

Can I Charge My Therapy to the University?

Jodi O'Brien

Being included can be a lesson in “being not” as much as “being in.”

(AHMED, 2012, P. 163)

There is difference and there is power; and who holds the power decides the meaning of the difference.

(JORDAN, 1994, P. 197)

Conocimiento es otro modo de conectar across colors and other differences to allies also trying to negotiate contradictions, survive the stresses and traumas of daily life, and develop a spiritual-imaginal-political vision together.

(ANZALDÚA & KEATING, 2002, P. 571)

In a voiced community, we all flourish.

(WILLIAMS, 2012, P. 129)

In May 2010, I became a household name in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. The occasion for this midwestern notoriety was my dismissal as the recently hired dean of arts and sciences at Marquette University, a Jesuit Catholic university, on the grounds that my scholarship was “anti-Catholic.” I am a lesbian feminist sociologist and my qualifications at the time included sixteen years as a faculty member at another Jesuit university where I had held several faculty administrative positions and was teaching and conducting research on the social psychology of prejudice and discrimination, with an emphasis on gender, race, sexuality, and religion. I have been openly queer throughout my career in academe. With full knowledge of these facts, a well-established professional search firm working on behalf of Marquette pursued me for two years, courting me for the position.

DOI: 10.7330/9781607329664.c009

When they rushed to shortlist me for the position in the first year, I withdrew on the grounds that I couldn't, in good conscience, continue the process knowing that I would likely decline an offer. But they persisted. Apparently, the university had identified me as a potential "diversity dean"—someone capable of building bridges between the university and the diverse groups and communities in the region. Additionally, my deep familiarity with Jesuit higher education gave me the added edge of being a "mission" candidate.

Despite considerable hesitation on my part, when I finally agreed to visit the campus I was moved by the collective embrace I experienced. Students, staff, faculty, administrators, and community members welcomed me with open arms and assured me that I was the one they were looking for to help them write Marquette's next chapter. I was eventually persuaded to take the position and I signed the contract. While preparing to move from Seattle to Wisconsin, I received an unanticipated and bewildering phone call from the Marquette University president informing me that the dean's position had been "revoked." His explanation was muddled and confusing, but the gist was that a small but influential group consisting of a regional archbishop and some longtime donors didn't want me at Marquette and they had prevailed in their efforts to have my contract cancelled. The university community reacted to the news of my "non-hire" with wide-scale protest. The eruption of dissent was chronicled in the *New York Times* and the *Chronicle of Higher Education* as well as local and regional news outlets (O'Brien, 2012).

Although the event was deeply unsettling for me and upsetting to friends and family, in subsequent public talks I stressed that the Marquette debacle was not so much about injury to me as it was a betrayal of a community that had followed every procedure to the letter in finding and hiring the dean *they* had chosen. Yet, when my candidacy became problematic, the president simply overturned this collective process. My illegal and unceremonious unhiring at Marquette drew such a large reaction, in part, because it was a lightning rod for all the pent-up energy that crackles just below the surface in institutions that make strenuous claims of diversity and inclusion, only to betray these commitments and turn to a politics of containment when these commitments encounter pushback from the established status quo. This story resonated so broadly precisely because so many people have experienced some version of it themselves or among members of their own communities—a welcoming invitation of inclusion followed by a dis-invitation when you turn out not to be the correct subject—too queer, too ethnic, too angry, too feminist, too "not one of us." The upshot is a chilling reminder of the "just us" justice of institutional logic.

After a protracted but ultimately victorious legal battle focused on requiring Marquette University to be accountable to its community through financial and symbolic reparations, I returned to my faculty position at Seattle University. I was battle-weary, but also more clear-headed about the tensions and contradictions inherent in institutional logics of diversity and inclusion. This event was a watershed moment for me, an experience that has shaped much of my subsequent thinking and action as a faculty administrator engaged in social justice work

within the constraints of a university. In the ensuing nine years, I've held many additional faculty administrative positions, including several years as the chair of the university tenure and promotion committee, an endowed chair in gender and diversity studies, and as the director of a National Science Foundation-funded program for advancing women and minoritized faculty. What I've come to know is that this work is fraught with tensions, contradictions, and paradoxes, all of which turn on the incompatibilities between communities of liberation and institutionalized diversity programs. The politics of institutional belonging is obstinately exclusionary for all but the "correct" subjects, and while the definition of "correct subject" may shift to incorporate broader social categories (for instance, women and People of Color, once actively prohibited from a place in higher education, are now formally recruited), belonging is still contingent on "fitting in" with institutional practices rooted in discriminatory histories.

This is a far cry from liberatory action in which the aim is to be set free from institutionalized systems of oppression. One of the great tensions of contemporary higher education is that this is a site where so many of us have encountered transformative knowledges, ideas in which we have found voice and a promise of liberation, only to find ourselves reensnared by institutional logics. Despite a public rhetoric of higher education as "too liberal," academe continues to be one of the most colonized, patriarchal, elitist, racist, and homophobic institutions in contemporary society. Can we transform it? In my own work, I vacillate continually between energetic optimism and anguished disillusionment. Are we really making a difference, or just aiding the institution in the neoliberal business of diversity as branding: achieving demographic diversity, generating diversity information, and checking boxes? Am I a savvy trickster helping to destabilize entrenched systems and breaking paths to new paradigms, or a naive fool being played as an institutional pawn? Many days it feels like both. In wrestling with these incongruities and my own complicity, I turn often to Gloria Anzaldúa's instructive method of auto-historia. She counsels us to go deeper into the complexities—the messiness and pain—of this experience to move toward a more informed consciousness from which we are able to shift from the inside out. This always-shifting-self paradigm is what I bring to this work and the perspective from which I attempt to write new scripts, or terms of engagement. I share some of these reflections in this chapter.

WHAT ARE WE DOING WITH DIVERSITY WORK AND WHAT IS IT DOING TO US?

In her timely and inspired book, *On Being Included*, critical race scholar Sarah Ahmed implores us to keep asking what we are doing with diversity work and what it is doing to us (2012, p. 17). For her, "inclusion could be read as a technology of governance," a way of bringing strangers into the nation and making them into subjects whose citizenship is conditional on consenting to the terms of inclusion (p. 163). These terms are defined by those in authority and reflect institutional "narratives of repair" and a "conditional hospitality" whereby the

institution is host and we diversity subjects behave as appreciative guests who show our gratitude by putting our injuries behind us and accepting the logic that, through its equality regimes, the institution has repaired systems of oppression (pp. 43, 168). Rather than transforming institutions, the logic of diversity work too often requires individuals to transform themselves to fit the rhetoric of repair and hospitality, to serve as correct subjects whose presence and involvement indicate that the institution is, indeed, doing its part to undo oppression by incorporating us.

This question of what diversity work is doing to us resonates deeply for me. To paraphrase sociologist Dorothy Smith (2005), how do we track our own lives within the inequality regimes that characterize universities, especially as faculty administrators intent on transforming institutional agendas that were not established with us in mind? This work requires us to navigate multiple contradictory spaces, logics, and rhetorics, to be nimble, innovative bridgers. How do I locate myself in this? Patricia Hill Collins calls this work a form of intellectual-administrative activism undertaken by the “outsider-within”—the person within an institutional context whose location on the edge provides necessary alternative perspectives for institutional reorientation. In her words: “Speaking the truth to power in ways that undermine and challenge that power can often best be done as an insider . . . Challenging power structures from the inside working the cracks within the system, however, requires learning to speak multiple languages of power convincingly” (2012, p. xiii). These words serve as my compass in navigating inequality regimes. In particular, I aim to remove hurdles and open gates to welcome a wider range of voices and perspectives to academe *without* requiring those expressing them to eclipse or cleave off huge chunks of themselves in order to “fit.” Doing this has required me not only to learn multiple languages—the languages of budgets, administration, fundraising, grant-writing, and general institutional bureaucratise—but to translate these languages across different groups (e.g., explaining to department hiring committees why selecting candidates only from elite universities necessarily limits the likelihood of diversity hiring, or effectively teaching tenure and promotion review committees how to identify systematic racism and sexism in student evaluation comments, or helping a dean to understand how a Woman of Color’s fear and anger in her department reflects institutional patterns of injustice, not emotional imbalance on her part). I’m grateful for these skills of institutional multilinguality and have honed them studiously and intentionally. But in the constant navigation through and across these varied domains, I often lose myself.

Recently, I suggested to my therapist that I may be “overidentified” with my professional work. Even as I uttered these words, I felt tremendous anger at taking precious therapy time to talk about work (and I fantasized about sending the bill to the university). But the fact of the matter is, I need help managing an unhealthy amount of time in the shower spent puzzling over and anguishing about my work, specifically, about navigating the isolation and inbetweenness that increasingly plague me in my bridging position. While I like to think that I am robustly critically aware of the tensions of diversity work *on* institutions—we are both

complicit with and agents for change in systems of institutional oppression—it's more challenging for me to admit the ways in which I may have become *of* the institution as a consequence of my deep engagement in working to change the institution. Minoritized faculty members drawn into administrative positions through a desire for institutional transformation typically face a choice of being dismissed as “too radical” or finding themselves becoming administrative allies who take on the perspective of authority, which is one of internalized dominance. Those of us trying to navigate these dynamics, to be strategic change-agents rather than co-opted instruments, experience tremendous isolation, self-doubt, and a constant struggle to find an effective voice—one that doesn't betray our deepest commitments. There is a constant sense of inbetweenness—of being viewed with suspicion and envy by supposed collegial friends (I've sold out and am just clamoring for power) combined with an awareness that one's worth in administrative circles is instrumental, never truly relational. The urge to simply walk away is always there, yet, at the same time, I feel “bound”—both committed and obligated to the possibilities of the work.

NEVER AT HOME

Anzaldúa suggests that the consciousness forged in the borderlands of the *mestiza's* experience is the wellspring of more complex, innovative thinking—a perspective that, again, may be valued in institutional diversity work, but typically in ways that are transactional: the *mestiza* never really belongs. Ahmed reports on the deep institutional ambivalence that diversity practitioners experience: we value the opportunity to engage in this work and find it satisfying in many ways, but we are also continually reminded through many everyday experiences that the institution does not represent us, is not our home, and requires us to adhere to unspoken but firmly entrenched rules for being *acceptably* different in order to maintain our place.

Expectations of relational engagement alongside unwritten codes for acceptance constitute an insidiously unstable terrain for minoritized faculty administrators doing diversity work, and this includes not only formal “diversity officers” but department chairs, deans, and other mid-level administrators. We may feel as if we're being invited to the table of power, and, to some extent, we have been. The lure of inclusion, especially in significant administrative processes, may temporarily blind us to the fact that, ultimately, we are operating from entirely different paradigms. The challenge is exacerbated by the fact that I work with many well-intentioned administrators who very much want to “get it.” But that earnestness invokes even more tension as I seek to maintain my footing with those who often really don't get it, but with whom I must continue to diplomatically engage if I want to advance the work that matters to me. A question I ponder regularly is whether to step away from university administrative work and focus instead on community organizations, where I'm more at home.

This question came to the foreground in a recent dissertation defense conversation. Building on his superb book of oral histories on transgender intersectionalities

(*Trans/Portraits*, 2015), Jackson Shultz recently completed doctoral research on the institutional experiences of transgender and gender-nonconforming university administrators. His advisory committee included me and two other feminist scholars with long histories of university administration, including one as chief diversity officer. Jack was describing the relentless “emotional labor” required of the administrators whose stories he was chronicling (cf. Hochschild, 2012). Jack had synthesized this concept with the ideas of “covering” and “comforting,” terms used by sociologist Erving Goffman to explain the interpersonal work required of people with “stigmatized” identities (1986). As Jack explained, trans administrators must constantly assess whether, when, and how to reveal their status in the workplace. In addition to the daunting daily dance of covering, they must also engage in constant “comforting”—everyday practices of putting others at ease in their presence. These practices, which include humor, educational commentaries, and efforts to highlight sameness, are exhausting.

As we talked further, the conversation turned to the fact that Women of Color and LGBTQ folk head the ranks of university administrators engaged in diversity work. But despite our significant presence in numbers, we feel routinely blocked in our work (Ahmed’s brick wall), excluded from meaningful decision-making bodies, tokenized, and repeatedly “put in our place.”

Add to all this the emotional labor of comforting and covering—well, it’s a wonder we show up at all. Quoting Ahmed, Jack noted that the trans administrators he talked with frequently lamented that all we do as diversity practitioners is “make paper,” or promote the “diversity as brand” efforts of the institution while simultaneously protecting it from litigation. Through our efforts, we generate extensive knowledge of institutions, but with very little likelihood of actual transformation. We three committee members nodded in solemn recognition as Jack articulated a common thread across the stories he’d gathered: administrative diversity work by minoritized faculty and staff requires exhaustive emotional labor that is draining, demoralizing, and often harmful to actual communities and personal well-being.

For Jackson, these interrogations come down to a sense of home. In the contemporary university, despite our attempts at inclusive curricula, practices, and policies, the prevailing terms of engagement—the everyday practices and languages—remain stubbornly grounded in a paradigm of power and control that is fundamentally at odds with the generative, collaborative engagement that is the wellspring of liberation. The paradox is that, even as we advance critical understandings of university inequality regimes, we become increasingly alienated through our own instrumentalization. Much of our confusion and anguish lies in the tension of recognizing the utility and possibilities of our work, while slamming up against continual reminders that this is not our home.

DIVERSITY EMBRACEMENT AND RELATIONAL ENGAGEMENT

My colleague Holly Ferraro studies diversity in organizational management and has introduced the idea of “diversity embracement” as a counter-practice to the

instrumentalization of minoritized employee experience. She suggests, “The paradox of inclusive practices not leading to inclusive experiences led me to study diversity embracement which I define as the transformation of interpersonal situations (i.e., the ‘small moments’) and relational identities to allow people to interact across difference” (Ferraro, 2018). For Ferraro, a missing question in inclusion work is, inclusion in *what* or belonging to *what*? She asks, “To what does one belong or in what is one included?” Ferraro’s framework can be powerfully applied to considerations of engagement. How do institutional dynamics tear us apart, and how can we come together in more sustained solidarity?

Diversity practitioners typically practice ongoing self-interrogation so as to not become reensnared by the institutional paradigms and the internalized dominance we hope to crack. Yet one of the most insidious aspects of mid-level university leadership is how our positions isolate us from—and even turn us against—one another. Dynamics of divide and conquer are common in institutional environments with hierarchical authority structures and cultures of competition. We have to be ever vigilant against these self-defeating divisions. For instance, how do I navigate having my integrity and motivation questioned as a result of a colleague, someone I thought a friend, throwing me under the bus in what feels like a maneuver to advance their own agenda? During such moments (which are more frequent than I sometimes want to acknowledge), I strive to stay focused on the institutional logics that pit us against one another in the first place, the internalized dominance practiced by persons in positions of received, unexamined authority who resort to a parental script and treat us as if we are misbehaving children—fighting siblings in need of discipline and time out. This individualization of minoritized faculty as troublemakers who can’t get along with one another and need to be contained reinforces lines of institutional authority and divides us even further. These are the occasions that most try my capacity to stay in solidarity with my colleagues, and yet this is also when it’s most important to seek them out for honest discussion about what’s really going on, to remember that staying aligned is our only way through these mechanics of containment and diminishment.

Another question Ferraro prompts is, in the midst of annihilating institutional mechanics, where and how are our voices heard, renewed, and cherished? What are the practices, the “small moments,” that cultivate vibrant diversity embracement? For me, this begins in genuine and generous curiosity about one another’s stories with the intent to learn and stretch rather than to control and incorporate. This can be especially challenging for administrators concerned with keeping order and discomfited by stories and experiences that disrupt the logic of the institution as inclusive host. Faculty administrators concerned with protecting the institution (feeling accountable to administrative superiors) will attempt to shut down or redirect stories and experiences that implicate institutional leaders and systems in injurious practices. Alternatively, when we are genuinely engaged with one another, we are open to these stories and all the pain, anger, and discord that they hold. We not only make room for them, we are prepared to be moved and changed by them. Another closely related aspect of relational

engagement is recognizing, highlighting, and counting the relational/educational work that minoritized faculty contribute. Minoritized students, staff, and faculty are expected to “educate” those whose positions reflect the status quo, but with no recognition of the implications. Much has been written about how wearisome this burden of diversity work can be, but we need to give considerably more attention to reframing this work as a *contribution* in its own right: knowledges and skills that add value and enhance institutional life, rather than educational experiences that institutions are entitled to use as a price of inclusion. This work, which includes countless hours spent advising and mentoring minoritized students and colleagues, participating in ubiquitous diversity committees and panels, and fielding numerous requests to “help us ‘get it,’” enhances the university mission in tangible ways (O'Brien, 2016), but the work is often hidden, or deemed a hobby interest of diverse faculty, the fruits of which the university is freely entitled to.

Ferraro notes that one of the tensions of institutional diversity is that minoritized subjects may be ambivalent or even resistant to being absorbed into the culture of the institution. Yet one of the demands of hospitality is showing appreciation for the including institution and, more insidiously, being grateful for the appropriation of one's experiences and stories into the institutional fabric. In exploring this issue from a relational rather than an instrumental/institutional entitlement paradigm, Ferraro flips the question to suggest that relational embracement means that persons who hold traditional institutional dominance are not entitled to anything; rather, they have an opportunity to stretch into and learn from others' experiences, but doing so relationally means being vulnerable, disoriented, and not in control of the experience. This is the sort of “inescapable scratchiness” wherein genuine personal transformation can occur, but only if institutional leaders let go of the safety reins of authority and embrace the freefall of relational engagement.

Full recognition of the value of social justice work undertaken by minoritized faculty means not only counting it in formal appraisal processes but learning to embrace the scratchiness of it when practiced outside the lines of existing organizational hierarchy charts. Done well, which is to say when forms of shared governance enable diverse groups to participate fully without the expectation that they will change themselves to conform to existing institutional practices (i.e., to speak and engage only in ways that reflect languages of dominance), these practices *are* a form of transformation. For this to happen, those in positions of power much stretch through their own discomfort and learn to be with difference without trying to contain it or make it conform. If this sort of transformation is truly under way, it will be unsettling.

There is tremendous potential in this approach, but it also exposes more clearly the inherent tensions between administrative roles and social justice advocacy. Provosts or presidents might be personally moved, even committed to deeper personal transformation and engagement, but they are constrained by additional external institutional dynamics, such as the demands of a board of regents unimpressed by social justice concerns except as branding. Contemplating the way

through this labyrinth is beyond the scope of this chapter, but my own brief observation is that these dynamics of the status quo are pliable in response to perceived shifts in wider cultural circles: a savvy administrator can move governing bodies into new, potentially transformative terrain by demonstrating the promise of “value added” through embracing diverse perspectives and directions. But for this to truly crack through entrenched systems, such administrators must be grounded in and operating from a place of paradigm shift in themselves. They must be literate and nimble in the multiple languages of both the status quo and *transformation à la libération* (rather than instrumental). Such administrators are reflexively motivated by and accountable to the diverse groups they serve and strive to bring more recognition and voice to. These are the stealth academic administrators who can say, I am a *faculty* dean, or a *faculty- and student-oriented* provost and who are champions of shared governance and practiced in generative mid-level collaboration (as opposed to top-down authority), who understand that they must stake a commitment of accountability: seeking to raise the voices and contributions of those with whom they feel solidarity while educating and persuading those in positions of power without succumbing to the lure of dominance. Such administrators are bridge-builders par excellence.

SOME CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

Recently, my therapist asked me what distinguishes the strong conviction I felt in responding to the Marquette debacle and the creeping desolation that sometimes overtakes me in my current work. Immediately, I recalled the collective solidarity that characterized those weeks following the unhiring. Rather than seek terms of personal settlement, which has become a routinized formula by which a university washes its hands of its own misdeeds, I sought community retribution. Working with a team of astute attorneys and advisors (all of whom enthusiastically volunteered their time and expertise), we drew up a plan obligating the university to create ongoing funding for education and programming in gender and sexuality studies. The illegalities of the case were so publicly egregious that I was in a strong negotiating position, buttressed by ongoing campus protests on my behalf, and a mostly positive media portrayal. I was also buoyed by the more than 400 letters I received from Marquette students and alumni as well as Milwaukee-area residents, many of them practicing Catholics, expressing outrage at the university’s actions and offering support and encouragement. Despite all this, Marquette threw up multiple obstacles, but we never wavered, and eventually we prevailed. The process itself was grueling—I often felt nothing in my life could have prepared me for it—but, as my therapist eight years later pointed out, my conviction was firm throughout. That the case was so clearly a wrongdoing helped me in this conviction, but mostly it was the collective support, the shared truth of the wrongness of the actions, that kept me focused and animated.

In contrast, the everyday bridging work of the outsider-within is not so straightforward. The relentless business of framing “our ideas in a language that is familiar to and comfortable for the dominant group” (Collins, 2002, p. 7),

working against the grain of unquestioned “commonsense” practices of hierarchy, and maintaining internal equilibrium in the face of destabilizing disbelief from those in power leaves us tattered and frayed. We barely have energy for ourselves, let alone those with whom we wish to be in solidarity. In Anzaldúan terms, this place of extreme vulnerability is where we are least likely to be able to access the inner resources that mobilize us. For her this is *nepantla*—an in-between place, a threshold from which we are invited to go deeper into the “chaos of living between stories” (Anzaldúa & Keating, 2002, p. 545). This threshold is where we develop *conocimiento*, a way of being and knowing that enables us to “negotiate contradictions, survive the stresses and traumas of daily life, and develop a spiritual-imaginal-political vision together” (p. 571). We zigzag repeatedly between ignorance and awareness, but the hallmark of the journey is going deeper into our own breakdowns so that we can break free from habitual coping strategies and emerge with new ways of knowing/being: to arrive at “the critical turning point of transformation, [and] develop an ethical, compassionate strategy with which to negotiate conflict and difference within self and between others, and find common ground by forming holistic alliances” (p. 545).

What I am learning from this struggle is that real liberation includes cultivating new habits for staying engaged. Despite my strong urge to retreat into myself when wounded, I am at my best, with potential for synergistic renewal and unwavering conviction, when I am in community, in genuine engagement with others, working collaboratively. Alternatively, when I'm too isolated, I become confused and doubt myself and then begin to doubt others, including (and sometimes especially) those with whom I desire to be in solidarity. Thus, I'm learning to recognize the importance of renewal—not just for ourselves but collectively.

I have a cherished colleague who is beautifully practiced in the art of collective renewal. She never misses an occasion to celebrate with festive gatherings the accomplishments of our other colleagues. Making time to sit with one another sharing food, stories, tears, laughter, and music (she always makes us sing and dance) reminds me, if not entirely who I am, at least of where I might regain voice. When I gather with my colleagues in a spirit of camaraderie, these self-defeating voices are magically vanquished (and in a manner much less costly and more sustainable than the many hours of billable therapy). During these moments of coming together in genuine curiosity and generous respect, I am reminded of all the ways my dear colleagues delight me; their intelligence of mind, body, and spirit consoles and renews me and (re)sources me for returning to a politics of possibility. I feel inspired to be more fierce with my detractors, and more sustainably aligned with my allies. In other words, I am, once again, more assured in myself.

I am not so naive as to think that my suggestions here will transform the long-standing oppressions of institutional inequality regimes. But I do think that we have choices in how we engage with these institutional practices, especially those of us with the relative privilege of institutional authority as faculty administrators. Small but persistent, mindful practices of relational engagement that confer dignity, respect, and voice shift us all and allow us to come together in ways other

than narratives of instrumental hospitality. These “small moments” push against the edifices of institutional oppression and may, indeed, create some cracks. For me, staying engaged in these practices requires a sort of alchemy, a transformation that can only be achieved through *nepantla*, in the threshold places where I’m thrown off balance and forced to confront my own (dis)identifications, beliefs, and practices. Genuine, relational, emergent collaborative engagement *is* messy. In growing our capacity to engage with this messiness we expand and become more whole. We are motivated to articulate commonalities from which to build bridges and to invite others to do the same.

The lessons I carry with me these days include fiercely mindful collaboration with those like-minded folk (and they come in many guises) who are literate in the multiple languages of institutional dominance and oppression; an appreciation for “stealth” colleagues working intelligently and subversively behind the scenes to confront discrimination in its many forms; a more cautious, curious response to those “sellouts” I may have been too quick to condemn and dismiss (as others have often done to me); ongoing interrogative reflection on who/what I’m feeling accountable to (who’s the audience in my head?); and, perhaps most important, the absolute necessity of sustained collective recognition and renewal in solidarity with others. This practice is, in itself, the spirit of transformation, the everyday graces in which we see, honor, and hold each other up in all our splendid possibility.

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, S. (2012). *On being included*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Anzaldúa, G., & Keating, A. (2002). *This bridge we call home: Radical visions for transformation*. New York: Routledge.
- Collins, P. H. (2002). *Black feminist thought*. New York: Routledge.
- Collins, P. H. (2012). *On intellectual activism*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Ferraro, H. (2018). Inclusive organizational practice vs inclusive experience. Research proposal in progress.
- Goffman, E. (1986). *Stigma*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Hochschild, A. (2012). *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Jordan, J. (1994). *Technical difficulties*. Boston: Beacon.
- O’Brien, J. (2012). Stained-glass ceilings: Religion, sexuality, and the cultural politics of belonging. *Social Philosophy Today*, 28, 5–26.
- O’Brien, J. (2016). What counts as success? Recognizing and rewarding women faculty’s differential contributions in a comprehensive liberal arts university. National Science Foundation Institutional Transformation ADVANCE Grant #1629875.
- Shultz, J. (2015). *Trans/portraits: Voices from transgender communities*. Hanover, NH: Dartmouth University Press.
- Smith, D. (2005). *Institutional ethnography: A sociology for people*. Landham, ND: AltaMira.
- Tempest Williams, T. (2012). *When women were birds*. New York: Picador.