The Urban Review (2021) 53:470–490
https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-020-00576-w

Listening to Counternarratives of Faculty of Color: Studying Rural Racism in One of Most Conservative Communities in America

Keonghee Tao Han[1] · W. Reed Scull[2] · Clifford P. Harbour[3]

Published online: 9 April 2020

Abstract
This study reports on a qualitative narrative, counterstory of six faculty and one administrator of color (Merriam in Qualitative research: a guide to design and implementation. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 2009; Yosso in Critical race counterstories along the Chicana/Chicano educational pipeline. Taylor & Francis Group, New York, 2006) teaching at a Predominately White Institution teacher education in a rural U. S. state. The study examined the experiences of how the racial hierarchy, the macro-level and the organizational-individual relations impacted diverse (i.e., Othered) faculty. Specifically, participants explained how unequal racial relations had significant professional and personal consequences. In reflecting on the findings, we theorize how future research on diversity-racial relations in teacher education programs may be enhanced by foregrounding insights from the literature on Whiteness Studies, Critical Race Theory, and examination of White organizational structures toward strengthening multiracial coalitions.

Keywords Race/racism · Rural university · Critical race theory · Critical whiteness studies · Faculty of color

✉ Keonghee Tao Han
khan@uwyo.edu

W. Reed Scull
wscull@uwyo.edu

Clifford P. Harbour
Cliff.Harbour@unt.edu

[1] School of Teacher Education, University of Wyoming, Laramie, USA

[2] Higher Education Administration Program, School of Counseling, Leadership, Advocacy, and Design (CLAD), College of Education, University of Wyoming, Laramie, USA

[3] Higher Education Program, UNT Higher Education Development Initiative, Department of Counseling and Higher Education, University of North Texas, Denton, USA

Racism is rampant in American higher education (Clark 2018). Studied more often in urban educational settings, race/racism in the rural educational context has been sparsely documented (Han 2018). In order to fill the gap in rural education research regarding racial relations, we document experiences of faculty of color (FOC) in a traditional, rural and predominantly White institution (PWI). In our work, thus, a geographical location is an important factor as rural racism magnifies the Othering of FOC in obscure rural communities often subsumed in red-state conservative politics (see more detail on red-state politics in Han et al. 2018). Our purpose is twofold: (a) to challenge the status quo by telling FOC's counterstories of resistance to marginalization and colonization and (b) to support the first steps in creating flexible critical coalitions in the settings we study, encompassing Others and Whites, to move humanity forward (Du Bois 1940). Our purpose, therefore, is constructive and intended to actively promote equity, freedom, and dignity for the FOC in this study and similarly situated FOC across PWIs in America and the world.

In the following sections, we first provide literature on rural racism relevant to the local context under study, then we relay this literature to FOC in teacher education. Next, we explain the theoretical frameworks, Whiteness Studies and Critical Race Theory (CRT), followed by a description of our methodology and study findings. Finally, we conclude that higher education leaders should begin to undo and unlearn the detrimental impact of Whiteness and this process has no better starting point than in teacher education.

Literature Review

Understanding Rural Racism in University-Wide Communities

The particular PWI, the setting of this study, is located in the American West and also in one of the 10 Whitest states in the U. S. (Lee et al. 2012). The 10 Whitest states are known for: (a) a demographic and epistemological divide; (b) conservative Red-State politics; and (c) rural racism.

A Demographic and Epistemological Divide

Han (2015, 2018) named the phenomenon, a demographic and epistemological divide, existing in some White states—the 10 Whitest states which are the three northern New England states, West Virginia, Iowa, Wyoming, Idaho, Montana, Kentucky, and North Dakota (Lee et al. 2012). A demographic divide refers to the existence of little to no diversity in rural locales, with White citizens comprising more than 90% of the population. When almost all Euro-Americans constitute the majority population in a place, the epistemological stance of residents tends to reflect conservative red-state politics (rugged individualism; traditional social values; and limited, conservative government policies on select economic issues, see Han et al. 2018). Epistemological racism means that the rationale of White supremacy works to distort and delegitimize all Other epistemologies in order to perpetuate White cultural traditions (Scheurich and Young 1997).

Rural Racism

Rural racism refers to the White oppression of Others witnessed by race scholars; particularly, in his landmark work, Du Bois in the U. S. (1903) observed that "The chance for lawless oppression and illegal exactions is vastly greater in the back country than in the city" (p. 93). Han (2018) and Han et al. (2018) captured the rural Whiteness fueled by conservative red-state politics and detailed the rural White backlash about diverse people and diversity and skewed power relations between institutions and FOC.

A particular rural racism is heightened with rugged cowboy, lone ranger individualism and red-state politics disadvantaging FOC, best explained by Coates' (2011) covert racism. At the micro individual level and informally, FOC are shunned and oppressed by minority associated biases. (In)formally and individually, they are excluded and subjected to restrictive membership status and covenants. At the meso-macro levels, FOC experience institutional bias, discriminatory distinctions, racial profiling, fear and loathing, presumptions of guilt/competences, inadequate mentoring/advice to FOC. Institutions treat FOC with benign neglect, the model minority syndrome, outsider status, and selective rules and expulsions.

Adding to this complexity, the insidious and covert nature of rural racism can be captured in local-specific occasions. For example, in recent public debates, residents and some candidates for state offices expressed White traditional attitudes with expressions such as "The University is "way too liberal and does not support or represent State's [naming the state] culture or ideals," and "the University should not have a diversity coordinator" (WyomingNews.com). The residents and candidates' public verbal and attitudinal dispositions displayed a local specific White ideology and rural racism.

Research on Faculty of Color (FOC) in Teacher Education

Historically, higher education policies and practices have been established for Whites. White faculty and institutional leaders represent the norm inculcating and transmitting mainstream knowledge and culture to college students/teacher candidates (Cochran-Smith 1995; Han 2018; Ladson-Billings 1999, 2013). As such, the historical and current practices perpetuate disadvantages for diverse people and FOC, particularly in homogeneous, rural higher/teacher education contexts (Han et al. 2018).

There is a glass ceiling for FOC, for example, reflected in the lower rates of hiring, tenure/promotion (Yan and Museus 2013), salary discrepancy (Lee 2002), and few minoritized leaders (Kiang 2004; Yan and Museus 2013). There is also resistance against accepting FOC as valid and credible authorities in academia (Perry et al. 2009). FOC are not appointed as leaders for decision-making teams (Teranishi 2010). They experience lack of mentoring and departmental and institutional support (Han 2014, 2018; Stanley 2006). Frequently, White faculty engage in mainstream research and have more access to their choice of teaching assignments and

are in positions of power to sustain their mainstream scholarship, which accelerates their careers (Smith and Wolf-Wendel 2005). FOC also receive low student evaluations, stemming from the culturally incongruent teaching/learning practices of FOC and their use of non-standard language (i.e., an accent) (Li and Beckett 2006; Lowe and Kiczowiak 2016). As a consequence, Black and Asian woman faculty often receive some of the lowest student evaluations (Reid 2010).

In general, in rural American settings, students in teacher education programs are mostly White (Kiang 2004). Specifically in particular remote locales, White preservice teachers (PTs) make up over 95% in rural locales (Han 2014, 2015, 2018). Many PTs do not define themselves in racial terms or are indeterminate about self and Others' racial identities since they consider White to be the norm (Sleeter 2008). As such most PTs do not have a clear grasp of how race influences identity, teaching, and learning (Cochran-Smith 1995; Han and Leonard 2017; Ladson-Billings 1999). Unlike the recent White identity studies reporting urban PTs' growing critical consciousness, rural PTs are seldom exposed to Others—due to lack of diversity (i.e., a demographic divide) in their communities. Therefore, rural locales are not conducive for PTs to form social and work relationships with Others that can result in racial conscientization (i.e., epistemological divide and rural racism). Frequently in such rural settings, FOC struggle with challenges and resistance presented by White PTs.

What further complicates and stretches FOC's dignity is the systematic White supremacy embedded in macro-red-state politics and the rural racism impressed in meso-institutional and micro-individual policies, practices, and interactions. Despite the political lip service given for diversity, as stated in university plans and documents, institutional leaders and the university-wide community often lack sensitivity and genuine commitment to diversity and equity education (Han 2014, 2018; Merryfield 2000).

For example, when grade disputes or other problems surface, students/PTs' narratives are frequently privileged over FOC professional assessments and emboldened by a White administration (Han 2014, 2018). FOC are told to change grades, apologize to the students/PTs, sometimes resulting in a decline or FOC's professional status. Often, rural PTs shun FOC and multicultural education and prefer traditional educational pedagogies to social justice curriculum (Han 2014; Han et al. 2015; Perry et al. 2009). This shunning of diversity and social justice education is culturally validated and cascades, (in)formally, from the top-down White power structure practices.

Where rural racism coincides with epistemological racism for FOC, for instance, when FOC published race-based research in the ethnic journals, FOC are subjected to White backlash in several respects. First, their scholarship is minimized and undervalued (Han et al. 2018; Scheurich and Young 1997; Stanley 2006; Turner et al. 2008). Second, adverse and often racist narratives are formulated and FOC are surreptitiously labeled as "difficult persons." Third, a token minority—a minority colleague coopted by the White power structure (a) criticizes Others to advance their own interests, thus they gain a super-standing enhanced racial status in White academic space (Bell 1992) and (b) they are presented to 'show' that the institution has its minority, therefore they are not racist. Finally, PTs/students come to resist FOC

and view them as lacking credibility when compared to White faculty (Ford 2011; Han 2014; Perry et al. 2009). As a result, FOC are subjected to emotional stress that often result in physical illnesses—they suffer from racial micro-and-macro-aggression and racial battle fatigue (Han et al. under review; Smith et al. 2006).

Theoretical Frameworks

We use Whiteness Studies and Critical Race Theory (CRT) to interpret the qualitative data, interviews of faculty and administrator of color. Our use of Whiteness Studies focuses on the third wave of Whiteness (Twine and Gallagher 2008). Whiteness in this study refers to "a collective racial epistemology with a history of violence against people of color" (Leonardo 2009, p. 111). From CRT scholars' works, we employ concepts such as racial standing rules—see details below (Bell 1992) and covert racism. We explained covert racism earlier with rural racism (Coats 2011).

Whiteness Studies

Whiteness Studies frames racial domination and subordination. Whiteness Studies originates and its legacy dates to insights developed by W. E. B. Du Bois. Du Bois (1903) argued that race and Whiteness were intimately connected in that White supremacy, based on color prejudice, legalized White privilege. Twine and Gallagher (2008) explained Whiteness in three waves. Based on Du Bois' works, the first wave identified and deconstructed the White supremacy in the U.S. from the nineteenth century to mid twentieth century. The second wave (with the works of Frankenberg 1997; Rasmussen 2001) challenged and made visible White supremacy and institutional racism in the second half of the twentieth century into the 1990s (Garner 2017). The 'third wave' of Whiteness Studies incorporates first and second wave insights and investigates Whiteness in other specific ways. Points emerging in third wave Whiteness, relevant to the current study include the following focus areas. First, Whiteness studies focuses on daily practices to better understand White normalcy (Garner 2017). Second, this scholarship explores various ideological narratives in capturing how Whites struggle to restore and maintain White supremacy. Third, it focuses on "a nuanced and locally specific ways" (Twine and Gallagher 2008, p. 5). The current study builds on these three foci to uncover how homogeneity of Whiteness and its geopolitical cultural context shape racial attitudes and racial positionings towards FOC.

Critical Race Theory (CRT): Rules of Racial Standing (Bell 1992)

Bell's (1992) rules of racial standing pertinent to this study include: Rule 1: No matter what Blacks or Others' experience or expertise may be, Blacks/Others' views are discredited. Rule 2: Race/Racism accounts are given more credit and objectivity if Whites are the authors/speakers. Rule 3: The emergence of a perverse minority mentality that endorses the dominant group's call for condemnation of their own Blacks/Others in order to take higher positions for personal gain. By criticizing and

condemning their own minoritized colleagues, some "token minority" scholars: (a) minimize the effect of racism on Others; and (b) receive enhanced or super-standing status.

Critical Race Methodology: Counter-Storytelling

The CRT counter-storytelling method provides an important, critical tool to FOC to voice their lived experiences (Delgado 1989; Milner and Howard 2013; Solórzano and Yosso 2002). CRT's mandate to legitimatize the experiences of Others refutes the Whiteness ideology of objectivity, neutrality, colorblindness, and meritocracy. That is, through media, schooling, and familial and community socialization, Whiteness ideology or the master narrative has conditioned the majority of people to believe the rationality and democracy founded the White culture, while instituting the racial hierarchy of Other epistemologies (Scheurich and Young 1997). Bell (1992), as noted above, helped us uncover the paradox of race/racism in the way Whiteness ideology brainwashes the majority of individuals to protect White hegemony. Bell urges us to reassess the racialized reality of expertise and experience of Others and counter the master-narrative/whiteness ideology. Initiated with Bell, Delgado (1989), Chang (1993), and Solórzano and Yosso (2002) among other crits, expand critical race methodology to legitimate the experiential knowledge of people of color, thus supporting counterstories aimed at revealing master narratives that dominant groups use to justify racial subjugation of Others (Han 2014).

In our work, we expose Whiteness and its hegemony and how it is manifested and promoted in teacher education to reinforce White privilege in a rural PWI through interviews of FOC and existing demographic and sociopolitical data. To that end, we identify Du Bois' (1903) and Knowles' (2008) insight on patterns of rural racism stemming from a systematic structure of Othering as "the local production and operation of Whiteness" (Knowles, p. 168). White supremacy, reflected in the lawlessness of the backcountry foreshadowed the U.S. racial dilemma (Du Bois 1903), yet becomes more invidious when infused with White homogeneity inscribed in remote rural cultural practices. In this context, FOC share their experiential knowledge—the historically silent and marginalized peoples' voices in PWIs authorized by the CRT counterstory-telling methodology. We therefore endorse CRT for FOC and Others to tell their counterstories in our fight toward social/racial justice, freedom and dignity at rural PWIs and those similarly situated in White institutional spaces across the Americas and Oceania.

Methodology

Setting and Informants

Setting

As described in the literature review, the PWI under study, University of West Mountain (UWM, pseudonym), is located in the rural mountain west and one of the 10 Whitest states. UWM is a research university funded by the state. UWM's approximate student enrollment is as follows: 10,000—White: 7000; Hispanic: 700; Asian: 100; Black or African American: 100; Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander: under 100; International: 700; and Ethnicity and Race Unknown: 1000. UWM's approximate faculty and staff number are as follows; Total Employees: 1000 -Minoritized members: 400; Women: 400; White, 600 (email correspondence with UWM personnel, 2017).

Informants

Six FOC and one administrator of color participated as informants: One East Indian (international) faculty in social work, one Asian faculty (international) in communication studies, and three international faculty—one Korean, two African professors in teacher education participated, and finally, one Mexican–American faculty (US-born of parents of migrant-farmer background) and one administrator of color (U.S-born from-immigrant parents) in undisclosed units. This participant pool was developed through convenience sampling since informants were selected based on the availability at a particular site (Merriam 2009). FOCs' availability for this race-based research included some risk because: (a) FOCs are numerically minoritized group, and (b) participation by FOC brings fear of added hostile treatment and the risk of losing a professorship. We note, however, that these faculty and the administrator of color participated in this research mindfully, accepting the associated stress, fear, and job-insecurity.

Researcher Identities

The first author, an Asian American woman faculty, has been a faculty member in two red-state rural PWIs. The second author, a White male administrator, has held positions of administrative leadership and a faculty position. Third author is White male faculty has been in administrative positions and professor for about a decade at UWM. All of us were employed in a College of Education's rural teacher education and/or graduate education program at the time of data collection.

Study Design, Data Sources, and Analysis Procedure

We use the counterstorytelling method to tell FOC's lived lives at one PWI. Without telling FOC's own side, White ideology justifies the racial subjugation of Others as it fits White privilege (Chang 1993; Delgado 1989; Yosso 2006). Master narratives manipulate Other epistemologies to perpetuate White supremacy and privilege, thereby colonizing minds of Others to further oppress and subjugate Other accounts. To counter the distortions and colonization of Others' ideas and dignity, CRT authorizes and legitimates the experiential knowledge of people of color. Therefore, FOC's racial battle and suffering must be told from their own voices and be interpreted through FOC's perspectives (Delgado 1989; Han 2018). We acknowledge that this counternarrative is not politically and socioculturally neutral.

Data Sources

Data sources included: (a) interview data with six FOC and conversations with one administrator of color; and (b) educational and sociopolitical-demographic data (e.g., The Pew Research Center, NCES). The primary data set is the interviews with FOC. During semi-structured interviews, we asked whether FOC's experiences in this PWI are similar to existing research, asking our informants: Describe your experiences of successes, struggles, and sustaining mechanism working in a PWI; Provide recommendations to White administration and governance. Interviews took place individually or in small groups for a few hours. The second data set included: demographic, media, historical and sociopolitical data. This second data set illuminated macro-meso-micro structural racial oppression impacting rural red state university communities.

Data Analysis

Following the counterstorytelling methodology, data analysis included two phases. In the first phase, we followed thematic analysis of interview data looking for themes that were consistent across individual interviews (Merriam 2009; Yosso 2006). After a reiterative (re)reading process, color-coding themes and grouping them into similar themes, we identified recurring patterns that characterize the interview data. These themes were deficit views of FOC as shown in linguistic, cultural disconnect and low student evaluation, separation/isolation along the line of race, and degraded FOC's ethnic, race-based research.

During the second phase, we began to connect primary data (interviews) with theoretical concepts from our overviews of research literature and the second data set, sociopolitical-demographic data. Reading research literature in line with diversity, CRT, and Whiteness Studies in relation to the second data set, socio-political data affirmed that the themes derived from our interview data were

remarkably similar to the topics raised in the overview of literature and sociopolitical data.

Findings

White Super Structure: Skewed Racial Positioning Among Whites-FOC and FOC–FOC

In the current study, White supremacy clearly showed through the types of positions occupied (Han et al. 2018). At UWM, the structure of the leadership and managerial governance mirrors the racial hierarchy seen in the larger society—White-top and Others-at-the middle-to-the bottom. Currently at UWM only Whites occupy executive (e.g., above dean) positions. Most department chairs are White except in two ethnic studies departments. The first chief diversity officer (FOC) was hired in 2017.

In the U.S. academy overall, 80% or more of executive/higher positions are occupied by Whites. The remaining 20% of these positions are distributed as follows; Blacks, 9.6%; Hispanics, 4.6%; Asian/Pacific Islanders, 3.2%; and Native Indian/Alaskan Natives, .46% (National Center for Education Statistics, NCES 2010). A White top-heavy racial hierarchy is common in higher education generally, but there is a much higher rate of Whites in leadership positions at UWM. At the college of education at UWM, dean, associate deans and associate directors and department chairs are all Whites. At the time of the study, there were seven FOC out of 70 total faculty (10%). Retention rates for the FOC are often unknown except via interviews with the FOC—Interviews with FOC and administrator of color revealed that several FOC left universities due to the hostile treatment of the local communities, social isolation, or not being granted tenure and promotion (Han 2018).

Culture at UWM seems to divide along the color line, despite an appearance that FOC are treated equally as White faculty, that is, insider and outsider circles are common. The insiders are the ones that often receive preferred treatments, for example, institutional recognition—more White faculty are appointed as college leaders occupying (associate) director positions and annual awards for research, teaching, and service. Also, favorable teaching assignments are repeatedly assigned to White faculty or to their token minority faculty with super-standing racial status (Bell 1992). Token minority faculty enact 'acting White' in order to obtain that insider status and align themselves with the White dominant culture. This associates with Bell's Rule 3: The minoritized mentality that responds to the dominant group's call for condemnation of their own Blacks/Others in order to take higher positions for personal gain. By criticizing and condemning their own minoritized colleagues, some token minority faculty have: (a) minimized the effect of racism on Others; and (b) received his/her enhanced or super-standing status.

Coates (2011) identified such racial patterning as a form of covert racism. That is, selective rules are enforced depending on *WHO* does the work, and not *WHAT* work gets done. The racial codes range from "Token minority" to "Exotic Other" (Coats 2011, p. 127). The Token/Super standing status can only be secured by limiting access to the racial group by other racialized FOC, particularly non-elites (Bell

1992; Coats 2011). Such racial codes placed on Others depend on exclusion of Others—the more racial diversity, the less value there is associated with such Token/Super minority FOC. Conversely, the less diverse the faculty there is, the more power is granted to the Token/Super minority FOC (Bell 1992; Coats 2011). Frequently institutional leaders have inadvertently created a commodification of FOC; Determining a few Token/Super-standing minority for marketing, while devaluing remaining FOC as outsiders. By ascribing discriminated rank to FOC, the rural PWI enforces differential rules without explanation or transparency (see Coats 2011). UWM appears to value diverse people and diversity—while in fact the racial code of categorizing and designating FOC as a marketing commodity serves as evidence of covert racism.

Minimizing FOC's Research: Epistemological Racism

Scheurich and Young (1997) delineated epistemological racism in that White supremacy rationalized and legitimated Euro-American cultural and epistemological tradition as the only *official knowledge.* Whites advance and assert promotion of and tenure faculty based on objective meritocratic criteria. In so doing, White academia exclusively positions ways of doing research via its own cultural and epistemological image: Consequently, the academy has established mainstream research and publishing in mainstream journals as preeminent knowledge and delegitimized Other epistemologies. At UWM, in scholarship, FOC's research on ethnicity, race/racism and publications in ethnic journals have not been weighted equally as the mainstream ideas and scholarship (Han et al. 2018; Stanley 2006; Turner et al. 2008). When White faculty are the authors of such research, however, they are endowed with more credit and authority (Bell 1992).

During interviews, FOC asserted that administrators and faculty who are members of the tenure and promotion committee questioned the legitimacy of the ethnic journals and race-themed research. Some participants in this study mentioned that race/racism research topics are being shunned, ignored, and they feel that they are outsiders and often excluded and subject to a restrictive membership status. In particular, one Mexican faculty member published his research in ethnic journals for several years and he assessed White administrators' epistemological racism as follows:

> The research, probably the biggest thing is that it's still kind of a Euro-centric academic world where if you're not publishing in ASR, American Sociological Review, or anything that doesn't have an ethnic marker in the title of the journal then you are probably ok, but if you're you know, if you're publishing too many things in the Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, a very well-known journal, has been around for almost twenty-five, thirty years, you know, all kinds of scholars publish in it, you know, but if you have one too many of those you know, then you start having questions raised about your scholarship.

This FOC identified epistemological racism and third wave Whiteness when he reiterated the admonishment from a White administrator, "When are you going to

start publishing in the mainstream journals?" and asserted student interrogation saying, "the students questioned [ethnic] refereed journal articles even." This FOC illuminated rural, covert racism by showing that White ways of knowing and doing research have become legitimated and seeped into dominant culture as operating truth at this local rural context. These interview excerpts demonstrate all three specific components of the 3rd wave Whiteness: (a) they capture every day practices of entrenching White normalcy (i.e., FOC should think like mainstream researchers and publish in mainstream journals); (b) they reify the White ideological stance, Whites strive to restore and maintain White supremacy (i.e., White ways, methods, and its tradition of research is acknowledged and valorized as official, preeminent knowledge in academia); and (c) they uncover the nuanced, locally specific way that White administrators position FOC's research as something to shun, ignore, and devalue.

Other faculty shared similar comments reflecting the bias of White administrators and White faculty. These included remarks such as, "[Dr. A]'s research is repetitive and lacks scientific methods and rigorous data," "Why does a professor in Literacy research [or teach] social racial issues?," "Why are you criticizing Whites? We want to live the way it is here." Rural racism is insidiously rooted within the local cultural atmosphere where Whiteness and its cultural traditions operate as the normal ways of knowing and doing research, and the only accepted forms of knowledge (Scheurich and Young 1997). Often White university community members (administrators, faculty, and students) espoused the mainstream, positivistic views of absolutizing facts. Interview excerpts from an Asian faculty reported that some students' distrust and resistance toward FOCs' racial research and remarked, "Articles we read are racist, so you should change the reading materials," or "the text contents [written by ethnic scholars] are presented as facts, but those are not facts…. If texts or research are written with sound methodology and proven with scientific knowledge, I can accept them as facts and knowledge, but not the [diverse author's] personal accounts." Such Western or mainstream ways of knowing based on positivistic rationality was repudiated by the Frankfurt School scholars (Giroux 2017). By absolutizing facts and scientific methods, Western ways of knowing have established mainstream research as the official premier knowledge, while silencing and marginalizing Other epistemologies (Scheurich and Young 1997). Valorizing some truths or Western/mainstream ways of knowing and relegating diverse epistemology to lesser than that of mainstream, much of power and ideology issues remain hidden as shown in this PWI (Giroux 2017; Scheurich and Young 1997).

As such controlling culture of doing research and stratifying the hierarchy of knowledge, White normalcy is maintained daily as business-usual, despite overt pro-diversity policies in the university strategic plan. The above excerpts confirmed that rural racism signals covert racism: At the micro, individual level, FOC's ideas and research are shunned, ignored, thus, their scholarship is excluded and subject to the limiting status. At the meso-macro levels, institutional practices show covertly discriminatory racial profiling. These excerpts mirror the dynamics appearing in American society to reinforce White supremacy. Yet acute epistemological racism and third wave Whiteness (presented through locally nuanced and specific ways of Othering) often leaves FOC experiencing White pushback against Others. This is

similar to what Knowles (2008) observed as rural racism and Othering; "bodily feelings and emotion of the feeling of unease, dread…feeling I don't belong" (p. 167).

Deficit views of and Being Others at UWM

Burden of Proof on FOC

When the local atmosphere represents exclusively dominant Whiteness at this PWI, FOC's realties in this particular university-wide community can only be fully understood in cloistered conversations. FOC often worry about their job and speak passionately about the stress stemming from rural cultural norm and White rules of racial standing (Bell 1992). Often FOC worry about their cultural, ethnic background clashing with the White cultural norms. One Hispanic faculty recapped,

> … there are some lines of racial segregation in [naming UWM]. While growing up as a migrant family household in the segregated town, these points were crucial for my ethnic and racial identity development. I have one leg on the dominant culture, and one leg on the Latino culture.

Asian women faculty also pointed out the cultural clash being a professor caught between two worlds. One Asian professor remarked, "As professor, you have to look serious and demanding, you have to distance yourself from students and everything has to be structured…. But here [at UWM], it alarmed me how students can be disrespectful to me…" She went on to say:

> I blame myself for not knowing how to relate to students well. It was my fault that I did not know how to approach students, I understand I must relate to my students more not only during class I interact with them before class and after class and go more interpersonal level and I have to show more interest in students.

The Asian, Confucius model of educator or professor is often regarded as master of all-knowing authority and assuming respect from students (Han 2012). However, based on views of individualism and meritocracy, White students/preservice teachers (PTs) attempt to keep equal standing with the professors by assuming a casual relationship (e.g., calling professors by first names and *not automatically* rendering respect to the professors, Han 2012). Amid the cultural clash, the Asian woman informants blamed themselves, as all Asian woman faculty stated, "I do not want to cause trouble," "It was my fault that I did not know how to approach students," and "I just need to be more assertive." More than male FOC, women faculty in this study struggled with poor relationships with White students/PTs, which often resulted in lower course evaluations. The cultural Otherness—Asian ways of teaching and learning—was challenged and resisted by the mainstream norms of White students/PTs (Han 2014, 2018; Reid 2010). The "Other" status is not unique to UWM and perhaps applies to many PWIs across the U. S. and the world. Yet particularly unique to the rural PWI context, White students/PTs often encounter FOC/Others in their college years for the first time

and resist FOCs and their multicultural, social justice subject expertise more so than urban PTs (Han et al. 2015; Perry et al. 2009). As a result, rural PTs seldom form relationships with FOC, demonstrate curiosity for diverse ideas, or cultures, which often leads to a lack of opportunities toward developing critical consciousness (Han 2014, 2018; Marx 2006).

Furthermore, confounding the Otherness is FOC's foreign accent and skin colors that are not White. For example, one African-American faculty asserted his point of being a suspect in the White mainstream: "Over here I am a suspect…. So, that's what I am saying, it's like a paradox. I'm not sure where I fit, I'm always questioning myself. I'm always, always looking out."

The notion, "suspect," hung in the minds among this participant FOC, because once "mistakes" are made and attributed to a FOC, they are concretized, recorded, singled out and the officials in power and other university members get the confirmation of the narrative, constructed about FOC by the White super structure. The narrative begins with "This FOC is difficult to get along with, not intelligent enough, has unclear communication, or lacks something." The African-American faculty explained this vulnerability:

> When I get to a situation where people can understand and appreciate the fact that this guy is not an angry Black male and as long as I don't make a mistake. But I have to make sure that I don't make a mistake, because my mistake is usually not seen as a human mistake, it is seen as that black male international mistake …so I am not allowed make a mistake, because if I make a mistake I find myself back to square one. It's like, if I make a mistake, they go "Ah-Ha" they knew it. I have proven then that they knew. You are suspect and they are looking for reasons to convict….I am constantly having to prove myself.

As this FOC reminisced the notion of suspect and the paradoxical lives lived at UWM, FOC, particularly non-elite/non super-standing ones often get scrutinized more closely when applying for promotion and tenure. Their constant battle to prove themselves worthy of authority, expertise, and credibility as professors represents White pushback against the legitimacy of FOC. Because of a small-town cowboy culture, the production and operation of Whiteness is inscribed in recent remarks made in political speeches such as, UWM is "way too liberal and does not support or represent State's [naming the state] culture or ideals" and "the University should not have a diversity coordinator." Similar sentiments were reflected when one administrator admonished a FOC and said, "Tone down your ethnicity as the students here cannot take it."

"Mistakes" committed by FOC are also qualitatively different from those made by mainstream faculty and often attributed to the FOC's race or ethnicity. As one FOC shared:

> The issues of acceptance are always here, because I am accepted as long as I don't make a mistake. Mistakes seem attributed to race and ethnicity, in my case the angry black male syndrome mistake. I am vulnerable to accusations that my mistakes are due to an ethnic flaw.

As this faculty member observed, FOC constantly struggle with the notion of being identified as a "suspect." At any time, their mistakes can convert to being identified as a "difficult person." A few interview excerpts show how FOC are accused of ethnic flaws:

For example, one FOC reiterated his White middle-level administrator's reproach. This White administrator stated, "Our students at the University are different here so you have to tone down your ethnicity." The administrator's statement, of "tone down your ethnicity" may appear as one instance of seemingly benign neglect or a friendly suggestion. In analysis, however, this is a reprimand to squash down FOC's cultural ways of teaching, thinking, and identity thereby upholding Whiteness and White normalcy at the institution.

Recollecting her painful experience, an Asian woman faculty also shared her annual evaluation by a White administrator, written in the third person:

> This model [Confucianism] is one with which she was trained and educated more than half of her life. It is this reversion to the more traditional model that causes friction between [this FOC] and her students. Students perceive her teaching as a lack of respect and trust and this is evident in the qualitative course evaluation comments.

With such comments, this middle-level administrator attacked and problematized the very essence of FOC's cultural spirit. Seen and reasoned through his Whiteness lens, the middle level administrator reduced the FOC's status to a victim, a deviant—a poor professor whose ethnicity caused the friction with White students. These words by White administrators are the production and operation of Whiteness. The third wave manifestation in that White structure: (a) interprets FOC with a White lens and practice White normalcy daily, annually, and (in)formally at the institutional-meso level; and (b) in so doing, secures both the PWI and White supremacy.

Deficit Views of FOC

As White mainstream power structure finds faults with and labels FOC and their mistakes as "due to ethnic flaws," White students/PTs often resist instruction from FOC. All informants reported, "folks think that it's a freak accident or something that I am the professor," or "Some students, staff, or colleagues assume that I cannot be intelligent enough to be in the [professor] position that I am in." Another FOC explained what it was like to live as a permanent cultural suspect at UWM:

> Over here [in the United States], all of a sudden I realized that my experiences depended on situations. One situation is when the mainstream culture wants or needs something from me, they hold me as a very important person, … I am in a position of power but it is a power that is questioned, it's not full power….I need to be careful.

In the American academy, as an immigrant foreign faculty, this FOC is not acknowledged as the best. Bell's (1992) rules of racial standing states, no matter

what the Black's and Other's experience or expertise might be, Blacks/Others' views are doubted or discredited; and White accounts are given more credit and objectivity if White are the authors/speakers. Conversely, White college students and PTs are perceptive, and they know who is (not) with power: While rights, benefits, privilege have endorsed White faculty with higher-rank positions, positionings of FOC are often a notch down and less than the best and this shows in student course evaluations.

Due to deficit views on Other language and culture, when it comes to teaching, undue attention to FOC's accent, ethnicity, and identity are common experiences for all FOC participating in this study. The language dimension—forced English use, the accent, foreign pronunciation, and occasional grammar errors brought heightened scrutiny and continuing grief for FOC under study. The Latino faculty shared that his Spanish was taken away while growing up. A woman FOC stressed that the problems posed by the language barrier and how they had haunted her since her arrival. Her voice was especially agonizing: "Aah [sighing], I have very bad language barriers. I could hardly speak any English." Stressing over her accent, this faculty was sick about the possibility of not getting tenured and promoted. She attended an English language/speech clinic for 2 years. "Foreign" accents can be the source of student complaints and low student course evaluations. For our participants, problems with English pronunciation generated much turmoil for the sheltered population of UWM students. Unlike many urban students who are frequently exposed to diverse faculty, their speech and multicultural ideas, our students grew up in locales lacking the opportunities to form relationships with and experience Others (Han 2014, 2018; Han et al. 2015). A few faculty members mentioned that students even mimicked FOC's speech patterns in informal settings and accents were disproportionately associated with low student course evaluations. An African American faculty chimed in:

When people see me, a Black male, it appears like a "CD" comes on that expects them to experience "Angry Black Male Syndrome." But when I open my mouth and they hear my accent, they get confused. It's not just a Black male, but one with a foreign accent. So they assume that they cannot understand me. Some of them assume that I cannot be intelligent enough to be in the position that I am in, and therefore, I have to prove myself.

Another faculty added, my students report that they cannot understand my instruction because of my "broken English." At this PWI, foreign-born FOC, with foreign speech patterns and foreign appearance are described in student evaluations, administrator evaluations and other texts as different where different signaled deficient. The identity markers (language barrier and phenotypes) often sparked "poor teacher" evaluation from White administrators who assessed FOC's pedagogical practices as a cause of negative social relations with students (and colleagues). Aware of these deficit views or being designated as Other, FOC often blamed themselves or searched for ways to prove themselves.

Deficit views and perceptions of FOC as having less than official knowledge, expertise, and professorial authority still thrive in academia. Deficit views are not White students/PTs' own initiation. Rather, this phenomenon—Minimizing Others' epistemology, expertise and experience, while simultaneously restore to maintain

White supremacy—cascades down from the PWI's White structure, which in turn reflects the larger society's ugly racist stance.

Discussion

Our findings show that rural racism and epistemological racism are apparent in teacher education, particularly in some rural states in the U.S. The small rural university communities located in Whitest states remain predominantly White in their demographic make-up and university leadership, political leaders, and even community members often hold fast to Whiteness and White ignorance (Leonardo 2009). As shown in the findings, the differential power dynamics were clear in teacher education program setting discussed by our participants. Furthermore, as governing policies and administrative practices are established to benefit Whites, rural academia is seriously ill-prepared for respecting, constructing and building on diversity. Instead, rural academia often operates to ensure and secure White privilege.

The Role of Administrative Leaders at PWIs

Given our findings reported above, our focus now turns to two important discussion points. First, we explicate the roles and responsibilities of administrators and governing authorities in addressing rural racism and epistemological racism. We approach this topic with a preliminary assessment of the context and potential for change at a rural PWI. Then, we consider alternative approaches that might be applied with in the PWI. We close with a proposal for a bottom-up, trickle-up approach to social justice (Spade 2015).

Including a Focus Beyond Diversity Toward Excellence

To begin with, we note that at institutions like UWM, with no significant participation by FOC in college or university administrative roles, progress depends, at least initially, on determining whether FOC and allies will directly (and aggressively) confront rural and epistemological racist behaviors or indirectly through institutional processes (hiring, promotion, or the Faculty Senate). Of course, we acknowledge that both approaches must be used when appropriate and often simultaneously. But, in those circumstances where a choice may be forced, FOC and allies must be conscious of the decisions made and the possible consequences.

When an opportunity appears open for progress using institutional venues and processes, we note that given the clear risk to FOC in appearing as "difficult" following established decision-making paths has merit. These processes (e.g., hiring, promotion) and venues (faculty senate), however, often only offer hope. Consequently, the choice between direct confrontation (with the risk of humiliation or career sabotage) or indirect policy measures (with only marginal progress) is discouraging and disempowering. Institutions must draw upon leadership perspectives that move beyond incremental change policies to view and understand diversity as a

pathway to achieving higher levels of educational performance. Diversity, as well as higher education generally, can be viewed as an objective for change in light of collegial, bureaucratic, and political dimensions (Birnbaum 1991).

The Need to Shift Perspectives to Middle-Level Governance

Scholars in the field of higher education have noted that most attention to leadership has generally focused on those at the very top of institutional hierarchy. Yet, it is the leaders in the middle, the deans, associate deans, and department chairs, who are handling the day-to-day budgetary and personnel decisions that often have the greatest immediate impact on faculty, staff, and students. Leaders at this level, since they are more numerous than those at the top level, also tend to display a broader diversity of leadership techniques and models (Amey and Eddey 2018). Thus, leading "from the middle," may offer greater potential to implement policy in ways that could be more sensitive to the needs of faculty, staff, and students of color. To be sure, as reported in the findings, the pernicious and insidious nature of rural and epistemological racism may undermine progress even with ally administrators positioned in offices where change is possible. However, FOC generally have more voice with and better access to these middle level leaders (Han and Leonard 2017; Han et al. 2018).

It is important to note that, at the same time, while racial and ethnic diversity agendas can be developed at departmental, classroom, and individual leader levels, it is appropriate that agendas be based on a holistic, institution-wide approach that is forwarded and nurtured by top administration (Han et al. 2018). Manifestations of this approach include official institutional diversity plans with measurable outcomes, the presence of a Chief Diversity Officer reporting directly to the President, and institutional diversity committees which include faculty, staff, and students.

Towards Diversity and Inclusion and Moving Beyond Diversity

As FOC voiced in the findings, rural and epistemological racism was at the core of restoring and maintaining Whiteness at UWM. It operated simultaneously, however, to commit to distort and disable cultural and racial identities inscribed in Other epistemologies (Scheurich and Young 1997). FOC's voices from this study made it clear that leaders must find ways to support researchers who study diversity, social justice, and related topics (Han et al. 2018; Williams 2013).

To value diverse ideas, peoples, and their epistemologies and scholarship, we suggest other opportunities for FOC. University leaders should: (a) establish affinity groups that will provide a forum for students, alumni, and friends to identify common interests relevant to diversity issues, (b) identify and reach out to wealthy alumni who may have an interest in diversity issues; (c) appeal to large global corporations with a presence in the rural state; and (d) establish invited speaker series, regional and national conferences, and campus colloquia—all focused on the issues relevant to combat against White supremacy, rural racism and epistemological racism.

Furthermore, leaders must have the courage to navigate higher education environments and respond to reactionary backlashes, whether chronic or acute (McElderry and Rivera 2017). Backlashes that disadvantaged FOC in our study were student course evaluations that repeatedly spotlighted the "deficiencies" of FOC but failed to acknowledge their unique strengths. Milestone administrator evaluations (used in tenure and promotion processes) also operated as a backlash, effectively sidelining or delaying advancement. From FOC's suggestions, we recommend that particularly middle-level leaders must be made aware of chronic and acute problems in evaluating FOC performance (Reid 2010; Turner et al. 2008) as well as other organizational processes compromised by covert racism bias (Jost et al. 2009). Focusing on student evaluation as measuring the teaching quality, without considering other sources strongly reinforces reactionary White backlash and perpetuates White normalcy and supremacy.

Contribution of the Current Study

The current study contributes in the areas of diversity and social justice research in higher education and we urge the academy to listen to the voices of Others. Particularly we direct attention to the reports of FOC and their experiences at White, rural PWI's. We also urge further research on Whiteness at these institutions. Of course, we do not intend Whiteness to be (re)glorified. But we believe that understanding the current White racism in all its nuances and particulars in various geopolitical situations is the first step to dismantle White supremacy and the goal of the third-wave Whiteness. Only after acknowledging these phenomena, can we begin moving forward toward racial justice in PWIs.

Forming Multiracial Coalitions

While our research focuses on voicing the experiences of FOC at a rural, conservative PWI, we draw upon FOCs' suggestions for forming multiracial coalitions. That is, we know that White allies and advocates of Others in some academic environments are few in number and often nearly invisible and silent. FOC in rural areas, in particular, must explore the possibilities of cultivating coalitions and networks of understanding colleagues and work to integrate them into diversity and social justice committees and units on their campuses. We also believe, as experienced faculty in a college of education, that teacher education is the place to initiate education of young children and ourselves! Beginning with PTs and teacher educators, equity and social justice priorities can be furthered by forming multiracial allies and supporting White allies and FOC to ascend to administrative positions. We suggest multiracial coalitions in PWIs are an especially important opportunity for progress and provide hope for further research and praxis.

Conclusion

The goal of our study was to actualize a change that "moves the needle" in improving the positions of FOC, and in doing so, we must turn our focus more intently on the need to identify the administrative interpersonal and organization dynamics perpetuated by the dominant culture at PWIs. We also urge consideration of Spade's (2015) conceptualization of "trickle up" social justice as a path to protect the most vulnerable members of the university community. As Spade recounts, albeit in the context of transgender social justice issues, reliance upon established processes and venues to protect the interests and needs of the oppressed is usually unproductive. Instead, as evidenced by Spade's field research, a better path is to build leadership and membership from within the community of oppressed persons and then identify harmful conditions that impeded progress. The goal should be to develop a new politics that operates independently of existing institutions. Instead, trickle up social justice movements, reject the traditional path of policy, as an avenue to progress, and instead concentrate activists' energy on the creation of an independent community with its own processes and venues to articulate the need for change. As these independent communities grow–free from institutional norms—FOC might experience the same success that has been reported by Spade in the transgender and LGBTQ movements.

What our research shows is that White supremacy, rural, covert racism, and epistemological racism are crippling ideologies, implicitly and sometimes explicitly endorsed by PWIs like UWM. The material manifestations of these ideologies affect cultural and administrative violence upon FOC and call for responses that may require more than direct or indirect action. Sometimes social justice needs to focus first on protecting the vulnerable and then, as the community of oppressed expands, to include a larger part of the institutional community. If so, change becomes an objective and priority for a critical mass that affects change not through policy but through the political force of simply confronting administrative violence whenever and however it appears. The point, therefore, is not constructing or reforming policy but creation of a community committed to confronting injustice and advocating for the success and well-being of FOC, LGBTQ colleagues, indigenous populations, women, and all those marginalized and oppressed by capitalist, settler colonialism and the administrators mediating this power.

References

Amey, M. J., & Eddey, P. L. (2018). Leading in the middle. In J. S. Levin & S. T. Kater (Eds.), *Understanding community colleges* (pp. 203–226). New York, NY: Routledge.

Bell, D. A. (1992). *Faces at the bottom of the well: The permanence of racism*. New York, NY: Basic.

Birnbaum, R. (1991). *How colleges work: The cybernetics of academic organization and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Chang, M. J. (1993). Toward an Asian American legal scholarship: Critical race theory, post- structuralism, and narrative space. *California Law Review, 81,* 1241–1323. https://doi.org/10.2307/3480919.

Clark, T. (2018). *ISU researchers: Racism is rampant in higher education*. Retrieved April 3, 2020 from https://www.kcrg.com/content/news/ISU-researchers-Racism-is-rampant-in-higher-education-485066951.html.

Coats, R. D. (2011). *Covert racism: Theories, institutions, and experiences: Studies in critical social sciences*. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill Publishers.

Cochran-Smith, M. (1995). Uncertain allies: Understanding the boundaries of race and teaching. *Harvard Educational Review, 65*(4), 541–570.

Delgado, R. (1989). Storytelling for oppositionists and others: A plea for narrative. *Michigan Law Review, 81,* 2411–2441.

Du Bois, W. E. B. (1903). *The souls of black folk*. New York: NY Dover Publications Inc.

Du Bois, W. E. B. (1940). *Dusk of dawn: An essay toward an autobiography of a race concept*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Ford, K. A. (2011). Race, gender, bodily (mis)recognitions: Women of color faculty experiences with White students in the college classrooms. *The Journal of Higher Education, 82,* 444–478. https://doi.org/10.1353/jhe.2011.0026.

Frankenberg, R. (Ed.). (1997). *Displacing whiteness*. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press.

Garner, S. (2017). Surfing the third wave of whiteness studies: Reflections on Twine and Gallagher. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 40*(9), 1582–1597. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2017.1300301.

Giroux, H. A. (2017). Critical theory and educational practice. In A. Darder, R. D. Torres, & M. P. Baltodano (Eds.), *The Critical Pedagogy Reader* (pp. 31–55). New York, NY: Routledge.

Han, K. T. (2012). Experiences of faculty of color teaching in a predominantly White university: Fostering interracial relationships among faculty of color and White preservice teachers. *International Journal of Progressive Education, 8*(2), 25–48.

Han, K. T. (2014). Moving racial discussion forward: A counterstory of racialized dynamics between an Asian-woman faculty of color and White preservice teachers in traditional rural America. *The Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 7*(2), 126–146. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0036055.

Han, K. T. (2015). Challenges in implementing critical literacy practices in remote rural teacher education programs. In B. Yoon & R. Sharif (Eds.), *Critical literacy practice: Applications of critical theory in diverse settings* (pp. 129–146). New York: Springer.

Han, K. T. (2018). A demographic and epistemological divide: Problematizing diversity and equity education in traditional rural teacher education. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*. https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2018.1455997.

Han, K. T., & Leonard, J. (2017). Why diversity matters in rural America: Women faculty of color challenging Whiteness. *The Urban Review, 49*(1), 112–139. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-016-0384-7.

Han, K.T., Leonardo, J., & Kambutu, J. (Under review). Macroaggressions, microaggressions, and silencing in the academy: Counternarratives of faculty of color in rural teacher education. Submitted to *American Educational Research Journal*.

Han, K. T., Madhuri, M., & Scull, W. R. (2015). Two sides of the same coin: Preservice teachers' dispositions towards critical pedagogy and social justice concerns in rural and urban teacher education contexts. *The Urban Review, 47*(4), 626–656. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-015-0327-8.

Han, K. T., Scull, W. R., Nganga, L., & Kambutu, J. (2018). Voices from the red states: Challenging racial positioning in some of the most conservative communities in America. *Race, Ethnicity, and Education.*. https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2018.1468751.

Jost, J. T., Rudman, L. A., Blair, I. V., Carney, D. R., Dasgupta, N., Glaser, J., et al. (2009). The existence of implicit bias is beyond reasonable doubt: A refutation of ideological and methodological objections and executive summary of ten studies that no manager should ignore. In A. P. Brief & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior, 29* (pp. 39–69). New York, NY: Elsevier.

Kiang, P. N. (2004). Linking strategies and interventions in Asian American Studies to K–12 classrooms and teacher preparation. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 17*(2), 199–225.

Knowles, C. (2008). The landscape of post-imperial whiteness in rural Britain. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 31*(1), 167–184.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1999). Preparing teachers for diverse student populations: A critical race theory perspective. *Review of Research in Education, 24,* 211–247.

Lee, S. M. (2002). Do Asian American faculty face a glass ceiling in higher education? *American Educational Research Journal*, *39*, 695–724. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312039003695.

Lee, B., Iceland, J., & Sharp, G. (2012). Racial and ethnic diversity goes local: Charting change in American communities over three decades. http://diversity.ucsc.edu/news-events/news/images/US2010.pdf.

Leonardo, Z. (2009). *Race, Whiteness, and education*. New York: Routledge.

Li, G., & Beckett, G. (Eds.). (2006). *"Strangers" of the academy: Asian women scholars in higher education*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Lowe, R. J., & Kiczowiak, M. (2016). Native-speakerism and the complexity of personal experience: A duoethnographic study. *Cogent Education, 3*(1), 1264171.

Marx, S. (2006). *Revealing the invisible: Confronting passive racism in teacher education*. New York: Routledge.

McElderry, J., & Rivera, S. (2017). Your agenda item, our experience: two administrators' insights on campus unrest at Mizzou. *Journal of Negro Education, 86*(3), 318–337.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Merryfield, M. M. (2000). Why aren't teachers being prepared to teach for diversity, equity, and global interconnectedness? A study of lived experiences in the making of multicultural and global educators? *Teaching and Teacher Education, 16,* 429–443.

Milner, H. R., & Howard, T. C. (2013). Counter-narrative as method: Race, policy and research for teacher education. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 16*(4), 536–561.

Perry, G., Moore, H., Edwards, C., Acosta, K., & Frey, C. (2009). Maintaining credibility and authority as an instructor of color in diversity education classrooms: A qualitative inquiry. *The Journal of Higher Education, 80,* 80–105. https://doi.org/10.1353/jhe.0.0030.

Rasmussen, B. B. (Ed.). (2001). *The making and unmaking of whiteness*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Reid, L. D. (2010). The role of perceived race and gender in the evaluation of college teaching on RateMyProfessorsCom. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 3*(3), 137–152.

Scheurich, J. J., & Young, M. (1997). Coloring Epistemologies: Are our research epistemologies racially Biased? *Educational Researcher, 26,* 4–16.

Sleeter, C. E. (2008). Preparing White teachers for diverse students. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Namser, D. J. McIntyre, & K. E. Demers (Eds.), *Handbook of research in teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts* (pp. 559–582). New York, NY: Routledge.

Smith, D. G., & Wolf-Wendel, L. E. (2005). *The challenge of diversity: Involvement or alienation in the academy?*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Periodicals.

Smith, W. A., Yosso, T. J., & Solorzano, D. G. (2006). Challenging racial battle fatigue on historically White campuses: A critical race examination of race-related stress. In C. A. Stanley (Ed.), *Faculty of Color: Teaching in predominantly White colleges and universities* (pp. 298–327). Boston, MA: Anker Publishing.

Solórzano, D. G., & Yosso, T. J. (2002). Critical race methodology: Counter-storytelling as an analytical framework for educational research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *8*, 23–44.

Spade, D. (2015). *Normal life: Administrative violence, critical trans politics, & the limits of law*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Stanley, C. A. (2006). Coloring the academic land- scape: Faculty of color breaking the silence in predominantly White colleges and universities. *American Educational Research Journal, 43,* 701–736. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312043004701.

Teranishi, R. T. (2010). *Asians in the ivory tower: Dilemmas of racial inequality in American higher education*. New York: Teachers College Record.

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

Twine, F. W., & Gallagher, C. (2008). The future of whiteness: A map of the 'third wave'. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 31*(1), 4–24.

Williams, D. (2013). *Strategic diversity leadership: activating change and transformation in higher education*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishers.

Yan, W., & Museus, S. D. (2013). Asian American and Pacific Islander faculty and the glass ceiling in the academy. In S. D. Museus, D. C. Maramba, & R. T. Teranishi (Eds.), *The misrepresented minority: New insights on Asian American and Pacific Islanders, and the implications for higher education* (pp. 249–265). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing LLC.

Yosso, T. J. (2006). *Critical race counterstories along the Chicana/Chicano educational pipeline*. New York, NY: Taylor & Francis Group.