutional perception seemed selective. Meaning, the institution recognized one identity aspect of the participant such as being Latina or being a lesbian. In other ways, as will be seen in India’s experience below, something about her appearance did not quite fit the embodiment of a Department Chair for the colleague. These participants could be experiencing selective perceptions in that who they are and what they embody does not match their academic institution’s idea of what a LGBQ Latina and / or Chicana. This suggests institutional perception may be guided by visible aspects of the LGBQ–LX. However, what did not make sense to me was that all the participants I interviewed are “out of the closet” in their academic institutions. It’s not as if the participants cover one aspect of their identity such as their sexual orientation, or the fact they are Latinas.

For example, Sylvia articulated her initial experience at her institution as a selective perception.

I once saw a survey of white faculty diversity and I was not noted as a lesbian ((laughs)). [AH: Ok.] I was only noted as a Latina. [AH: Ok.] So it’s interesting that on the one hand that’s perhaps because of the way I was recruited and the way the department and the university sees me as a . . . the work that I do on Latinos more generally is what is important to them. So that’s what they see most. [. . .] So I would say that although it’s common knowledge, and everybody knows it, and I’ve been with my partner for [disclosed number] years [. . .] it doesn’t really seem to register as an integral part of my institutional identity. (Sylvia)
In this extract, Sylvia’s experience was interpreted as selective perception. The institution notices her ethnicity, but does not acknowledge her sexual orientation. India stated her experience with institutional perception happens all the time.

I’m a full professor at 'Lee' University, I was the Chair of my department, [...] I had assembled this meeting with all the different faculties . . . and pretty much she . . . asked me if I was the secretary. And I was like: ‘no, I’m the Chair of the Department.’ I couldn’t help myself and I said: ‘it must be the lipstick.’ Like there was a way, like I still . . . you know . . . that stuff is . . . you know . . . it happens all the time. (India)

India complicated the meaning of institutional cultural perceptions for LGBQ–LX intersecting visible aspects of the body—such as skin color—assumptions and stereotyping of performance.

The fact that I wear lipstick and high-heels. Cause that’s not how . . . you know professors are supposed to . . . like be a certain kind of like . . . divorced from their bodies. Like kind of asexual. So I think . . . yeah . . . I think that my particular embodiment, how I perform femininity which gets read in certain classed ways but in ways that are also very much associated with certain . . . you know . . . excessive . . . the excessive sexuality that it’s imagined to attach itself to Latinas. (India)

“Getting to know” Lolita by listening and rereading multiple times her interview, her lived experience in the academic culture dealt mostly with tokenizing. Lolita’s insight on the
institutional perception was “I think it has a lot to do with the ‘what for’ to appear like you want diversity but they’re not, not really wanting it. ((2 sec. silence))” (Lolita, Interview, p. 4)

Sandra associated institutional perception with her experience with the hiring committee at her institution.

. . . it’s like they were offering me this menu of choices of I could be lesbian in this space and I could be Latina but maybe not people that I knew as Latina in this other space. It was very strange. But never once was it like, ‘Oh you’re a Latina lesbian. Let me tell you about queer women of color here.’ No, it was very lesbians on the one hand and Latinos on the other . . . and different geographic spaces as well. (Sandra)

In these instances of the participant’s experience in the academic culture, it could be assumed the visible takes over recognition of intersecting identities. For these participants, identifying as Latina, Chicana race/ethnicity and lesbians, gay, bisexual or queer did not seem as a preferential choice. For each participant, race and sexual identity cannot exist without the other. Their reality in the academic culture, as manifested in their experiences, tell a different story: Academic culture perception may be entrenched in skin color as institutional practices may be reinforcing those perceptions.

The challenges for LGBQ–LX stem from negotiating space between their identities and the academic institution’s perceptions.
Practices and Ideology

Institutional perception could exist at an institutional level, reflected on the LGBQ–LX faculty member’s experience. An institution may have an inability to “grasp,” (Sylvia, Interview, p. 2), “get” (Sylvia, Interview, p. 3) or “understand” (Sylvia, Interview, p. 2) diversity. Perceptions may also lead to academic hierarchies in institutions manifested by hiring practices and commitment for diversity. Sylvia provided information highlighting her institution’s practices.

Parsons U doesn’t understand for some reason that we all . . . the few of us that are there often like to debate, doesn’t quite grasp the importance of the field of Latino Studies. [. . .] They seem to grasp the importance of African American Studies. They grasp the importance to an extent of Native American Studies. They don’t grasp Latino Studies. They also don’t grasp Asian American Studies that well either. So, it seems like the fundamental . . . they view it as a fundamental field through the process of American nation building, African American Studies, splitting placements, civil rights movement. I mean those things and for Native American Studies you know disposition of land, genocide, I mean they get that. But the process or the role that Latinos have played in nation building, you know, process of the United States, I don’t think that’s something that people know much about . . . or they know but they don’t put it at the same level of importance as these other fields. So therefore, I feel that when it comes to hiring the institution feels that it gets a lot more bang for their buck if they hire in these other fields where they feel that it’s communicating more forcefully their commitment to diversity because they kind of represent . . . particularly African Americans. (Sylvia)
Sylvia becoming part of the institution, or as she labels “institutional citizen:”

I think although it’s really difficult to me it feels that if you don’t become a part of your institution in some way . . . I think it’s really easy to get rid of you . . . basically, because I don’t think fundamentally deep inside these institutions really care that much about diversity. (Sylvia)

India’s memory of institutional practices at the first institution she was faculty member at was described

AH: When that professor said: “over my dead body” in 'Robbins' College; when they were going to hire you, did you encounter any other barrier like that [?] [I: Daily] AH: You thought that was [I: Daily.] (India)

Lolita’s experience with institutional practices was initially associated with a memory of when she was a graduate student. First with the curriculum and later with tokenization.

. . . there weren’t even any ethnic studies classes or gender studies classes or LGBT studies classes. So I had like no . . . I don’t know. I never saw anything about me reflected in any curriculum that I took. (Lolita)

when standards were set for what does it mean to be a good academic? And those were very white standards like . . . and very white male standards too. [. . .] I just really began to like be a kind of scholar that could keep up in terms of white norms even as I had a
critique of it. And . . . but then like would constantly be phrased in ways that I think were
((3 sec. silence)) I never knew if they were genuine or not, if that makes sense?
Because . . . it was like so you’re this poor Chicana from [State]. Like how impressive
that you can write well or how impressive that you can speak well or whatever these
things were. (Lolita)

Presently, Lolita situated institutional practices in terms of the realities of some LGBQ–LX (such as herself) research and getting published, put forward by institutional culture
practices.

It’s also meant for people who do particular kinds of research that will get published in
the best journals in their field regularly. Not meant for those of us who research stuff that
the mainstream journals in our field could care less about what we’re saying. And they
have lower impact factors. [...] you have to figure out well how do I narrate the choices
I’ve made for publication or you second guess yourself. The reason that I’m not getting
publications in those top journals, not just cause I study what I study or I write the way I
do, but actually I’m not as good as the white people who I see getting published in all
these journals. (Lolita)

Sandra had similar beginnings in academia as Lolita. Sandra described her initial
experience with institutional practices as a graduate student as isolating.

Initially I was going to do my master’s thesis about the experiences of queer Chicanas
and queer Latinas but I was advised against that. I was told that talking about my own
experience was not a good way to start doing my scholarship or to start doing research or making a name for myself [. . .] people were telling me that it would be narcissistic to look at people who shared my experience and to be interested in that. And so initially I was discouraged against that. And it was a very lonely and isolating experience as a master’s student. (Sandra)

As a faculty member, Sandra shared a story when developing a course:

I was encouraged when I was here to develop courses in my research area. So I started developing courses around race and sexuality. [. . .] so I was telling him [senior colleague] about the courses I teach and so he said, ‘You know . . . we now have gay marriage. So, I don’t think anyone . . . it doesn’t seem to really be an issue any more this whole queer thing that you’re talking about. But people are really interested in talking about race. So you might as well develop that course and not so much the other one.’ So ((laugh)) what . . . in that moment I just feel like I’m again split in half and I have to choose between one or the other as opposed to recognizing that both of these things are who I am. Both of these things are informing everything I teach, everything I write. But that I am with people who only want to see one or the other. (Sandra)

Institutional practices and socio-cultural ideologies within the institutional culture can at times lead to contradictory experiences for the LGBQ–LX faculty members in the academic culture. However, amid institutional perception, practices and ideology, negotiating space, learning was revealed. The resilience of these LGBQ–LX faculty members to maintain
themselves in the academic culture is because their identity is knitted with scholarship and being an academic. Every participant shared a conflicting experience where I noticed a learning process followed by inquiry and reflection which resulted in creating a tool for them to be able to negotiate and navigate their academic cultures.

**Learning**

Learning, within the experiences in their institutional culture, appeared throughout their professorship. For Lolita and Sandra, there seems to have been a learning process drawing from their experiences as graduate students. For Sandra, the learning process imbues queer Chicana readings. For her, queer Chicana readings are spiritual, as well as influential in her initial aspirations for education.

It was through other Latinas, other Chicanas that I even felt that I wanted to continue school. When I got to . . . but I suppose having their company, having their inspiration, and having their experiences make me feel as comfortable as I did . . . I also knew from their experiences that it would be difficult and painful in academia. (Sandra)

The academic world surrounding Sandra became more of a resistance to her race and sexual orientation than a solace. The way Sandra makes meaning of being in the academic culture goes much deeper than just fitting in or belonging. For her it is about being; seeing the academy as a spiritual space. Her relationship with queer Chicana readings attests to it. Learning in the academic culture, has also been a space for Sandra to learn belonging and identity. It seems to be a contested territory she constantly renegotiates.
I think because so much of the context for my being able to come out came through the reading of queer women of color. It’s . . . that’s how I understand it. That’s how I understand being a queer Chicana is through the writings of queer Chicanas. [. . .] through the experiences of feeling like I didn’t belong in some place or the other is I think what my writing in that particular project often comes back around to is feeling like, ‘Oh I don’t belong here, I don’t belong here.’ But that’s I guess also part of like the story that I’ve had for my whole life. (Sandra)

For Lolita, learning occurred as a race/ethnicity self-awareness process. The first-time learning appears in Lolita’s personal narrative is when she was in graduate school. Her learning experience can be closely connected to institutional practices, and at the time, her lack of awareness of racial differences.

. . . professors were like, ‘Well, you can get grad school paid for’ and I was like, ‘cool!’ Excited about that I guess. And I, at this point like I don’t think I even really . . . like my parents talked so little about things . . . I mean like culture was a big part of our life, but it wasn’t something I thought about like racialized terms. And so and I’m pretty like light skinned and so I hadn’t really even thought about things like affirmative action, for example. Like . . . I look back now and the reason I got this huge scholarship at ‘Amity’ College when I was really just kind of an average student was definitely because I was Latina. [. . .] the same thing applying for graduate programs. Like I got in these master’s programs and I got funding and like I know now that part of what made me so attractive
was the fact that there so few Latinas in academia. But that’s all retroactive sense making. Like at the time I had no sense of this. (Lolita)

I coded this data extract as institutional practices. Institutional practices represent the actions enacted by the group that makes up the institution (i.e. colleagues, staff, students, administration). I saw physical characteristics of skin to signify race. Lolita reflected on her lived experience of earning a scholarship award to race. Lolita narrated her experience with the professor and affirmative action ending the story using “like I know now” as a form of genuine discovery and meaning–making. I thought Lolita had reflected and understood the experience because of the way she used language and positioned herself as an observer as she retold her story.

India’s story in regards to learning was mostly told in the last interview question, where participants were asked what advice would they give future LGBQ faculty members entering the academic culture. In this section of the interview, it seemed India’s advice drew from experiences in the academic culture—I could trace some of her advice to various stories she told in the first interview. For example, “Learning how to compete” relates to India’s story when she was interviewing for job positions, prior to becoming a faculty member at Robbins U. Other advice India gave had to do with navigating the academic culture.

. . . in this first año, I don’t care, you know . . . Find out what the standard is of this department. So you can really know what you’re getting into. […] Constantly in this profession you are doing things that you’ve never done before. You’ve never . . . you know, I’ve never read a dissertation, let alone written one. Well, go read a dissertation.
Hold it in your hands, see what it looks like. So you’re constantly kind of mastering new forms. (India)

Sylvia’s learning was told in a way in which she “realizes” certain events in the professoriate. Some of Sylvia’s realizations (learnings) processes are connected to the institutional culture.

. . . then I realized the second part of it, which is apart from that, which is what Parsons U cares about, what the areas of study they invest in, the kind of intellectual scholar that they feel is the top notch, there was also the fact that all my life before that time I was never institutionalized. [. . .] I had lived on the margins of institutions all my life. (Sylvia)

Tools signify those things or ways in which each participant created from their experience learning their institutional culture. Sylvia learned leverage by making sense (learning process) of privilege in academia. Lolita learned to recognize the logics of institutional tokenizing practices based on her lived experiences. I inferred learning to recognize institutional logistics shaped her as an ally and faculty member. The need to find a space to belong, instilled in Sandra the need to create a tool (writing) where she makes sense of the academic world. With Sylvia, I felt short about what it meant for her being in the margins of institutions. During the interview, Sylvia did not provide additional information on what being in the margins of institutions was like for her. I can assume and guess she was referring to growing up in a family of academics. However, at this point it remains an assumption.
**Discourse of LGBQ Faculty Members**

In answering the second interview question, all participants described their daily work tasks and responsibilities as faculty members. Gee (1999) offers us a linguistic analysis of Discourse (with a capital “D”), “the way a member of a certain sort engaged in ways of thinking, acting, interacting, feeling and believing” (p. 21). For this study, I drew on Gee’s definition of Discourse, where Discourse of LGBQ faculty members mean the ways of being and the ways in which these participants engaged as LGBQ Latina and Chicana faculty members in academic institutions located in the U.S. (LGBQ–LX). Different ways of engaging and interacting in academia than white, heterosexual male/female faculty members.

Sylvia described Discourse as an LGBQ—LX faculty member is mentoring students.

I’m one of the few Latina faculty members, a lot of times . . . I think it falls into a few areas. One is . . . they need support for pursuing what they want to pursue. They just . . . there’s no one else they can turn to. They’re wondering and doubting. So that’s a certain kind of conversation. Like to reinforce and support students who are interested in pursuing certain kinds of questions that are not . . . that other people are not . . . there are no other resources really to do [. . . ] and again it’s the students who . . . none American who comes from a minority group in Europe and uhmm but who wants to stay in the U.S. and pursue this work. So I think it’s a lot of students that . . . or a lot of people—staff, researchers, all kinds of people—who want to do something outside the box. I think I get mostly that kind of person. (Sylvia)
India told of a similar experience as Sylvia in engaging the academic culture as a LGBQ–LX faculty member.

The fact that there are that many Latinas on campus, even . . . there are no other queer Latinas on campus . . . I taught . . . the idea of intersectionality also means that all this work intersects, so people that are looking for feminists, people that are looking for queer persons, people that are looking for Latina, people that are looking for Caribbeanness all of those people end up at my door. (India)

One topic that was mentioned across all participants located in the U.S. was being an exemplary institutional citizen. I adopted exemplary institutional citizen from Sylvia’s interview because it seemed to delineate a clear difference between LGBQ–LX faculty members and faculty members:

If you’re at an institution like mine where there’s very few people of color and there’s very few Latinos and you step into everything that they’re asking you to do [. . .] you do all that and you do it because you want to make the institution a better place–I guess–and then you realize that exemplary citizenship which is that you are accepting to serve the institution in all these multiple capacities ends up taking a lot of your research time. And it’s not necessarily recognized as valuable labor when it comes to promotion and salary. (Sylvia)

Lolita summarized her Discourse, as an LGBQ faculty member at her institution towards the end of a story when she was debating whether or not to move from academic institutions.
... when I was trying to decide if I was going to leave my... a white male colleague said to me, ‘Have you been happy here at ‘Derby’?’ And I said, ‘Huh... No one’s ever asked me that before.’ And I guess I’ve never thought about that. But... I don’t... I guess... I feel like I spend most of my days here either putting out fires or talking people off of various cliffs... because I constantly have students in my... office who don’t have any other queer faculty of color to go to. I’m constantly asked to participate in these things because of the kind of multiplicity of identities I represent. (Lolita)

Later in the interview, Lolita added:

We are tasked with so much more emotional labor than any of, any of our white colleagues in particular. I mean and we share this with definitely other colleagues of color across the board. But you’re going to be asked more than likely to be sponsors of student groups connected to either your race and ethnicity or your gender sexuality or both. Then on the other hand you might not be asked to serve, to on student groups for your race or ethnicity or gender/sexuality because you’re... you don’t look like exactly what they want because you have this dual identity. And so then that’s a whole other set of politics. (Lolita)

Sandra’s racial experience during graduate studies shaped who she became as a faculty member. The ways she currently engages students as an LGBQ faculty member was influenced by institutional culture.
there was so much racial violence in that department […] my friend and I, when we were in grad school we would always talk about when we worked, when we got jobs that we were always going to use them as a model of what we would never do to our students. (Sandra)

Ally

Pay forward (helping other LGBT faculty members that come behind you), mentoring, support and advocacy are three characteristics for an ally described by each LGBQ–LX faculty member. Each participant included a story about an experience they had with an ally when they were in graduate school or during the interview process. Participants also mentioned becoming and being allies to students as faculty members. India, Lolita and Sandra clearly stated becoming an ally because of their experiences as graduate students in the academic culture. Sylvia also claimed being an ally to students and staff. Based on how she tells her ally story, it is as though she sees being an ally as activism.

Sylvia told her story of when she was hired at Parsons U. An ally here was described as an advocate in the hiring process.

So, what the chair of the committee did is that he changed the rules of. . . making the decision from consensus to majority. [. . .] So I got the job offer. (Sylvia)

India’s experience with an ally came early in her career from a faculty member who supported her.
[Undisclosed scholar] who I had never taken a class with, agreed to be on my committee. and was the kindest most generous person. [. . .] And maybe a lesson there is you have no idea who might help you. (India)

India had a similar experience to Sylvia when interviewing for a faculty member position at Robbins College. India also had an ally within the hiring committee that stepped in.

. . . the students adored me, [. . .] But the Department . . . there was one guy in the Department who was like, ‘You will hire her over my dead body.’ [. . .] The President of the college did take the bullet and called [faculty member] [. . .] And [faculty member] says: ‘Oh, she’s great, hire her’ and they did. (India)

Lolita attributed her mentor’s support as her positive outcome of graduate school.

But . . . uhmm . . . I was also, I think I was also very lucky in that I had so many people of color and queer people of color as mentors . . . throughout. And who really I think affirmed my identities and who recognized them as something valuable, not just from the perspective that I brought for scholarship, but also from the perspectives I would bring to the classroom. (Lolita)

Lolita talked about the time she defined her purpose in academia as a LGBQ–LX faculty member and became an ally.
And then it became very political for me. Both because I’m light skinned and get a lot of privileges from that, and also because I was like I have a huge obligation to use my identities in political ways to create space for others. (Lolita)

Sandra has had a similar experience to Lolita in becoming an ally: as an outcome of graduate school.

I think the reality of the kind of students that I work with. So, I’m working with queer students or I’m working with queer students of color or students of color and I have a hard time . . . when they need something I have a hard time putting myself first because I have such a memory of . . . well of my own experience being in grad school or even undergrad and knowing how stressful that is. (Sandra)

In the third interview question, by the way Sandra framed her initial response, I wondered if she was a recipient of pay forward. In other words, if she had an ally who mentored her. “I think the advice that I have is like you said based on my own experience, and so much of that is advice that I’ve been given” (Sandra).

Sandra’s answer to the third interview question provided advice for becoming an ally (a) and being an ally by pay forward (b).

(a) make alliances. And to find people that are trustworthy—both whites and not white. And recognize that that’s Ok. That some white people might be more trustworthy than others and they have access to power in ways that other people don’t. (Sandra)
(b) especially queer people of color can be our allies and you need to develop those relationships as well for our survival and for our growth to in order to expand the systems and let others in so we’re not so alone. (Sandra)

**Findings – Puerto Rico (LGBQ–PR)**

**Leadership**

*Exemplary Institutional Citizen*

The institutional and cultural context for LGBQ–P.R. has undergone changes in the past two decades regarding the visibility of the LGBT community inside and outside the university. These faculty members distinguished themselves as exemplary institutional citizens in leadership roles at their academic institution as outside the academy (e.g. political activism, feminist groups). They shared the institutional changes and sociocultural changes happening in Puerto Rico. Combined, they paint a contrasting picture from the time they entered higher education to the present state. Their academic commitment involved teaching; however, each of their histories comes together with experiences within solidarity efforts, political and feminist activism and collaborating and organizing LGBT conferences and supporting advocacy events. These types of engagements provide them with many opportunities to refine themselves as allies.

**Dolores**

Dolores’ leadership began in the U.S. at the time she was promoted to Associate Professor and was selected by the department to replace the director who at the time was on
sabbatical. From that experience, Dolores developed as a leader in her academic institution. In Puerto Rico, it seems she uses her multiple responsibilities at her institution to advocate and create spaces for incoming faculty members (especially, LGBT faculty members). Leadership skills and learning to be a leader are two aspects Dolores saw as important to succeed in the academic culture.

After I got tenure, something I did was to make sure I participated in staff committees. You are required to have tenure to participate in the Personnel Committee. In part to know the processes and to be able to help incoming people to the department assisting them to prepare their dossier when their tenure process arrives. (Dolores)

Being an active participant in her university refined Dolores’s knowledge. The phrases “make sure” and “be able” suggest a commitment to the institution and peer collaboration that may have shaped her learning experience as a leader.

The other thing is: I think one should assume leadership positions. I have, for me that has helped me because in my leadership positions I could demonstrate my work ethic, my work capacities. No one can question the quality or commitment I have with the institution, because I'm there to do the work and I do it to the best of my capacity. I recognize not everyone can lead. Because if you do not have capacity for leadership well, try to educate yourself; try to learn. You can also learn how to be a leader. But assuming leadership positions is the way one demonstrates the commitment one has with the
institution, with students and with education in general; working. (Dolores)

Assuming leadership positions, Dolores could develop the capacity for leadership. Learning is indicated by the phrase “I could demonstrate.” Two learned concepts she mentioned are her work ethic and capacities, which are outcomes of her commitment with the institution. Working and commitment seemed to have a lot of value for Dolores.

Olga

For Olga, becoming a leader was complex. She realized the opportunity to organize an LGBT event in Puerto Rico, also required for her to come out institutionally. Her success at her academic institution is due in part to her involvement organizing “The Event,” conducting hybrid responsibilities which include LGBT activism, and being a public figure and spokesperson for LGBT rights inside and outside Kappa U.

After I attained tenure, I started to work in academic leadership, with . . . as I told you, coordinating the [Department]. I began there, and I have continued fulfilling various roles, and I have maintained this since I attained tenure with hybrid responsibilities. (Olga)

[AH] would you like to share as an example to those visibility steps as an LGBQ faculty member? [Olga] Well, for me the most important is precisely that one . . . which originated organizing the [Event]. Yes, for me that was my institutional coming out of the closet. And it also was my coming out of the closet as an activist in the academic context,
and in fact it marked a before and after of my professional career, university identity and personal of my life in the broadest sense of the word. So, I would say that event. (Olga)

Leadership is linked to the closet and her coming out process. Leadership for Olga represented a visible outcome, a tangible exchange from being in the margins (before) to a full participant in the community (after) as a public figure.

Ruth

Ruth’s exemplary institutional citizenship is embedded in the different categories that make up emotional intelligence: performativity, working with perceptions and differences, managing difficult situations, and self-motivation and academic commitment. Leadership was portrayed throughout Ruth’s stories: working in government policy making, as teacher and mentor. What seemed important to Ruth was integrity, academic contribution and recognition as a human being and professional over sexual identity. The way she gave this piece of advice brought together sociocultural aspects to the public sphere outside of academia with her role of faculty member within the academic culture. The following extract also revealed the vulnerability of academia when it reflects sociocultural values and ideologies regarding homophobia and heterosexual normativity.

Academic commitment and inclusion in academic research groups in the specialty where they are performing in order to achieve success and so others can recognize from your professional, intellectual, academic point-of-view, and the sexuality side, about: Who do you go to bed with? Or stop sleeping with? Or with whom are you married to? Well, it is
Visibility

Several stories dealt with different aspects of visibility. I understood visibility, for these faculty members intersecting voice, advocacy, labor and knowledge; a presence in academic participation (i.e. voice/advocacy) and professional recognition (i.e. knowledge) amongst colleagues, political activism and their memory participating in Puerto Rican feminist movement. Visibility constituted a turning-point in their lives. For LGBQ–PR, visibility was discussed using vocabulary of the closet (i.e., coming out, being out), imbricated with leadership and personal development because of sociocultural shifts and changes regarding Puerto Rico’s LGBT movement.

Dolores

Visibility for Dolores was seen first in her experience as faculty member in the US. Her examples of being out of the closet seemed to provide her with the ability to “identify” as an LGBT faculty member and organize a student support group, in addition to participating in a solidarity effort with a colleague undergoing transgender transition and the institutional practices that were preventing that colleague to keep her job as a transgendered faculty member.

I was out of the closet with all my colleagues. In that university, a student LGBT organization was created and then a kind of support system for LGBT faculty towards students was created. I was part of that organization and you identified your office with a
decal the students knew that in that space was a safe space where they could come to talk about LGBT topics. I also had the opportunity in that first work experience to work as in a solidarity effort to support a colleague [undisclosed year] who made her transgender transition. (Dolores)

In the beginning stages of Dolores’s professorial career, being out of the closet showed a relation that could be inferred as belonging (“being part of”). By “identifying your office” her use of language recognized and established an office space as a safe space, or another way to belong. I assume Dolores would have had a different experience if she had been residing in Puerto Rico and identified her office with an LGBT decal in that decade.

Olga

Visibility represented a turning-point as an outcome of organizing and collaborating with “The Event”. Visibility is evident in the following passage as a “process of dramatic change”, in becoming “a public spokesperson” (Olga, Interview, p. 4) LGBT–related at her academic institution. It seemed that “The Event” at Kappa U made it possible to break the silence of LGBT presence and to initiate an open dialogue within the academic community.

But of course, from where I am, I can assure you there was for me a process of dramatic change when accepting to assume a public fi . . . a spokesperson . . . on these issues in Kappa U and now there is no turning back. In other words, for me it is a place that could only change to . . . towards being more radical . . . not to . . . [AH: Exactly] Not to return to the closet . . . And I also think Kappa U is now different. And it is different not
because of the work I did . . . that we have done in the collective or that I feel I have done. Above all, for the all the work the people I mentioned have done and those who I am sure have remained anonymous for this discussion to occur at Kappa, so these topics are openly talked about. (Olga)

Dramatic exchanges constitute turning points in visibility. For Olga, dramatic change served as transformation from being in the closet to becoming an LGBT spokesperson. This parallels her stance as a public figure, a transformation she took despite others choosing to “remain anonymous.”

In her advice to future faculty members, visibility appeared in “take hold of visibility other people have planted” (Olga, Interview, p. 6). In the following passage, it seemed the continuity of visibility is needed to maintain changes in the Puerto Rican academic culture and socio-culture.

If I were going to recommend something to someone now, it is: start, that is, try to . . . take hold of the visibility other people have planted . . . Instead of . . . if there is . . . actions are taken against them because of their sexual orientation, it can be shown there’s been discrimination. Because if you are in the closet and no one knows it, well, you cannot prove that they kicked you out because of it, or it's more difficult. (Olga)

This passage reminded me of Joan Scott’s (1991) statement, “Seeing is the origin of knowing” (p. 776). Olga’s statement, “take hold of the visibility other people have planted,” assumes an exchange and awareness of civil rights not previously available in Puerto Rico.
Ruth’s visibility seemed to be a way of dealing with the silence and invisibility existing in the Puerto Rican culture in the 20th century. It seemed Ruth’s visibility was manifested by contributing in organizations and being recognized among academic peers.

All the process of my career as a faculty member and LGBT I can tell you that I have always sought to contribute within the academy. At that time, we were invisible. We could not be manifesting any kind of inclination or sexual preference and focalized all my academic career in specializing in my area of specialty is, was [undisclosed specialization] and in that moment there was much legal need for appropriate services for this marginalized population. (Ruth)

Ruth’s use of the LGBT abbreviation locates herself within the LGBT community at large. In addition, the legal needs Ruth referred to are for other minorities (non-LGBT). This extract reinforces the invisibility in Puerto Rico experienced by Ruth (among the LGBT community) as a faculty member. Visibility in the form of manifestations or visible inclination was not permitted at that time. Discovery of same-sex inclinations could have negative professional, social, and familial repercussions.

However, Ruth’s visibility concerning her sexuality occurred when same-sex marriage was legalized in Puerto Rico. The steps she took to support visibility she legalized her marriage and posted her wedding photos on Facebook.

I am comparing with how I was at the invisibility level in relation to which I had when I was [undisclosed age] in [undisclosed year] versus today when I am [undisclosed age] in
which I have my relationship of more than [years] with my partner. And when marriage was allowed at the level of the Supreme Court, I immediately went, I legalize my status in New York, got married and the first thing I did was put the photos on Facebook©. Never would I have dreamed that I would have done that having a start in my college career. Because to have done that, for my professional development in that time, would have truncated it totally. (Ruth)

Visibility seemed also relative and not absolute to social/professional events. Relative visibility because the lens in which LGBQ attendees saw the event gay party was unbeknown to heterosexual attendees. As I understand it, there is a code within the LGBQ community where the majority present covertly claims space. When Ruth says, “this is a gay party, pero cooliá” she may be using language to reference this code of claiming space. A gay party “coolíá,” in my experience, did not mean to openly perform in a way heterosexuals would evidence gayness. Having an LGBQ majority in a social gathering, there was a sense of being with your LGBQ community outside of designated gay places such as gay bars, and clubs.

[AH] About the invisibility that you were talking about in the beginning of your career until now, do you have an anecdote you can share as an example? [Ruth] Well . . . in relation to an anecdote, really the most I can tell you of that aspect of invisibility is that . . . something funny is that maybe one could be in a faculty activity where you knew the present majority were gay and that one said, look, this is a gay party, pero cooliá that is a Puerto Rican old saying ((laughs)) a gay party without the heterosexual people knowing they are at a gay party, but we are
having a gay party. (Ruth)

This extract also supports Scott’s (1991) assertion that “knowledge is visibility.” Knowing in the context of public space occurs at a social gathering where LGBQ faculty members seemed to experience belonging and visibility among their own professional LGBQ community. I think there was a sense of empowerment, specifically, attending social events where the established normality seemed heterosexual.

**Emotional Intelligence (U.S. / P.R.)**

**Negotiation**

Emotional intelligence was a term Ruth provided during her interview. Emotional intelligence, according to Ruth, meant:

> there is something called emotional intelligence. And I believe that many in the gay community . . . use it successfully. In other words, one could sell the Eskimo a refrigerator . . . Like . . . another old saying, right? [. . .] you have to market yourself, know how to sell yourself, that your product is important and so they stop seeing you as a sexual entity, but also as an active entity in your participation in different scenarios. Not only limit yourself to go and fulfill your academic load and be an excellent professional in your field, or recognized by colleagues or students, but also interact socially on all committees. (Ruth)

Emotional intelligence may be interpreted as knowing to negotiate and navigate oneself
to change the reproduction of internalized homophobia in society. Based on this definition of emotional intelligence, I found several segments of Olga’s experiences that could be associated with it. I interpreted Olga’s experience in her quest to have the Chancellor’s support of “The Event.” Here, Olga’s negotiation of the situation used different aspects: her critical stance, the role of director, and building consciousness with the institution’s administration.

I had several experiences, some very positive and some very unfortunate with the authorities with the university leadership. […] At first instance, I had a negative response from the two and an opportunity to eventually build consciousness to the [Dean] who after a meeting first privately and then with the collective which organized the event on that first occasion, from hosting the event as part of the official activities of the [Faculty] and to also support it economically. (Olga)

Ruth’s insights of emotional intelligence, when applied, apparently had different dimensions: negotiation. Per the following statement made by Ruth, I saw that negotiation of emotional intelligence could be interpreted as a transactional knowledge. What I saw as an important aspect of negotiation/transaction was that it needed a product or result; expressed in “we will come to a mediation to make a . . .”. Another aspect of negotiation via emotional intelligence is knowing how to manage difficult situations. In managing, per emotional intelligence, I also saw an element of negotiation/transaction.

[AH] How was your emotional intelligence as an LGBQ individual within 'higher education'? [Ruth] Well, I tried to always do as Covey would say, ‘A win-win situation’
((said in English)) Where you win, and I win, and we negotiate. So, we sit to share the areas in which we thought the same way, but when the controversy existed, we will come to a mediation to make a ‘happy medium’ [. . .] Therefore, one must learn, in emotional intelligence, to work with diversity. Maybe I think it is something natural for gay people or LGBT since one has already been... has had such situational conflicts from the social point of view in so much silence, you must . . . manage all those aspects, since one within one’s social aspect you have could manage, within the academic circle that are smaller groups, because maybe, that is a small portrait of society. (Ruth)

According to Ruth, a third dimension of emotional intelligence lies in knowing how to market yourself. Here, I saw marketing related to negotiation/transaction in which Ruth may have connected the socio-cultural perceptions of LGBT individuals in the professional scenarios.

you must market yourself, know how to sell yourself, that your product is important and so they stop seeing you as a sexual entity, but also as an active entity in your participation in different scenarios. Not only limit yourself to go and fulfill your academic load and be an excellent professional in your field, or recognized by colleagues or students, but also interact socially on all committees. (Ruth)

Sylvia learned to negotiate visibility and influence an institution’s resources using leverage. In the prior example, where Ruth related negotiation/transactions connected to the socio-cultural perceptions in professional scenarios, here, negotiation/transactions occurred
between negotiating space of Sylvia’s self and her institutional culture.

How I figured it out was one day I was telling this to a friend of mine who was a writer and she told me a story about a colleague of hers that seemed to be having the same issues. [. . .] So she told me the way he solved it. Which actually gave me a handle to how I could solve it. [. . .] I translated that to my situation and was, ‘Oh I can use the resources and the influence and the visibility of this institution to amplify the concerns that I have.’ [. . .] then once I figured that I had done that it’s like Ok so now I can be in this environment but I’m going to leverage my position to the things that I care about, which means that I didn’t solve the contradiction of being in a privileged environment. But I found a way I could negotiate with it that seemed somewhat consistent to what I thought was important. (Sylvia)

Two instances in Sandra’s story were interpreted as negotiation. The first, dealt with Sandra’s negotiation of being against race and queerness.

while I came to being a lesbian later in life I was always, I was always Mexican-American; that was how I always understood myself as I was walking through the world. But then when I decided that not only was I a lesbian, I always had been, but that I could be that in the world I couldn’t understand it outside of being a woman of color. And that . . . well I guess it’s partially in the way that so much of queer politics feels like white queer politics. (Sandra)

The second instance, I observed it as intermixing race, family practices of silence and
[AH] help me understand what you meant when you said ‘mistrust.’? [Sandra] One of the narratives in my family from early on is that you can’t trust white people; you can’t trust rich people. You pretty much can’t trust anybody who’s not family. And so, I learned to, or I was trained to, I was socialized to be quiet. I think both as a woman and certainly as a Mexican-American I was told to be, to not trust other people with information. (Sandra)

Related to Sandra’s family practices, Anzaldúa (1987) also explored silence in a childhood memory; stating,

Talking too much, talking back, having a big mouth, questioning, carrying tales are all signs of being mal criada. In my culture, they are all words that are derogatory if applied to women—I’ve never heard them applied to men [. . .] Language is a male discourse.

(Anzaldúa, 1987, p. 54)

Negotiation, in the context of Latina lesbian’s sexual identity with family members, may take various forms of silence as a strategy to maintain family loyalty (Acosta, 2010). As Acosta (2010) explored (using non-faculty member participants) Latina and Puerto Rican lesbians often chose to exile their families and homeland to the United States to preserve their un-acknowledged sexual orientation and family acceptance. For Sandra, the information suggested negotiation strategizing academic institution, her sexual identity and family loyalty.
Academia has certainly confirmed this—that I mean, I guess when I was growing up I was conditioned to believe that as a working-class Mexican-American family, and a mixed-race family, we only had each other. [. . .] so when I came out I was afraid that I would lose that. And so, I have always made the decision to keep my . . . more likely to keep my academic life, to keep my romantic life, to keep my sexual politics completely separate from my family for fear of losing them. (Sandra)

_Empowerment (Being “Out”) (P.R.)_

Dolores

Dolores continued to be out of the closet as a faculty member in the U.S. when she moved to Puerto Rico and as part of her institutional identity in Rho U and in Kappa U as a faculty member. It was likely that throughout her experiences at Kappa U hired as an Associate Professor through her promotion to full professor, she might have learned empowerment being out of the closet.

The second thing that has worked for me—but, once again I recognize these are individual situations and each one of us must decide based on their circumstances. For me, being out of the closet has worked. Because being out of the closet, prevents the possibility of any blackmail. There is no one who can blackmail you saying, ‘I'm going to out you, and I’m going to tell so-and-so you are this.’ If you are out of the closet that possibility, that door completely closes. I recognize for some people it is not safe. [AH: mm hmm] It is not safe to come out of the closet. It represents a danger to your . . . for
your physical safety. So, it's not that I tell people, ‘Come out of the closet.’ But I do recognize that being out of the closet gives you . . . takes away ammunition, it removes others weapons against . . . against you. (Dolores)

Olga

This lived event stood out for me because of the way Olga described the impact “The Event” had in her life. “The Event” seemed to not only constitute a process (which reminded me of a transformational learning process), but also as empowering. What empowering meant for me in this passage was specifically tied to Olga’s words, “now there is no turning back.” Empowerment is also related to her assertion that because of the work she (and others) did in “The Event”, the institution’s culture regarding the sexual identity discourse has changed.

But of course, from where I am, I can assure you there was for me a process of dramatic change when accepting to assume a public fi . . . a spokesperson . . . on these issues in Kappa U and now there is no turning back. In other words, for me it is a place that could only change to . . . towards being more radical . . . Not to . . . [AH: Exactly] Not to return to the closet . . . And I also think Kappa U is now different. And it is different not because of the work I did . . . that we have done in the collective or that I feel I have done. Above all, for the all the work the people I mentioned have done and those who I am sure have remained anonymous for this discussion to occur at Kappa U, so these topics are openly talked about. (Olga)

Equally important was Olga’s suggestion of how individuals negotiate being out at their
academic jobs, and the repercussions of being out in an academic institution.

That is my suggestion but from a very different place of people who, for example, do not have a job position right now, or have a job position but feel vulnerable due to the country's economic situation. So, to that effect . . . well . . . I would not dare give absolute recommendations, you know? [AH: Ok.] Because it seems to me . . . it seems . . . First of all, that coming out of the closet is a life process. [AH: Correct] And that one comes out in different scenarios; different times and sometimes you enter different scenarios and different contexts. [. . .] I certainly recognize that being out of the closet gives you empowerment against abuse and discrimination very particularly and I think it’s very important. (Olga)

Ruth

Ruth’s comparison of the before/after regarding invisibility—visibility in the sociocultural context of Puerto Rico may be referred to as empowerment. That is, when looking at the visible steps she took when legalizing her marriage to what could be attributed to her understanding if she would have gone public with her marriage status. And yet, it seemed interesting that although marriage was legalized in Puerto Rico, it was in New York where she got married.

I am comparing with how I was at the invisibility level in relation to which I had when I was [undisclosed age] in [undisclosed year] versus today when I am [undisclosed age] in which I have my relationship of more than [years] with my partner. And when marriage was allowed at the level of the Supreme Court, I immediately went, I legalize my status
in New York, got married and the first thing I did was put the photos on Facebook®. Never would I have dreamed that I would have done that having a start in my college career. Because to have done that, for my professional development in that time, would have truncated it totally. (Ruth)

**Findings – Thematic Similarities and Cultural Distinctions**

**Memory (U.S./P.R.)**

Memories are those traditions we carry linked to our socio-cultural condition (Anzaldúa, 1987). Participants from both cultures (and Puerto Rico) overlapped sharing memories during their interviews. However, there were differences with the memory content. Memories of LGBQ Puerto Rican faculty members located in Puerto Rico were about silence and cultural invisibility, socio-cultural practices/social pressures, and being out of the closet, whereas for LGBQ Latina and Chicanas memories dealt with family culture, class, value of education, belonging and being invisible in the institutional culture. All LGBQ–P.R. expressed memories on engaging and interacting in social and professional activities.

**Family Culture (U.S.)**

I chose to name this theme “family culture” because each selected participant located in the U.S. shared information describing their family and the environment they grew up in. LatCrit (Hernández–Truyol, 1998) recognizes family culture among the comunidad Latina. “This big tent [abuelas/os (grandparents), tías/os (aunts and uncles), etc.] . . . generationally
unchanging molds in turn become proof of the correctness of the point, about our proper and befitting places; what conduct is suitable and acceptable [. . .]” (Hernández-Truyol, 1998, p. 816). Within this lens, experiences regarding family culture better informed how these participants structured their interviews and how the memory of family culture was connected to their learning institutional culture.

Two elements of Sylvia’s family culture stood out to me. First, unlike all other participants (both U.S. and in P.R.), Sylvia was not looking for a job in academia. Second, she was the only participant to come from a family of academics. All other participants (no family information was provided by Puerto Rican participants) came from working-class families, and also they were the only ones to attain a college degree.

I wasn’t looking for a job in academia. I had finished my Ph.D. It was important to my mother. I did my Ph.D. for my mother. ((laugh)) [AH: Wow] You know the day I graduated I defended my dissertation, I called my mom, and I said ‘Ok done!’ She cried and she was very happy and that was that. (Sylvia)

I viewed [academia] as the family business. That’s why I have no . . . it’s like selling rugs. Right? I have nothing to do with it. But I did go through the motions of, for my parents. A Ph.D. meant security, it meant stability and it was very important to them that I do it and I was vocationally inclined. I mean I was . . . I considered myself a scholar or an intellectual and so forth. So, I did it. It wasn’t painful or anything. But I didn’t want to convert that into an academic appointment. (Sylvia)
Lolita and Sandra had a similar memory about the lack of racial awareness in their family culture when they were growing up.

[AH] Can you say more about your awakening of race and sexual orientation? [Lolita] in terms of my racial and cultural consciousness . . . I didn’t ((2 sec. silence)) like we knew we were Mexican–American growing up, for example. And I knew that there were things that were different about like my home life and my friends. […] So like holiday traditions, for example, were different. The kinds of food that we ate were different. The ways that we interacted with our family was different. But . . . and I knew that had something to do with being Mexican–American but I didn’t really know what that had to do with it because the only Latinos we were really around were either family members or they were like my dad’s friends from childhood. And so they were essentially family members. And, so I just I didn’t have any knowledge of that stuff. (Lolita)

I didn’t come from . . . I came from a kind of a rural, industrial small town in [State]. And a Catholic family. And so not only did I think that that was not possible for me, I also thought it was wrong. (Sandra)

Sandra was the only participant (in both cultures) to mention spirituality and the ways spirituality is part of her life. Sandra was like India in that after graduating from high school they both worked, taking her longer to finish her undergraduate studies. Hernández–Truyol (1998) states, “The cultural expectation/interpretation of Latinas, simply because of their sex, by
the cultura Latina tracks the dominant paradigm’s construction of sex” (p. 818), then she adds, “Should the family needs demand the Latina to work outside of the home, employment is viewed as a means of continuing to serve the family” (ibid.).

When I got out of high school I didn’t go straight to college because I think as I said before I’m a first-generation college student. [. . .] when I first got out of high school my family’s expectation and my own expectation was that I would work. [. . .] as soon as I graduated from high school I started working full time from the moment I got out. [. . .] And so it took me 12 years to finish my undergraduate degree. (Sandra)

Even after I graduated from high school, I didn’t go to college right away. [AH: Ok.] I participated in what was called a [Government Program] to help kind of low-income kids. [AH: Ok.] And so I had a job after high school. (India)

Breaking away from the cultural Latina paradigm, Sandra and India declare they were the only ones in the family to go to college.

[AH] Are you the first one to pursue a Ph.D. degree in your family? Oh, yeah. College, Ph.D., the whole thing. (Sandra)

[AH] Are you the first one in your family to have a higher education? Oh, yeah. (India)

Class (U.S.)

Sylvia and India although converging in the concept of class, they both experienced class from different perspectives. Although in the following extract, it seems that Sylvia situates
privilege being at her institution and coming from a family of academics, I contrasted her experience with India. It was also important to note that Sylvia was the only participant (from both groups) to use the word “privilege” when referring to academia. Additionally, it seemed that Sylvia resisted her class background (privilege), while India embraced coming from a working-class family.

So being institutionalized and being institutionalized in a place of privilege, of such enormous privilege, I think raised the question also of who I was politically and what the politics of my projects were. Whereas the first fight was to not internalize the values of what they think is important and to value what I thought was important in that context where you really have no support to what you think is important. The second part was how did I become . . . how do I negotiate with this position of privilege? Because when you’re inside Parsons U you can’t say you’re not privileged. [. . .] that was something that I’ve never identified with. I never identified with . . . although my [undisclosed] are academics and, and I grew up whatever middle class suburbia in Puerto Rico, I never identified with those values or whatever people associate with that class or, or that place in society. But now it was a bit too much in my face. (Sylvia)

[AH] Are you the first one in your family to have a higher education? [India] Oh yeah. [AH: Ok] My father has a grade level education. [. . .] My mother my mother was an educated person. [AH: Ok.] So . . . you know, she read . . . she read. [. . .] And to a certain extent we had, well, every now and then we had money, we had more money than
class, let’s put it this way, like everything in our house you know, fell off of a truck. [. . .] So there’s education, there’s class, there’s money. Those were complicated little things . . . So yeah . . . that was, that was sort of my class background. (India)

Compared to other U.S. participants, India was most descriptive about coming from a working-class background and what it financially entailed to achieve an education.

I also went to 'Java' College which was $5.00 a unit. So . . . [AH: Wow!] The fact . . . yeah ((laughs)) So the fact that education was affordable . . . ((2 sec. silence)) [AH: Yes] was everything, [. . .] So that also made it easy for me, I mean, you know, it was affordable, and as a Latina, as a working-class person, as someone that was working their way through college I was just _una cualquiera_. (India)

Whereas class for Lolita, was underlined by tokenism.

professors were like, ‘Well, you can get grad school paid for’ and I was like, ‘cool!’ Excited about that I guess. And I, at this point like I don’t think I even really . . . like my parents talked so little about things . . . I mean like culture was a big part of our life, but it wasn’t something I thought about like racialized terms. And so and I’m pretty like light skinned and so I hadn’t really even thought about things like affirmative action, for example. Like . . . I look back now and the reason I got this huge scholarship at ‘Amity’ College when I was really just kind of an average student was definitely because I was Latina. (Lolita)
Class continued throughout India’s first interview. In her first faculty position at Robbins U, the concept of class came up again, this time, as “class anxiety.”

the kind of class anxiety that that place brought up for me was, you know . . . my father has to pay for this education, you know, very . . . Dad came from a very working class sector, so that was just really intimidating. (India)

“The Only One” (U.S.)

Sylvia and Sandra have experienced being the only one in the sense of feeling lonely and alienated. Sandra felt isolated during her graduate studies, while Sylvia experienced loneliness in her first years at Parsons U.

On the one hand I felt they don’t really . . . I’m obviously not like all the others. It’s like the Sesame Street [song] hay uno que no es como los otros ((laughs)) I definitely felt I was like no como los otros. (Sylvia)

When I got to graduate school, [. . .] that was a really isolating experience because there . . . I didn’t know any other . . . there, certainly were no other queer Chicanas or Latinas in my program from either students or faculty. And in, at . . . I didn’t think there were any others in the university that I was at. (Sandra)
Value of Education (U.S.)

The selected LGBQ–LX participants mentioned their family culture when speaking about their beginning experiences in academia. I observed contrasting differences in the way Sylvia, India and Lolita situated their parents and education within the context of their beginnings in academia. Sandra was the only LGBQ–LX whose parents were not mentioned in influencing her decision to continue education.

A Ph.D. meant security, it meant stability and it was very important to them that I do it and I was vocationally inclined. I mean I was . . . I considered myself a scholar or an intellectual and so forth. So I did it. It wasn’t painful or anything. But I didn’t want to convert that into an academic appointment. (Sylvia)

But somehow I got in, I got this full ride, [. . .] and you get the letter and it tells you how much the package is worth right(?) [. . .] So, I sent this letter to my parents and my father says: Ay mija, con esto, sabes, pudieras empezar un negocio o algo / Oh girl, with this, you know, you could start a business or something. Like, ‘can they just give you the money so you can do something really useful instead of you know, I don’t know go to school?’ But it didn’t really work that way. (India)

My parents’ education of course was very important to my parents. So, they . . . I needed to go to college. So, that was definitely ((2 sec. silence)) like that wasn’t an option not to. So, I was definitely going to go to college. (Lolita)
It was through other Latinas, other Chicanas that I even felt that I wanted to continue school. (Sandra)

Silence (P.R.)

Out of all the selected LGBQ Puerto Rican faculty members located in Puerto Rico (LGBQ–P.R.), Ruth had the most longevity in the academic culture in Puerto Rico. Compared to Olga and Dolores, she shared more experiences about the silence that permeated the academic culture.

For . . . in relation to your success in the academic world, and to achieve tenure in the institution, because although previously they could say there was no discrimination, for sex, race, political aspects, underhandedly there was discrimination. Now . . . and there was a lot of silence and there was a lot of fear. I understand that fear does not exist, and we who belong to another generation and another time, we are learning to break the silence. Seeing the models of new colleagues in the University who openly come and share with other colleagues and may be introducing themselves in some social activity saying . . . a female professor introducing her wife versus another female professor introducing her husband. (Ruth)

Ruth’s understanding is that silence in the academic culture is changing. She is learning how to “break the silence.”

[AH] Help me understand what you referred to by learning to break the silence? [Ruth]
learning to break the silence because there is much enthusiasm to see young people within various professions and within higher education arriving and without . . . in the most natural way interact socially and presence . . . and introduce their partners and the rest of the faculty is learning to respect sexual preference does not have anything to do with professionalism aspect and with the dedication in relation to your profession. (Ruth)

Olga also mentioned notions of silence in the academic culture.

When a student approached me to collaborate in that endeavor, well, I immediately said yes and it was my first . . . let's say . . . extensive experience to deal completely out of the closet and completely open my sexuality. And my . . . more than my sexuality, that was something that already more or less people . . . mostly . . . especially those close to me had full knowledge . . . At the level of academic activism . . . in an outspoken manner opened the way for a discussion in the university context in [City] that was quite covert and silenced. (Olga)

**Invisibility (U.S./P.R.)**

Ruth defined what it meant to be invisible in the academic culture and what she did to navigate invisibility.

All the process of my career as a faculty member and LGBT I can tell you that I have always sought to contribute within the academy. At that time we were invisible, we could not be manifesting any kind of inclination or sexual preference and focalized all my academic career in specializing in my area of specialty is, was [undisclosed]
specialization] and in that moment there was much legal need for appropriate services for this marginalized population. (Ruth)

The part of LGBQ well here, I worked it through activism in the feminist groups in Puerto Rico. Although there were no gay groups there was a social recognition within these groups there was great diversity, but it was not indicated by the aspect of being a movement where they demanded diversities of rights in a conservative machismo society, but that we could be advancing the cause of oppression from different women’s points of view. (Ruth)

Sylvia explained institutional invisibility in the context of being an LGBQ faculty at Parsons U.

Parsons U is not a place where LGBT faculty are that visible in LGBT studies. It’s recently the university has put funding into recruitment of explicitly LGBT studies faculty. [. . .] So it seemed like that when it comes to certain types of service, depends on who’s involved and they have knowledge of my work or of my person, then I might be asked to serve in those contexts. But it doesn’t seem to have that much relevance to how people view my work. So I think that it has more relevance how people see me in you know as part of the institutional community as a faculty member who would have some kind of framework to evaluate certain things. (Sylvia)
Social/Professional Activities (P.R.)

Ruth and Dolores were the only LGBQ–P.R. participants to tell about experiences in social events. Following is the Ruth’s anecdote situated in a time where public manifestations were not accepted in Puerto Rico (See p. 87)

Dolores experienced social gatherings differently than Ruth. “I participated in all kinds of extracurricular activities [in the US]. My partner of [undisclosed years] always participated in all the extracurricular activities with my colleagues and never had any problems” (Dolores).

Socio-Cultural Practices/Social Pressures (P.R.)

Ruth told in her stories the changes that have occurred for the LGBT community in Puerto Rico as she understood them. She as well as Olga experienced social pressures which led me to think how these influenced them to negotiate their sexual orientation and being faculty members.

Those were typical social pressures and especially in conservative scenarios because education . . . is a very conservative scenario, especially when one works directly in education. Because they understood in that time there could be conflicts that children could be exposed to influences that they gave perhaps undue and there could be other types of partnerships that was not the traditional mom and dad couple and that kind of dialogue one had to omit. Until then arrive to the present time where visibility is different. (Ruth)
In the case of Puerto Rico, I was very much afraid at the social level, being open in a much smaller space and in fact, that was the second reason. (Olga)

**Institutional Culture: Practices (U.S./P.R.)**

Institutional culture practices mean the “things” or “doings” that happen in higher education academic institutions in the United States and in Puerto Rico. The way these participants told their stories and positioned themselves as LGBQ faculty members as “I,” the academic institution (includes other individuals) as “they,” or “them” I observed these interactions may indicate ways in which they learn their institutional culture.

I didn’t really have much of an understanding of anything like that I do now which is totally embedded in Chicano/Latino feminism and queer politics, and that kind of thing. But, I did start to understand myself as a much more racialized person and then the more I came out also started to understand what it meant, not just to be a lesbian, but to be a someone with queer politics too. And so that became very central to me, not just how I understood myself as a kind of scholar that I was becoming. (Lolita)

But it wasn’t even just white professors. Another professor of mine who was a queer Chicana. She did the same thing. […] like never engaged us really intellectually even though both of us had come to work with her. And then we found out . . . that while she had been asking us to housesit [there were] white students who she had created a reading group on like critical race theory and phenomenology […] And so it was like she had developed what she . . . I’m assuming she thought that she was showing us how much she
trusted us […] But when it came to thing we were there to do, which was to be better scholars she only wanted to support these white students. (Lolita)

And it was always . . . so like I got this . . . I never . . . it was hard for me to ever find . . . I think like I was saying last time we talked it was always hard for me to find a space where I felt like I was right. Like the Chicanas and Latinas were always like looking me up and down suspiciously because I’m so light and then like white people also are like, ‘Hmm you don’t quite seem like us either.’ So those experiences really shaped me.
(Sandra)

Before, one was dedicated to being a workaholic. I was always observing that in universities and in different professions, people preferred to hire single people but did not say that they were hired because they were gay, they hired them because they thought they had no responsibilities for . . . children and that their time was not so limited. That was the social excuse and always gay people in different professions and within academic faculty, you knew by some characteristics who could possibly be a lesbian, homosexual that did not maintain the established status quo. (Ruth)

**Belonging (U.S.)**

Selected participants from the U.S. were the only faculty members to include information about “belonging” in the academic culture.

[AH] what did belongingness feel like? [Sylvia] So how that played out for me is that I
think that all of a sudden I really started feeling who is . . . who are my . . . interlocutors? Because before I went into my . . . into academia I was part of a pretty strong network of Puerto Rican academics and artists and, and intellectuals that were not in the academy. And we had a space that we you know we published, we commented, we collaborated. But once you entered academia; an academic setting that is so white . . . of course so white, Parsons U so white right? [AH: Yeah.] Once you enter that space you have to . . . you now have to build this different community and this different network but you’re building it with people that don’t really share your interests or your influences or your genealogy, your intellectual genealogy. (Sylvia)

I certainly, I have good table manners, I know . . . you know, which one is the salad fork, but for example, I remember freaking out over what to do with the damn butter. [AH: Wow] These are circular tables, so what do you do with the butter? Do you butter your bread? Or do you put a pad of butter on your butter dish. ((2 sec. silence)) Like, so somehow I just felt that me, not knowing the answer to that question. Was somehow a judgment on whether or not I belonged to that institution. ((2 sec. silence))

As a professor … (India)

And I got there and I’m light skinned, I have [accent], and I don’t know anything about the [undisclosed place]. That’s not where I’m from. That’s not the history that I was raised with. And so, I felt very outside again and… First the women I wanted to work with, there were so many tensions. (Sandra)
Race (U.S.–Chicanas Only)

Among the four LGBQ faculty members located in the U.S. who were interviewed, the subject of race only appeared with the selected participants who identified as Chicanas as a learning process of their racial consciousness. Lolita and Sandra were graduate students. Their academic institutions seemed to provide a way of racial awareness they did not experience before in their family culture.

‘Whoa that’s totally . . .’ Like, I thought that was just me. Or I thought that was just my family or like I didn’t realize that that was something that lots of people who grew up in Mexican–American homes do. Or even experiences of racism. Like we were both brown and poor. And so it was so easy to like I said attribute everything to class and not necessarily to race. And so it was through reading and talking with people about their experiences really in graduate school, that I was like, ‘Huh, Ok.’ (Lolita)

[AH] In your coming out experiences you said that in your undergrads that you were reading about queer Chicanas and queer academics. [Sandra] Since then like a whole world has opened up. Of queer Latinas, of Latina lesbians. And like wow, I had no idea like oh there’s more than just a couple. (Sandra)

Race resurfaces for Sandra as a faculty member.

so in my discipline in academic conferences I often find it very hard to decide where to put my allegiances. Do I go to the La Raza caucus? Do I go to the Latino division? Or
do I go to the LGBT division? [. . .] And in each place I feel really out of place. And so, it, it’s very . . . it can at times feel very divisive. (Sandra)

**Turning-Point (U.S./P.R.)**

For Denzin (1989) and Creswell (2013) turning points are epiphanies or special events in that impact or affect an individual’s life. These major epiphanies, disruptive events (Riessman, 1993) or turning-points may be positive or negative. Riessman asserts the most important indicators of these turning-points are the ways participant’s “handled” or “did” in the event. In this study, all participants experienced a turning-point as faculty members in the academic cultures.

Sylvia was having a successful career as a freelance journalist.

While I was there I got a call from a professor at Parsons U [. . .] he was part of this committee and he I guess interested the rest of the committee members to you know to read my work. So, I get a letter from the chair of the committee, which was someone else, saying we would like you to apply for the job. And at that point I said ‘what’s the worst thing that can happen? You know which was I would get the job.’ [. . .] Anyway so that’s how I got there. So, I got there because a mentor put my name in the hat and the [Department] became supportive and the chair of the department changed the rules. So, all those things had to be in place for me to be able to even to get there. (Sylvia)

I saw India’s turning-point hidden in the first section of her interview.
After I graduated from high school, I ran into one of the teachers from that alternative high school at the gay bar. She said, ‘Why aren’t you going to college?’ And I was like: ‘Oh! Well, that’s a good idea, where did you go to college?’ And she said: ‘I went to Graham U.’ And I said: ‘Oh! Ok, maybe I could go there.’ So, I, literally when [temporary] job was over, I got in my car and I drove to Graham U, and I said: ‘I want to go to college.’ And they said: ‘Did you apply?’ And I said: ‘No, but if you give me the application, I’ll apply.’ Like, I had no idea. (India)

I interpreted Lolita’s turning-point when she discovers she can be a professor—Lolita structures her narrative by following her first “I can be a professor.”

I was dating this woman [. . .] And she had . . . a clear goal in life was to become a professor [. . .]. And so I was like, ‘Oh that’s, that could be cool,’ cause I didn’t know what the hell I was going to do with my like college degree. I was like ‘that could be cool.’ I could do that. I was like, ‘I can, I can be a professor.’ (Lolita)

Sandra’s turning point may have been through readings and experiences of other Chicanas. “Through my experiences in that way that even led me to contemplate going on to graduate school. It was through other Latinas, other Chicanas that I even felt that I wanted to continue school” (Sandra).

Ruth’s turning point appeared to be when the Supreme Court legalized same-sex marriage. This event is deemed significant because it pinpoints how Ruth dealt with invisibility.
The social and cultural context Ruth experienced described the trending socio-cultural context in Puerto Rico made this a turning point event (See p. 86).

Olga took the leadership of “The Event” based on her description—it is likely it was a turning-point.

it was my first . . . let's say . . . extensive experience to deal completely out of the closet and completely open my sexuality. And my . . . more than my sexuality, that was something that already more or less people . . . mostly. . . especially those close to me had full knowledge . . . At the level of academic activism . . . in an outspoken manner opened the way for a discussion in the university context in [City] that was quite covert and silenced. (Olga)

[AH] would you like to share as an example to those visibility steps as an LGBQ faculty member? [Olga] Well, for me the most important is precisely that one . . . which originated organizing the [Event]. [AH: mm hmm] Yes, for me that was my institutional coming out of the closet. [AH: Ok] And it also was my coming out of the closet as an activist in the academic context, and in fact it marked a before and after of my professional career, university identity and personal of my life in the broadest sense of the word. So, I would say that event . . . (Olga)

Dolores’ turning point apparently happened early in her professorial career while she was
part of a solidarity effort towards a transgender faculty colleague undergoing male-to-female transition.

An experience that . . . certainly . . . shaped me significantly was to meet this colleague . . . this female colleague whom I mentioned that made his transition from man to woman. It was a one of a kind experience. [. . . ] It was a wonderful experience to be able to support her, be there . . . make the attempt to help her keep her job. We failed in that attempt but, eventually she achieved a very important legal victory. So, that was an unforgettable experience; opening me to the prospects for being a more inclusive . . . to see more . . . further than your nose as we say in Puerto Rico.

So, that was . . . It was a unique experience. It was interesting because one must question our starting premises even within our LGBT community. How do we handle ourselves when the person you are trying to support is doing . . . their behavior is not something you are familiar with or the transition is not something you know first-hand. It was a wonderful experience to be able to support her, be there... make the attempt to help her keep her job. (Dolores)

Ally (U.S./P.R.)

Throughout their academic career from their beginnings until present, allies represented role models, mentors, or advocates during the interview process facilitating these participants to be hired as faculty members at their institution. Such was the case for Sylvia, India, Lolita and Sandra. Allies also corresponded in roles described by Dolores as pay forward.
So what the chair of the committee did is that he changed the rules of take . . . making the decision from consensus to majority. (Sylvia)

If you’re having a conflict in your department then you need to know who you can look up to. So try to make friends not just in your department but across your campus . . . So that people have your back. ((3 sec. silence)). (India)

But . . . uhhm . . . I was also, I think I was also very lucky in that I had so many people of color and queer people of color as mentors . . . throughout. And who really I think affirmed my identities and who recognized them as something valuable, not just from the perspective that I brought for scholarship, but also from the perspectives I would bring to the classroom. [. . .] I’ve never experienced overt racist or sexist or homophobic hostility about my scholarship. I mean there’s always micro-aggressions but no one stood in my way. And I think people tried to open doors for me to succeed. (Lolita)

It wasn’t because the department structure itself wasn’t racist, sexist and homophobic because of course it was. But these individuals who were teeny kinds of decision makers and space makers didn’t get in my way. In fact, maybe it oiled the way for me to slide through in my . . . but yeah I’m very, very lucky. It’s been pure good luck and a lot of hard work too. But a lot of people work really hard and still don’t get tenure. (Lolita)

Make alliances. And to find people that are trustworthy—both whites and not white.
And recognize that that’s Ok. That some white people might be more trustworthy than others and they have access to power in ways that other people don’t. [. . .] especially queer people of color can be our allies and you need to develop those relationships as well for our survival and for our growth to in order to expand the systems and let others in so we’re not so alone. (Sandra)

After I got tenure, something I did was to make sure I participated in Staff Committees. You are required to have tenure to participate in the Personnel Committee. In part to know the processes and to be able to help incoming people to the department assisting them to prepare their dossier when their tenure process arrives. [. . .] In the first place, it seems to me the most important thing is always seek allies. Seek people who are allies and look beyond common places. These allies do not necessarily have to be LGBT. There are allies in all . . . in many places, so always seek allies. In some cases, these allies can also become mentors; you can never have too many mentors when you are a ‘junior faculty member’ ((said in English)). When you are starting your career, it is always good to have a mentor. Have someone who knows the processes. Well the first thing I would recommend is to seek allies. (Dolores)

The [undisclosed colleague] was [. . .] a clear support . . . to the . . . initiative and as a definite support without a doubt to my activism in it. (Olga)

**Negotiating Space (U.S.)**

I saw as negotiating space the way participants located in the U.S. identified themselves
and the way they experienced the institution perceptions. Negotiating space may be found imbricated in the language, participant and their institutional culture compelling participants to learn their institutional culture. Negotiating space may also reveal practices embedded within a culture. For example, Sylvia attributes her academic institution’s view of diversity as “the box”. It can be also said her use of metaphor “the box” intersects with academic perception discussed earlier, “the box I say that they put me in in terms of how they view diversity […] not necessarily the way I present myself or, or anything.”

Sylvia contradiction started when she was recruited at Parsons U.

The areas of study that I was recruited to teach and the box I say that they put me in in terms of how they view diversity, the department and at the university, seems to . . . and I say again these are external . . . not necessarily the way I present myself or, or anything. But it’s the way I think the institution perceives me as fundamentally someone who is viewed through the prism of race. Yes. (Sylvia)

The way I understood Sylvia described the way Parsons U sees diversity, I saw it as contradicting her precepts on diversity. Sylvia describes the conflict between her work and the institution’s practices of “the box.”

It doesn’t matter what I do […] they never put it on their website. And I think it’s because I don’t do what they do. […] These are things they don’t understand, care for . . . they don’t . . . it’s not in their box. Their literary study box right and related because they might care about critical theory or they might care about feminist theory but Latino stuff, they don’t get it. (Sylvia)
India’s experience (as graduate student) at Parsons U may reinforce Sylvia’s conflict with her institution’s definition of diversity.

So I was there and . . . I loved [State] but that program just you know, really wasn’t right. I had applied telling them I wanted to do ‘Latino and Caribbean Lit’ and really at the end they were like you know, ‘We just don’t do that.’ They did Latin-American stuff but they were really not interested in Latino as a category of analysis. (India)

When standards were set for what does it mean to be a good academic? And those were very white standards like . . . and very white male standards too. [. . .] I just really began to like be a kind of scholar that could keep up in terms of white norms even as I had a critique of it. And . . . but then like would constantly be phrased in ways that I think were ((3 sec. silence)) I never knew if they were genuine or not, if that makes sense? Because . . . it was like so you’re this poor Chicana from rural [State]. Like how impressive that you can write well or how impressive that you can speak well or whatever these things were. (Lolita)

Contradiction in this case was observed between Sandra and a senior colleague.

I was encouraged when I was here to develop courses in my research area. So I started developing courses around race and sexuality. [. . .] so I was telling him [senior colleague] about the courses I teach and so he said, ‘You know . . . we now have gay marriage. So, I don’t think anyone . . . it doesn’t seem to really be an issue any more this
whole queer thing that you’re talking about. But people are really interested in talking about race. So you might as well develop that course and not so much the other one.’ So ((laugh)) what . . . in that moment I just feel like I’m again split in half and I have to choose between one or the other as opposed to recognizing that both of these things are who I am. Both of these things are informing everything I teach, everything I write. But that I am with people who only want to see one or the other. (Sandra)

Sandra’s intellectual conflict regarding charges of plagiarism result in intellectual conflict, feeling confused, angry and ashamed.

Both times I remember feeling confused and sort of surprised and with the guy who told me he didn’t think that there was any way I could have written that. I was ashamed. And I was really angry because I had done the work and now looking back on the experience, I think it’s very clear that he didn’t think that someone like me could have done that level of work. (Sandra)

Contradiction gathered in how Sandra sees herself and the academic space.

And so, then academia often becomes for me a space where I can write about that. [. . .] I’m always drawing from my own experience to make sense of it, to do that kind of theory of the flesh that I was initially introduced to. So, in that way then academia becomes a really—as painful as it can be—it becomes a space where I can do political work and be vocal and be visible in ways that I can’t outside of it. (Sandra)
Negotiating space between the way Sandra saw herself and the institution’s ideological practices.

First I noticed that there were tensions between them and they were both very open about those tensions [. . .] people would mix them up. […] And then I had my own experience of that actually [. . .] And so I found the experience to be . . . again this place that I went to that I . . . this place that I initially had found solace and identification and resistance became a place of deep depression and loneliness and difficulty. (Sandra)

**Emotional Intelligence (U.S./P.R.)**

The term and definition emotional intelligence was borrowed for this study from Ruth’s interview to provide textural richness on how these selected participants have learned their institutional culture.

There is something called emotional intelligence. And I believe that many in the gay community . . . use it successfully. [. . .] you have to market yourself, know how to sell yourself, that your product is important and so they stop seeing you as a sexual entity, but also as an active entity in your participation in different scenarios. (Ruth)

Based on this definition, the following extracts tell how these faculty members learn their institutional culture.

When I became tenured . . . I started realizing that if I wanted to continue making film, if I wanted to continue doing scholarship I was going to need more support from the institution than I had. So . . . I negotiated a number of things that I think helped me be
much more productive. (Sylvia)

I think that in different contexts what may be the salient dynamics might be different depending on who’s there and what are the goals of that place and all that? So in other words if I’m sitting with the president I know what moves . . . what kind of project, and what kind of values he wants to be associated with and it’s a kind of conversation that’s very different if you are talking to the provost who has his hands more on the, on micromanaging you know resources. And they’re both white men but for, well they’re very different white men for one. But also their functions, their roles are different. So . . . .

. they’re different conversations. (Sylvia)

In ways that, that you have to then figure out: ‘Well, how do I want to be?’ Yeah. Because maybe you are angry and maybe anger has worked for you and will continue to work for you . . . and is, you know it’s not that I never get angry, but I’m . . . I tend to maybe work around people. You know, like that guy that was really mean to me . . . I was only nice to him. Because I knew it would make him feel bad ((laughs)) you know . . . I just . . . it was another kind of power . . . yeah. (India)

I’m pretty comfortable around white affects. Like I don’t like it. But I’m pretty comfortable around it. And I understand it. And I know how to maneuver those spaces quite well. (Lolita)
In the collected stories, the closet has a different significance between cultures. For participants in the United States, Sandra’s coming out of the closet is a significant part of their coming to consciousness as they were exposed to queer Chicana readings.

Well . . . it was . . . ((3 sec. silence)) let’s see . . . ((laughs)) I’m still trying to figure out a good point of entry . . . I . . . well I guess I came out when I was an undergrad in my, in my [age undisclosed]. And it was . . . that was, one of the things that made that possible was through actually reading about other queer Chicana, queer Latina, queer women of color, reading about their writings as an undergrad. So, I think it was only and first through the experiences of others that I felt that I could even access my own experience. [. . .] And then through my friends circle in school that even made that a possibility.

(Sandra)

For participants located in Puerto Rico, The Closet came up in different events and in different times during the interview. It may be interpreted that The Closet has deep value for the selected participants in the academic culture in Puerto Rico. For example, Ruth claimed within the experience of considering herself part of the feminist group in Puerto Rico, she experienced oppression, even though it did not affect her academic achievements and recognition as academic. Ruth concentrated advancing her academic career. At that time in Puerto Rico, you could not manifest any type of inclination or sexual preference. Ruth remained in the closet.

Dolores did not mention her coming out story. However, when she began her interview,
right away she established being out of the closet in the academic institution.

Well, I started working in [undisclosed year] in the United States at a university is now called ‘Union’ University. [...] And since beginning that work, although the subject did not come out during the interview, I was out of the closet. So, it just became like a reality of my life. I was out of the closet with all my colleagues. In that university, a student LGBT organization was created and then a kind of support system for LGBTT faculty towards students was created. I was part of that organization. (Dolores)

During interview question #3, Dolores the closet seemed to signify a symbol of empowerment.

So, it's not that I tell people, ‘Come out of the closet.’ But I do recognize that being out of the closet gives you . . . takes away ammunition, it removes others weapons against . . . against you. (Dolores)

Similarly, to Dolores, being out of the closet signified for Olga a symbol of empowerment. I found it interesting to hear about Olga’s political activist participation and contrasting her involvement in political activism in Puerto Rico while coming out of the closet at her institution took her seven years. I wonder about the distinction of fear between political public acts and crossing private/public space of the closet.

For me . . . if I were to start over again, yeah . . . Maybe an average guess or maybe unfair, because I already have lived the experience. So I think . . . And this was something . . . that I did . . . As far as my ideological-political positions are concerned. I
have lived very openly let’s say my political stance, radicalism […] as a person committed to the social causes, of the most unprotected … I have lived in a totally open way since the first semester that I studied in ‘Kappa’. I participated in the [political movements]. In other words, I have participated in all. that is, in all these events openly from the first day. In terms of my sexuality and my sexual orientation, it took me almost seven years. (Olga)

**Discourse of LGBQ Faculty Member (U.S./P.R.)**

For this study, I categorized Discourse of LGBQ Faculty Members those work tasks that seemed unique to the selected participants from non-LGBQ faculty members. For example, I saw responsibilities such as teaching, committee memberships, heading committees, service and scholarship as requirements for all faculty members in all academic institutions. Where I infer a distinctive difference between these participants and non-LGBQ faculty members are in the type of mentorship they provide, who comes to them for mentorship, and the activities required being racial and sexual minorities. Within the category of Discourse of LGBQ faculty member is also knowing they are the only ones intersecting sexual orientation, class and Latino race, or Chicana ethnicity.

The term and definition of “exemplary institutional citizen” was drawn from Sylvia and made part of the texture for LGBQ–LX and LGBQ–P.R. discourse as LGBQ faculty members.

And I would say that for people of color, at least in my institution, ((laugh)) I see a clear pattern that the people who do more of their own work ((2 secs. silence)) are treated better than the people who do institutional work. And by that I mean I think they get …
they’re better paid. So in other words I wonder what the cost of being an exemplary institutional citizen is on people’s work ((5 sec. silence)). (Sylvia)

If you’re at an institution like mine where there’s very few people of color and there’s very few Latinos and you step into everything that they’re asking you to do: [. . .] you do all that and you do it because you want to make the institution a better place—I guess—and then you realize that exemplary citizenship which is that you are accepting to serve the institution in all these multiple capacities ends up taking a lot of your research time. And it’s not necessarily recognized as valuable labor when it comes to promotion and salary. (Sylvia)

Below are the ways in which both groups of participants were seen following the definition of exemplary institutional citizen.

I’m one of the few Latina faculty members, a lot of times . . . I think it falls into a few areas. One is . . . they need support for pursuing what they want to pursue. They just . . . there’s no one else they can turn to. They’re wondering and doubting. So that’s a certain kind of conversation. Like to reinforce and support students who are interested in pursuing certain kinds of questions that are not . . . that other people are not . . . there are no other resources really to do. (Sylvia, Interview, p. 11)

My main thing in most of these conversations I think what I’m trying to do is figure out what the student really wants to do and try to provide as much support for that student to
be able to accomplish that well. And it’s not only Latino students. You know I get students from every background, but that don’t in some ways don’t fit the mold that, that they find that they don’t fit the mold. (Sylvia)

Sometimes also a student might come with a feeling that they’re not doing well but it’s very important for them to succeed—like I get that a lot from first generation college students. Like they’re the first people in their family to go to college and they have a tremendous pressure on them to succeed. But maybe they’re . . . they feel they’re not doing as well as they can. [...] like for instance yesterday there was . . . actually he was not a student—he was a staff member. [...] I want to go into this you know direction professionally but I have no idea how to start. [...] So I do a lot of that. (Sylvia)

The fact that there are that many Latinas on campus, even . . . there are no other queer Latinas on campus . . . I taught . . . the idea of ‘intersectionality’ also means that all this work intersects, so people that are looking for feminists, people that are looking for queer persons, people that are looking for Latina, people that are looking for Caribbeanness all of those people end up at my door. (India)

I think one of the things that’s interesting is as a queer woman of color, a lot of students ask me for things that I know they would never ask the white male professor. (India)

Even if someone’s just ‘TA-ing’ for me, they’re not my student, but you know . . .
‘Would you look over my CV?’ Like, they’re asking me for professional advice that they’re not getting at their home department. Because their home department doesn’t have anybody who’s a first-generation professor, might not have anyone who is a person of color. (India)

They’re my own graduate students that again precisely because a lot of them are also, you know . . . queers, or people of color, or first generation students, maybe need a little more help cause, they’ve never done any of this stuff before. They don’t have a . . . someone in their family they can ask, or they just don’t have those same kinds of relationships. (India)

I mean . . . I think it’s gotten harder to be . . . well it’s easier on the one hand to be like a queer Chicana and doing what I do at this point in my career because I’ve been tenured now at two major research universities. I have built a reputation among people who I admire for being a decent enough scholar and professionally I’m doing very, very well. (Lolita)

We are tasked with so much more emotional labor than any of, any of our white colleagues in particular. I mean and we share this with definitely other colleagues of color across the board. But you’re going to be asked more than likely to be sponsors of student groups connected to either your race and ethnicity or your gender sexuality or both. Then on the other hand you might not be asked to serve, to on student groups for your race or ethnicity or gender/sexuality because you’re . . . you don’t look like exactly
what they want because you have this dual identity. And so then that’s a whole other set of politics. [ . . . ] More than likely you’re going to be asked to be on committees that you just have no business serving on as a junior faculty member. But they need diversity and your senior colleagues of color are already completely tapped out. So now they’re down to you cause there’s probably only a couple of you in your department. That you’re going to do all this labor for students who don’t know you but they know what your identities are. And they need to talk to somebody like you. They need to talk to someone who helps them feel safe and comfortable and who understands at least something about how they grew up. And it may not have anything to do with curriculum or anything to do with your class, and then all of a sudden you find yourself three hours later you’re still sitting in your office having a conversation with a student who really needs to have that conversation. And rest assured your white male colleagues are rarely if ever asked to do those kinds of things. (Lolita)

And from the service to the institution—one of the things I did in the United States and that I have done here at Kappa U—work as a counselor for LGBT student organizations. Sometimes students are . . . have ideas have the illusion of creating organizations and do not find support. And sometimes, there is a member or a faculty member to help them, to help them with the process, give them the support to establish the organizations and that is super important. (Dolores)

On that path, I’ve had various administrative responsibilities. I was first coordinator of
the [undisclosed Program], then I was director of the [undisclosed Department] for a [undisclosed time]. In that year . . . during that period, in that year and a half, there were two events that were very important for the topic of this interview, because I collaborated with a collective that organizes a feminist conference here in Puerto Rico in [undisclosed year]. (Olga)

That meant that being in that group of academic leadership, well . . . I considered it. In fact, after those events, I made the decision to resign to my position in that academic leadership. [AH: mm hmm] Not because I was asked to resign, but because I felt uncomfortable . . . say, collaborating with . . . in a work team that had such homophobic attitudes . . . so openly homophobic. (Olga)

**Visibility (P.R.)**

LGBQ Puerto Rican faculty members seemed to engage in different practices of visibility as a way for sustaining and moving forward the changes in the academic culture. Visibility was interpreted as linked to being out of the closet. Visibility also provided them with an empowerment that otherwise, might not have led to the changes they have seen at their academic institution in Puerto Rico.

Well, I started working in [undisclosed year] in the United States at a university is now called Union U. At that time, it was Union C. And since beginning at that work, although the subject did not come out during the interview, I was out of the closet. So, it just
became like a reality of my life. I was out of the closet with all my colleagues. (Dolores)

I was out of the closet with all my colleagues. In that university, a student LGBT organization was created and then a kind of support system for LGBT faculty towards students was created. I was part of that organization and you identified your office with a decal the students knew that in that space was a safe space where they could come to talk about LGBT topics. I also had the opportunity in that first work experience to work as in a solidarity effort to support a colleague [undisclosed year] who made her transgender transition. (Dolores)

I were going to recommend something to someone now, it is: start, that is, try to . . . take hold of the visibility other people have planted . . . [AH: Correct] Instead of . . . if there is . . . actions are taken against them because of their sexual orientation, it can be shown there’s been discrimination. Because if you are in the closet and no one knows it, well, you cannot prove that they kicked you out because of it, or it's more difficult. (Olga)

Different than Dolores and Olga, where they have used being out of the closet as a means of empowerment, Ruth enacted visibility (what seemed backstage) through her academic standards and work as an educator.

Not only I did my first masters, in [undisclosed year]; I did another second master's degree in [undisclosed year] with another specialty within that field to strengthen my academic presence, and the recognition of my contributions in different types of
situations; where groups, colleagues knew through writing or through my active participation in different universities, not only where I performed as advisor on the recommendations that were to be followed within the field that was so conflicting at that time. (Ruth)

Those were typical social pressures and especially in conservative scenarios because education . . . is a very conservative scenario, especially when one works directly in education. Because they understood in that time there could be conflicts that children could be exposed to influences that they gave perhaps undue and there could be other types of partnerships that was not the traditional mom and dad couple and that kind of dialogue one had to omit. Until then arrive to the present time where visibility is different. (Ruth)

Conclusion

This chapter analyzed the similarities and differences resulting from the comparison between the selected group of participants in the United States and Puerto Rico. Several themes converged between cultures. These were: memory, turning-point, ally, emotional intelligence, and learning. However, there were differences in the way these themes performed, referred to as cultural relevant distinctions. The memories for LGBQ–Latina and Chicana faculty members were in the contexts of class, tokenism (during and after graduate studies), family culture, value of education, and socio-culture/ethnicity. Memory for participants in Puerto Rico was about negotiating space and navigating their sexual orientation within a culture of silence, invisibility,
and hetero-normative social pressures. Turning points for participants in the U.S. meant realizing they could ‘be’ faculty members. For participants in Puerto Rico, turning points were related to visibility. Their visibility connected to the language of the closet. Allies and emotional intelligence were two common themes shared in both cultures. Exemplary institutional citizenship, a term borrowed from Sylvia, served to recognize what distinguished LGBQ–Latina, Chicana, and Puerto Rican faculty members from non-LGBQ faculty members.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

This study explored how a group of LGBQ Latina and Chicana faculty members in higher education institutions in the United States (LGBQ–LX) and a group of LGBQ Puerto Rican faculty members in higher education institutions in Puerto Rico (LGBQ–P.R.) learned to achieve success as faculty in their academic institutions. Achievement of success meant for LGBQ–LX and LGBQ–PR faculty members to be on a tenure-track position, have tenure, or be retired from tenure. Each faculty member who participated in this study shared their lived experiences in which negotiating space became a hub for learning. Negotiating space sometimes meant for these participants to resist their institutional culture—like Sylvia resisted to become “institutionalized”. As Sandra, be resilient to loneliness and not belonging, or like Olga, to assume a critical stance to “build consciousness”.

Thematic analysis served to reveal similar and different themes between the United States participants and Puerto Rico’s participants. Following Braun and Clarke (2006) approach to thematic analysis the stories shared by the selected group of participants began to weave experiences to reflect. The themes were then cross-culturally compared using intersectionality approach telling a story of shared experiences. In this final chapter, I discuss the implications and recommendations of this study.

Implications

Findings showed how these participants negotiated space, were resilient and at times
resisted higher education institutions ideologies. As faculty members, each participant experienced belonging in the context of intersectionality. There is a reason for why the participants chose to share the stories they told during the interview, selected a particular language, and placed them in the storyline order they did. Gee (1995) calls this process language-in-action within a cultural model.

This research also revealed the universality of binarism embedded and practiced through institutional perceptions. By institutional perception, I mean specific identity aspects that academic institutions choose to recognize and acknowledge over others. For example, Sandra’s comment “It was very lesbians on the one hand and Latinos on the other . . . and different geographic spaces as well”, or when Sylvia said, “Although it’s common knowledge, and everybody knows it, and I’ve been with my partner for [disclosed number] years [. . .] it doesn’t really seem to register as an integral part of my institutional identity”. The reality for this group of LGBQ–LX faculty members is that they experienced institutional practices recognizing either their race, or their sexual orientation.

Both groups of LGBQ–LX and LGBQ–P.R. faculty members carry with them a socio-cultural and familial culture memory. Memory, as in the memory of belonging or memory to find identity, is engaged by colonized populations and part of postcolonial literature. Differences between the groups of participants were the subjects of their memories. The memory of LGBQ–P.R. was mostly constructed over social invisibility and visibility, and socio-cultural practices. Memory of LGBQ–LX had to do with familial culture, race, and class. I found this theme of interest because I also saw this theme personally reflected. I also tend to share my memory of Puerto Rican socio-cultural practices and familial culture. This might explain why during the
analysis I noticed those instances when each participant included narratives signaling towards memory.

This study tells us about the perception between these participants and the challenges experienced in the institutional culture. We learned about the lived experiences of these group of participants and their learning process within each of their academic institutions. As part of their learning process, they created tools that helped them navigate the academic culture and achieve success. Institutional perceptions contrasted the way these faculty members identify and should be further explored.

Six of the participants had tenure. Four of them are full-professors, while one participant was on a tenure-track position. Yet creativity and resilience was found as a common trait. Despite the stories of struggles and issues each participant shared, both groups of participants (U.S. and P.R) did not fit the definition oppressed. Maybe what we have understood as oppression in pedagogical context (Freire, 1979), has reached a turning-point in the conversation. Sylvia shared a story of being marginalized, India experienced institutional and social perceptions with faculty-queer Latina embodiment, Lolita dealt with tokenism, Sandra experienced loneliness, Ruth and Olga experienced shifts of invisibility–visibility and Dolores’s solidarity efforts. These participants learned to move beyond the paradigms of marginality in their academic institutional culture. This research should be expanded to include more participants maintaining similar cultures to further assess learning process in moving beyond marginality.

The themes and experiences shared by this group of participants made them distinct from other non-LGBQ faculty members. Even though these faculty members do the standard work
tasks required by higher education academic institutions—teaching, research, institutional and community service—it is in the intricacies where we learned what makes them unique. For example, the topics of conversations with students, the type of student arriving at their door (first–generation, LGBT identified), and tokenism by colleagues, what is valued as labor; a discourse shared by both groups of participants which they also counter with describing their non-LGBQ colleagues. A recommendation is to reevaluate what counts as labor to meet professorial standards. Realigning academic labor for this population could redefine who becomes an institutional citizen.

This study also revealed how this group of faculty members survive and maintain themselves achieving in academia. Having allies and advocates was an important part of their experience as faculty members. These participants also became allies and interlocutors, and firmly identify themselves as allies with students and in their commitment to their universities.

**Recommendations**

During the recruitment process, other potential participants identifying as LGBQ in the U.S. and Puerto Rico were contacted. The initial letter had a requirement of three-90 minute interviews. Potential subjects who fit the criteria may have become hesitant due to the time commitment. Understanding the hesitancy to the time-commitment and how that may have impacted the response rate to the research invitation, I suggest participants who are faculty members to control the interview time length. Having more participants, especially in Puerto Rico, would have benefitted the interpretation and contextualization of their experiences. Adding more participants to the study would allow for triangulation (Creswell, 2013; Maxwell, 2005).
Another need would be to further reflect on my role as a researcher in the analysis stage. At times, I found myself biased and spending time assuming when conducting investigation in my own country. Taking the time to reflect on those assumptions and biases so they do not cloud the analysis was essential. This may speak to the limitations of one person taking on the role as researcher, interviewer, and analyst. Specially, when I am conducting research on a topic which I am seeing myself reflected in several stories shared by the group of LGBQ–LX and having similar socio-cultural experiences as the group of LGBQ Puerto Rican faculty members residing in Puerto Rico.

In my extensive reading on theories that capture LGBQ–Latinas, Chicanas, and Puerto Ricans, I soon learned there is not a one-size-fits-all theoretical framework. Thinking intersectionally (MacKinnon, 1991) for a cross-culture comparison was effective because as I familiarized myself with the data, generated codes and further collated categories into subthemes and themes, I consistently noted how data converged or diverged among and between cultural groups. Latino critical theory (Hernández–Truyol, 1998) as a theoretical lens while conducting the thematic analysis provided depth to the analysis, highlighting aspects akin to the Latino culture. In-depth data collected using semi-structured interviews could be further analyzed using critical discourse analysis or semiotic phenomenology (Martinez, 2000, 2003). If using a different analytic approach, I suggest constructing a different set of interview questions to generate conversations tailored to the respective qualitative approach.

This study contributes to the field of women’s studies and adult education by its originality, serving as groundwork for future studies focused on queer Latinas, Chicanas, and Puerto Ricans who learned success in their field. Queer Latinas, Chicanas, and Puerto Ricans are
the subject of the research. As primary subjects, they were not swept under the faculty of color umbrella. More research highlighting the accomplishments of queer Latinas, Chicanas, and Puerto Ricans as themselves are needed to expand the research literature. The theme sets in this study in relation to language use and culture need further exploration.

Finally, this study contributes to comparative and international education by bringing essential elements of qualitative approach into a smaller-scale study. The field of comparative and international education may benefit from interdisciplinary sources to further explore how systems and ideologies embedded in cultures shape learning for marginalized populations. Interdisciplinary sources such as language use may reveal the conditions, actions and perceptions experienced by a selected group of participants amidst a specific culture. This in turn, may move the conversation from learning as being measured mostly as an outcome, to learning as process.

**Research Agenda**

After successfully defending my dissertation, I am beginning my next phase of my research, specifically, intersecting adult learning with queer-feminism. So far, I have found a gap in research literature embracing queer-feminism and adult education, particularly belonging and negotiating space. As previously discussed, LGBQ Latinas, Chicanas, and Puerto Rican faculty members are an understudied population, as such, my long–term goal is to follow up this study by collecting more lived experiences from these faculty members in the United States and Puerto Rico. Eventually, I see this study incorporating LGBQ faculty members from Cuba and the Dominican Republic to draw other comparisons between cultures. Networking and establishing connections with potential participants as well as researching and understanding the education
system and socio-cultural patterns will take time. It will also require travelling to Cuba and the Dominican Republic. Therefore, grant writing is another area I am interested and eager to learn.

My short-term goals as a scholar is to conclude and publish the following working papers within this year: *Queer Migrations, Latina Lesbians and ‘The Stranger’*, and *Factors Impacting LGBTQ Faculty of Color in Academia*. The former was a conference paper written for the Department of Geography at Penn State University No-Boundaries Student Conference (2015). This paper reexamined queer migration using the Latina lesbian as subject through the lens of social theory. I used Georg Simmel’s essay *The Stranger* (1908) where he discusses the individual amidst the sociology of space. The latter identify factors impacting the academic climate of African American and Latina faculty members in higher education institutions.

Other short–term goals are to become an active member of one academic organization, teach at a higher education institution, present my work at two national conferences, and become involved in a community-activist project or initiative. Conference presentations, becoming an active member of an academic organization, and conducting research requires travel, which having the resources and support from a university is imperative.

For the past four years, my graduate assistantship involved being instructor and coordinator of the Urban Teaching Collaborative After School Online Tutoring Program, an course designed to provide undergraduate students from the College of Education at Penn State to experience tutoring remotely a group of 3rd and 4th grade level students (tutees) located in the Philadelphia Public School District. Being the liaison between the College of Education in Penn State University, I have gotten to establish a relationship with the participating schools, especially the parents. When the tutees visit the Penn State campus, their parents have expressed
interest to develop their writing skills and are inspired to further their education. Some of them are working towards a high school diploma. Establishing an initiative to facilitate online learning through the school is something I am considering.
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APPENDIX B - LETTER OF INVITATION – ENGLISH

To Whom It May Concern:

I am Annette Hestres, Dual-Ph.D. student in Adult Education and Comparative Education, minoring in Women’s, Gender and Sexuality Studies. I seek help to connect with Latina faculty members in the United States, and Puerto Rico working at a private or public higher academic institution.

For this research, I am populating a community of participants who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual or queer, and Latina, Hispanic, Chicana, or Puerto Rican. Participants must be either working in a tenure-track position with a minimum of three years, or currently have tenure in a higher academic institution, or retired from a higher academic institution from tenure.

The title of my doctoral thesis is "Learning from Tenure: Lived Experiences of Queer Latina and Puerto Rican Faculty Members in Higher Education Institutions in the United States and Puerto Rico” (IRB Study ID: 00005624). This study aims to explore learning as a phenomenological activity outcome extracted from the lived experiences of tenure process by LGBQ Latina faculty members located in the United States, and Puerto Rico.

I plan to conduct research interviews beginning Monday, September 19, 2016 until Wednesday, October 26, 2016. Participants will be asked to provide a verbal consent (permission) prior to the first interview. Each participant and the researcher will arrange via email three separate 30 to 60 minute interviews spaced from 3 days to a week apart. Interviews will be conducted remotely (via Internet or phone). Each interview will be audio recorded for transcription purposes. No personal information (ex. personal names, contact information, institution) will be disclosed in written reports or during formal presentations. Pseudonyms will be used in all transcriptions and written information about the participants.

Would you be willing, or know someone who would be willing to participate in this research project? Feel free to contact me at amh300@psu.edu.

Cordially,

Annette M. Hestres, ABD
Dual-Ph.D. Adult Education & Comparative and International Education; Women, Gender and Sexuality Studies Minor
Penn State University
APPENDIX C – LETTER OF INVITATION (SPANISH)

Saludos,

Soy Annette Hestres García, estudiante en la Universidad de Penn State a nivel doctoral en Educación de Adultos, Educación Comparada, y subespecialidad en Estudios de Sexualidad y Género. Estoy solicitando ayuda para contactar a miembros de facultad de instituciones académicas en educación superior públicas y privadas en Puerto Rico.

Para la investigación, estoy requiriendo participación de una comunidad que se identifique como lesbianas, gay, o bisexual, de género femenino, de etnicidad Puertorriqueña y/o Hispán. Además deben cumplir con los siguientes requisitos: ocupar posición permanente o en su lugar estar trabajando con un mínimo de tres años en vías de obtener posición permanente, o ser jubilado habiendo obtenido la permanencia.

El título de mi tesis doctoral es "Learning from Tenure: Lived Experiences of Queer Latina Faculty Members in Higher Education Institutions in the United States, and Puerto Rico". Este estudio tiene como objetivo explorar el aprendizaje como resultado de una actividad fenomenológica extraído de las experiencias vividas del proceso en la obtención de la permanencia por miembros del profesorado LGBQ en el ámbito académico en Puerto Rico, o Estados Unidos.

Planeo llevar a cabo entrevistas comenzando lunes, 19 de septiembre de 2016 hasta miércoles, 26 de octubre de 2016. Cada participante deberá proporcionar un consentimiento (permiso) verbal antes de la primera entrevista. Cada participante y la investigadora organizará por correo electrónico, secuencia de tres entrevistas separadas con duración de 30 a 60 minutos aproximadamente; espaciadas de tres días a una semana por separado. Todas las entrevistas se llevarán a cabo remotamente (vía Internet o teléfono). Cada entrevista será audio-grabada para fines de transcripción. No se divulgará ninguna información personal como por ejemplo, nombres personales e información de contacto, edad, institución académica, en informes escritos o presentaciones formales. Únicamente se utilizaran seudónimos del país de procedencia en las transcripciones e información sobre los participantes.

¿Está dispuesta o conoce a alguien que esté dispuesta a participar en este proyecto de investigación? Agradeceré se contacte conmigo al amh300@psu.edu.

Gracias por su atención.

Cordialmente,
Annette M. Hestres, ABD, Candidata
Estudiante de Doctorado, Educación Adulta & Educación Comparada e Internacional; Subespecialidad en Estudios de la Mujer, Género y Sexualidad
Universidad de Penn State, Pennsylvania, EEUU
APPENDIX D – CONSENT/INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR EXEMPT RESEARCH
The Pennsylvania State University
IRB Approval: STUDY00005624

Title of Project: LEARNING FROM TENURE: LIVED EXPERIENCES OF QUEER LATINA AND PUERTO RICAN FACULTY MEMBERS IN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS IN THE UNITED STATES AND PUERTO RICO

Principal Investigator: Annette Marie Hestres Garcia
Telephone Number:
Advisor: Fred Schied, Ph.D.
Advisor Telephone Number:

Thank you for your willingness to participate in this research study in sharing your lived experiences of the tenure process as an LGBQ Latina faculty member in the United States. This interview follows the Three-Interview Series—a data collections method consisting of three, 90-minute interviews (Seidman, 2013). The first interview will focus on your life history, in which the context of your experience with tenure is established. The second interview will concentrate on details about your present lived experience as an LGBQ professor in a higher education institution in the United States. The third interview will encourage reflection highlighting the meanings of your experience with the tenure process.

Each interview will take about 90 minutes. Each interview consists of one question. I’ll ask the question and then invite you to tell as much as possible about yourself in light of the topic up to the present time. I will be audio-recording this interview as well as taking notes. The information I gather will remain confidential. Your name or other identifying information will not be used in any written documents or presentations associated with the results of this study. All research data will be accessible only to the principal researcher (me).

Your participation is voluntary and you may end the interview at any time. You do not have to answer any questions that you do not want to answer. Do you consent to participate in this research?

Interview 1: Tell me as much as possible about yourself and your journey as an LGBQ Latina faculty member from your beginnings in academia up to your attainment of tenure.

Interview 2: Please tell me about your workday. Take me through what you do from the moment you wake up until the time you fall asleep.

Interview 3: Given what you have said about your lived experience in higher education as you attained tenure and given what you have said about your workday, what advice do you have for future LGBQ Latinas faculty members entering the tenure process in a higher education institution in the United States?
APPENDIX E – HOJA DE CONSENTIMIENTO/PREGUNTAS PARA ENTREVISTA
The Pennsylvania State University
IRB Approval: STUDY00005624

Título del Proyecto: “LEARNING FROM TENURE: LIVED EXPERIENCES OF QUEER LATINA AND PUERTO RICAN FACULTY MEMBERS IN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS IN THE UNITED STATES, PUERTO RICO AND LATIN AMERICA”

Investigadora Principal: Annette Marie Hestres García
Número de teléfono: 
Consejero Académico: Fred Schied, Ph.D.
Número de teléfono del Consejero Académico:

Gracias por haber accedido a participar en este estudio de investigación compartiendo sus experiencias sobre del proceso de permanencia como miembro de la facultad LGBQ en Puerto Rico. Esta entrevista sigue el “Three Interview Method” — un método de colección de datos que consta de tres entrevistas (Seidman, 2013). La primera entrevista se centra en su historia, estableciendo el marco de su experiencia con la permanencia académica. La segunda entrevista se concentra en detalles acerca de su experiencia actual como profesor LGBQ en una institución de educación superior en Puerto Rico. La tercera entrevista fomenta a la reflexión destacando lo que ha significado su experiencia en el proceso de permanencia.

Cada entrevista toma de 30 a 60 minutos aproximadamente y consisten de una pregunta. Le haré la pregunta y luego le invito a decir tanto como le sea posible sobre sí misma a la luz del tema, hasta el momento actual. Estaré grabando el audio de esta entrevista y tomando notas. Cabe puntualizar que su información será confidencial. Su nombre u otra información de identificación no serán utilizados en documentos escritos o presentaciones relacionadas a los resultados de este estudio. Todos los datos de la investigación serán accesibles sólo a la investigadora principal (Annette Hestres), quien velará por su confidencialidad en todo momento.

Su participación es voluntaria y usted puede terminar la entrevista en cualquier momento; no tiene que responder a preguntas que no desee contestar.

Deseo su consentimiento para participar en esta investigación relevante a mi estudio doctoral. Espero su confirmación.

Entrevista 1: Hábleme lo más posible sobre usted y su trayectoria como miembro de facultad LGBQ desde sus inicios en el mundo académico hasta lograr la permanencia en su institución académica. Sea lo más explícita posible.

Entrevista 2: Por favor hable acerca de un día laboral, comenzando desde que despierta hasta el momento que se queda dormida.

Entrevista 3: Teniendo en cuenta lo que ha dicho acerca de sus vivencias en la educación superior para lograr la permanencia, y teniendo en cuenta lo que ha dicho acerca de su día de trabajo, ¿Qué consejo le daría a futuros miembros de la facultad LGBQ que entran en el proceso de permanencia en una institución de educación superior en Puerto Rico?
APPENDIX F – ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS DURING INTERVIEW

Listening
Do I understand the substance the interviewee is saying?
Is the substance detailed and complete, as I would like it to be?
Listen for linguistic clues
What are the ways things are being said?

Clarification Questions
Please explain what you meant by ___.
Help me understand what you meant when you said ____.
Can you say more about ___?

Additional Interview Questions
What was the tenure process like for you?
Do you have a moment that stands out while ___?
Do you have a moment that stands out during your academic career as an LGBQ Latina faculty member?
What happened throughout ___?
What happened throughout the time you were settling in as a faculty member in [INSTITUTION]
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