Teaching outside the Classroom: Conversations on Race and Research

Marybeth Gasman
University of Pennsylvania

Sibby Anderson- Thompkins
Georgia State University

Nia Woods Haydel
Georgia State University

Contact Information:

Marybeth Gasman
Assistant Professor
Higher Education Division
Graduate School of Education
University of Pennsylvania
3700 Walnut Street
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6216
gasman@gse.upenn.edu
215-573-3990

In a reflective essay, Brian Coppola, a faculty member at the University of Michigan, argues that the "open discourse about the nature of academic life, its requirements and expectations, and where and how to improve it are all missing in the experience of a majority of graduate students (Coppola, 2002, p. 2)." This problem is particularly acute for African American graduate students at predominantly white institutions wishing to pursue faculty careers. These students encounter isolation, a lack of an established support network, and a shortage of mentoring and professional opportunities (Cheatham & Phelps, 1995; Chism & Pruitt, 1995; Ellis, 1997; Feagin et al, 1996; Steele, 1995; Willie, Grady, & Hope, 1991). Furthermore, many African Americans, as first generation students, enter the academy with little knowledge of what is necessary, socially and politically, to succeed in an academic environment (Anderson-Thompkins et al, 2003). Often, negative experiences take place inside the classroom through the formal curriculum or teaching practices. But, what of the teaching practices that take place outside of the classroom – the casual conversations with faculty or chance meetings in the hallway (Armstrong, 1999; Cooper & Robinson, 2000; Jones, 1997)? How can faculty members use these informal interactions to enhance the experiences of African American students? More importantly and more broadly, what can faculty members learn from doctoral students in these same settings? How can the faculty-student relationships move beyond advisory to one that challenges both participants?

In January of 2001, we began a research project in which we explored alumni giving at historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs). We were interested in how HBCUs ask their alumni for financial support and how the alumni, in turn, responded to these requests. This project was the impetus for our teaching and learning

experiences outside of the classroom. It offered us an opportunity to talk informally with each other and to challenge each other's assumptions. This paper is a convergence of our individual experiences working collaboratively on the project. In effect, the paper is a study of a study – the original study on HBCU alumni giving provided a laboratory for innovative student/teacher interaction. Specifically, in the paper, we discuss our fears, assumptions, growth, and learning during the research process. As you will discover through our narratives, many of the discussions that took place during our collaboration were about outsider research; but even more than that they were about why people do research and how someone arrives at a research topic.

We have organized our paper into three sections. Initially, we explain the theories that guided our thought processes for this paper, specifically collaborative learning. Secondly, we provide three narratives, one for each of the two students and one for the professor leading the original HBCU study, that detail our personal journeys through the research process (pursuing the HBCU topic). Lastly, we discuss recommendations for faculty and graduate student collaborations in the area of research. Although these recommendations are specifically related to African American graduate students interested in faculty careers, in many cases, they could be applied to the general student/faculty relationship.

<div align="center">Conceptual Framework</div>

Underlying conventional teaching practices is, as Ann Stanton (1996) explains, an assumption that "anyone with command of the material can teach and anyone who tries hard enough can learn" (p. 35). Stanton (1996) states, "We professors know very little about who our students are, how they learn, and what they know and remember beyond

the written products that we require them to deliver" (p. 35). Stanton (1996) contends

that "Most teaching effort at the college level is directed at matters of *procedural*

knowledge – presenting and utilizing the theories, methods, controversies, and findings of

our fields. Most college teachers, however, overlook the pivotal perspective of *subjective*

knowing. (If anything we stamp it out – to make sure that students don't get away with

unsupported personal opinions.)" (p. 40).

In this context of teaching/learning, subjective knowing is discounted. Stanton

(1996) argues, what is lost is "the student's sense of not only having but owning her/his

own opinion – and how that capacity must be built upon to acquire more powerful

thinking strategies" (p. 40). Thus, teaching is an epistemological inquiry whose core

questions are: Who is the learner? What does s/he bring to the learning process?

Without asking these questions, the teacher, in effect, treats students as if they are

identically programmed computers, non individual human beings.

Collaborative Learning

The focus of much of the literature on collaborative learning has been on

changing the social context of the classroom and creating conditions within the classroom

in which a particular kind of dialogue can flourish (Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and

Tarule, 1986, 1996). However, are graduate education classrooms really collaborative?

Tarule (1996) argues that college classrooms "are a teacher's construction of knowledge

delivered through syllabus, lectures, even facilitated discussions. The boundaries of

knowledge are predefined" (p. 291). Moreover, Tarule (1996) contends that collaborative

learning is rare in the culture of the academy. In fact, collaboration as a practice is

devalued within the academy (i.e., co-written articles count less, and although study groups are encouraged, working together during a test is considered cheating.)

However, when collaborative learning works, Tarule (1996) argues, there are two prerequisites: a shared vocabulary that may include specific disciplinary terminology and a shift in roles among students and teachers. Successful collaborative learning challenges us to rethink the role of teacher as expert or authority and to find new ways and new places to engage students.

In his observations of schools, anthropologist Paul Rabinow (1986) suggests that "corridor talk" is an important component of knowledge production within any discipline. These informal conversations, Tarule (1996) contends, have long been part of the learning environment. She argues "the academy has required these [activities] be outside 'regular' class time, relegating them to the corridors and coffee shops ensuring that although they may support individuals' learning, they are not designed intentionally as part of the classroom discourse" (p. 291).

Much of what Rabinow (1986) and Tarule (1996) describe mirrors the idea of "learning centered teaching" which emphasizes the personalization of classroom discussion and student/teacher interaction. Bringing subjective knowledge into both the classroom and daily interactions between teachers and students fosters more trust and growth on the part of all participants (Coppola, 2002; Cross, 2002; Reynolds, 2000; Stage et al, 1998). And, learner-focused teaching as well as faculty/student relationships can result in students maintaining their own sense of self rather than adopting that of the faculty member (Coppola, 2002).

Method/Rationale

Our method of inquiry, critical self-reflections, allows us to share with the readers our individual subjective knowledge. This format allows us to tell the story of our self-discoveries. Tarule (1996) argues that "dialogue is making knowledge in conversation" (p. 280). Learning is expanded and directed by conversation. Using the metaphor of racquetball, Tarule describes the learning process thus: "the ball bounces off all surfaces, just as in group conversations ideas bounce around. They may seem to emerge from left field or from nowhere as all ideas are included, debated, contested, [and] expanded."

In the case of our team, conversations on race, identity, and research led to student learning and the development of students' research agendas. Moreover, these conversations led to new teacher knowledge. Collaborative learning and teaching emphasizes the significance of relationships in the process of constructing knowledge. The essays that follow are critical self-reflections that illustrate collaborative learning and teaching, with particular emphasis on relationships.

Critical Self-Reflections: Learning Outside the Classroom

Critical Self-Reflection: Nia Woods Haydel

I am an African American female doctoral student from Louisiana. Deciding on whether or not to pursue a Ph.D. was not an individual decision, but a family one. This is an important distinction because it demonstrates from the beginning the importance placed on this degree and the burden placed on me. I should be clear that the pressure to succeed is self-imposed, but is also rooted in the desire I have to make my family and

community proud. These points contribute to the importance of the lessons I learned throughout our research.

When I first began my doctoral studies I was uncertain about many things. I was not sure what a doctoral program would demand or how well I would measure up to the other students. I was even uncertain about the ultimate use of my degree.   Amidst all of my doubts, there was one thing I knew — research would be an essential part of my graduate program and the portion of the process I would dislike the most.

What convinced me of this? There were many factors that contributed to my anticipated dislike of research. Among them were my own negative experiences as an undergraduate and master's-level graduate student, but these were insignificant compared to the personal stories I had heard from seasoned doctoral students. I believed that inherent in the tales replaying the hours spent finding sufficient supporting evidence to substantiate one's position, was a subtle message of dissatisfaction with the research process. I concluded that I would be no different from other students who had experienced the trials of research. Compounding the problem was my belief that my ability to be a researcher could either make my life in the academy successful or make me reconsider my future profession. Before I had even begun my coursework, research was becoming a larger than life problem.

There are several facts I have come to discover for myself through this research experience. First, I now realize that most of my trepidation came from merely not knowing — not knowing what would be required by the faculty or whether or not I had what would be needed to rise to the challenge of doctoral level work. Second, I did not fully understand that research could serve as a means to support my personal interests as

it relates to activism in my community.   Finally, I now understand that everyone's experience is indeed different and that feelings a student develops toward research can be greatly influenced by the role faculty members in the student's research interests. Fortunately for me, as a result of the relationship I developed through informal interactions with faculty in my department, I learned that research could be meaningful and that my initial anxiety was natural.

I was fortunate that during my first semester, my professors introduced me to the benefits of research. They made research less intimidating. This transformation began during our first class meeting when they brought us to the library and introduced the resources and staff that were available to assist us. Learning that there was a support system in place made the challenge easier to address. Although this step was critical in initiating a shift in my perception of research, I still was not intrigued by the idea of making research a primary part of my life.

Then enters Dr. Gasman who would soon do more to alter my attitude toward research in one conversation than others had done in my entire academic career.   While speaking with Dr. Gasman about her area of concentration, I became intrigued by a number of factors surrounding this scholar. The factor that I was most interested in was that she chose to research philanthropy in the African American community and at historically Black colleges and universities. I could not understand why a White woman from the Midwest would choose to spend her professional career investigating how Black institutions received funding and what could be done to increase their philanthropic support.

Through our discussions I gained insight on the role of research. I began to understand more thoroughly the power behind research or rather the power that research provides. I started to comprehend how having documentation for issues on which I had previously only had opinion could strengthen my positions.

But this new knowledge did not answer the questions I had surrounding Marybeth's research area. I was still unclear as to why she chose to research issues pertaining to the African American community. Why was it that she was attempting to provide documentation supporting the need of the African American community in areas related to higher education?

Before hearing her explanation, I was extremely skeptical of her intent. It was not that I did not think Marybeth was sincere. As an individual, I had already begun to trust her sincerity and her passion for the topics she researched. However, my past experiences had provided me with more than ample reasons to be distrustful of anyone outside of the African American community who claimed to be working to improve our status in society or the opportunities available to us (Cassell, 1998; Merriam et al, 2001; Newsom, Ridenour, & Kinnucan-Welsh, 1999). Throughout my education, the only inclusion of African Americans in my classes had been related to negative instances in history. The exclusion of the positive while continuously being bombarded with the negative supported my belief that those external to our community did not intend anything good for us. Subsequently, I had concluded that if people outside of our race were attempting to do research pertaining to us, there was probably something extremely profitable in it for them.

I have always had an interest in investigating the inequity and disparity for Blacks in education. In my opinion this was my right and my responsibility. For me to do this work would help to uplift my race and to propel those who came behind me to a higher status. It has been difficult for me to understand why anyone outside of my race would have any reason or desire to work toward uplifting us (Watson & Scraton, 2001).

However, Dr. Gasman was going to surprise me once again. She explained to me that she had developed her research interest during her graduate studies. Additionally, she explained that her research in this area was a response to White racism and ignorance. She realized that some Whites were not willing to listen to African American scholars writing to make changes in these areas. As I understood Marybeth's position, lack of respect and a reluctance to listen has inhibited the much-needed change in the White community. Dr. Gasman realized that she could influence opinion and do her part to change minds and confront prejudice as a White researcher in the White community studying African Americans.

Through our conversation I began to better comprehend the power of research. I found that it could be liberating to explore a topic that has been previously treated with skepticism because research can be a mechanism to provide voice to a forgotten, but important topic.

By observing Dr. Gasman's commitment to forge ahead in a somewhat controversial area of research given her "outsider" status, I learned that there is a role for everyone in the exploration of each research area-- any topic is worthy of being explored and not all researchers have ill-intent when researching histories and cultures other than their own (Merchant, 2001; Merriam et al, 2001). Above all, Marybeth showed me that

an introduction of data through research might be the strongest tool for combating fear and ignorance.

Dr. Gasman provided a welcoming space in which I could be open about my concerns and fears regarding how delicate topics—subjects of personal value to me—are treated in the academy. This was an invitation that I was not expecting, but it was greatly appreciated. In this initial conversation, which took place in an informal setting, she gave something to me and I believe that I provided her with something as well. We share and we learn in an effort to broaden our understanding of the other's position; this in turn helps us to be open-minded researchers. We have built a collegial partnership based on egalitarianism, which I believe is rare in faculty-student partnerships. There is no doubt that this has emerged due to our willingness to openly engage in difficult conversations during class, but also on an informal basis: in the hallway, in the office, via email or telephone. I am glad that I have had the opportunity to meet a faculty member who is comfortable deviating from the conventional student-faculty tradition and who uses liberatory pedagogy as a means of engagement. As a result of her unorthodox approach we were both able to teach each other; our relationship was reciprocal.

Critical Self-Reflection: Sibby Anderson-Thompkins

I am a doctoral student in educational research, statistics, and measurements. I am also a fourth generation college-educated African American woman. In my family, education has not only been viewed as a "means to an end," but it has been our family business. From my great-grandfather to my siblings and me, we have been teachers, principals, college deans and instructors. And, though my family's educational background provides me with a certain level of ease within the academy, I admit I am

apprehensive and doubtful of the motivations behind many of my White faculty and peers' research agendas.

My apprehension was evident at the onset of our research project. Though I held my professor in high regard, I questioned the intentions of a White woman "doing research" on African Americans. My apprehensions were shaped by the countless writings of people of color about the "outsider" researcher who comes into the community, collects its stories, and then builds a promising career on the backs of the disenfranchised (Bridges, 2002, McKinley & Deyhley, 2000, Merriam et al, 2001). Smith (1999), a post-colonial theorist, elucidates this phenomenon further, describing the outsider researcher who enters communities of color, "armed with good will" and, who—after collecting their stories and other profitable commodities—justifies his or her actions as "intended for the greater good" of knowledge or research.

Furthermore, I felt uneasy about the prospect of looking at patterns of giving among African American alumni at historically Black colleges and universities. I was concerned that under the harsh gaze of the outsider researcher-- our traditions and our community's ways of giving would be interpreted as somehow "not as good" as those at predominantly White institutions. Too, I was afraid that some unfavorable aspect of African American culture might be exposed, laid bare before the critical outsider (Valverde, 1980).

However, after several conversations with Dr. Gasman, she put me at ease.   I realized that she was genuine in her interests in African American history and culture. More importantly, she articulated an activist agenda of "confronting the prejudices of

members of her own race while educating those within the academy (Watson & Scraton, 2001)."

In the beginning, we talked mainly about methodological issues —how they are indelibly linked to history, culture, and identity. What type of methodology should we as a multiracial research team use when working with African American communities? What data collection techniques would we use? For several months, I researched different methodologies including collaborative or participatory research, community action research, emancipatory research, and evaluative ethnography. The idea was for me to read and prepare summaries on methods for our weekly meetings. In these sessions, Dr. Gasman and I would engage in lively dialogue about the merits of each method and talk about how or if these models coalesced with the goals of our project. Our weekly conversations were invaluable to me. They served to facilitate a greater understanding of methods on my part—more valuable than what I had learned through my coursework or by reading textbooks. During this time we formed a relationship that was collegial, one in which my professional opinion was valued.

As time passed, our conversations took on a more personal nature, and they challenged me to examine my own biases. Having grown up in a predominantly White neighborhood, educated at predominantly White schools, and having spent most of my career at predominantly White institutions—I had to concede that I held some of the same beliefs and attitudes I had initially attributed to the White outsider researcher. In truth, I too was an "outsider" (Plows, 1998). Though I am an African American woman, I have limited knowledge of HBCUs or their fundraising practices. As a result of our conversations I had to reconsider the preconceived notions I held regarding patterns of

giving among African Americans, as well as, my own biases and prejudices about HBCUs. These conversations challenged me on multiple levels—as an African American woman, as a researcher, and as a teacher.

Reflecting on my journey, I realize it taught me much about the research process and working in collaboration with communities to find solutions to educational problems while striving to empower those with whom we work. As a doctoral student in educational research those are important outcomes. However, an unexpected benefit was my own personal growth and self-awareness.

Critical Self-Reflection: Marybeth Gasman

I am a White, female faculty member. I grew up in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan as part of a large family. We lived on an animal and vegetable farm. My hometown was made up of European immigrants (Polish, Finnish, and Swedish families) and a small Native American population. There were *no* African American families in my town. Difference was not tolerated and still is not today.

Growing up on a farm, I learned how to be disciplined, to work hard, and to be self-sufficient. I also learned not to listen to the "towns folk" and their rantings about those who were "different." My mother, who was reared in a diverse area of the Lower Peninsula of Michigan, made sure that I did not adopt the habits of our neighbors – prejudice and uniformed racist attitudes. My mother's words and my experiences in a large farm family have shaped by thoughts and actions as a researcher and teacher.

In her narrative, Nia discussed her fear of research. I hear this often from students wishing to pursue faculty careers; I felt it myself when I was a student. In fact, I was wandering aimlessly in my graduate program until I read James D. Anderson's

(1988) *The Education of Blacks in the South*. Prior to reading his book, I could not make a connection with research, let alone think about dissertation topics. Anderson's work changed my perspective on higher education and opened up a world of new knowledge and research of which I was not familiar. Further, he did what others in the history of education often do not – he treated African Americans as actors with agency, rather than as merely subjects being acted upon. This notion is at the foundation of my research.

When choosing a dissertation topic, I looked at the work of Black sociologist and educator Charles S. Johnson (Gilpin & Gasman, 2003). In his life, I found what motivates me. Johnson spent his professional career cultivating scholars and leaders in the African American community. He influenced many of today's leaders and luminaries – including Johnnetta B. Cole, former Spelman College President and now President of Bennett College; David Levering Lewis, Pulitzer Prize winning biographer of W.E.B. Du Bois; Hazel O'Leary, former Clinton Energy Secretary; and Preston King, recently exonerated civil rights activist. Johnson hooked students on research, leadership, and activism while they were enrolled at Fisk University. Johnson was an internationally known figure who made contributions in the arts, social sciences, race politics, and international diplomacy. It may not be possible for me to do everything Johnson did, but it is possible to inspire students to appreciate research and to be activist in their approach.

In my role as a faculty member, I try to help students make connections between their individual interests, concerns and passions and educational research. For example, when teaching students about educational theorists, I try to include African American perspectives. The use of Carter G. Woodson's theories on the education of Blacks has been an inspiration to one of my African American male students. Prior to reading

Woodson, nothing connected when he was reading course-assigned literature. Where course-assigned literature gave scant coverage to African American thought and identity, Woodson's theories helped the student connect his experiences with those of his African American ancestors. Using Woodson as a framework helped to motivate the student to pursue his research interests in the area of African American male student identity. In other classes and at other universities, I have been told that African American philosophers and theorists are often dismissed or discredited.

Nia brings up a question that I have been asked over and over. "Why does a woman from the Midwest study philanthropy and Black colleges?" "Why would I care about the financial and philanthropic future, of these institutions?" After reading James Anderson's work, I delved into the literature on historically Black colleges – both historical and present perspectives. I learned of the importance of these institutions, especially in the area of cultivating future scholars and leaders. I was surprised to discover that, regardless of the aftermath of *Brown* and the Black presence at predominantly White institutions, the vast majority of African American scholars and many leaders are reared in the Black college arena (Drewry & Doermann, 2001). Sound financial support is crucial to the continued existence of these institutions. Thus, my discovery of the importance of HBCUs led to a new motivation for my research: to bring attention to these institutions within the academic and public spheres, and particularly within the White community, which, by and large, is still ignorant of them (Watson & Scraton, 2001). Efforts to abolish this ignorance are needed in government, foundations, and the academy.

Like Nia, Sibby brings up the idea of the "outsider researcher." I think that much of the concern pertaining to "outsider" status results from studying "people as subjects." I try to avoid speaking of African Americans as "other" and consider my work a contribution to the overall literature in this area rather than authoritative or the "end all" of research on this topic (Merchant, 2001). Being White, I think it is important to work with African American scholars, graduate students and informants (participants when I do oral history), and gatekeepers (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996). Checking my ideas and the way I present them with various segments of the African American community is crucial (Newsom, Ridenour & Kinnucan-Welsh, 1999).

Too often, researchers criticize Black colleges for problems that are rarely discussed with regard to predominantly White institutions. Sibby brings up the fear among some members of the Black community that White researchers will expose "bad" practices in Black institutions (Robson, 1999). This is a valid concern and one that I must confront. Because the goal of my research is to help and benefit Black colleges, I am not interested in focusing on ineffective practices. However, they must be pointed out in order to change them. I think that placing the focus on "best practices" and involving Black college practitioners is essential to research of this type. It is also imperative that Black colleges not be held to a higher standard than their predominantly White counterparts.

When doing research on philanthropy and giving in the Black community, specifically the historically Black college community, it is essential to have a sense of history (Freeman, 1998). Of course, this can be gained through secondary sources and archives. However, Sibby and Nia, who are from families that have placed a special

emphasis on service and education, have an invaluable contribution to make. Because of their participation in Black sororities and fraternities, elite social and service organizations, their families have firsthand knowledge of the major venues for Black giving. Having their perspectives on my findings pertaining to giving in the Black community helps to filter out depictions that might be misinterpreted. In addition to their own insight, both Sibby and Nia have helped me to gain access to others within the Black community. I, in turn, try to help smooth their entrance into the academic community – creating opportunities for graduate assistantships, conference attendance, the writing of journal articles, and most importantly, a sounding board for ideas and frustrations. This kind of support encompasses the teaching that can take place outside of the classroom – for both professor and student.

Implications for Teaching and Learning Outside the Classroom

Much can be learned from our experiences in this research endeavor. First and foremost, we realize how important it is for faculty and students to take advantage of the informal and impromptu opportunities for teaching and learning that occur in the academy. Maximizing these opportunities can assist both faculty and students in fostering relationships that build a rapport and reinforce the learning that takes place inside the classroom. Most importantly, these opportunities allow for discussion of why one does a particular type of research, and the modus operandi of the academy.

Most will agree that developing solid research skills as a graduate student is invaluable. Those students who are afforded the opportunity to collaborate on meaningful research projects have a clear advantage over their colleagues. Clear instruction on research methods will allay students' apprehensions about the research

process. This instruction must be conveyed not only through the textbook, but during the day to day activities of faculty members.

Although important for all graduate students, it is particularly critical to introduce African American students to the philosophies of the academy. Often they are first generation college students or have not had the same kind of mentoring that many white students had prior to graduate studies. Faculty need to communicate to their students that for some the academy is not just another hurdle to overcome on the way to a career, but a destination: that research is a creative end. Most importantly, what a student adds to the academy through research could be liberating for both the individual student and for his or her community. In order for students to truly become interested in research and in effect faculty careers, they must not only model faculty members' methods of doing research but their attitudes toward the endeavor. At some point during their educational process, faculty members must have moved beyond doing research in order to fulfill assignments and have begun to do research out of a sense of personal commitment. As shared in this article, when graduate students understand how professors connect their research agenda to their overall life experiences they learn how to explore their own research interests. This includes an understanding of research methods that might be considered controversial by other faculty. Within the confines of the classroom, there is hardly time to engage in in-depth conversations about these topics.

Though these informal mentoring activities are actions that can be used to enhance the learning of all graduate students, they are critical for graduate students of color. Much has been written on the challenges facing graduate students of color within the academy: the lack of mentors and professional opportunities; being devalued as

scholars and intellectuals; and the invisibility of minority perspectives within the formal curriculum (Ellis, 1997; Cheatham & Phelps, 1995; Steele, 1995; Chism & Pruitt, 1995; Willie, Grady & Hope, 1991). Research is at the core of the academy; by allowing graduate students of color to take ownership of it, we make them full partners in the university community. In order to accomplish this, however, it is necessary for all faculty members to be open about the personal motivations that underlie their research. For many graduate students of color, the link between race, identity, and research is a major concern. Often, they may be challenged as serious researchers or "ghettoized" because they choose race-specific research topics. But if all faculty members are open and honest about the source of their concerns it becomes clear that no person's agenda is without a specific viewpoint. This admission paves the way for faculty to create environments in which all students are valued and encouraged.

As mentioned earlier, the idea of subjectivity is an important part of the research process. When subjective knowledge is ignored and neglected, the student is not allowed to have a point of view, and it is precisely this point of view that enables the student to choose a topic, conduct research, and be passionate about the research process.

Open relationships between students and faculty members both inside and outside of the classroom benefit not only the student but the faculty member as well. Because they have a point of view that is outside of the academy and is representative of a new generation's thinking, students offer a fresh perspective on faculty work. Empowered, students can provide important feedback and challenge to faculty ideas. This was often the case in our research project as graduate students of color offered insights to a White faculty member.

By engaging in a two-way conversation, faculty members step outside the role that is prescribed to them by the academy. Traditionally, this role has been one of gatekeeper and preserver of hierarchies. Many of the rituals of the academy, as experienced by the graduate students of color participating in this research project, involve maintaining distance between student and professor. Opaque answers to questions, ambiguous information about the research process, secretiveness about faculty research motivations, and general coldness all serve to keep the existing order of the academy. Unfortunately, they also serve to inhibit learning. By breaching these traditions, faculty may be going astray according to the rules of the academy but it is this kind of transgression that is needed to impress upon the next generation the importance of research. Modeling good research methods and practices, giving positive constructive criticism, and demonstrating a diligent work ethic are direct results of comfortable relationships between individuals; these learner-centered practices will be perpetuated when students become faculty members themselves.

Based on our collaborative learning project, we make the following suggestions for working with and advising students of color:

1. Faculty members should take advantage of informal and impromptu opportunities to talk about their research and the motivations behind it. Often times, students are less inclined to ask specific questions in the classroom and these informal interactions can get at the core of student concerns and fears.

2. Students of color benefit when faculty members "deconstruct" the mysteries of the academy. Research shows that many students of color

don't have mentors and thus, are often left out of conversations pertaining to the inner workings of higher education – including conversations related to the tenure process and what is valued in the area of scholarship.

3. Faculty members should communicate their passion for research to their students, relating the intangible benefits of choosing a career in the academy. Too often students of color are told "tales of failure" instead of success stories and as a result, they avoid an academic career.

4. Through mentoring informal processes, faculty members should encourage students of color to develop their own research point of view – avoiding the urge to create protégés that mimic research interests and methods.

5. Lastly, faculty members and students of color benefit from open conversations about research that are reciprocal in nature. Students begin to understand the value of their perspective and faculty members benefit from a more collaborative, and less adversarial process that, long term, will change the racial and ethnic landscape of the academy.

References

Anderson, J. (1988). <u>The education of Blacks in the South.</u> North Carolina: The University of North Carolina.

Anderson-Thompkins, S., M. Gasman, C. Gerstl-Pepin, K. L. Hathaway, and L. Rasheed, 'Casualties of War': Suggestions for Helping African American Graduate Students to Succeed in the Academy. In Darrell Cleveland (Ed.). <u>A long way to go: Conversations about race by African American faculty and graduate students in higher education</u> (New York: Peter Lang, 2003).

Armstrong, M. (1999). Models for faculty-student interaction outside the classroom: The Duke University faculty associated program, <u>College Student Affairs Journal</u>, 19 (1), 4-16.

Bridges, D. (2002). "The ethics of outsider research," <u>www.dur.ac.uk/r.d.smith/Bridges.html</u>.

Cassell, J. (1988). The relationship of observer to observed when studying up, <u>Studies in Qualitative Methodology</u>, 1, 89-108.

Cheatham, H. and Phelps, C. (1995). Promoting the development of graduate students of color. In Anne Pruitt and Paul Issac (Eds). <u>Student services for the changing graduate student Population.</u> 72(4): 91-99.

Chism, N. and Pruitt, A. (1995). Promoting inclusiveness in college teaching. In W. Wright (Ed). <u>Teaching improvement practices: Successful strategies for higher education</u>. Bolton, MA: Anker.

Cooper, J. & P. Robinson (2000). Getting started: Informal small-group strategies in large classes <u>New Directions for Teaching and Learning</u>, 81, 17-24.

Coppola, Brian P. (2002). Treating graduate students with dignity. <u>Chronicle of Higher Education</u>, 48 (48): 1-4.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). <u>Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions.</u> Thousand Oakes, CA: Sage.

Cross, P. K. (March 2002). <u>The role of class discussion in the learning-centered classroom.</u> Phoenix, AZ: League for Innovation in the Community College.

Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y.S. (Eds.). (2000). <u>Handbook of qualitative research.</u> (2nd Ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y.S. (Eds.). (1998). Strategies<u> of qualitative inquiry.</u> Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y.S. (Eds.). (1994). <u>Handbook of qualitative research.</u> Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Drewry, H. N. & H. Doerman (2001). <u>Stand and prosper. Private Black colleges and their students.</u> Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Ellis, E. M. (1997). The impact of race and gender on graduate school socialization, satisfaction with graduate study and commitment to completion of the degree among Black and White doctoral students. Unpublished dissertation. College Park: Pennsylvania State University.

Feagin, J. R., H. Vera, and N. O. Imani (1996). <u>The agony of education: Black students at White colleges and universities</u>. New York: Routledge.

Freeman, K. (1998). <u>African American culture and heritage in higher education research and practice.</u> Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Publishing.

Gall, M., W. R. Borg, and J. P. Gall. (1996). <u>Educational research</u>. White Plains, New York: Longman.

Gilpin, P.J. & M.B. Gasman (2003). <u>Charles S. Johnson: Leadership Beyond the Veil in the Age of Jim Crow</u>. New York: State University of New York Press.

Jones, L. (1997). Talking about 'everyday' issues in the formal classroom setting: A framework for understanding the dynamics of interaction, <u>Journal of Curriculum Studies</u>, 29 (5), 559-67.

Kemmis, S. & McTaggart, R. (2000). Participatory Action Research. In N. K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.). (2000). <u>Handbook of qualitative research.</u> (2nd Ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

McKinley Brayboy, B. & D. Deyhle. (2000). Insider-Outsider: Researchers in American Indian communities, <u>Theory into Practice</u>, 39, (3).

Merchant, B. M. (2001). Negotiating the boundaries and sometimes missing the mark: A White researcher and a Mexican American research assistant, In B. M. Merchant and Arlette Ingram Willis (2001). (Eds.), <u>Multiple and intersecting identities in qualitative research,</u> New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Merriam, S., J. Johnson-Bailey, M. Lee, Y. Kee, G. Ntseane, & M. Muhamad. (2001). Power and positionality: Negotiating insider/outsider status within and across cultures, <u>International Journal of Lifelong Education</u>, 20, 5.

Newsom, C.M. C. Ridenour, & K. Kinnucan-Welsh. (1999). 'Is the tape off?' African American respondents' spontaneous discussions of race and racism when the

researcher is also African American, Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, WA.

Plows, A. Pushing the boundaries': Personal biography, reflexivity and partisanship in feminist research. The case of new social movements, www.iol.ie/~mazzoldi/toolsforchange/archive/papers/pap001.html.

Rabinow, P. (1986). In Goldberger, N., J. Tarule, B. Clinchy, and M. Belenky (1996). Knowledge, difference, and power. (New York: Basic Books).

Reynolds, J. (Fall 2000). Learning-centered learning: Theory into Practice. Inquiry, 15 (2): 9-15.

Robson, J. (1999). Outsider on the Inside: A First-person account of the research process in a further education college, Research in Post-Compulsory Education, 4, (1).

Smith, L. (1999). Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples. London: Zed Books Ltd.

Stage, F. K., and P.A. Muller, J. Kinzie, A. Simmons, Creating learning centered classrooms. What does learning theory have to say? Eric Digest, EDO-HE-98-4.

Stanton, A. (1996). Goldberger, N., J. Tarule, B. Clinchy, and M. Belenky (1996). Knowledge, difference, and power. (New York: Basic Books).

Steele, C. (1999). A threat in the air: How stereotypes shape intellectual identity. In Euguene Lowe's (Ed). Promise and dilemma: perspectives on racial diversity and higher education. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ.

Goldberger, N., J. Tarule, B. Clinchy, and M. Belenky (1996). Knowledge, difference, and power. (New York: Basic Books).

Valverde, L. (1980). Development of ethnic researches and the education of White researchers, Educational Researcher, 9, (9): 16-20.

Watson, B. & S. Scraton (2001). Confronting Whiteness? Researching the leisure lives of South Asian mothers, Journal of Gender Studies, 10, (3).

Willie, C.V., Grady, M.K., and Hope, R.O. (1991). African Americans and the doctoral experience: Implications for policy. New York: Teacher's College Press.