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Abstract

Social justice-oriented teacher education is a way for prospective teachers to learn and practice taking critical perspectives and use reflection for their future teaching practice (McDonald & Zeichner, 2009). Despite preservice teachers’ interest and effort in engaging with racially and culturally just educational work, their approaches often result in (re)producing the marginalization of people of color and/or people from non-dominant backgrounds (Leonardo, 2013). Meanwhile, studies have addressed how preservice teachers feel when they are forced to engage in anti-racist work when they have little space to reconcile the dilemmas they may experience during their journeys to becoming critical educators (Mason, 2016; Philip & Zavala, 2016).

In this dissertation research, I seek ways to support preservice teachers’ engagement with the topics and practices related to race, racism, and cultural diversity. This work is grounded in the understanding that various axes and dimensions of power relations deeply inform teacher practice (Asher, 2007) and assumes that future teachers must learn how to navigate various forms of domination and exclusion in society. The four main areas of scholarship are in the foreground of this study: (Critical) Whiteness Studies, Postcolonial Theory, Feminist Theory, and Intersectionality Theory. While each of these areas has developed its own distinctive approaches and perspectives, they together create a new space to explore how the hegemonic insider-outsider exists and operates in society.

In terms of research methodology, based on Vagle’s (2018) post-intentional phenomenology, I suggest intercultural post-intentional phenomenology by claiming the necessity of intercultural inquiry because Western/Eurocentric approaches tend to prevent researchers from more fully understanding different cultural aspects involved in educational phenomena (Hong, 2019). This methodological development builds on Lau’s (2016) intercultural phenomenological understanding, which challenges the Eurocentric tradition and tendency of phenomenology and promotes an intercultural and/or decolonizing phenomenological approach.

The research questions guiding this study are as follows: (1) How might the hegemonic insider-outsider take shape for students in a justice-oriented teacher education course? (2) What role does the hegemonic insider-outsider play in a teacher education course? (3) What does it mean to explore the experience of the hegemonic insider-outsider in the context of a teacher education course? (4) How does the experience of the hegemonic insider-outsider change over the progression of a semester-long course that promotes critical self-reflection and the examination of social context?

This dissertation captures some of the tentative productions and manifestations of the phenomenon of the hegemonic insider-outsider in a teacher education course focusing on three analytical foci: space, inyeon, and desire. My analysis shows how the hegemonic insider-outsider is produced as individual preservice teachers navigate various forms and levels of relationships, dominant discourses, oppressions, and marginalization. This study finds that the phenomenon of the hegemonic insider-outsider is constructed in multiple ways and levels as it is produced at the intersections of individual students’ positionalities, social systems, and structures. Nonetheless, racism and white supremacy always reside where the phenomenon is produced and provoked.
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Chapter 1. Introduction

In a justice-oriented teacher education program, I have seen that many preservice teachers encountered moments when their confidence in equitable and inclusive teaching based on their learned knowledge lessened as they experienced a complex reality. From a Confucian perspective, if one cannot conduct what they know in real life, they do not truly acquire and internalize the knowledge they believed they knew (Tien, 2004, 2012). In English, the phrase “Actions speak louder than words” conveys a similar meaning, i.e., that intellectual knowledge itself cannot create change without action in our lives and society. This Confucian perspective helps me to be mindful that preservice teachers’ capacity for providing “good” and “right” responses on their assignments does not guarantee their practice as socially just and culturally relevant teachers. This perspective also teaches that uniting knowledge and action requires continuous reflection of self and knowledge, as well as persistent practice to achieve the goal. Considering the value and meaning of the perspective, I view what the preservice teachers experienced as an indicator that they have strived to put into practice what they learned in the teacher education course to make changes in education. It also shows that they did not simplify the complex and complicated nature of social justice practice to make the process easier.

During my PhD program, I have been working with prospective teachers as a teacher educator in an elementary education program at a midwestern flagship university. Over the last four years, I have met and taught many students who entered the program and pursued their degrees to be elementary teachers. Among these students, I supervised several in their introductory elementary practicum during their undergraduate and full-time student teaching in the licensure program. One such student was Riley, a white
female student from a midwestern small town. One day during a fall semester, I visited a fourth-grade classroom to observe her literacy lesson. I told her I would take notes on what I observed, and we could have a conversation about the lesson afterwards. Attempting to ease her nerves, I assured her that I did not intend to evaluate her teaching.

During her lesson, her mentor teacher, Mrs. Thompson, assisted Riley’s teaching by redirecting students to better focus on Riley’s lesson, quietly asking students to pay attention, but the tension between the mentor teacher and several students of color was visible to a visitor like me. After Riley finished teaching, we met in an empty classroom in the school building. Even before I asked about the relationship between Mrs. Thompson and the students, Riley acknowledged that her lesson was not very good because she did not intervene in the tension between her mentor teacher and the students. Then, she shared her view that her teacher’s pedagogical approach did not seem to be equitable and inclusive to students of color. Rather, it was problematic. As she explained what she believes is socially just education and how it should look, she frequently cited what she read and discussed in the teacher education courses. Riley said that witnessing the interaction between Mrs. Thompson and the students gave her discomfort and tension as she perceived that how the teacher treated her students of color was not right. Then, she asked me whether I would recommend any possible approaches that she could try to resolve the tension and help the classroom relationships. At the same time, Riley was concerned that she would be hesitant to act if it would potentially hurt her reputation and her relationship with Mrs. Thompson.

Riley seemed upset to admit that the reality of teaching and the classroom was much more complex than she had ever imagined in her past undergraduate coursework.
As she started taking on more responsibilities as a full-time student teacher in the classroom, in addition to her job search, nothing was the same as when she did her part-time student teaching and was getting indirect experience through reading articles and books. Riley seemed confused that she was not confident in her perspectives and decisions while she had been when she discussed educational equity issues in her course papers and class discussions before she started student teaching. During the conversation with Riley, I related my experience of this gap in that having more knowledge related to social justice and equity did not naturally prepare me to make a just, equitable, and ethical decision in the moment. As an educator and an individual, I, too, experience the dilemma of making equitable and just choices and feel guilty when I do not make the most ethical and just decisions in my practice and everyday life.

Despite this reality, my students and other people often assume I am perfect at social justice pedagogy, and at the same time, I pressure myself to rise up to the expectation projected on me. By expressing my empathy with Riley, I do not mean to justify Riley’s action of keeping silent to secure her position and relationship, despite the fact that her decision conflicted with what she had pursued theoretically in her coursework. Instead, I would like to validate that the process is complex, and any achievements are tentative. Also, this educational practice is not and should not be confined to our actions in teaching and other educational contexts. Instead, it should take into account our actions outside educational contexts. Below, I add a layer to this narrative by providing my own experience of maintaining silence in a problematic moment. This is one of many stories that illustrates a decision that I am not proud of, but
it exemplifies struggles that I, like many other educators, have experienced and will continue to confront as I teach and live.

During a break for an administrative purpose that was necessary to maintain my active tenured teacher position in South Korea, I visited an elementary school where I used to teach. A couple of years prior, the school had welcomed a new administrator as the previous one had transferred to another school. I introduced myself to the new vice principal, Mrs. Choi, who seemed to be in her late fifties. She warmly welcomed me and asked how my studies were going in the United States. As soon as she knew that I was married, Mrs. Choi asked if my parents-in-law gladly allowed me to study abroad, leaving my partner alone in South Korea. Then, she added that she considered my partner to be very understanding because he let his wife study abroad alone in a foreign country. I felt upset as she seemed to consider a married woman as belonging to her husband’s family. Even when she complimented my achievement of working toward a PhD, the object of the compliment was mainly my partner and in-laws, not me or my parents.

It was clear that her perspective and remarks were old-fashioned and sexist. The more she talked, I became confident that what she said was unacceptable. After she said she felt sorry for married men in her son’s generation as they were asked to help their wives with housework, I felt I should say something. However, I was afraid that my utterance would affect my job status—even though I had very little risk of getting fired—or future career as I might come back to the same school after finishing my graduate program. I carefully told her, “But many women also have jobs and work these days as much as men do…” Mrs. Choi responded that she thinks it is problematic that younger generations try to divide everything equally even in their marriage. After she concluded
her remarks, I did not say anything but slowly nodded my head. Since I did not say anything that would make her uncomfortable, my brief meeting with Mrs. Choi maintained a friendly mood.

However, as a graduate student who passionately read, learned, and discussed feminism during my PhD program, I am always ashamed when I recall that moment with Mrs. Choi. When I shared this story with other people, most told me that I would not have made a difference in her thinking even if I expressed my discomfort with the problematic perspective and utterances. Others have also told me that I cannot and should not always express what I think, and it is important to select the right time to point out problems. However, I know that no matter when I become a “kill joy” (Ahmed, 2010) to disrupt oppressive norms and perspectives, there will be people who will say it was not the right time to speak up. Even though my ethics and philosophy textbooks and classes provided several roadmaps to disrupt unjust situations in life, they did not teach me the right time to raise my voice and take action. Also, the dilemma cases reflecting real life situations used to teach the lessons barely included complex power dynamics and relationships associated with taking action.

Circling back to Riley, her inaction regarding her mentor teacher’s problematic pedagogical approach reinforced racism and racial tensions at play in the classroom. From this perspective, her decision can be interpreted in relation to Riley’s whiteness and white supremacy as well as Mrs. Thompson’s white racial identity. However, Riley’s whiteness as socially dominant in U.S. society does not mean that she holds an absolute dominant position in different contexts and relationships. As a student teacher at the elementary school, she does not have as much power and authority as her mentor teacher.
Her position may be also more precarious than most teachers and other staff members in the school, especially considering that her reputation at this school would impact her future career. Meanwhile, she still has more power compared to her students in the classroom and also holds white privilege that her students of color do not have. If she had taken action in a way she believed to be equitable, the decision may have caused various effects on her positions and relationships; at the same time, the interpretation of the action may vary depending on people’s perspectives and values.

As her supervisor, I did not want to demand that she take an action that could potentially put her at risk in her position and her relationships in the school. Riley and I continued this conversation throughout the school year. While we proceeded in our thinking and conversations, she engaged in multiple activities and approaches to resolve the tension initiated by her mentor teacher. In the process, Riley provided suggestions to her mentor teacher based on what she learned in the teacher education program, and some of those were accepted and incorporated into both Riley’s and her mentor teacher’s teaching practices. Riley’s process of navigating and negotiating her multifaceted roles and positions as a student teacher exemplifies the complicated processes that every preservice teacher undergoes as they strive to become socially just and equitable with their students. Meanwhile, the story of my own experience informs that not only preservice teachers, but every individual, has their own process to navigate their different roles and possibilities in education and society. As a phenomenologist, my goals in this dissertation study are to provide an overview of possible approaches to more deeply understand the complex processes in and complicated reality of teacher education. To achieve these goals, I found it worthwhile to set the processes and reality--phenomenon--
as the unit of analysis and zoom into how it takes (un)shape and the meanings in a
teacher education course. Taking on this phenomenological exploration, I start by
naming the phenomenon associated with these complex processes and complicated
connections in teacher education: a “hegemonic insider-outsider.”

**Framing the “Hegemonic Insider-Outsider”**

If having more power and capital than other people, as well as benefiting from
certain cultures or systems, makes an individual an insider, then who are the insiders in
our society? And further, who are the outsiders? Merriam-Webster defines “insider” as “a
person recognized or accepted as a member of a group, category, or organization: such as
a person who is in a position of power or has access to confidential information.” On the
other hand, Oxford Learner’s Dictionaries defines “outsider” as “a person who is not
accepted as a member of society, group, etc.; a person who is not part of a particular
organization or profession; a person taking [part] in a competition that is not expected to
win.” As these definitions imply, and since “insider” and “outsider” are used in different
fields and communities, viewing an individual as an insider or outsider is always
disputable depending on the culture and nature of a context. Meanwhile, recently in
South Korea, younger generations have started using an abbreviation of the Korean word
for “insider” to refer to trendy, sociable, and “cool” individuals, and this word has
become popular both in and out of online spaces. In contrast, an abbreviation of the
Korean word for “outsider” has been used to indicate people who are not sociable and/or
their interests and tastes are out of fashion. Likewise, being an insider or an outsider
involves various values and aspects in a society; there are no absolutes. No insider and
outsider maintains a status that transcends sociohistorical and political circumstances. They are always relative positions.

If one is considered an insider, this means that not only a community or an organization accepts them as an insider, but also they acknowledge themselves as an insider or as having certain insider dispositions. By being an insider, they have much more privilege than others who are outsiders or are less of an insider; they have more voice and influence in terms of making decisions and creating norms. The members of the community/organization accept them based on the value system which they have embodied as members of the group as well as of broader society. Including their self-acceptance, these processes are intertwined with norms and values manifested and/or weighted in the community. These norms and values are considered to be common sense and contribute to maintaining the current dominant culture of the group and/or the society, which Gramsci (1971) theorizes as “cultural hegemony”: “Common sense is not something rigid and immobile, but is continually transforming itself [. . .] Common sense creates the folklore of the future, that is as a relatively rigid phase of popular knowledge at a given place and time” (Gramsci, 1971, p. 326).

A hegemonic insider-outsider, thus, is one who finds their positionality and privilege in flux depending on the dominant culture’s values and the values of the social group with which they identify. The use of the hyphen signifies that insider-outsiderness is shifting and tentative, sometimes moment-to-moment and day-to-day (Fine, 1994). For instance, women faculty’s positionality and privilege in patriarchal intuitions is an example of one being a hegemonic insider-outsider. As Shalaby et al., (2020) reports, “women incur a disproportionate burden of institutional service with little recognition
from their universities and review committees for such “invisible” labor.” Despite their privileges that they have as “professors”–insiders–in universities, considering this gender inequality, women faculty are more an outsider in relative to the positionalities and privileges that men faculty have.

**The Research Problem**

Educators concerned with more equitable and just education commonly emphasize the importance of preparing and supporting classroom teachers to engage in justice-oriented work, as they are the key actors in the classroom. Making an equitable and inclusive classroom for all students seems to be a doable project as much has been shared and theorized as resources to guide and support teaching practices, especially concerning racial inclusion and diversity. However, despite teachers’ efforts to engage in critical work with their students, their approaches often result in other forms of othering of students of color and/or students from low income families. Leonardo (2013) notes that the focus on multicultural education has been heavily centered on individual students of color, and that this adds an extra burden on people of color and their communities. In this regard, scholars concerned with a critical approach to and understanding of whiteness have addressed the need to shift the conversations toward white privilege and white supremacy in teaching practice and amongst teachers (Jupp & Slattery, 2010; Lensmire et al., 2013).

This effort of directly discussing and disrupting dominant power structures, such as whiteness and white supremacy, is an imperative maneuver as it aims to dismantle the fundamental oppressive system and culture in education which have contributed to the ease of certain people becoming and/or maintaining the insider position in a group or
organization. However, several scholars are concerned that this approach could (re)center whiteness and obscure the history and oppression of Black people, Indigenous people, and other people of color. Accordingly, it is crucial to take up whiteness as a nuanced symbolic term describing oppressive power structures and systemic oppression toward both human and non-human beings rather than limit its connotation with regard to white people. This allows scholars and educators to pay attention to various forms and dimensions of power dynamics, inclusion and exclusion, and domination and subordination within multiple educational spaces.

Recently, teacher education programs have aimed to prepare more teachers from different racial and cultural backgrounds to teach diverse students; however, it is crucial to support them as they learn about “dismantling racial, socioeconomic, gender and language injustices” (UMN, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, 2021). If teachers do not understand the intersectionality and multidimensionality of their own positionality as well as that of their students, they may not even be aware that their pedagogical choice reinforces certain students’ outsider-ness while it maintains and strengthens others’ insider positions. Therefore, the phenomenon of the hegemonic insider-outsider often perpetuates marginalization, exclusion, othering, and subordination, keeping teachers from making their classrooms more equitable and inclusive spaces for all students.

With this in mind, four main areas of scholarship are in the foreground of this study: (Critical) Whiteness Studies, Postcolonial Theory, Feminist Theory, and Intersectionality Theory. While each of these areas has developed its own distinctive approaches and perspectives, they together create a new space to explore how the hegemonic insider-outsider exists and operates in society. Hence, I situate the
phenomenon of the hegemonic insider-outsider within the ground generated by the four areas together, intersecting and interacting with justice-oriented teacher education.

In order to study the phenomenon, I developed four research questions that would guide me to capture and illustrate tentative manifestations and provocations in preservice teachers’ learning practices:

1. How might the hegemonic insider-outsider take shape for students in a justice-oriented teacher education course?
2. What role does the hegemonic insider-outsider play in a teacher education course?
3. What does it mean to explore the experience of the hegemonic insider-outsider in the context of a teacher education course?
4. How does the experience of the hegemonic insider-outsider change over the progression of a semester-long course that promotes critical self-reflection and the examination of social context?

Statement of the Phenomenon

In this dissertation, I pay attention to the manifestations and provocations of the phenomenon of the hegemonic insider-outsider, and I theorize the potential findings through a lens of intercultural post-intentional phenomenology. Post-intentional phenomenology is a branch of phenomenology which acknowledges the impossibility of tracing the beginning and end of each intentionality. In this regard, post-intentional phenomenology encourages a researcher to start their phenomenological practices from the middle of the intentionalities and focus on how a phenomenon is becoming and being rather than expecting clear and linear features of intentional relationships. This
epistemological perspective and the conceptualization of intentionality resonate with how I perceive the lived experience as the complex interconnections and interdependencies within the world where human beings and non-human beings exist. It would be a positivistic conceit to suggest it is possible to fully understand these relations and connections with a clear cause-and-effect logic, relying on human consciousness and experience.

However, as a scholar from a non-Western context who also is concerned with decolonization of research approaches, I cannot simply take up phenomenology as my research methodology knowing that Husserl’s rejection of non-European philosophies and his Eurocentric tendencies remain in phenomenology which have not been challenged and further articulated by later phenomenologists (Lau, 2016). Acknowledging that I call upon an intercultural post-intentional phenomenological approach is to consider the lived experience in non-Eurocentric and egocentric ways, which also acknowledges the plurality of truth. This onto/epistemological understanding of phenomenology helps me to dismantle the positioning of Western/Eurocentric research methodologies as benchmarks to understand and validate phenomena. This also encourages me to critically contemplate and theorize the intentional relationships that I bring into this research.

It is crucial to clarify that my approach of dismantling Western/Eurocentric methodologies while calling on non-Western philosophy, thinking, and wisdom is not an attempt to reshape Western-centered phenomenology with Eastern philosophy. Lee (2002, 2006) takes precaution in comparing and contrasting philosophical ideas; he emphasizes that the value of thinking with philosophical ideas from different cultural and
geographical orientations is not to replace a mode of doing philosophy with a better one but to understand deeper, as well as to envision, new possibilities of philosophy. He introduces a mode of philosophy of leaving and breaking the current legitimate boundaries of each philosophical thinking by appreciating and discussing them from and with the exterior. Lee (2002, 2006) refers to this as “thinking through the exterior;” thinking from exterior perspectives considered excluded in the same realm generates new insights and conversations. I consider this attitude as helping me to push the boundaries within myself as well as existing research approaches that I intend to employ as I trace and capture the intentional movement and relationships.

**Dissertation Overview**

Following this introduction chapter, Chapter 2 situates my study within the ground generated by four areas of study: (Critical) Whiteness Studies, Postcolonial Theory, Feminist Theory, and Intersectionality Theory. I focus on their theoretical and practical approaches to disrupting the dominant and oppressive structures and norms in education, society, and the world through a complicated understanding of relationships and power. In Chapter 3, I propose an intercultural post-intentional phenomenological approach. Based on Vagle’s (2014, 2018) post-intentional phenomenology and Lau’s (2016) intercultural phenomenology, I attempt a conceptual dialogue to develop the intercultural post-intentional phenomenological approach that is used in this dissertation study. While Chapter 3 mainly focuses on the philosophical ideas grounding my research, Chapter 4 more specifically outlines my research methodology and the context of the study and participants. I provide a description of how I gathered phenomenological materials–data–and the processes of data analysis using narrative inquiry and discourse
analysis. I also illustrate my research participants as well as my researcher-participant positionality. This dissertation consists of three analysis chapters, and each chapter has its own analysis focus: space, inyeon, and desire. In each analysis chapter, I introduce the reader to the phenomenon of the hegemonic insider-outsider through stories organized by character(s). The stories of Becca, Joe, and Youn center Chapter 5. Focusing on illuminating the multiple layers and dimensions of the teacher education space, I describe how the students and instructor position themselves and also were positioned in the space. Chapter 6, based on stories of Francisco and Gary, zooms in to sociohistorical and cultural connections and relationships with which the phenomenon of the hegemonic insider-outsider is associated. I take up the concept of inyeon–connections: cause and conditions—to explain how the hegemonic insider-outsider is produced, manifested, and provoked in a teacher education space and how the phenomenon is associated with different times and spaces beyond the educational context. Chapter 7 focuses on desires in the educational space through Choua’s stories. Using Deleuze and Guattari’s concept of desire as an autonomous and generative force, instead of viewing desire as a lack or an absence, I explore the desires that are manifested and prioritized as well as other desires that are hidden and silenced in the teacher education course. Based on these chapters, in Chapter 8, I illustrate a vision for justice-oriented teacher education that involves prospective educators and teacher educators who have different cultural, geographical, sociohistorical, and spiritual values and backgrounds. I also provide ideas for future research, practices, and activism in Chapter 8.
Chapter 2. Theoretical Grounding

When democratic movements were active in South Korea from 1970-1980, women’s voices addressing their double oppression both in society and in their families were hardly valued. These movements reinforced the assumption that women’s rights would naturally be respected and protected when the overall social consciousness of human rights was improved (Nam, 2002). Despite the fast social and economic development, raising women’s voices and being a voice for women have been considered a luxury in patriarchal society. Society has “developed” while maintaining norms and values rooted in androcentrism (Moon, 2005). I do not doubt the various forms of sacrifice and dedication devoted to the social justice they desired; however, we also must remember the silenced voices and lives of those whose oppression was hardly considered in our justice-oriented work.

As Sandel (2010) notes, confronting tensions and disagreements is inevitable as we try to exercise justice because the interpretation and perspective of “the good” varies depending on situations and the value system of individuals and/or a group of people. With this in mind, justice-oriented work ought to be conscious of what we are missing and silencing when we pursue the justice, considering certain aspects within a specific context.

My theoretical basis in the planning and exploration of this phenomenological research is the “North Star” (p. 132) which guides our understanding of the phenomenon without losing sight of dismantling inequity in educational practices and societies (Love, 2019). This theoretical grounding section is also a space for me to honor and remember precedent works, stories, lives, and wisdom that have inspired and guided me in my
scholarship and teaching practice. In this regard, I am mindful of choosing works to cite in this study as theories that I believe contribute to questioning and seeing injustice in power structures, systems, and individual people’s lives, instead of forcing us to limit our understanding and practices (Ahmed, 2017). In my scholarship and teaching practice, there are strong influences on what (critical) whiteness studies, feminism theory, intersectionality theory, and postcolonial theory provide, especially when they interact and intersect with each other. I begin this literature review with an overview of the four theoretical disciplines regarding how these theories both together and separately guide this phenomenological exploration of the hegemonic insider-outsider in a teacher education program.

**Introduction to the Theories**

Classroom teachers’ practice is full of a series of small and big decisions of which various perspectives and interests, which are often conflicting, interplay in the processes (Lee, 2011). Acknowledging this, framing discourse with a consideration of the socially-situated and complex nature of teacher identity and responsibility is a critical foundation in my practice and theoretical exploration and development. Preservice teachers enter teacher education programs with the perception of being a teacher and taking on a teacher role that is largely influenced by the stereotype of teachers represented as white middle-class women’s work (Ullucci, 2012; Yoon, 2018). Moreover, they are likely to confront numerous tensions and conflicts as they seek to challenge the normalized dominant culture and system not only in their educational practice, but also in their daily lives (Philip, 2011; Philip & Zavala, 2016).
While pushing (critical) whiteness studies further by taking up whiteness as a nuanced symbolic term describing systemic oppression and oppressive cultural norms, I am cautious of the U.S-based approaches becoming a master narrative which implicitly forces local scholars to assimilate their research (Motha & Varghese, 2018). Scholars can avoid this by not remaining stuck in understanding and theorizing preservice teachers’ practice with Western/European-based theories or not sticking to the approaches that have been considered canon in a discipline. The insights from postcolonial theory and its enactment in practices are helpful for teacher educators to validate knowledge and values which have been denigrated by the white heteropatriarchal gaze (Anzaldúa, 1987; Bhabha, 1994/2004).

Teacher education programs can also encourage teachers to articulate various axes and dimensions of power relations to understand how they and their students are situated and take up spaces both in local and global contexts. Intersectionality theory provides an additional conceptual framework of how intersectionality has formed and shifted with history and political climate (Levine-Rasky, 2011). The lack of conversation between various critical approaches—each begun and developed with different goals and perspectives—results in misunderstandings and creates more obsession with proving the legitimacy of their own discipline over others. Philip and Zavala (2016) address the narrow possibilities of critical work for teachers that are often related to simplistic approaches and solutions drawn on a certain perspective. This is likely to become the “us” and “them” binary, a common rhetoric that does not embrace alternative and multiple approaches to being critical, and is likely to be performed in toxic masculine ways to solidify dominance in the field.
In this respect, it is unsurprising that preservice teachers often perform critical reflection and practice promoted by their program without deeper engagement with the work. It seems that they feel they are being forced to be critical and engage in anti-racist work while there is little space for them to address and reconcile the inner and outer conflict that they experience during their journey to becoming “critical teachers” (Mason, 2016; Philip & Zavala, 2016). Creating a space that embraces diversity and differences, including contradictions, is imperative for preservice teachers to be agents of dismantling racist and sexist conventions in education (Moraga & Anzaldúa, 1981/2015). The generative space that feminist scholars, especially transnational and Third World feminists (Herr, 2014; Moraga & Anzaldúa, 1981/2015), have cultivated is a valuable inspiration to create and support space in my teaching practice in that it encourages myself and students to examine and reflect on the cultures and values of being critical, which have been overshadowed by patriarchy as well as white feminism.

In the following sections, I will review precedent studies in each discipline. The structure of this literature review is unavoidably linear; the theoretical discipline placed first might seem to be more important than those that follow, or those that follow might seem to build on the previous theories in my research. However, I want this chapter to be read in multiple ways rather than to be read section by section, similar to what Deleuze and Guattari suggest to their *A Thousand Plateaus* readers. I have learned and been influenced by each theory in nonlinear ways—sometimes a theory has come to me and shaped my work at different moments and for different durations; other times, multiple theories created theoretical spaces together. I want to note that, as I was crafting this chapter, an image of airport concourses had been on my mind. From a passenger
perspective, we enter a specific concourse to take a flight. However, when the plane takes off, we come to realize that many other planes are departing from different concourses, and come into play on the same ground as our plane. Each section is like a distinctive concourse for future departures and flights—a phenomenological exploration in this study.

**Critical Whiteness Studies**

(Critical) whiteness studies in teacher education were initiated in the U.S. in the late 1980s (Leonardo, 2013) and have evolved and shifted as they incorporate diverse ways to understand whiteness and white identities in white teachers’ learning and teaching practices (Jupp et al., 2016; Lensmire et al., 2013; Sleeter, 2001). These works have troubled normalized whiteness and white privilege, which underlie the social norms and systemic domination of people of color (Crowley, 2016; Tanner, 2018; Ullucci, 2012; Yoon, 2012). At the same time, they contribute to shifting the main focus and responsibility of multicultural education to white people, in that equitable education for all people is not possible without dismantling whiteness and its systems (Mason, 2016; Picower, 2009; Ullucci, 2012).

**Critical Whiteness Studies**

This section explores (critical) whiteness studies in teacher education, focusing on more recent work, such as second-wave white teacher identity studies. This review of literature is based on how recent works in whiteness studies have responded to the

---

1 This section is grounded by many studies in the realm of critical whiteness studies; however, since not all scholars’ works that I review in this chapter consider their work to be critical whiteness studies, and some of them trouble the application of “critical” in whiteness studies, I parenthesized the word “critical.”
critique of the limitations to whiteness and white teacher identities in the approaches of early works.

McIntosh’s (1989/2008) work on white privilege, “White Privilege: Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack,” has given educators a new analytical perspective on schooling, focusing on whiteness (Leonardo, 2013). This metaphor of the “invisible knapsack” implies the invisible presence of whiteness that has structured norms and power relations in the U.S. While McIntosh’s list of white privilege features has been criticized for various reasons, including that the work assumes monolithic white people’s identities, this work ignited scholars to take up whiteness and white privilege as a focal point to discuss inequity issues in education (Leonardo, 2013). Making whiteness visible is crucial to dismantling dominant power structures benefitting whiteness (Leonardo, 2013; Lynch, 2018; Mason, 2016; Tanner, 2020; Ullucci, 2012). Critical whiteness studies locate whiteness at the center of the discourse and enable educators to look at familiar aspects differently, even strangely. Besides, the focus on multicultural education which has been heavily centered on students of color has shifted the conversation toward teachers’ white privilege (Leonardo, 2013). Meanwhile, the critique on the monolithic viewpoint of white teachers has pushed this field to be more nuanced and to acknowledge complex processes to become race conscious.

Early whiteness studies in teacher education mainly focused on individual white teachers’ privilege and race evasive practices (Berchini, 2016; Jupp et al., 2016; Jupp, 2017; Ulysse et al., 2016). Because it essentialized whiteness and white teacher identities, this approach overlooked the complexity of identity and nuanced whiteness as non-static and malleable (Jupp & Slattery, 2010). Scholars urged for whiteness studies to move...
beyond McIntosh’s essentializing representation of white people and identities (e.g., Jupp & Slattery, 2010; Lensmire et al., 2013). Recent whiteness studies still build on early whiteness studies’ focus on race-evasive tendencies, but they approach whiteness from social and historical perspectives, including intersectionality and power dynamics involved in the construction of whiteness. In this regard, sociohistorical analysis and different approaches to white identities are prominent in recent whiteness studies in teacher education (Lensmire et al., 2013). Jupp et al. (2016) characterize this developing field as “second-wave critical white teacher identity studies.” This epistemological shift of understanding whiteness and white identity encourages scholars to avoid assuming white teachers’ identities as homogenous and fixed and, rather, to look at how their different experiences and processes influence their racial identities (Jupp & Slattery, 2010). In addition, second-wave work and other recent studies on whiteness in (teacher) education provide empirical research on white teachers’ participation in and challenge of whiteness during their teaching and learning practices (Jupp, 2017). Even as the field in general has moved beyond the simple treatment of white privilege and race-evasive practices, some scholars still heavily address white teachers’ race-evasive identities (Jupp et al., 2016).

**Defining Whiteness**

Before more closely reviewing how whiteness studies have taken up whiteness and white identity, this review will discuss in the next few paragraphs how these scholars define and articulate whiteness in their work. Whiteness is not a synonym for a body with a white skin color (Lynch, 2018); that being said, whiteness is also not defined by a biological category but is socially and culturally constructed over time (Applebaum,
2003). Leonardo (2002) uses a case from Ireland to explain this malleable nature of whiteness. For example, even though Irish people were not enslaved like African people, they experienced extreme labor exploitation, and their children were educated with a colonial curriculum in charter schools. They were “othered” in their own land as well. However, Irish labor became regarded as white as (white) bourgeoisie called for Irish people to solidify their privilege from the working class (Leonardo, 2002; Roediger, 1991).

Irish people definitely benefited from their white skin, unlike Native American and African American people in the U.S. (Leonardo, 2002). As we see from the Irish example, whiteness heavily relies on the dominant people’s interests and maintenance of power over other people (Leonardo, 2013). Whiteness perpetually otherizes the position of “other people” and makes their privilege less visible while neutralizing white people’s own oppressive values to ensure their interests (Ullucci, 2012). Thus, whiteness should not be viewed as individual people’s identity and practice but, rather, as an ideology and system which benefit white people (Leonardo, 2013; Lewis, 2004; Tanner, 2018). White people have legitimized their power over people of color through colonialism, slavery, segregation, and oppression over time; the white norms constructed throughout history shape not only the lives of people of color, but also white people (Crowley, 2016; Lynch, 2018). In addition to understanding and analyzing whiteness from a sociohistorical perspective, Ulysse et al. (2016) prompt us to remember that our identities and choices are also part of the construction of society and history.
Different Approaches to Whiteness Research

Sleeter’s (2001) literature review discusses works that try to understand methods to prepare teachers for culturally diverse schools. Pointing out that most of the studies address issues of white preservice teachers’ attitudes and lack of knowledge, she encourages scholars to expand their studies on the realities of teachers in culturally diverse schools. More recent research on critical whiteness explores diverse ways of approaching these issues, transcending the monolithic approach and treatment toward the oppressive force of whiteness in education.

Narrative approaches are used as various tools and processes to approach whiteness. This includes autobiography, the life history approach, and a researcher’s field notes or journal entries (e.g., Crowley, 2016; Jupp & Slattery, 2010; Lensmire et al., 2013; Lynch, 2018; Tanner, 2020; Ullucci, 2012). For example, Lensmire et al. (2013) use narrative research to critique McIntosh’s essentialized conceptualization of whiteness. Jupp and Slattery (2010) use life history to emphasize that white identity is not monolithic nor static but, rather, complex and variable within sociohistorical dimensions. Furthermore, Ullucci’s (2012) study uses autobiography to allow preservice teachers to grapple with their cultural and racial understandings. Several scholars conducted teacher interviews and classroom observations to understand situated white teachers’ teaching practice (e.g., Berchini, 2016; Yoon, 2012; Yoon, 2018). Yoon (2012) critiques how almost none of the studies on whiteness examine how whiteness plays a role in the discursive practice of two or more people in the classroom, despite whiteness’s social outcomes and processes. She focuses on discourse, she names “whiteness at work” to examine how individual teachers challenge and/or participate in a teacher community.
Berchini (2016) uses interviews and observation to understand the teachers’ viewpoints on racially-conscious teaching and how textbooks influence practice. This adds another layer to the analysis: contextual aspects can obscure a teacher’s intention to implement a racially-conscious lesson.

While empirical studies have developed greatly in (critical) whiteness work, conceptual and theoretical work provide insight into historical understandings and, possibly, different ways to envision research on whiteness. For example, a literature review by Jupp and his colleagues (2016) lays out the genealogy of white teacher identity studies, focusing on works from 2004 to 2014. Also, Lensmire and Snaza (2010) introduce possible ways to understand the identity formation of white people through sociohistorical experiences with Blackface minstrelsy. These scholars encourage the return to earlier and foundational Black scholarship, not only to understand how these studies contribute to the development of the field, but also to gain insight into approaching and theorizing our understanding of whiteness and white teachers (Jupp et al., 2016; Lensmire & Snaza, 2010).

The Sociocultural Understanding and Emotional Aspects of Whiteness

One of the most prominent shifts in whiteness work is the sociocultural understanding of whiteness and white racial identities. Scholars have emphasized the need for whiteness pedagogy in teacher education to overcome the homogenous understanding and treatment of white teachers’ colorblind and race-evasive practices and decisions. Jupp’s (2017) definition of race-visible teaching is helpful to grasp what needs to be included in the understanding of white teachers’ educational practices: “race-
visible” refers to work that recognizes identity features, including race, class, culture, and language.

Lewis (2004) contends the importance of understanding whiteness within a social context, that whiteness discourse without contextual approaches obscures the importance of shifting our demands on educational problems from people of color to white people. Besides, focusing on structural and institutional analyses provides a clearer view of how whiteness is embedded in social, economic, and political construction (Lensmire et al., 2013). In regards to whiteness as a social and historical construction, Tanner (2020) relates white teachers’ identity to their socialization process by acknowledging that white people have not had a space to question and play with the idea of their race as they grew up, so this might have limited their racial imagination. Understanding white people’s experience of growing up as a white person encourages scholars to consider the need for space for teachers to wrestle with their racial identity and to question and reimagine it in relation to other racial identities (Jupp, 2017; Lynch, 2018; Mason, 2016; Tanner, 2020).

Jupp (2017) and Tanner (2020) suggest paying attention to white people’s psychosocial conditions along with the structural and systemic analyses of white teachers’ teaching and learning practices. These studies remind us that individual white teachers bear complex identity formation processes, including mental and emotional aspects. The sociohistorical understanding of whiteness challenges the monolithic conceptualization of whiteness and white racial identities and leads us to confront the intersections of white people (Asher, 2007).

In terms of emotional aspects of whiteness, Lynch (2018) pays attention to white teachers’ feelings of guilt, which she argues are not a feeling but a mask to cover their
fear. She contends that white people’s guilt stems from their fear of not being able to maintain their privilege and power over people of color. Matias (2016) views that emotions should be understood as systemized in the power structure, as expressing emotions require the object to receive the expressed emotions. This study also explains that emotional aspects manipulated to benefit whiteness are rampant in education systems and educational policies (Matias, 2016). Lensmire and Snaza (2010) focus on white people’s ambivalent emotions toward people of color from literature on Blackface minstrelsy—desire and shame, envy and repulsion, sympathy and fear (p.419)—and that these are part of white people’s identity formation process. These studies introduce that emotions and feelings are involved in white teachers’ reflections on their own and other people’s racialization. Scholars suggest that creating a space for white teachers to explore and discuss their feelings and emotions can help them examine their whiteness and white privilege in heterogeneous ways (e.g., Lynch, 2018; Picower, 2009).

**Whiteness Pedagogy as a Becoming Process**

Several scholars argue the value of process-oriented teacher education programs, rather than simple identifications of race-evasive aspects in their practices (e.g., Jupp, 2017; Mason, 2016; Ulysse et al., 2016). Most white students have little experience with reflecting on their own race and culture before entering a teacher education program (Ullucci, 2012). Studies also notice that white teachers can become confused and struggle when they engage with the concept of their own whiteness and white identities (e.g., Crowley, 2016; Tanner, 2018). Their confusion is unsurprising considering that whiteness usually remains neutral to them until teacher education programs make their whiteness visible and articulate (Ullucci, 2012). Moreover, due to the repetition of the
monolithic conceptualization of whiteness and white racial identity in most textbooks and materials used in the teacher education field, white teachers might have had little chance to deeply engage with and reflect on their own racial identities (Lensmire & Snaza, 2010; Lynch, 2018; Mason, 2016; Ulysse et al., 2016).

Mason (2016) reminds us that teacher educators should not expect teachers’ transformation in a short time. Rather, teacher educators need to provide a space and time for white students to navigate their racialized identity and reflect on white privilege (Lynch, 2018; Mason, 2016). In addition, Flowers (2016) suggests that teacher educators should keep engaging with questions and discussions about what they offer to white teachers. These questions and topics include the ultimate goal for their teacher education pedagogy as well as ways to evaluate students’ learning processes and outcomes (Flowers, 2016).

**Theory to Practice**

Another significant development in whiteness work is scholars conducting research emphasizing white teachers’ transformation in race-conscious practice. Applebaum (2003) contends that whiteness work needs to support white teachers in “transgressing” the confession of their white privilege and race-evasive practice. Flowers (2016) emphasizes that transgressive practice means advancing beyond a teacher’s intellectual effort which accompanies their transformation of decisions and behaviors in their teaching practice. With this in mind, it is crucial to make sure white teachers’ intellectual endeavors are translated into their practice. For example, Berchini (2016) focuses on how textbooks structure a white teacher’s teaching practice in relation to the teacher’s dissatisfaction with the textbook and how it does not provide much assistance to
serve her diverse students. She provides analysis focusing on the structural characteristics influenced by the textbook as well as the role the teacher’s whiteness plays in the classroom in terms of whether she failed or was unable to create space for her diverse students. Yoon’s (2018) work also addresses a white teacher’s teaching practice in the classroom, focusing on how the teacher who is committed to race-conscious teaching responds to students of color’s racialized humor. In addition to these two studies focusing on teachers’ practices at the classroom level, Yoon (2012) provides insight into white teachers’ discursive practice within a teacher community by discussing how she noticed hesitancy and silence when topics related to race were brought up.

Ullucci’s (2012) and Crowley’s (2016) studies focus on white teachers’ learning practice. Ullucci (2012) suggests autobiography as a white pedagogy for white teachers to reflect on their different experiences and aspects of their white identities. While the author introduces the benefits of using autobiography as a race-visible learning practice, she implies a need for finding ways to encourage students to elaborate on their racial identity more deeply along with other features of positionality. Crowley (2016) documents white preservice teachers’ learning practice, focusing on their process of negotiating whiteness in a teacher education course. The author provides analysis on the students’ engagement in classroom discussion as well as on their reflexive writings.

**Intersectionality Theory and Feminist Theory**

As members of such an economy, we have all been programmed to respond to the human difference between us with fear and loathing and to handle that difference in one of three ways: ignore it, and if that is not possible, copy it if we think it is dominant, or destroy if we think it is subordinate. But we have no patterns for relating across our
human differences as equals. As a result, those differences have been misnamed and
misused in the service of separation and confusion (Lorde, 1984/2007, p. 115).

Lorde (1984/2007) directs our attention to having a consciousness toward the
ways we have responded to differences among us. Our responses are rooted in a social
system and culture which barely celebrate and embrace difference. This is a critical
reminder that it is necessary to understand and use our differences correctly, and this
process must include correcting misnamed differences and redirecting the use of the
differences in our work toward social change and building coalition. In this regard,
intersectionality theory provides an important basis to understand individual prospective
teachers’ practices and develop ways to better support their learning to become socially
just and culturally relevant educators. This theoretical framework is especially valuable in
this study as this research acknowledges a phenomenon which is produced and provoked
by the prospective teachers and the instructor, who have different racial, ethnic, cultural,
linguistic, gender, and geographical backgrounds. Also, the classroom space where the
phenomenon is situated needs to be understood as a complex institutional space where
various ideologies and cultures are at work, including white supremacy, heteropatriarchy,
and capitalism. Intersectionality theory helps us to understand how individual actors
reproduce and challenge the power systems while they engage in their teaching and
learning practices both in and outside the institutional space.

This section traces some precedent works on intersectionality theory, not only to
understand their theoretical lessons, but also to carry on their commitments which have
been inherited and developed by Black women, other women of color, and Third World
feminists. As the development of intersectionality theory is inseparable from Black
women, women of color, and Third World feminists and their works, I will review the
literature of intersectional theory and feminist theory together so as not to lose their
contexts, links, and overlap. This review starts with a brief definition and history of
intersectionality theory, followed by a review of feminists of color’s works. The next
section narrows its focus to intersectionality theory as an analytical tool which introduces
studies that applied intersectionality to analyze cases in various local and transnational
contexts. Then, I will close this section with a review of studies that encourage people to
take up intersectionality beyond a theoretical framework.

**Definition and History of Intersectionality Theory**

Collins and Bilge (2016) start the first chapter of their book, *Intersectionality*, by
defining the term “intersectionality.” The authors acknowledge that this term is defined in
various ways depending on groups and projects that have taken up the concept for their
different purposes and in different contexts. In this regard, they define the term with a
general description in the first chapter, then further articulate the theory with specific
historical and social contexts in the later chapters (Collins and Bilge, 2016, p. 1). Collins
and Bilge (2016) outline the idea:

Intersectionality is a way of understanding and analyzing the complexity in the
world, in people, and in human experiences [. . .] When it comes to social
inequality, people’s lives and the organization of power in a given society are
better understood as being shaped not by a single axis of social division, be it race
or gender or class, but by many axes that work together and influence each other.

(p. 2)
Scholars emphasize that intersectionality is not just a mere analytical tool to examine various dimensions and axes involved in social systems and structures and to understand their complexities; rather, it ought to be used as an empowering and generative tool to dismantle systemic oppression and dominance (Asher, 2019; de Jong, 2013; May, 2015). Anzaldúa (1990) considers intersectionality as helping us to better recognize and understand various realities which have not been considered or have been misapprehended due to the narrow spectrum of social discourses and perspectives. Our gaze has been programmed to perceive certain realities with limited possibilities of interpreting other people’s experiences and situations. May (2015) argues that this “conditioned perception” (Anzaldúa, 1990, p. xxi) needs to be “identified and challenged” (p. 190) to tear down the oppressive linkage which hinders our understandings of differences. Asher (2019) encourages scholars to conduct intersectional work at the “interstices” (Asher, 2005) and urges us to recognize ourselves as interbeings and to challenge and work beyond binary ways of viewing the world. This implies that intersectional work is not only a theoretical endeavor to understand the world and others, but also an active practice of re-examining our own world view and ways of being. To better understand intersectionality as a justice-oriented tool to disrupt social inequality, it is worthwhile to have some contextual understanding of how the idea of intersectionality was started, named, and developed by activities and scholars.

The reviews of literature from studies tracing the “origin” of intersectionality theory often cite Crenshaw’s article “Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex” (1989) as the root of intersectionality theory since, within it, Crenshaw coined the term “intersectionality” and further developed the concept in her 1991 article “Mapping the
In her 1989 article, Crenshaw conceptualizes intersectionality to articulate Black women’s experiences and positionalities, which cannot be properly understood with single-dimensional analysis on the basis of the narrow definitions of “Black” and “women.” In her later article, Crenshaw (1991) drew explicit links to structural and political aspects of systemic exclusion and oppressions against Black women which were shaped at the intersection of race and gender.

In the meantime, in the U.S., intersectionality was introduced in social movements in the late 1980s as a concept to encourage people to see diverse positionalities and tensions existing and arising in the work of Black rights movement and other social movement organizations (Cho et al., 2013; Collins and Bilge, 2016). Black women were discriminated against and excluded in the social movements and politics seeking Black rights and women’s rights. Sexism was prevalent in the works of the Black rights movement; Black women’s multilayered oppressions and struggles were not named properly, were denied, and were not taken into consideration (Byrne, 2015; hooks, 1981/2014). The feminist movement also failed to acknowledge the complexity of Black and other women of color’s experiences since feminist movements and organizations were dominated by white middle-class heterosexual feminists, and the discourse was centered in their own struggles (Byrne, 2015; hooks, 1981/2014; Lorde, 1984/2007). hooks (1981/2014) writes:

> It is obvious that many women have appropriated feminism to serve their own ends, especially those white women who have been at the forefront of the movement; but rather than resigning myself to this appropriation I choose to re-appropriate the term “feminism,” to focus on the fact that to be “feminist” in any
hooks’ (1981/2014) words above illustrate that Black feminists not only envision feminism to be inclusive of Black women’s complex positionalities and voices, but also to prompt activism to accompany active resistance and transformation to liberate all people from various systemic dominance and separations. This represents the way Black feminists responded to the discrimination and exclusion of Black women, considering all people’s liberation from any oppressions instead of only reacting to the sexism and exclusion in the organizations themselves.

Cho et al. (2013) argue that, from the beginning, intersectionality has played the critical role of promoting intersectional studies to address various levels of power relations and how they are constructed as social inequalities which also shape individual people’s lives. Intersectionality informs us of how risky it is to view and understand the world, others, and self with a single-dimensional perception, especially in working toward social justice (Cho et al., 2013; Crenshaw, 1991). Even if we look more carefully and deeply, we may still overlook or misunderstand the unique power dynamics and relations shaped by multiple factors and their interactions, since they would be hardly noticeable without exploring multiple categories and relationships simultaneously. This framework also enables us to acknowledge that individual people are associated with various social systems, structures, and powers at the same time; considering this, acknowledging how we are “inter-are” (Asher, 2019) is a much-needed mindset to proceed in our intersectionality studies and practice. Regarding our work with other
theoretical frameworks, May (2015) encourages us to read those theories and approaches at the intersection of different worldviews, norms, and registers.

This overview of the definition and historical context of intersectionality mainly reviews works based in North America and Europe. It is valuable to honor and learn the history of how intersectionality was born out of social movements, named, and developed; however, it is also important to know and remember that people on other continents have used and developed the idea of intersectionality without naming it as such (Collins & Bilge, 2016). Collins and Bilge (2016) provide the example of Savitribai Phule, who used the concept of intersectionality in nineteenth-century colonial India without naming it. I also found examples in Korea’s women’s movements in the 1920s during the Japanese colonization, during which Korean women protested low wages and the mistreatment of women and also addressed their complex positions and struggles in the colonial nation, workplace, and household (Broadbent, 2007; Kim, 1997; Kwon, 1998). As we can learn from these instances, in our work of intersectionality and feminism, it is also crucial to acknowledge that a great deal of women’s works and stories in the world have not been documented, broadly shared, or represented in academia and the media. This limitation is associated with the inequality existing in academia and the media in which the English language and North American and European contexts are still valued more highly and dominate. In addition, many women’s stories and achievements have been removed and distorted through colonization, wars, and imperialism.

**Third World Feminism**

It was difficult to decide on a title for this section—whether I would choose “Women of Color in Feminism” or “Third World Feminism”. If I were to follow
Sauvy’s\textsuperscript{2} commonly-known definition of “Third World,” then I am not quite a Third World woman because South Korea would not be considered as such due to its political and economic alliance with the U.S. Considering the politics of using the term “Third World,” Minh‐ha (1989) explains,

> Whether “Third World” sounds negative or positive also depends on \textit{who} uses it. Coming from you Westerners, the word can hardly mean the same as when it comes from Us members of the Third World. (p. 97-98)

Then, she further articulates that naming people and countries as Third World people and Third World can be an empowering tool which promotes solidarity amongst those people. Minh-ha (1989) writes,

> “Third World” now refers to more than the geographically and economically determined nations of the “South” (versus “North”) [. . .] there no longer exists such a thing as a unified unaligned Third World bloc [. . .] What is at stake is not only the hegemony of Western cultures, but also their identity as unified cultures. (p. 98)

Based on this insight, I carefully situate my work with Third World feminism while it is still critical for me to be mindful of other people’s differences and any dominant aspects in my positionality as I seek solidarity with other Third World feminists and their works.

\textsuperscript{2}The term “Third World” was coined in 1952 by the French demographer and historian Alfred Sauvy in an article, “Three Worlds, One Planet,” published in \textit{L’Observateur}, a French weekly of socialist orientation. According to Solarz (2012), “Third World” is often used as a synonym for the underdeveloped world. In addition to this connotation, Sauvy also “assigned a political-international meaning to the concept in that he associated the idea of the Third World with the Cold War. From this perspective, the Third World was undoubtedly both a field on which inter-bloc rivalry played out and an obstacle on the road to the peaceful coexistence of the two blocs, and even the root cause of many disasters within the boundaries of each of these two worlds individually and as the world system as a whole” (Solarz, 2012, p. 1563).
By utilizing Third World feminism, this study attends to disrupting coloniality, whiteness, and Western/Eurocentric ideologies and logic in feminism.

When a woman of color engages in feminist works, she is likely to be left stranded by multiple categories (Minh-ha, 1989). For example, she would be expected to prioritize her “culture” to inherit and protect her ethnic, cultural, and racial community from racism and whiteness. Meanwhile, white feminists would emphasize “sisterhood” and ask her to be in solidarity to fight against sexism in society (de Jong, 2013; Lorde, 1984/2007). She would be blamed for choosing either side while her complicated struggles derived from being a member of multiple oppressed groups simultaneously would not be acknowledged and addressed (Lorde, 1984/2007; Lugones, 2007, 2010).

Lugones (2014) points out that the development of feminisms have not explicitly addressed different social categories—such as race, gender, class, and heterosexuality—with which women of color are associated in how they are racialized and oppressed within specific contexts and power relations. This tendency is also observable in the rising discourse of global feminism and sisterhood, which seem to address various women’s oppressions in the world. Instead, this “global” discourse allows white feminists to avoid confronting women of color’s and Third World women’s inequality issues by emphasizing the common victimhood experience “as woman,” despite that women of color’s struggles are intertwined with global whiteness, of which any white woman cannot be free from responsibility (de Jong, 2013; Lorde, 1984/2007). Scholars have argued that the monolithic discourse on gender invalidates and silences women of color’s oppression because there is little space for various languages to articulate the complex state and condition of being a woman of color in specific contexts (Anzaldúa, 1987;
hooks, 1981/2014; Lorde, 1984/2007). This discourse is rooted in the analogies between sex inequality and racial discrimination which still reproduce and perpetuate a limited and distorted understanding of gender (May, 2015; Lugones, 2007, 2014). In this regard, scholars have urged us to reconstruct the homogeneous understanding of gender which is centered around white and masculine norms as it erases a multiplicity of genders in various cultures and races (May, 2015; Lugones, 2014). Lugones (2007, 2010) suggests that this work include unraveling functions and the arrangement of gender systems before colonization and modernization, as Western/European forces—such as capitalism—have confined the concept of gender and its functions.

Women of color scholars and activists have identified how women of color are exploited and tokenized in progressive organizations and social discourses seeking diversity and solidarity, including feminist conferences (e.g., CRC, 1986; hooks, 1981/2014; Lorde, 1984/2007; Lugones, 2014; Minh-ha, 1989; Purkayastha, 2012; Yamada, 2015). Minh-ha (1989) describes how women of color representatives are essentialized and objectified in organizational conferences. They are expected to represent “pure” nativism in terms of issues of hegemony, racism, and sexism, so women of color are forced to align themselves to certain figures and voices. She further criticizes how white feminists seek diversity and demand differences while they want the differences to be “safe” and “not too different” so they can still secure their positions and emotions. Yamada (2015) discerns that women of color’s expressions of ideological problems are often misunderstood and undervalued, dismissed as personal issues and complaints born from personal anger against dominant groups. Lugones (2007) points out that this lack of consciousness is rooted in feminism that has been constructed on the
basis of a narrow definition of white bourgeois womanhood, and these “white bourgeois feminists theorized whitewomanhood as if all women were white” (p. 17).

The exploitation and tokenization of women of color in social discourse could become even more sly, depending on contexts that are still implicated in the construction and maintenance of white women’s womanhood. For example, after apartheid, while there has been a decrease in use of words directly indicating race in social discourse, vocabularies related to morality and rationality continue to imply racial hierarchy and binaries. Utilizing this new racial discourse, white women in South Africa have solidified their whitewomanhood to a better place than Black women’s womanhood (van der Westhuizen, 2016). Similarly, describing women of color as lacking morality and rationality produces the discourse that they do not deserve the same treatment as white middle-class women (Espiritu, 1997; Lugones, 2007). Despite variances in patterns, women of color consistently become otherized by white women. Lorde (1984/2007) argues that white women overlook their own white privilege and focus on their victimhood as women, then they interpret women of color’s experiences from their limited perception and experiences of being women without comprehending women of color’s complexity.
Troubling Normalized Coloniality, Patriarchy, and Dualism.

Third World feminists, Indigenous feminists, and other women of color feminists have been deliberately attending to the disruption and unlearning of coloniality, normalized masculinity, and dualism in their scholarly works and activism. In their response to sexism and racism in society, they work to dismantle the various bases of oppressive roots while striving to establish new foundations for all people’s liberation. Purkayastha (2012) troubles the category “American” by addressing the colonial nature of the construction of the category, that different levels of hierarchies are unavoidably produced through classifying people based on religion, culture, ethnicity, language, sex, and gender.

Not only in North America, but also in many other communities and countries, Christianity encroached on native people’s spiritual beliefs, community organizations and leaderships, and various aspects of modes of being (Lugones, 2007). Allen (1992) articulates how colonialists coerced Indigenous people to convert to Christianity and its relation to the colonial project, emphasizing their commitment to replacing Indigenous people’s gynocratic spiritual beliefs and social organizations with patriarchal and dogmatic systems and beliefs. This colonial project was implemented as a civilizing mission, saving those who do not have “proper” spiritual beliefs, social organizations, and education (Allen, 1992; Jaimes-Guerrero, 2003). Of course, the colonists held the firm belief that their qualification to conquer and colonize Indigenous people and their land was granted by God; therefore, they easily rationalized the cruelty with little guilt (Lugones, 2007). According to Jaimes-Guerrero (2003), the imperial and patriarchal colonialists subjugated Indigenous people and other people of color to advance their
ethnocide agenda through erasing the gender role dynamics in Indigenous communities; the “denigration of the female principle” (p.68) represents how colonists imposed the Western sexist gender system on Indigenous people and others as part of the subordination.

Lugones’ (2010) observation of the coloniality of gender helps us to view the system and individual people as a living and evolving history of (post)colonialism and imperialism. As she discusses,

Coloniality of gender enables us to understand the oppressive imposition as a complex interaction of economic, racializing, and gender systems in which every person in the colonial encounter can be found as a live, historical, fully described being. (p. 247)

It is important to understand that Third World, Indigenous, Black, and other women of color feminists are cautious of overlooking or justifying the use of the “master’s tool,” which many of us have embodied to survive or even have from just being in the world (Minh-ha, 1989). Combahee River Collective (1986) reminds us that feminist work toward liberating all oppressed people must not “mess over people in the name of politics,” interpreted as a commitment to all oppressed people’s exclusion, exploitation, and pain while not justifying any unjust aspects and processes with a political and organizational agenda and outcomes. Restoring and remembering the history of the coloniality of gender teaches us that what we may have believed as “universal” and “inherent features,” such as sexual and gender binaries and norms as well as racial hierarchy, may be the products of colonialism and imperialism, which needed a firm foundation for ideological and material domination (Minh-ha, 1989). This process also
complicates the understanding and acceptance of what we have believed as convention and truth. Minh-ha (1989) claims that our work still will be trapped within “the male-is-norm-divide-and-conquer” quagmire (p. 101) if we neglect the careful examination of various ideologies, logic, and stories which have been fuel for capitalist and colonial ways of understanding social categories (Lugones, 2010, 2014).

Indeed, intersectionality is a crucial framework in the process of disrupting homogeneous and dichotomous ways of understanding society and individual people as well as reconstructing heterogeneous norms for multiple possibilities. This endeavor is meant to be complicated; intersectional work is not supposed to be unified and clearly identifiable with a single label and logic (Bailey, 2007; May, 2015). A concept or theory may work well for a purpose and from a certain perspective and value; however, this approach still may be missing other points and may (re)produce different issues. Purkayastha’s (2012) concerns on the usage of the term “woman of color” is a great example of the necessity of considering and learning from multiple theories in intersectionality work. She points out that the term “women of color” is useful in North American and European contexts to indicate these women’s circumstances in a relative sense to white women (Purkayastha, 2012). However, this categorization makes invisible other aspects of hierarchy and power relations among these women of color because it obscures global hierarchy, colonial and exploitation histories, and tensions between countries/communities as well as these issues within a community and country (Purkayastha, 2012; Yamamoto, 2000). Considering gray areas in critical inquiries, openness to multiple theories and ontologies, and learning from them would become a powerful foundation to grow valuable insight for challenging normalized coloniality,
patriarchy, and dualism as well as detecting to what we have been oblivious (Lugones, 2010, 2014; Spivak, 1985). Furthermore, Asher (2019) motivates us to persist in intersectional work as “interbeings” (Asher, 2003)—those who attend to the plurality of the world and in-between spaces—“with the recursive work of restructuring the discursive landscape in generative ways, foregrounding multiplicities, contradictions, contestations, and congruence.” (p. 5)

(Re)Writing Her/His-story.

The majority of institutionalized ideas and stories have shaped into theories and histories which were (re)written and documented from androcentric and white supremacist perspectives, and schools have played the role of transmitting this knowledge and these experiences in the name of education (Villegas, 2007). Stories voiced by women and/or people of color were denigrated as “difficult to understand” and “not valid” by men and/or white people, and this pattern has been a vital part of constructing conventions and canons in the U.S. (Minh-ha, 1989). Minh-ha (1989) observes the male-biased culture and systems of academia (in this bias, male is inclusive of all male, but mainly white male), and she provides discussion of anthropological research and understanding man. She articulates that “Anthropology, like all these sciences of man, is, therefore, male-biased not only because ‘we who are ourselves men study men’, but also because it is gender blind in its pretensions to science” (p. 105). Likewise, the problems of androcentric culture and systems are not only rooted in the fact that male researchers conduct research with their male-biased perspectives, but also are built upon the traditions which have been oblivious to the dynamics of gender systems and roles and how they operate in the context in which they are studied. Nonetheless, women scholars
and other people in communities in every corner of the world have strived to protect and
revitalize women’s and other cultures’ languages, customs, and values amongst exclusive
institutionalization predominantly led by white males, and these works are valuable
instances of and inspirations for challenging colonial logic and patriarchal traditions
(Grande, 2018; Sunseri, 2000).

Women scholars have noted that many women had to learn and become familiar
with dominant languages and modes of being (e.g., Mason & Ngo, 2019; Minh-ha, 1989;
familiar with the language and manners of the oppressor, even sometimes adapting them
for some illusion of protection” (p. 114). However, this process does not stay limited to
performing languages and manners; the institutionalization shapes people’s “cognitive
modality” (p. 79), so it is likely that people have embodied and internalized the dominant
values and perspectives while engaging in intellectual works (Lugones, 2014). Thus,
transforming institutions into equitable and inclusive groundings requires unlearning
patriarchal and white supremacist languages and values while engaging in issues of
gender, race, and educational systems (Asher, 2019; Keddie, 2006). The paths paved by a
number of women in the world who have relentlessly worked toward rejecting patriarchal
and white supremacist institutionalized language imply the need for establishing new
systems, operative norms, and cultures (Mason & Ngo, 2019; Minh-ha, 1989). In other
words, our work must envision a radical renewal of the basic infrastructure in intellectual
spaces (Mason & Ngo, 2019; Spivak, 1978). Mason and Ngo (2019) emphasize that we
are likely to be occupied by dominant institutional power if our work remains at the
surface level “diversity discourses” (p. 17).
Therefore, instead of adding women to the existing history, it is crucial to rewrite the current stories with women’s voices and from women’s perspectives. This work challenges various ideas and values which have been universally constructed and accepted by men (Spivak, 1978). Spivak (1978) exemplifies this process through re-reading Marx and Freud theories in her article “Feminism and Critical Theory.” In her re-reading of Freud’s understanding of normality and health, she troubles Freud’s notion of pain as abnormality in that it does not account for how pain operates differently for men and women (Spivak, 1978). Spivak (1978) claims that if we consider the womb, “pain exists within the concepts of normality and productivity” (p. 244). Similarly, in Marx’s theory of production, the notion of use-value does not include the value of women’s labor for family as well as the production in the womb. Considering this inadequate omission, Spivak (1978) points out that “one fundamental human relationship to product and labor is not taken into account” (p. 244). The rereading and rewriting of canonical literature enables people to cultivate new awareness because it alters patriarchal and homogenous understandings of humans, concepts, and systems (Collins & Bilge, 2016; Minh-ha, 1989; Spivak, 1978). Feminist scholars have shared the pleasure of restoring undiscovered and invalidated women’s stories and customs, despite that this mission may take much energy, time, and courage to trace them due to dominant cultures and powers (Collins & Bilge, 2016; Minh-ha, 1989). As scholars have emphasized, this work is not only important in research and institutional education, but also is critical grounding for the reconceptualization of women in legal systems, social movements, work places, and many other sectors of society (Cho et al., 2013; Crenshaw, 1991; Spivak, 1978).
Intersectionality as an Analytical Framework

Collins and Bilge (2016) summarize six themes that keep appearing in the works which employ intersectionality as an analytical framework: inequality, relationality, power, social context, complexity, and social justice (see p. 25-30). They further explain that these themes are not always present in every analysis, and each idea is taken up in various ways (Collins & Bilge, 2016). This section reviews studies which use intersectionality as a framework to deepen and complicate their perspectives, analyses, and discussions with different contexts and scopes.

One of the instances shared in Collins and Bilge’s (2016) book is a complicated analysis of Brazil’s national discourse on national identity and the development project (see p. 18-25). This discussion is followed by a section which addresses the dilemma in dealing with global economic inequity between neoliberal logic and social welfare. The authors juxtapose the meeting of Latinidades—the largest women’s festival in Latin America—with Brazil’s 2014 World Cup, considering how these festivals’ successes were measured and discussed in national and global discourses. While Latinidades’ success was judged by the inclusivity and visibility of attendees, the evaluation of the Brazil World Cup’s achievements barely accounted for social inequalities (Collins & Bilge, 2016). Through this analysis of a specific case, the authors identify political languages and perspectives describing racial exclusion and discrimination which have been erased by neoliberal logic, which is dominant in the nation’s identity construction and development agenda. Moreover, Byrne’s (2015) study on citizenship and right to love highlights the presence of whiteness, masculinity, and heteronormativity in Britain’s notion of citizenship, family, and immigration. This research exemplifies understanding
social campaigns against the spousal visa policy amendment through the concept of intersectionality. Meanwhile, the author points out that the usage of intersectionality loses its critical power as it is used without a deeper understanding of the concept, such as being applied to mesh distinct social categories when the concept is taken up as a synonym of “junction” (para. 7.1).

Such analyses represent how the conceptualization of national and global citizenship privileges certain groups of people while marginalizing “others.” de Jong (2013) observes an exclusive tendency in theories and discourses on global citizenship. Despite that the word “global” sounds inclusive and equitable, its membership is stratified based on racial, gender, and class categories. In other words, the conceptualization of global citizenship has built upon the histories of colonialism and capitalism while concealing the histories of displaced and oppressed people (Byrne, 2014, 2015). de Jong (2013) states that the dominant groups—many of whom are white and male—have solidified their privileged citizenships by (re)producing others both within their nations and in the transnational context. International security arrangements are a great portrayal of the exclusive and stratified membership of global citizenship; Others’ bodies are suspected and controlled in the name of global security, which is closely intertwined with racial inequality issues in Western countries (Purkayastha, 2012). These works illuminate the dominant discourses on global citizenship which advertise the convenience of border crossing and benefit of living in different places as exclusive for certain privileged people. For some (privileged) people, border crossing is an exciting, interesting, and convenient experience; however, for Others, the meaning and experiences of border crossing are likely to be intertwined with separation, displacement,
colonization, and survival—and these are the realities that privileged global citizens want to avoid in their conceptualization of the globalization and modernization of the world.

Obviously, people of color’s experiences of border crossing vary, such as going through airport security or an immigration center, and not all of their experiences might be associated with negative emotions and dehumanizing treatments. As Purkayastha (2012) indicates, the problem of the “women of color” categorization is that individual people’s experiences and positionalities within same/similar racial or ethnic groups need to be further elaborated on with global hierarchies, dynamics of genders, and various tensions intertwined with history, economy, and politics. This brings forth questions that consider whether racial privilege and domination are only associated with white people in homogenous ways as well as whether people of color are free from embodying and reproducing coloniality and racial privilege. Considering these inquiries, scholars have complicated the concept and understanding of whiteness—which can be understood as the collective manifestation and operation of white supremacy and domination, coloniality, and capitalism—through intersectional observation in various world contexts (e.g., Bonnett, 2002; Christian & Namaganda, 2018; de Jong, 2013; Grewal & Kaplan, 1994; Levine-Rasky, 2002). Levine-Rasky (2002) challenges the general notion of normalized white privilege and whiteness based on the image of the white middle class in North America and Western Europe. She argues that this notion fails to grasp various experiences and modes of being white in different social and historical contexts and conditions (Levine-Rasky, 2002). Meanwhile, white privilege and whiteness have traveled to different parts of the world through colonialism and capitalism, and are then transformed into multiple features. Christian and Namaganda (2018) claim that,
therefore, whiteness ought to be taken up beyond a tool to articulate racial injustice in that people have embodied whiteness in various forms, and the various forms are enacted in unique ways in different regions. Before moving on to the review of studies on various patterns and manifestation of whiteness, it is crucial to note that adding extra dimensions to the understanding of whiteness must not mean that some white people are less responsible or can escape from whiteness and white privilege.

Intersectionality not only allows us to examine how dominant powers and structures operate in society, but also is helpful to acknowledge that a number of hegemony pieces, which have modified, disseminated, and crashed within global spaces, are manifested and create unique variances depending on milieus (Christian & Namaganda, 2018; Grewal & Kaplan, 1994). Bonnett (2002) examines how symbolic whiteness was shaped in Japan; whiteness in the Japanese context needs to be explained with its modernization process, in which Japanese intellectuals and social leaders made efforts to differentiate their country from other countries in Asia. This tendency was especially prominent before and during the Second World War, and they claimed their advancement through aligning themselves with European values and ideologies which can be considered as symbolic whiteness (Bonnett, 2002). Bonnett (2002) articulates that people “make use of whiteness, as something to aspire to, to define oneself against or, as in Japan, in a more complex and tense relationship of assimilation and refusal” (p. 100). Japan had embodied and used whiteness to assimilate with Europeans to display “their ethnic uniqueness” (Bonnett, 2002, p. 100) while refusing their Asian-ness. As we see in this case, in a country/community where race is less visible or not prominent, whiteness
would be better identified as the “active strategy used by some groups to claim power and superiority over others in the same society” (Arat-Koç, 2010, p. 156).

Christian and Namaganda’s (2018) transnational intersectionality study analyzes Ugandan domestic workers’ racialized and gendered experiences in three different regions of Uganda. This study demonstrates unique manifestations of whiteness in Africa regarding racial power dynamics, not only among African people, but also between a Ugandan domestic worker and an East Asian ambassador. Christian and Namaganda (2018) state,

North Africans are not constructed as “black” and fall closer to whiteness, “social whites,” in the global hierarchy of nations in relation to East Africa. They are an example of how whiteness is materially and symbolically deployed through the maintenance of anti-blackness imbued within global white supremacy. (p. 326)

As the analysis above indicates, intersectionality sheds light on the construction of (social) whiteness within contexts in which whiteness would not have been graspable with a homogenous conceptualization of whiteness. In her article “A Global Critical Race and Racism Framework: Racial Entanglements and Deep and Malleable Whiteness,” Christian (2019) emphasizes the cruciality of adding historical and global dimensions, especially capitalism and modernity, in frameworks studying race and racialization. In this respect, Christian and Namaganda (2018) articulate a distinctive manifestation of whiteness in the Ugandan context without erasing or flattening historical and sociopolitical dimensions; they do this by attending to multiple social categories, such as a regional conceptualization of race and gender as well as their perception and demarcation of the labor. Likewise, intersectionality provides insight into understanding
how power structures and sociopolitical relations have formed and shifted with history, geography, and political climate (Levine-Rasky, 2011). This perspective is especially valuable to understand how individual people’s social status, privilege, and marginalization have modified and solidified in different spaces and times.

By accentuating complex power relations regarding one’s positionalities in local and global contexts, Levine-Rasky (2011) explains that individual people are members of multiple domination groups and subordination groups at the same time. This also implies contradictions in one’s positionality: that certain aspects will reinforce each other in some conditions while they can contradict in others. Her point reflects Purkayastha’s (2012) perceptive discussion on people who are marginalized even in justice-oriented work and spaces. Often virtual communities are considered an important medium to mitigate the information gap as technology supports people having access to information from various sources as well as connecting people from different parts of the world. However, Purkayastha (2012) reminds us that these communities and resources are still available and affordable for only certain people who are literate in the English language and have time and capital for the online space. This further raises questions about the optimistic scenarios of reducing inequalities through virtual spaces and with technologies that market, intellectual and social leaders have addressed. The author worries that the power inequality and marginalization will be reproduced within and through virtual communities since the development of online spaces and communications has continued in (post)coloniality, fueled by capitalism (Purkayastha, 2012). Besides, intersectionality also helps us to be alert to technologies being used not only by governments, but also by private companies, to increase the level of surveillance and control people’s behaviors,
words, and even ideologies (Purkayastha, 2012). These analyses elucidate multiple realities of how certain people are imagined by other people’s realities—such as being otherized, not acknowledged, excluded, and generalized by privileged people—as well as how people imagine their own realities—such as feeling incapable, disenfranchised, not safe—in various spaces (including virtual communities) and times.

**Beyond the Theories**

Scholars, practitioners, and activists have shared their concerns regarding intersectionality losing its critical power as people simply take up its concept for a research method and theoretical framework without proper understanding of how intersectionality has been born and developed (e.g., Byrne, 2015; Collins & Bilge, 2016; Lorde, 1984/2007; May, 2015; Minh-ha, 1989). They do not mean that intersectionality work should address what is and is not intersectionality work; these people value the generative possibilities that intersectionality enables in our intellectual work and practice. Collins and Bilge (2016) observe that some people use intersectionality to justify social inequalities and even apply the framework to criticize other people’s and group’s efforts toward social inclusion and reducing inequalities. They assert that intersectionality should be an empowering tool rather than simply being taken up as a research tool to comprehend complexities (or even justify injustice) (Collins & Bilge, 2016). Byrne (2015) also worries that intersectionality would lose its “much-needed critical tools for examining the complexities of power, agency and resistance” (para. 4.1) when scholars use it as an umbrella term to indicate “all those complex aspects” without elaborated understanding and analyses of power distributions. Scholars also state that naming a work “intersectional” and using the concept does not necessarily make the work critical and
contribute to social justice (e.g., Byrne, 2015; Collins and Bilge, 2016; May, 2015; Minh-ha, 1989). Collins and Bilge (2016) clarify that “scholarship and practice that claim terms such as ‘critical,’ ‘progressive,’ ‘intersectional,’ and even ‘radical’ are not necessarily oriented toward social justice” (p. 41).

May (2015) explicates how intersectionality has not been properly understood due to the literal understanding of its name in that the name “intersectionality” implies categorical division, while it does not signify intersubjectivity of social categories and power relations. She further explains,

Intersectionality is thus repeatedly misrecognized in its own name—it is read or operationalized as adhering to categorical separation and as furthering atomized logics, rather than as rupturing these epistemes by drawing on knowledges, historical memories, and political desires derived from living/being/thinking within enmeshment and resistance (May, 2015, p. 189).

The interpretation and application of the concept of intersectionality should go with the constant unlearning of dominant structures, languages, and ideologies which we have embodied and practiced (Lorde, 1984/2007). May (2015) calls intersectionality a “disposition” which “requires actively orienting ourselves, and expressly developing interpretive inclinations, modes of being, and political commitments in ways that disrupt, trouble, and fundamentally depart from mainstream logics, ontological habits, and perceptual practices” (p. 227). In other words, keeping ourselves away from the temptation of easier ways of doing intersectional work—such as the perfunctory identification of various aspects in social disparities and analyzing only certain aspects
that we are inclined to view and address—is also an imperative part of engaging in intersectionality.

Intersectionality as disposition enables us to value the process of working differences among us; this also corresponds with what Black women, other women of color, and Third World feminists have addressed in their resistance to white feminism and envisioning a revolutionary coalition without erasing and tolerating differences (Lugones, 2014; Lorde, 1984/2007; Anzaldúa, 1987). For example, Lorde (1984/2007) looks forward to the coalition which acknowledges and includes all forms and levels of oppressions without silencing differences and denying existing social hierarchies in the name of solidarity. She emphasizes the importance of unlearning the “piece of the oppressor” within ourselves by quoting Paulo Freire’s words: that we have to break up with “the oppressors’ tactics, the oppressors’ relationships”—such as denying and silencing differences and generalizing other people’s oppressions based on their own differences—for the “revolutionary change” (Lorde, 1984/2007, p. 123). In Lugones’ (2014) articulation of the “coalition within the logic of fusion,” she illustrates how this form of coalition can resist multiple oppressions at the same time. While this coalition emphasizes the importance of interdependency, the logic encourages us to be mindful of “how and to what extent these resistances support or undermine each other” (Lugones, 2014, p. 77). This echoes some aspects of what scholars have observed as the nature of intersectionality work: multiplicities and contradictions (e.g., Asher, 2019; Anzaldúa, 1987; Levine-Rasky, 2011). While these are unavoidable in working at intersections, coalition with the logic of fusion motivates women of color to pay attention to how these
multiplicities and contradictions take shape and how these operate in their interactions with other women of color.

As a critical reminder to attend to various differences and their intersections in this research, I would like to close this section with Lorde’s (1984/2007) words, which guide me to keep cultivating my intersectional disposition throughout this study:

It is not our differences which separate women, but our reluctance to recognize those differences and to deal effectively with the distortions which have resulted from the ignoring and misnaming of those differences [. . .] The future of our earth may depend upon the ability of all women to identify and develop new definitions of power and new patterns of relating across difference (p. 122-123).

Postcolonial Theory

Postcolonial theory is, to put it simply, a field of study which explores the cultural and political byproduct of colonialism and imperialism. Young (2016) identifies a distinctive characteristic of postcolonialism from the study of colonialism, imperialism, and neoliberalism, that it addresses the ambivalence of the current state as a postcolonial world, while other fields mainly focus on understanding and critiquing oppressive power relations and practices between and within various geographical spaces and systems. Bhabha (1994/2004) introduces postcolonial theory with the enunciation of “beyond” to clarify that this field of study focuses on the understanding of the postcolonial state and identity. According to Bhabha (1994/2004), “the ‘beyond’ is neither a new horizon, nor a leaving behind of the past [. . .] For there is a sense of disorientations, a disturbance of direction, in the ‘beyond’” (p. 1). Considering this articulation, postcolonialism is not a mere study of what happens “after” colonialism; rather, it obliges scholars to speculate
the complex features of identities, cultures, society, and their interactions as they are dominated and negotiated through colonialism, imperialism, and neo-colonialism/modernization.

In his book *The Location of Culture*, Bhabha (1994/2004) proposes a postcolonial theory with the concepts of mimicry, hybridity, the Third Space, and interstices while trying to develop the works of other postcolonial theorists, such as Frantz Fanon and Edward Said. In this section, I will review postcolonial studies on the basis of Bhabha’s work, especially his notion of cultural hybridity and the Third Space. The first section of this review focuses on the theoretical framework that postcolonial theory provides: What does this theory enable us to see and understand? What is unique about this theory? Then, the next section delineates the concept of hybridity and the Third Space, which can be considered the pivot of Bhabha’s (1994/2004) postcolonial theory. Since this study explores a phenomenon which is produced and provoked in an educational setting and concerns educational issues, I will review postcolonial studies applied in educational research, such as understanding of curriculum, school, knowledge, identity, and teaching and learning. Lastly, I will discuss the implication of postcolonialism, in a recursive manner, focusing on how this theory would be helpful to articulate postcoloniality in research that considers both local and international contexts at the same time.

**What Is Unique about Postcolonial Theory?**

Bhabha’s (1994/2004) conceptualization of postcolonialism explicates various features that are produced, manifested, and obscured in cultural differences “beyond” the usual narratives and approaches. He considers postcolonial work as happening in the “in-between” spaces which motivate people to acknowledge and (re)understand their own
identities and their societies that are implicated in multiple histories, geographical spaces, generations, and power relations (Bhabha, 1994/2004). This work increases the possibilities to dismantle oppressive power relations and politics of colonialism and imperialism; however, postcolonial studies may “seem not only unintelligible but frightening and chaotic” (p. 19) because academic disciplines have been dominated by positivistic values and perspectives which seek “universal truths” (Viruru, 2005). Anzaldúa (1999) encourages people to be patient with ambiguity which has been negatively conceptualized by (Western) colonialists but is unavoidable when multiple cultures are acknowledged by one another and interact. Spivak (1985) urges people to vanquish a positivist vision which “can only recognize domination” (p. 85) that justifies or hides the exploitation (of Others) while promulgating the advancements gained through the oppression of Others. To overcome this exclusive and oppressive vision, she suggests we hold on to multiple perspectives at the same time to “speculate and question values”; then one can better understand histories and issues (of production, in the original text) by distancing themselves from being stuck in a certain viewpoint (Spivak, 1985).

Based on Bhabha’s (1994/2004) notion of the interstices—which he also refers to as in-between spaces and the Third Space—individual and collective identities, values, and perceptions interact, collide, and are negotiated in the in-between spaces; in these processes, ordinary narratives and usual political relations become unhomely. More specifically, postcolonialism helps us to uncover “neo-colonial” relations which have been reformulated by colonialists’ unfinished colonial and imperialist agenda (Bhabha, 1994/2004). Said (1978) divulges how the West has historically (and inaccurately) represented the East’s culture, history, and people by developing the concept of
“Orientalism.” With this concept, Said (1978) examines how the West has formulated the false images of the East through the imaginations and discourses initiated and inherited by Western explorers, philosophers, scientists, military, politicians, and artists throughout the histories. In a similar respect, Weis (1995) points out that the colonized Other and the self are co-constructed through colonial imaginations and discourses; the Other is denigrated by the Western white while the colonial self solidifies their supremacy against the Other. By acknowledging the intersubjectivity of colonial identities, despite the colonial self having the dominant power of otherizing and exploiting the Other, postcolonialism motivates us to rethink the binaries and divisions in viewing and understanding different cultures, or cultural translation, which is deeply rooted in the positivist and colonialist vision (Viruru, 2005).

The discourse of modernity and internationalization has been troubled by postcolonial scholars, considering that the idea of modernity was built on the Western hegemonic notion of development, normality, production, and truth (e.g., Bhabha, 1994/2004; Kanu, 2005; Lugones, 2010; Spivak, 1978, 1985). Modernization has operated as a neo-colonial project by legitimizing historical inequalities and oppressions while establishing and solidifying intellectual norms and the notion of advancement based on the West’s ontological and epistemological perspectives (Kanu, 2005). Kanu (2005) further explains that the West has romanticized the discourse of internationalization and modernization while they “dominate knowledge and resources by virtue of their ownership of new science systems, the new technologies, premium academic institutions, and the dominance of English as the medium of instruction and research” (p. 2). Lugones (2010) argues that modernity discourse conceals the West’s
agenda of controlling “the rest of the world” by denying the multiplicity of ontologies and epistemologies, even the truths. Viveiros de Castro’s (2015) observation of European ethnocentrism is also helpful to understand how the West has hegemonized other cultures and bodies, which are, therefore, incorrectly understood and represented. In his critique of contemporary anthropology, Viveiros de Castro (2015) points out that “the Carestian rupture with medieval scholastics produced a radical simplification of our ontology, by positioning only two principles or substances: unextended thought and extended matter. Such simplification is still with us” (p. 293). The simplification that Viveiros de Castro (2015) acknowledges is relevant to the (post)coloniality of academics in that simple-minded ontology and epistemology are deeply rooted in research conventions, especially the studies of non-Western cultures and people, which “reduces reality to representation” (p. 294) and vice versa.

Asher (2009) articulates the paradoxical reality of how the colonized people have lost their homes while many of them are not geographically displaced. Understanding this form of colonial dislocation is an important aspect of postcolonialism in that coloniality has resided not only in political and economic realms, but also has transformed and negotiated generationally and discursively within homes (Anzaldúa, 1987; Asher, 2009). As Asher (2009) expresses, “the colonized are dislocated right ‘here’, without ever leaving home” (p. 3). Meanwhile, the West has positioned themselves as natural and superior while positioning the colonized as primitive and unnatural, therefore, the subject to be tamed (Tuck & Yang, 2012). Through these processes of colonialism and imperialism, even now in the postcolonial world, not only the colonized but also colonizers, in different ways, have embodied the colonial narratives of otherizing the
Other’s cultures, values, and bodies (Ahmed, 2000). The embodied experiences of producing strangers and designating strangers’ bodies as negative traits become an effective tool for the colonizers to maintain their supremacy while the colonized are continually devalued as strangers, also influencing their understanding of self (Ahmed, 2000; Bhabha, 1994/2004). To reiterate the earlier point, postcolonial studies go further than addressing the oppressive legacy of colonialism and imperialism. In this respect, it is important to consider how people refused and resisted what the colonizers attempted to impose on the people and the land (Asher, 2009). This work attends to the (re)conceptualizing contradictions of postcolonial subjects as well as the complex narratives of “border crossers” (Anzaldúa, 1987) who are implicated in various material and conceptual domains. As per Kanu’s (2003) illustration, the postcolonial imagination obliges the colonized or minority to “define themselves in terms of new memory by which they come to know, understand, and experience themselves—memories dissociated from the old collective identities, and re-imagined with another collective narrative” (p. 13).

**Pivotal Concepts**

**Mimicry and Hybridity.**

Bhabha’s (1994/2004) discussion of mimicry—“almost same, but not quite” (p. 123)—and the concept of hybridity play pivotal roles in postcolonial theory. Mimicry represents the ambivalence of colonial discourse while it also signifies the complexity of understanding postcoloniality. Bhabha (1994/2004) positions mimicry as “the sign of a double articulation, a complex strategy of reform, regulation and discipline, which ‘appropriates’ the Other as it visualizes power” (p.122). In his book, Bhabha (1994/2004)
illustrates the concept of mimicry through various literature sources and other scholars’
works, such as Christianity in colonial India (see Black Algerian’s racialization and self-
conceptualisation, p. 121-131). The story of Christianity in colonial India shows the
ambivalence of colonial authority; the conversion of Indian people to Christianity seems
to be successful in making Indian people to have the same religious beliefs as English
people. However, as the story of how the Bible was treated by people in Bengal goes,³
religious symbols failed to maintain their representational authority in the colonial space
(Bhabha, 1994/2004). Fanon’s (1952/2008) autographic theorization of racialization
provides insight into how mimicry works in the self-conceptualization of the colonized.
When a colonized Black man tries to fit into the (white) norm, the (white) colonizer will
continue to practice making the Black man feel inferior to the white. As Black people and
their community continue to be devalued by white society with derogatory images of
them, they are traumatized through these social processes and the self-conceptualization
within the context; at the same time, whiteness as norm and virtue is inscribed in Black
people (Fanon, 1952/2008). These examples illuminate that the effective and complete
control of people is never a possible project when there is always a space for refusal and
resistance (Foucault, 1980; Kanu, 2005). Simultaneously, mimicry still influences the
subjects to internalize colonial values imposed by the colonizer (Bhabha, 1994/2004;

"The ambivalence of mimicry (almost same, but not quite) does not merely

“rupture” the discourse, but becomes transformed into an uncertainty which fixes

³Bhabha (1994/2004) writes, “In May 1817 a missionary wrote from Bengal: Still everyone would gladly
received [sic] a Bible [. . .] Some have been bartered in the markets, others have been thrown in stuff
shops and used as wrapping paper” (p. 131).
the colonial subject as a “partial” presence [. . .] It is as if the very emergence of the “colonial” is dependent for its representation upon some strategic limitation or prohibition within the authoritative discourse itself. (p. 123)

If mimicry illuminates the ambivalent enactment of colonial discourse, especially the effect of ambivalence on the colonized individuals, hybridity can be understood as the ambivalence state of cultures that are represented and translated through colonial discourse. The colonialist authority attempts to subjugate people through imposing their ideologies and manners while separating the people and distorting their cultures and histories so the people will lose the power and consciousness to resist (Anzaldúa, 1987). In the meantime, discriminatory practices are required for the colonizer to consolidate their supremacy over the colonized; these discriminatory practices result in the forms of differentiations, individuation, and reconstruction of identity (Bhabha, 1994/2004). Hybridity is a collage of cultures, identities, languages, and histories of multiple locations. Bhabha considers hybridity as an “ambivalent ‘turn’ of the discriminated subject into the terrifying, exorbitant object of paranoid classification—a disturbing questioning of the images and presences of authority” (p. 162). For the colonized, acknowledging hybridity becomes the consciousness toward the colonialist authority and the distorted histories; in contrast, it threatens the colonizer by signifying the limitation of colonial authority and dismantles the very ground of their supremacy.

Bhabha (1994/2004) clarifies the notion of hybridity in regard to the fact that it “has no such perspective of depth or truth to provide” (p. 162). He uses the analogy of “the split screen of the self and its doubling” (p. 162) to emphasize that hybridity is not a concept which mitigates conflict or contradictions or mediates the gaps between cultures
In Kim’s (2008) analysis on South Korean people’s ambivalent view on the U.S. and Japan, she observes the incommensurable discourses of South Korean’s ethnocentrism and collective inferiority to the U.S. and Japan. Even though she does not use the term “hybridity” to explain this phenomenon, this study exemplifies the complicated and unresolvable features of hybridity in the South Korean context, rooted in the society’s discourses and sentiment on the West, Japan’s imperialism, and Japan’s colonization of Korea. Individual (post)colonial subjects embody hybridity; simultaneously, they discursively produce new hybridity through individual conceptualization and collective memory. Anzaldúa’s (1987) narrative describes hybridity within a self: “I didn’t leave all the parts of me; I kept the ground of my own being. On it I walked away, taking with me the land, the Valley, Texas” (p. 16).

**Third Space and Interstices.**

A Third Space is a generative in-between space where various identities and cultures make contact and are negotiated while they are not coerced to be fixed or united. Bhabha (1994/2004) provides an illustration of the Third Space:

It is that Third Space, though unrepresentable in itself, which constitutes the discursive conditions of enunciation that ensure that the meaning and symbols of culture have no primordial unity or fixity; that even the same sign can be appropriated, translated, rehistoricized and read anew. (p. 55)

The discursive conditions of the Third Space can be better explained with Bakhtin’s (1981) notion of heteroglossia. Heteroglossia refers to the multidimensional and multi-layered characteristics of language (Bakhtin, 1981; Barwell, 2014). This theory articulates that unitary language is socially constructed and that various socio-ideological
dimensions are involved in this process, so that languages are ever-changing in use (Bakhtin, 1981). In postcolonial theory, the Third Space can be understood as the possibilities of rereading, rehistoricizing, and retranslating cultural differences by attending to the multidimensional and multi-layered colonial discourse. A Third Space is possible in various formats; scholars have exemplified a Third Space in their aspiration of postcolonial practices. Bhabha (1994/2004) suggests that a cultural Third Space is valuable in our conceptualization of material and conceptual borderlines. As borderline discourses unavoidably create unsolvable tensions, a Third Space would be a new space to reimagine ways to negotiate these tensions (Bhabha, 1994/2004). Fanon’s (1961/2004) articulation of indeterminate space can be regarded as a Third Space; he values the indeterminate space since this space enables us to be less obsessive of the restrictive conceptualization of cultural identity. The fluidity of the Third Space not only enables people to endure hybrid identities, but also initiates the change of a society which has dehumanized individuals and communities in the name of unity and cultural identity (Fanon, 1961/2004). Asher’s (2009) autobiographical writing practice, which she named “writing home,” is a Third Space that provokes active reflection and resistance of colonial knowledge and practices. Asher (2009) explains how this form of Third Space works:

By “write home” I mean not only writing (to) ourselves, but also writing our own narratives of home that reflect both histories of colonization/oppression and efforts of resistance, that engage both our similarities and our differences across race, class, gender, culture, region, and nation. (p. 5)
As discussed above, this practice goes beyond discovering and acknowledging our (colonized) histories; it seeks radical collaboration by working through both similarities and differences and rewriting our individual and collective histories in the postcolonial space. In Spivak’s (1990) words, a Third Space is where we attend to the hybridities of histories, culture, and identities which “history has written for me” (p. 69).

Anzaldúa (1987) conceptualizes borderlands—a Third Space—as a space for “new consciousness” in her book *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza*. This book provides illustration and the author’s autobiographical narratives of borderlands and borderlands identity in multiple languages across multiple literature forms, prose and poem. She describes “borderland” as “a vague and undetermined place created by the emotional residue of an unnatural boundary. It is in a constant state of transition” (Anzaldúa, 1987, p. 3). Similar to what Bhabha (1994/2004) emphasizes as the importance of going beyond various binaries and divisions in postcolonial work, Anzaldúa (1987) asks us to combat the idea of opposite and split while recognizing that we are on multiple lands at the same time. She argues that new consciousness is available when we are patient with ambiguity while considering borderlands as “communal ground” (p. 87) in which we dwell together. Anzaldúa’s (1987) notion of new consciousness—a mestiza consciousness—goes beyond cultural hybridity because it does not stay at the stage of assemblage which simply bears contradictions or balances powers. She hopes for the future with her vision of the new consciousness—Anzaldúa’s Third Space—that creates “a new mythos—that is change in the way we perceive reality, the way we see ourselves, and the ways we behave” (p. 80). One of the distinctive aspects of this Third Space is that it considers the possibilities of healing through and with this
consciousness. Anzaldúa’s work inspires us to inquire as to how our postcolonial work could attend to the work of healing ourselves and others who are oppressed, hurt, and divided from colonialism, imperialism, and neo-colonialism.

**Education and Postcolonial Theory**

Scholars have explored that school functions as a space which shapes students’ national identity and is based on homogenous national ideologies and the unified image of citizen (e.g., Bourdieu & Passeron, 1970; Hickling-Hudson, 2002; Hudson, 2003; Macgilchrist et al., 2017). The operation of the school system and education much resembles the way the dominant attempt to control and exploit the Other effectively through colonialism and imperialism. Unsurprisingly, schools teach knowledge and manners that are based on Western ways of being and perceiving the world, and students are evaluated by the standards built upon the cultural norm (Hudson, 2003). Therefore, students and teachers have little space for alternative modes of being or to explore stories and knowledge in the educational spaces (Hickling-Hudson, 2002). Viruru (2005) points out that the discourses on child development and learning stages are based on the dominant (Western) development theories, which assume that there is a universal and linear stage for child development and learning. These theories have not been much challenged by educators while they are used as foundational frameworks for educational research to understand student learning and development. What is more problematic is that those theories and models are adopted and commonly utilized by scholars and practitioners in non-Western nations and communities. Hudson (2003) observes that this tendency is also prevalent in teacher education programs and faculties; therefore, they are likely to (re)produce culturally problematic teaching and practice in their classrooms.
Considering these various aspects of coloniality in education, scholars have approached these issues in various ways and with various foci (e.g., Asher, 2005, 2009; Hudson, 2003; Kanu, 2003, 2005; Macgilchrist et al., 2017): One way is focusing on how education is still dominated by coloniality despite the effort to be more socially just, and this approach is related to the concept of mimicry. Another approach is exploring how the educational space could be a Third Space for new possibilities. Hybridity is also a concept that has been taken up to examine ambivalent aspects in learning and teaching practices as well as educational systems.

Macgilchrist, Ahlrichs, Mielke, and Richtera (2017) explore how colonialism and imperialism are represented, taught, perceived, and challenged in multiple educational spaces in Germany. The authors discuss that the textbook curricula reproduce colonial discourses and disrupt the tendency at the same time; dominant perspectives still exist, but the curricula authors interrupt this by adding different perspectives on topics and issues. The analysis of teachers’ reflection and classroom practices with the concept of “lines of flight” can be understood as how mimicry is at work in educational spaces. The embodied colonial discourse reproduces coloniality through decision making and representation of educational materials despite the effort to add counter facts and perspectives in the textbooks and teaching practices. For example, the authors share that the organization of the textbooks—how much space the information takes up and where the information is located in a unit—also implies the message of “what is considered worth remembering” (p. 342) among other information (Macgilchrist et al., 2017). Meanwhile, the authors find the hybrid possibility from the classroom practices in the unexpected connections and signification that happen in students’ engagement with
topics and materials (Macgilchrist et al., 2017). Kanu (2005) also discusses that students
do not learn the same way a curriculum expects the students to learn, as well as that
individual students are “never exactly who the curriculum thinks he/she is” (p. 510).

Kanu (2005) observes cultural hybridity in her experience of working in a teacher
education program implemented in Pakistan. She shares that the program’s effort to teach
South Asian teachers to become effective teachers and initiate changes in their schools
was challenged by the teachers, especially regarding how the knowledge was expected to
be learned through activities and assignments (Kanu, 2005). How the program was
implemented for the teachers from India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh is problematic in that
it was based on a Eurocentric benchmark of good education which is based on
independent thinking and learning. Hudson (2003) discerns that this kind of
West/Eurocentric approach is likely to become a trajectory for “repugnant discourses of
racism that diminish both perpetrators and victims” (p. 387). The South Asian teachers
demanded the teacher education to be more suitable to their cultural practices and values;
therefore, the teachers transformed the program into a hybrid space where Western
knowledge and approaches and South Asian practices and values exist simultaneously.
However, this research also implies the destructive limitation of Western-led
“innovative” education in non-Western contexts as well as the question of how
postcolonial educators’ positionality is perceived and operates in different contexts. It is
not only the matter of Western institutions and staff that are likely to fail to understand
local cultural practices and values, but also how the local participants of the program
perceive and make sense of the pedagogy that is taught by staff from a Western
institution. Considering these aspects brings forth a question of whether a Third Space—
where liberal transformation happens—is a synonym of a space where hybridity exists.

Kanu (2003, 2005) is a Sierra Leone-born scholar who is affiliated with a Canadian institution; however, regardless of her other aspects of positionality, she was perceived as a Western scholar by the local participants. It reflects Asher’s (2009) warning to postcolonial educators, that notwithstanding of non-dominant positionality, they are still “implicated by their own participation in systems of education that are rooted in Eurocentric, colonialist, and oppressive traditions” (p. 8).

Identifying and formulating hybridity in educational spaces are valuable processes of interrupting dominant discourses in education. For example, validating multiple types of discursive practices in educational spaces creates hybridity, and this could become a Third Space that interrupts the discursive norm which is based on Western middle-class families and intellectuals (Hudson, 2003; Kanu, 2005). As Macgilchrist et al. (2017) exemplify, calling out colonial residues in the curricula languages and structural norms formulates a hybridity discussion, as this will reveal contradictory aspects in the current education. On the basis of hybridity, it is imperative for pedagogy to move further to create a Third Space which makes radical changes in educational spaces. Asher (2005) notes that this space is available when pedagogy “requires an engagement with ‘world realities’ and presents the ‘threat’ of unsettling student and teacher from their particular comfort zones [which] is necessary in enabling them to rethink their own beliefs (p. 1101). Educational studies with postcolonial theory illustrate that educational practice longing for a Third Space requires a practice of resistance; it requires bravery to reject the homogeneous and dominant worldview while discovering interstices within the school systems and structures. As Hudson (2003) values, postcolonial teaching is also a
generative work because it supports “students to identify and critique the different ‘regimes of truth’ that characterise our social arrangements, and to build positive identities that move easily between the local and the global” (p. 398).

**Postcolonial Implications**

The Others’ cultures have been studied and represented as a homogenous whole through the histories and perspectives of colonialism and imperialism (Kanu, 2005; Viveiros de Castro, 2015). While white men have become a figure of Man who is a default of world history and politics, women, Indigenous, the colonized, and the enslaved are located at the periphery or even removed from the discourse (Bhabha, 1994/2004). Postcolonial work ought to start from acknowledging and troubling the colonial discourse and history that are deeply rooted in various levels of systems and individual people’s identity construction and enactment. This process opens up the perspective that the world consists of numerous incommensurable cultural values and identities; therefore, we should not assume and predict communities and individuals based on their membership to social categories in our research (Bhabha, 1994/2004; Kanu, 2005). In respect to understanding the world and internationalism, Bhabha (1994/2004) demonstrates,

> The postcolonial perspective resists the attempt at holistic forms of social explanation. It forces a recognition of the more complex cultural and political boundaries that exist on the cusp of these often opposed political spheres. (p. 248)

This perspective also motivates us to understand emotionalities that are associated with colonial discourse, such as anxiety and fear (Asher, 2005; Bhabha, 1994/2004). These emotions are engines of colonial mechanisms because various “outside” people are produced and maintained by the colonizer’s reaction to the felt emotions. However,
Bhabha (1994/2004) suggests a new conceptualization of “outside” beyond the spatial and binary meaning; it could be interpreted as “constitutive of meaning and agency” which conveys “unacknowledged liminality or ‘margin’ of a discourse, the point where it contingently touches the ‘other’s’ discourse as itself” (p. 295). This idea ties back to Bhabha’s (1994/2004) notion of Third Space, which includes a new translation, historization, and reading of unacknowledged histories and invisibilized people and communities. This also relates to Anzaldúa’s (1987) notion of mestiza consciousness, which transgresses dualistic hegemony while embracing varied histories, cultures, identities, and spiritualities which have been undermined and denied in colonial and imperial discourses.

Scholars have interpreted and developed this concept considering the dispositions and perspectives that postcolonial scholars have to cultivate and prioritize in their postcolonial work (e.g., Asher, 2005, 2009, 2010; Kanu, 2003; Villenas, 1996). Villenas (1996) shares that we as researchers will be like a version of a colonizer if we do not keep engaging in the self-reflective practice of unlearning embodied colonial discourse. Human research traditions are intertwined with how privileged researchers have studied the Others with the colonial gaze (Viveiros de Castro, 2015); therefore, if we do not rupture institutional linkage, our research would only contribute to reproducing and perpetuating the colonial conventions (Villenas, 1996). Asher (2005) also illustrates that self-reflexive practices which contain active deconstruction of internalized oppressive systems and coloniality are imperative foundations for decolonizing and transformative education. Along with disrupting oppressive values and structures within self and society, it is also crucial to acknowledge that scholars who are based in the U.S. and other
Western/European countries, especially who are an “expatriate from former colonies” (p. 72), unavoidably contribute to strengthening Western/European-centered academia (Asher, 2010). To reiterate, postcolonial work happens at the interstices of different social categories and borders, and this consideration is not limited to the subject of “what is being studied” with a postcolonial perspective. As we who are committed to postcolonial work attend to multiple (ambivalent) aspects of our positionality by deconstructing oppressive selves while rehistoricizing and honoring oppressed selves, we will be able to find ways to create our own Third Space individually and also collectively. Anzaldúa (1987) shares that “the possibilities are numerous once we decide to act and not react” (p. 79); our research and practices will be generative and healing when we take initiative to break from colonial hegemony and cultivate new possibilities by crossing borders and reimagining the world.
Chapter 3. Philosophical Grounding

My Manifestation of Post-intentional Phenomenology: Introduction to the Philosophy

Phenomenology is the philosophical study of phenomena founded by Edmund Husserl in the early 20th century. It began as a way to inquire as to how things are manifested in the world and rely on human consciousness and experience. However, later phenomenologists have developed the initial understanding of phenomenology into qualitative research methodologies. Post-intentional phenomenological methodology (Vagle, 2018) which grounds this dissertation research is one of the emerging branches of phenomenological approaches. Post-intentional phenomenology opens up generative space to explore how a researcher is intentionally related to a phenomenon through conceptual dialogues with various philosophies, theories, and ideas. As post-intentional phenomenology is inspired by post-structuralism, it disrupts rigid hierarchies and structures which have been constructed as conventions in qualitative research. This empowers researchers to explore and initiate discussions about phenomena, especially those which have been restricted by research traditions and procedures that researchers were expected to follow.

Another prominent aspect of post-intentional phenomenology is that this approach acknowledges the impossibility of tracing the beginning and end of each intentionality. In this regard, post-intentional phenomenology encourages a researcher to jump right into the middle of the intentionalities and focus on how a phenomenon is becoming and being.

---

rather than expecting clear and linear features of intentional relationships. This aspect of post-intentional phenomenology also allows researchers to start a phenomenological exploration with less burden of understanding the history of phenomenology in the conventional way of tracing its genealogy from Husserl’s transcendental phenomenology.

However, it has been difficult for me to ignore the manifestation of the Eurocentric history and characteristics of phenomenology at large. I especially cannot simply take up phenomenology as my research methodology knowing that Husserl, the founder of phenomenology, rejects Eastern philosophy as “philosophy” based on his exclusive idea drawn from pure thêoria (Lau, 2016). Confronting Husserl’s exclusive attitude provoked me to inquire of intentional relationships amongst myself, phenomenology, and the phenomenon which I plan to explore. It is important to interpret “entering into the middle” in a sense that this encouragement does not mean to erase or disconnect the intentional relationships between post-intentional phenomenology and Husserl and Heidegger’s phenomenology.

This manifestation led me to wonder: what does it mean that a researcher, whose being is rooted in and largely influenced by non-European philosophy and culture, takes up phenomenology as an approach to explore her intentional relationships with the phenomenon? Am I perpetuating the positioning of Western/Eurocentric research methodologies as benchmarks to understand and validate phenomena including that which are oriented and becoming in a non-Europe lifeworld? Next, I confronted the biggest dilemma of taking up the phenomenological research methodology to understand my own being and becoming in this world as well as the phenomenon of becoming a
socially just educator, which involves the effort of dismantling dominant power structures in society. This manifestation of conflicts calls for overcoming the Eurocentric aspects of phenomenology and moving on to the intercultural phenomenological discussion.

In this section, I start this dialogue with the problem of Eurocentric phenomenology and introduce several examples of intercultural phenomenological attempts which fail to move beyond the validation of non-European philosophy using a Eurocentric viewpoint. The first part introduces possible conditions and approaches for intercultural phenomenology by mainly drawing on Kwok-Ying Lau’s (2016) *Phenomenology and Intercultural Understanding*. This section further aims to widen the possibility of phenomenological research which has been limited by a Eurocentric attitude largely influenced by and inherited from Husserl.

The second part proposes ways in which post-intentional phenomenology could be widened and deepened with the intercultural dimension. This discussion includes how an intercultural exploration of phenomenology could widen the understanding and approach of post-intentional phenomenology and vice versa. Building on these prior discussions, I conclude this paper with a brief implication of how an intercultural understanding and approach inform a research design decision. Following “lines of flights” in these discussions, I aspire to propose post-intentional phenomenology as an ethical and transformative inquiry.

**Intercultural Phenomenological Consideration**

**Limitation of Eurocentric Phenomenology**

My preliminary literature search about issues regarding Eurocentric phenomenology shows that the majority of studies discussing Eurocentric phenomenology
phenomenology are centered on the review and discussion of Husserl’s attitude on philosophy, especially his response to the crisis of Europe and European humanity. I do not intend to limit the scope of this discussion of Eurocentric phenomenology by focusing on Husserl; however, regarding precedent work on this topic, it seems difficult not to center this discussion on Husserl and his Eurocentric tendency. Further research is needed on this topic in terms of how Husserl’s phenomenological heirs have inherited and/or challenged the Eurocentric tendency in phenomenology.

It is still vital to start examining Husserl’s Eurocentric attitude and how his work and attitude have influenced the Eurocentric attitude in phenomenology at large. Particularly, reviewing Husserl’s Eurocentric attitude provides the opportunity to understand the sociohistorical context of Husserl’s work in which his perception of “crisis” and how he envisioned the solution to rescue Europe is grounded.

**Husserl’s Eurocentric Phenomenology.**

Husserl’s egocentric viewpoint and his assertion of the Eurocentric civilization of non-European cultures in considering ways to overcome the crisis and seek “truth” are often represented as his limitation of philosophizing humans and phenomena. Due to his strong Eurocentric stance, especially regarding his position as the founder of phenomenology, Husserl’s argument on defining philosophy and ways of seeking truth have remained an assignment for philosophical practitioners who seek intercultural phenomenological discussion (Lau, 2016). Besides this, Husserl’s assertion of the need of universality in phenomenological investigation led phenomenologists to inquire of the general attitude in phenomenology. For example, Lao (2004) shares the issue of phenomenology conflicting with Chinese ways of being and thinking in that it does not
have a sense of the “Chinese Mind” (p. 1). He further argues that the lack of phenomenologists’ attention, both Western and non-Western, to the non-European lifeworld continues to urge Chinese philosophers to consider phenomenology as a branch of European philosophy, which hardly makes sense with non-European being and thinking (Lao, 2004). Then he asks, based on the “transcendental ego” in Husserl’s phenomenology, “Where can we find the general attitude of phenomenologists?” (Lao, 2004, p. 2), indicating that we need to find the general attitude to bridge the gap between phenomenology and Chinese philosophy, and to enable intercultural consideration in phenomenology.

According to Tava (2016a), Husserl’s stance on the Europeanization of all other cultures is based on his firm belief and confidence in European culture. He shares that “For Husserl, European culture is not only the highest culture ever achieved in human history, but also ‘the first realisation of an absolute norm of development, which is called [berufen] to revolutionize every other self-developing culture’” (as cited in Tava, 2016a, p. 207). His obsession with a universal ground for all other cultures can be better explained by the social and historical context in which Husserl founded phenomenology. When Husserl diagnosed the crisis of European humanity and put subject-object back together, which was separated by Descartes, he was concerned with the problem of positive science in that people tend to understand and view the world through a mathematical perspective while attempting to avoid looking at meanings and constitutions of phenomena (Simms, 2005). Meanwhile, Husserl is hopeful of universal and rational science—European science before positive science—influencing how he
conceived the lifeworld as valid and universal regardless of cultural differences (Lau, 2016; Yu, 2004).

Husserl’s Eurocentric viewpoint is not separate from his egocentric conception of the world. Patočka points out that “Husserl’s entire enterprise is founded upon the idea of the self-responsibility of knowledge” (as cited in Lau, 2016, p. 88). He addresses that Husserl’s interpretation of the world as a horizon shows how his idea of the world is “subjectivized and leveled to a present anticipation” of human consciousness (Lau, 2016). Even one of the most important philosophical practices in Husserl’s phenomenology, epoché, shows that he believed in achieving a transcendental subject through egological reduction (Lau, 2016). In this respect, it is reasonable to contend that Husserl’s understanding of the world is limited in his capacity to conceive and perceive the world through a reliance on his own subjectivity.

**Limitation of Eurocentric Phenomenology.**

This discussion of the limitation of Eurocentric phenomenology represented by Husserl’s work will focus on how this viewpoint hinders fruitful dialogue regarding the solution of the crisis and globalization of the contemporary world. To reiterate, Husserl founded phenomenology in response to the diagnosis of Europe and humanity being in crisis. However, his exclusive idea of the world and philosophy not only denies the legitimacy of non-Western/European philosophies, but also fails to acknowledge a significant amount of wisdom shared by and inherited from Western thinkers as philosophy (Lau, 2016). More specifically, “Husserl’s judgment is based on his own predetermined idea of philosophy as ‘pure théoria,’ which is in turn based on his own
understanding of the philosophico-scientific attitude of the Greeks as ‘purely theoretical attitude’” (as cited in Lau, 2016, p. 125-126).

This idea of philosophy has influenced the bolstering Euro- and egocentric response to the problems in Europe which encourages humans to control the world with their power and to keep their borders safe (Tava, 2016b). Husserl had faith in the Europeanization of all other cultures as the best solution for fixing problems and conflicts in the world, and he was not much concerned about erasing cultural heritage from sociopolitical and intellectual diversity (Tava, 2016b; Yu, 2004). However, in contrast to his hopeful expectation, this tendency resulted not only in an exclusive attitude toward other cultures and communities, but also in a narrow-minded intellectual practice in Europe (Tava, 2016b).

Regarding the idea of universality and globalization, Yu (2004) raises our awareness with questions such as “If the globalization is desirable, should it be the result of conquering rather than mutual recognition and understanding? Should not different cultures learn from each other rather than impose their ideas on each other?” (p. 186). This leads us to inquire of the limitation of Husserl’s idea of Europe, of which he proves its orthodoxy from Greek philosophy and takes a dismissive attitude on non-European philosophies. As Gubser (2013) and Yu (2004) point out, Husserl’s idea of Europe is geopolitical, not philosophical. Compared to the philosophical idea of Europe, which will be discussed later, the geopolitical idea of Europe influences people to be obsessed with a subject-centered worldview and exclusive attitude toward others in which a culture of dominance and superiority becomes even more aggravated (Gubser, 2013; Tava, 2016b; Yu, 2004).
Lau (2016) contends that an exclusive attitude toward others, such as ethnocentrism, goes against the finding of truth. He adds that we are not self-sufficient for total truth and understanding total being in the world; rather, we are meant to co-construct our way toward the manifestation of truth with other cultures (Lau, 2016). Other scholars also argue the cruciality of recognizing others and understanding lifeworld as plural (e.g., Gubser, 2013; Ruggenini, 2004; Yu, 2004). For example, drawing on the interdependence of humans and the world argued by Patočka, Gubser (2013) addresses that only the intersubjective community can initiate an activity toward phenomena worldly. Yu (2004) suggests lifeworld and universalization as plural based on Alfred Schutz’s rejection of pure experience transcending cultural differences, that the cultural dimension is inseparable with every experience in the lifeworld. Further, Ruggenini (2004) points out the danger of Europe’s self-sufficient attitude in that defending and locking up themselves from others can only cause conflict. At the end of his book *Phenomenology and Intercultural Understanding*, Lau (2016) reminds us that the world cannot be self-sufficient, but it has always been shared and meant to be shared. This point enlarges the possible interpretation and inquiry of what “finding an [European] identity again” (Ruggenini, 2004) means and can be.

**Several Attempts Toward Intercultural Phenomenology and Their Limitations**

In his book, Lau (2016) introduces a phenomenological reading of Eastern philosophy, such as Daoism based on Laozi’s work, and Husserl’s stance on Buddhism. For instance, Lau (2016) discusses the similarity between Dao as a primordial nature and “the world of wild” addressed by Merleau-Ponty. Laozi and Merleau-Ponty both urge cultural renewal in the world of crisis through what we can learn from the order of
primordial beings and nature. This reading of Laozi through Merleau-Ponty identifies the commonality between one branch of Eastern philosophy and a Western thinker who seems to be inspired by Husserl. However, without any work disputing Husserl’s stance on Eastern philosophy, it is a logical leap to relate Husserl’s phenomenology and Daoism. After he introduces a possible phenomenological reading of Laozi through Merleau-Ponty’s work, Lau (2016) directs us to ask if “Husserl would accept to dialogue with a so-called ‘anti-rationalist’ Chinese thinker” (p. 52).

It is challenging to start intercultural phenomenological dialogue especially with a philosophy which was denigrated by the founder of phenomenology. Acknowledging this difficulty, I found two possible ways to enable this dialogue: one is restoration of Eastern philosophy through Husserl’s approval, drawing on his verbal and textual remarks, and the other is disputing Husserl’s stance on non-European philosophy and complementing its limitation through philosophical dialogue across other phenomenologists’ works. Lau’s (2016) chapter about Husserl and his comment on Buddhism introduce the approach closer to the first one by Husserl’s reading and appreciation of Buddhism.

According to Lau (2016), Husserl expresses his excitement toward Buddhism in a short review article in 1925 after encountering a German translated version of Buddhist scripts. In this article, Husserl praises the Buddhist attitude as a way of transgressing worldly life through comparing its significance with his transcendental phenomenology (Lau, 2016). However, Karl Schuhmann, who Lau (2016) introduces as one of the most influential researchers on Husserl’s life and work, shows that Husserl’s understanding of Buddhism is not much different from understanding Buddhism as Indian thought in general (as cited in Lau, 2016). Husserl put Buddha’s lessons on achieving happiness at
the same level as Socrates’ thoughts, as both consider “natural life as a whole which is the origin of the general state of unhappiness” (as cited in Lau, 2016, p. 61). Further, Lau identifies the similarity between questioning the meaning of the world in Buddhist attitude and his “epoché,” transcendental reduction. However, despite his granting of Buddhism as a valuable theoretical attitude, Husserl did not define Buddhism as a philosophy, as he viewed Buddhism as the absence of the “universal science of being” (Lau, 2016, p. 61). Therefore, Husserl’s enthusiasm toward Buddhism and his comparison of Buddha with Socrates are not enough to validate Eastern philosophy as fulfilling the requirement of Husserl’s transcendental phenomenology (Lau, 2016).

These attempts toward intercultural phenomenology through a reading of Daoism and tracing Husserl’s comments on Buddhism show that these approaches still maintain Husserl’s idea of philosophy as undisputed. Without challenging his idea of philosophy, it would be difficult to imagine the capacity of phenomenology “with” non-European philosophies and “about” cultures other than Europe while respecting their intellectual and cultural values and specificities. Fortunately, there are philosophers who challenge Husserl’s idea of philosophy, both directly and indirectly. Especially, Kwok-Ying Lau, a philosopher based in Hong Kong, has significantly developed intercultural discussion in phenomenology through conceptual dialogue across various philosophers, cultures, countries, languages, and eras. The preceding discussions about readings of Laozi and Husserl’s stance on Buddhism are also based on Lau’s work, but the following sections would not be possible without Lau’s intercultural work that introduces underrepresented philosophers and rereadings of well-known philosophers’ work.
Beyond Europe: Jan Patočka.

Jan Patočka is a vital philosopher for intercultural phenomenological discussion. Lau (2016) introduces him as one of the first philosophers who urged the necessity of abandoning the Eurocentric viewpoint and approach to the crisis diagnosed by Husserl. Patočka’s reflection on the natural world transgresses Husserl’s egocentric understanding in that he traces its history back to ancient Greece. Patočka characterizes the natural world as dynamic and human existence as based on the unfathomable order of nature, and this approach questions the universality and “humans as truth bearing” subject argued by Husserl (Lau, 2016). Lau (2016) interprets that Patočka’s worldview acknowledges the plurality of lifeworld from different cultures as well as invites philosophies from other cultures to better articulate the meaning and ways toward the truth of the world.

Patočka’s phenomenology of the natural world can be characterized as dynamic, as he views movement as the principle of phenomenality (Lau, 2016). This reflection seems quite distinct from Husserl’s phenomenology of the world at large; however, Patočka’s thematization of primordial nature inherits Husserl’s view on the Earth, that “The original ark, earth, does not move” (p. 80) (as cited in Lau, 2016). Human and life in Patočka’s phenomenology are represented as the existence of movement; meanwhile, this movement is based on the Earth, which he understands as “the ultimate referent of movement on the other” (Lau, 2016, p. 80). Through this thematization of the natural world, the Earth, Patočka further articulates how human existence is intentionally related to primordial nature and nothingness (Lau, 2016). Lau (2016) addresses that Patočka’s point would be better articulated and developed with Laozi’s Daodejing, which
understands Dao as the “inchoative nature of the primordial order” (p. 81). He adds the necessity of intercultural dialogue in that, while this way of ontological understanding might sound unfamiliar in European philosophical tradition, it is not at all new to Eastern philosophy (Lau, 2016). In this respect, Patočka’s phenomenology of the natural world and Lau’s (2016) interpretation of Patočka’s work contribute to establishing ground for a collective understanding of ontological/existential being-ness in the world.

Patočka is still influenced by Husserl’s pursuit of the way to encountering the profound meaning of Europe, but his approach transcends his masters’ ways, which trace the legitimacy of European philosophy from its inheritance of Greek philosophy (Lau, 2016). Patočka does not agree with the task of philosophy argued by Husserl as the self-responsibility of humanity through intellectual endeavor based on scientific rationality (Lau, 2016). He argues that this idea and way of philosophy goes against understanding the truth and meaning of the world itself; instead, Patočka underscores acknowledging humanity as plural and urges a need for dialogue across the humanities (Lau, 2016). To support his viewpoint, Patočka provides historical and anthropological reasoning based on his research into the context in which Greek philosophy originated (Lau, 2016). He further affirms that humans are capable of truth and justice, and it is an important ground to discuss Patočka’s belief in the philosophical task: “care for the soul” (Gubser, 2013; Lau, 2016; Szakolczai, 1994).

One might wonder how this approach overcomes Eurocentrism in phenomenology while Patočka’s work is still based on European soil and himself as an heir of European spirit. It is important to note that Patočka’s view on humanity transgresses Husserl’s scientific rationality in that his understanding of human existence
is grounded on the profound order of lifeworld which Patočka calls “world mystery” (Lau, 2016). It is plausible to argue that the world mystery echoes Dao in Laozi’s Daodejing as Patočka’s description of the world mystery represents its characteristics of not revealing the surface but the principle of all movement. Patočka articulates his world mystery as the common foundation of a particular community, culture, and history, and this worldview challenges Husserl’s singular lifeworld and diversity to be surpassed through transcendental philosophy (Lau, 2016).

**Merleau-Ponty’s Interworld and Cultural Flesh.**

It is important to go beyond a dualistic understanding of the world in intercultural work because a dichotomous viewpoint makes it difficult to recognize existence and possibility existing in the in-between space of binaries. Lau (2016) develops the notion of cultural flesh inspired by Merleau-Ponty’s reflection of flesh, that the cultivation of cultural flesh invites us to sense the world beyond the partial world which we have contacted within the boundary of our own culture. It is important to acknowledge the hybridity, entanglement, complexity, and messiness of intercultural experience as it could never be a clear and singular encounter (Lau, 2016). In this respect, Lau (2016) considers Husserl’s phenomenological epoché as a helpful attitude for experiencing other cultures, as it asks us to suspend ourselves from familiar values and embodied knowledge to enable self-understanding in terms of knowing aspects foreign to and in us.

According to Lau (2016), Merleau-Ponty directs our attention to a pre-objective experience of the world before the dualistic division through the notion of flesh. He developed this notion by taking up the characteristic of flesh which mediates us to the world through contact; at the same time, this contact brings the pre-existing world to us
Merleau-Ponty’s notion of flesh aims to understand the meaning of the things and world itself through sensibility (Lau, 2016). Merleau-Ponty describes flesh as “the coiling over the sensible upon the sensing body,” and selfhood is born “thanks to the movement of coiling over the flesh” (Lau, 2016, p. 185). Lau (2016) credits understanding the flesh for encouraging us to dive into the deeper understanding and contact of the world while this notion restrains us from perceiving things as materialistic and banal.

If we take Merleau-Ponty’s articulation of flesh as an ontological lens, the world cannot be understood in a homogenous way; rather, we encounter the “interpenetration, interdependence, intertwining, and encroachment” (Lau, 2016, p. 188) features of the world, especially due to the movement of the flesh. Merleau-Ponty coins the term “interworld” to name this world of heterogeneity and movement, then characterizes it: “With the flesh of the world [. . .] at the intersection of my views and at the intersection of my views with those of the others [. . .] that the sensible world and the historical world are always interworlds” (as cited in Lau, 2016, p. 188). This emphasizes the importance of acknowledging others as those who already exist and are always in intentional relationships with me. Lau (2004, 2016) interprets the quote as “things of the world are only partially unveiled to us” (p. 188), implying the world cannot be and should not be dominated by certain intelligences and/or powers.

Based on the review and discussion of Merleau-Ponty’s notion of the flesh, Lau (2016) elaborates cultural flesh as “a state of mind and of carnal dispositions” (p. 190) which allow us to “have the sensibility of other cultures” (p. 190). As in the role of the flesh, cultural flesh leads us to experience and have deeper understanding of other people
and their cultures. Meanwhile, Lau (2016) reads culture differences and borders as a potential of intercultural dialogue and also as a vital factor for the formation of cultural identity which creates a space to realize oneself and truth. Acknowledging the idea of the flesh, especially heterogeneity of the world, Lau (2016) concludes the chapter suggesting lateral universality—cultural and plural universality—which disputes Husserl’s Eurocentric universality as another ground for intercultural phenomenological dialogue.

*Phenomenology Transgressing a Theoretical Attitude*

**Orientative Philosophy and Rereading of Husserl.**

The intercultural understanding of phenomenology not only challenges Eurocentrism in phenomenology and grounds conceptual dialogue across philosophy rooted in other cultures, but also allows us to envision the possibility of widening a narrowly-defined idea of philosophy. This section discusses philosophy beyond the theoretical enterprise centering on Lao Sze-Gwang’s notion of orientative philosophy. In the chapter discussing the renewal of the concept of philosophy in Lau’s (2016) book, he introduces Lao Sze-Gwang’s work which argues that Chinese philosophy is still philosophy despite containing ethical and practical aspects, but these are based on self-understanding and reflective thinking only possible through a theoretical approach and decision. To reiterate the point mentioned earlier in this paper, the narrowly and exclusively defined idea of philosophy by Husserl not only rejects non-European philosophy, but also fails to acknowledge significant philosophical work proceeded by contemporary European/Western philosophers (Lau, 2016). In this regard, Lau (2016) argues a need for updating and widening the definition of philosophy through a
conceptual dialogue with Foucault and Lao Sze-Gwang. Then, he expands this discussion to a rereading of Husserl’s phenomenological attitude.

Lao Sze-Gwang coins the term “orientative philosophy” as a counter term for cognitive philosophy to thematize philosophy which involves “self-transformative” and “transformation of the world” (p. 129) aspects (Lau, 2016). He exemplifies Daoist philosophy and Confucianist philosophy to explain that orientative philosophy asks, “Where should we go?”, in contrast to cognitive philosophy, which asks, “What is it?” (Lau, 2016, p. 129). Lao emphasizes the ethical faculty of orientative philosophy through the example of Mancius’ Confucianism in that morality is the disposition which distinguishes human beings from other animals (Lau, 2016). Mancius considers moral faculty as “the special faculty of the human mind” (Lau, 2016, p.133);

A human being who has no sense of commiseration is not a human being at all. Similarly, a human being without the sense of shame and abhorrence (or evils), or without the sense of unacceptability (of improper things), or without the sense of right and wrong, ceases to be a human being (as cited in Lau, 2016, p.134).

As Lau (2016) starts the discussion of the limitation of Husserl’s idea of philosophy, he points out that cognitive philosophy fails to provide a deeper understanding of human knowledge as it is not situated in either a social or historical context. Then, he introduces Foucault as a vital philosopher who argues the cruciality of including power relations in understanding knowledge, as it naturally brings social, historical, and political considerations into the process. Foucault’s work shows that human beings are meant to strive for ethical endeavors and practice because human beings always exist with others, and this calls for them to be moral subjects (Lau, 2016).
Lau (2016) discusses Foucault’s other work in which he addresses that Greco-Roman philosophers also practiced and aimed for autonomous ethical achievement through self-understanding and transformation. In addition, Lau (2016) exemplifies Hellenistic-Roman philosophers’ self-cultivating practice through Foucault’s work which states that they cultivated their morality through writing letters to others or to oneself and a self-reflective diary. Through this discussion, he argues that the “ancient form of philosophical practice is neither a naïve approach to the quest for truth nor a mundane way of life, but an exercise of self-responsibility conditioned by self-transformation” (Lau, 2016, p. 145). In other words, philosophy handed down from Western antiquity unavoidably contains orientative philosophical faculty.

Based on this dialogue, Lau (2016) provides a different reading of Husserl’s phenomenological attitude, focusing on epoché in that this philosophical inquiry is not possible solely through cognitive philosophy without a self-transformative endeavor. This rereading contends that phenomenological suspension—one of the essential procedures for epoché—for transcending the individual’s worldly experience requires self-understanding and self-transformation through critical reflection on oneself (Lau, 2016). Also, he addresses that Husserl ultimately aims for a phenomenologist’s vocation to be extended to the universal level; he describes it in his book Crisis as “a far-reaching self-transformation of the whole praxis of human existence, i.e. the whole of cultural life” (as cited in Lau, 2016, p. 149). The next section discusses how Patočka’s phenomenology also transgresses “pure speculative theoretical thinking” (Lau, 2016, p. 128).
Patočka’s Care for the Soul.

This section expands Patočka’s idea of truth based on a previous discussion of his view on humanity and its intentional relationships grounded in the idea of world mystery. Patočka emphasizes self-transformative and reflective practice regarding seeking truth. According to Lau (2016), Patočka values a critical attitude while critiquing the idea of philosophy essentialized as a passive theoretical contemplation. Patočka refers to a vision of human existence in Ancient Greek to justify his idea of the ambivalent nature of the human being; he believes that the human being is capable of discovering and discerning truth and justice and, at the same time, is situated in a precarious condition due to their finite and mortal status in the universe (as cited in Lau, 2016). Patocka’s idea of philosophy can be represented as a philosophical project of “thinking and acting with clarity,” overcoming obscured truth due to humans’ precarious status (Lau, 2016). This idea is influenced by Husserl and Heidegger’s understanding of the human being as a being of truth, but Patočka develops this idea through a more profound and distinctive approach based on a “pre-reflective mythical framework” (Lau, 2016).

Lau (2016) interprets Patočka’s idea of philosophy and his approach as a European version of “how a particular cultural ground and mythical environment was transformed and elevated into a universal motivation and movement of human civilization” (p. 96). Patočka legitimizes his statement by contending that the ultimate goal in Greek philosophy must have been handed down from the mythical environment of archaic Greece (Lau, 2016). As it is an ontological framework which transcends Ancient Greek and European spirituality, Lau (2016) reemphasizes Patočka’s “care for
the soul,” which is based on profound philosophical and anthropological reflection and understanding.

By representing the Mencius theory as a Chinese version of how a human civilization understands and practices the human being as a being of truth, Lau (2016) develops his discussion of Patočka’s world mystery. He identifies that the celestial order in Mencius’ Confucianism corresponds with Patočka’s world history; Mencius addresses the existence of the human being rooted in four spiritual dispositions, and two of the dispositions, *zhi* and *yi*, can be considered Chinese versions of truth and justice, respectively (Lau, 2016). Regarding their idea of philosophy and the way of seeking truth, both Mencius and Patočka consider philosophy as not only an ontological project, but also a political and social project which involves critical reflection and praxis (Lau, 2016; Szakolczai, 1994; Tava, 2016a, 2016b; Tien, 2004, 2012). Lau (2016) respects both philosophers as those who desire the truth through their ethical practice which transgresses one’s biological life, though rather toward the higher order and value: truth and justice.

Patočka’s idea of philosophy and the conceptual dialogue proceeded by Lau in the matter of overcoming the narrow and exclusive idea of philosophy provides indispensable ground to direct our questions of what philosophy is; more specifically, what is phenomenology and what can be phenomenology? As a researcher, I take up and expand this inquiry into how phenomenological research can be re-imagined through the intercultural dialogue of phenomenology.
Intercultural Post-intentional Phenomenology

In post-intentional phenomenological research, Vagle (2018) emphasizes that “post” in post-intentional phenomenology does not mean “after” intentionality; instead, his further articulation implies that it rather connotes the undertaking of pushing the boundaries of intentionality in conventional phenomenological approaches. While post-intentional phenomenology infuses dynamic movements and capacity to its understanding of intentionality, it still draws on core concepts and approaches created and developed by preceding phenomenologists, such as intentionality, bracketing, and reduction. This phenomenological approach develops these core concepts in critical manners and encourages a researcher to commit to a radical and generative space produced by the mode of an inquiry influenced by post-structural ideas, such as the “line of flight” by Deleuze and Guattari (Vagle, 2018).

This characteristic of post-intentional phenomenology by Vagle (2018) kept manifesting when I was reviewing intercultural phenomenological approaches which mainly drew on Lau’s (2016) work. I noticed that both scholars create new spaces and expanding possibilities in phenomenological studies through their ways of conceptual dialogues. Despite quite a few similarities between two scholars’ approaches and discussions, there are also aspects which seem distinctive in each work. Reminding us of the characteristic of conceptual dialogue which cannot be unidirectional, the discussion proceeding below not only proposes how the intercultural discussion can be used in post-intentional phenomenology, but also describes how provocation occurs in the intercultural discussion. Through this dialogic approach which both scholars cherish, I
anticipate this conceptual dialogue will open up generative possibilities in both post-intentional phenomenology and intercultural phenomenology.

*When Post-intentional Phenomenology Meets Intercultural Phenomenology*

Vagle (2018) describes the most distinctive characteristics of post-intentional phenomenology from Husserl and Heidegger’s phenomenology as “through-ness” which connotes its generative and dynamic capacity and potential. He further articulates that this through-ness of post-intentional phenomenology leads us to view intentionality as plural and always moving. Vagle (2018) identifies this characteristic of post-intentional phenomenology as an ontological project, but the natural world including the profound ground of every order and all existence is not much discussed. Besides, while post-intentional phenomenology takes a radical and critical stance in phenomenological research, it has not much developed as an intercultural and/or decolonizing research methodology which challenges Western/Eurocentric perspectives and forms of knowledge production.

As introduced earlier, Patočka’s phenomenology of the natural world and movement of existence is a crucial foundation for intercultural phenomenology as it disputes Husserl’s Eurocentrism and supplements the idea of the natural world which was not fully articulated in Husserl and Heidegger’s phenomenology. For this reason, I suggest post-intentional phenomenology to take up Patočka’s idea of primordial nature as the abyssal and unfathomable order of the world as its ontological ground. This ontological understanding allows post-intentional phenomenological inquiry to be grounded on the common foundation for intercultural dialogue with philosophies from different cultures and countries. Furthermore, this ontological understanding is
indispensable with Patočka’s notion of “world mystery,” which Lau (2016) considers a vital ground for intercultural phenomenological discussion. Concurrently, the understanding of intentionality in post-intentional phenomenology provokes other attributes of the natural world and of the inquiry based on the natural world, such as non-linear and inconsistent movements of intentionality, which includes partial, fleeting, generative, and undoing activities. This way of understanding would embrace possible conflicts and contradictory aspects which are likely to occur in intercultural discussion; Lau (2016) also addresses its messiness and the complexity of intercultural work in his discussion of cultural flesh.

Post-intentional phenomenology inspired by Deleuze and Guattari’s post-structural idea loosens phenomenologists from the pressure of following conventional hierarchies and procedures, such as defining what “is” and “can be” philosophy when conducting conceptual dialogue (Vagle, 2018). Instead, it rather desires to see the generative possibilities and accomplishments imagined through the conceptual dialogue as these outcomes would not be possible with a single philosophy, theory, or idea as well as within a boundary of certain philosophies, theories, or ideas. In other words, the conceptual dialogue through the understanding of the natural world and the post-structural idea would infuse extra movements and depth in phenomenological understanding as well as encourage phenomenologists to pay careful attention to the diverse features of manifestations in this radical form of dialogue. For instance, Patočka’s reflection of the world as never self-sufficient but rather always meant to be shared with others and other cultures would push the boundary of post-intentional phenomenology
even further by posing questions and wonderings of how and what this reflection provokes and becomes in phenomenological research.

Another distinguishing feature in post-intentional phenomenology is that it emphasizes individuals and phenomena as social beings. It has different interests and viewpoints on intentional relations than Husserl’s transcendental phenomenology in that this phenomenological research understands a phenomenon as always in intentional relations with larger social dimensions, such as its history and tradition. As opposed to a-historical and a-social understandings of a phenomenon, it is a crucial ontological and epistemological perspective to proceed intercultural understanding and development of phenomenology; this enables us to understand a phenomenon from a view which considers an individual as playing either a subject or an object role or even both roles (drawing on the idea that the line between subject and object is blurred in post-intentional phenomenology) in their social relationships with a phenomenon. It draws phenomenologists toward contemplating intentionality in an existential sense which acknowledges various possibilities of the relationships and manifestations rooted in different civilizations, values, and practices. Besides, this viewpoint disputes Husserl’s universality of all cultures through the Eurocentric idea of scientific rationalism which accompanies surpassing and erasing other forms of relations with the world in other cultures. Based on this societal idea of phenomenon and human existence, I propose expanding phenomenological research to view the human being as a moral subject, which Foucault addresses in his reflection on knowledge as well as which constitutes Patočka and Mencius’ understanding of human dispositions in addition to human dispositions as beings of justice.
Lau (2016) introduces the idea of the human being as a moral subject with Foucault’s work, through which he addresses the importance of including power relations of knowledge in understanding knowledge. According to Foucault, the human being always exists with others, and this unavoidably involves the human being in power relations, locating them as a moral subject (as cited in Lau, 2016). This idea of individual and phenomenon not only brings social, historical, and political considerations to our phenomenological understanding of the world, but also draws phenomenologists’ attention toward human existence in relation to its moral disposition and ethical practice. The foundation in which we can ground through this understanding of human existence enables twofold consideration in post-phenomenological research: one is that it allows us to dispute the exclusive idea of philosophy as a purely cognitive enterprise; the other is that we can widen the capacity and possibility of this philosophical research beyond theoretical contemplation, for example, praxis as a vital philosophical endeavor.

Post-intentional phenomenology takes a critical stance on using the term “consciousness,” which is one of the core concepts in Husserl’s phenomenology (Vagle, 2018). The idea of “lines of flights” by Deleuze and Guattari connotes the possibility of intentional movements beyond human consciousness and control (Vagle, 2018), so post-intentional phenomenology drawing on this idea embraces the limitation of human consciousness and control in phenomena. Acknowledging that egocentrism pulls us back from disrupting egocentric boundaries and limiting the possibilities of a generative inquiry, Patočka’s critique of Husserl’s description of the world as horizon supports Vagle’s (2018) endeavor of distancing phenomenologists from an egocentric call and tendency. Patočka interprets Husserl’s description of the world as that which reduces
intentionality as “mere” intentionality which is anticipatable and limited within the capacity of human consciousness. Lau (2016) develops this analysis further in that Husserl’s understanding of the world is the basis of his belief in a “single life world.” While Patočka recognizes Husserl’s struggle of thematizing particularity in each culture and history, he proposes the lifeworld as plural based on the world mystery so one can never be the lifeworld (Lau, 2016).

In this respect, Patočka’s understanding not only buttresses a non-egocentric approach to post-intentional phenomenology by pointing out the pitfall of the egocentric worldview, but also paves a way to acknowledging and further articulating the plurality of lifeworld. Furthermore, it directly challenges the egocentric tendency prevalent in academia and also raises our awareness of egocentric calls which reduce a human to a being that controls the world with their power. Based on this dialogue, I propose post-intentional phenomenology to pay explicit attention to the plurality of the lifeworld and to take this approach as a political inquiry disrupting a Eurocentric and exclusive attitude in human research.

The last point I discuss in this subsection is post-intentional phenomenology’s interest in the work which is produced when we try not to “reconcile the edges and margins of the theories” (Vagle, 2018). I interpret this point as accepting conflicting and contradictory aspects in conceptual dialogue and take these edges and margins as space for various inquiries and wonderings to flourish, rather than avoiding these risks or forcing harmonization among different philosophies, theories, and ideas. This attitude resonates with the attitude which Lau (2016) cherishes throughout the intercultural phenomenological discussion in that it is crucial not to subsume cultural diversity to
universality, which Husserl envisions as the Europeanization of all other cultures. This radical request of post-intentional phenomenology widens the intercultural phenomenological inquiry and vice versa.

First, even though he emphasizes that intercultural work is meant to be complex, entangled, and even contradictory, Lau’s (2016) intercultural discussion on the philosophical level maintains consistency and logical flow throughout the discussions. In the first few chapters of this book, he addresses the holes and conflicting viewpoints and understandings in intercultural attempts; then, he fills those holes and mediates a different idea of philosophy through dialogue across various philosophical works. And, of course, his contribution establishes a vital ground which enables us to challenge Eurocentric philosophical ideas from an ontological level. However, we can still develop this intercultural conversation further or take a radical turn through/in the post-intentional phenomenological space which promotes us to be inspired, to be open, and to reimagine all kinds of possibilities. Simultaneously, appreciating the cultural diversity addressed in the intercultural consideration calls for post-intentional phenomenologists to pay close attention to different possibilities and forms of intentionality and manifestations based on a profound understanding of life and human existence. Furthermore, this also requires critical reflection on theoretical frameworks which influence a researcher’s phenomenological work; there are always possibilities that philosophies/theories/ideas which ground a framework have legitimized exclusive and discriminative ideas on others as well as inherited oppressive power structures.
What Does It Mean to Understand Intentionality in a Post- and Intercultural Manner?

This section proposes possible methods of intercultural post-intentional phenomenology research by buttressing and developing ethical and transformative aspects of Vagle’s (2018) post-intentional phenomenology. I consider how the definition of philosophy, expanded and renewed by the discussion of orientative philosophy, would be helpful to enlarge the scope and approaches of post-intentional phenomenology. In this respect, I draw on Lao Sze-Gwang’s notion of “orientative philosophy” (as cited in Lau, 2016) to explore the meaning and possibility of understanding intentionality in intercultural and post-intentional phenomenological research. I also aim to read the orientative philosophical nature of post-intentional phenomenology by pointing out what components transgress Husserl’s idea of philosophy and could expand the horizon of phenomenological inquiry.

Vagle (2018) states “the practice of a post-intentional philosophy is to remain open, flexible, and contemplative in our thinking, acting and decision making” (p. 135-136), meaning that this research methodology encourages a phenomenologist to distance themself from dichotomous thinking and practice. Drawing on some ideas introduced in Lau’s (2016) discussion, I read this statement to imply that self-reflective and transformative practice is based on understanding oneself as a moral subject and philosophical activity transgressing a purely cognitive endeavor. In the rereading of Husserl’s notion of epoché, Lau (2016) interprets that epoché is a process that requires self-understanding and ongoing self-transformation to return to encounter the world itself. In a similar vein, I read the “open, flexible, and contemplative” (p. 136) attitude which Vagle (2018) promotes as a self-reflective and transformative practice, as one has
to understand what aspects of their being and biases distance themself from achieving and/or maintaining the desirable attitude. Also, one has to strive to transform oneself based on this understanding to become closer to the very attitude.

The importance of the conjunction “and” highlighted in post-intentional phenomenology provides additional perspectives to orientative philosophical practice. Vagle (2018) addresses that Deleuzoguattarian philosophies negate the possibility and value of identifying endings and beginnings. With this viewpoint, Lao’s orientative philosophy can be supplemented as an on-going process toward self-knowledge and transformation. Furthermore, this way of doing philosophy provokes wonderings regarding the way toward truth and the understanding of the world which have been reiterated over time and described in the intercultural discussion as the ultimate goal of doing phenomenology. Considering the main interest of post-intentional phenomenology on how intentionalities take shape “through” and “in” phenomena and the various points discussed in the intercultural discussion, it is plausible to ask, “How should we understand and approach intentionality in intercultural post-intentional phenomenology?” Specifically, “How can intentionality be understood differently through/in this conceptual dialogue?”

Vagle (2018) defines intentionality as “those in-between spaces where individuals find-themselves intentionally in relations with others in the world” (p. 127). In post-intentional phenomenology, these in-between spaces are full of “fleeing, eluding, flowing, and leaking movements” of intentionalities, as Vagle (2018) animates the trait of intentionality from a post-structural perspective. Despite this understanding of intentionality in the post-intentional phenomenological approach being already complex
and dynamic, the intercultural phenomenological consideration even more complicates and adds additional dimensions to this process. This allows us to consider the process of understanding intentionality in intercultural and post-intentional phenomenology as the continued process of self-understanding, critical reflection, self-responsibility, caring for others, and commitment which always call for a courageous attitude and decisions. In this regard, I argue that the intercultural discussion solidifies post-intentional phenomenology as a philosophy for social change.

Vagle (2018) responds to the critique of phenomenology as a “total lack of any political philosophy” (Sokolowski, 2000, as cited p. 131) by saying that phenomenologists have been doing the political work in the ontological and epistemological work. Regarding the “on the ground” level of political work, Vagle (2018) suggests theoretical conversations of phenomenology be joined with other theories. Lau’s (2016) intercultural phenomenological discussion exemplifies theoretical dialogue while he proceeds the conversation mostly at the ontological and epistemological level. Intercultural post-intentional phenomenology is already a political philosophy without a conversation with politically-oriented theories and ideas, even though further conceptual dialogue is still worthwhile.

On the one hand, this approach not only questions and challenges the most fundamental belief and understanding of the world, but also requires self-reflective and transformative practice and decision. This process does not stay on the ontological and epistemological level of contemplation, but rather it requires tenacious body and mind practices which the notion of orientative philosophy implies. On the other hand, understanding intentionalities following the “lines of flight” and ethical commitment
transverses hierarchies and procedures in conventional philosophies and research methodologies which tend to be stable and conformative. A phenomenologist who takes up this approach is encouraged to take risks of less/unpredictable outcomes and also to bear tensions and conflict they are likely to encounter. Vagle (2018) reminds us that understanding intentionality through post-intentional phenomenology is difficult in terms of resisting the force trying to pull us back to linear, clearer, and dichotomous thinking. Besides, Mencius’ Confucianism and Patočka’s life-long endeavor of his brave philosophical practice have us keep in mind that one should put their theoretical and cognitive enlightenment into action, and this is not an easy road mentally, or even physically (Lau, 2016; Tien, 2004, 2012).
Chapter 4. Research Methods

Research Methodologies

**Phenomenological research approach**

In the previous chapter on philosophical grounding, I have continued a conceptual dialogue with a hope to produce and provoke insight into reading and developing post-intentional phenomenology as intercultural philosophical inquiry. The conversation started with the review and discussion of intercultural phenomenology based on the understanding that mere comparison of non-European philosophy with European philosophy and identification of common ideas from the comparison hardly overcome the Eurocentric disposition and its role as a philosophical benchmark of validity. The review and discussion of intercultural phenomenology developed by Lau (2016) imply that the intercultural understanding of phenomenology calls for a renewal of ontological and epistemological viewpoints. Based on the different possibilities projected in the discussion, I propose ways in which post-intentional phenomenology and intercultural phenomenology could exist within the generative in-between space which is enabled by the conceptual dialogue between the two. The (tentative) outcomes of this process, in that the idea of the world and intentionality in post-intentional phenomenology have been modified and shifted, require a researcher to take up post-intentional phenomenology differently in terms of their research design and implementation processes.

Vagle (2018) provides a guide for designing and implementing post-intentional phenomenological research, which he calls a “five-component approach.” The five components are 1) identify a post-intentional phenomenon in context(s) around a social issue; 2) devise a clear yet flexible process for gathering phenomenological material
appropriate for the phenomenon under investigation; 3) make a post-reflection plan; 4) explore the post-intentional phenomenon using theory, phenomenological material, and post-reflexions; and 5) craft a text that engages the production and provocation of the post-intentional phenomenon in context(s) around social issues (see Vagle, 2018, p. 139-161). Recently, however, Vagle (2019) proposed a triangular diagram that consists of three pivots in the post-intentional phenomenological research process—theories, phenomenological materials, and post-reflexing—as a replacement for the five-component approach. This new approach emphasizes a cyclical pattern in post-intentional phenomenological research that was not well highlighted in the previous approach. With an intercultural understanding of phenomenology, a phenomenological study should be designed on a ground which acknowledges the plurality of lifeworld and the idea of philosophy as an on-going project of self-transformation and responsibility for others which involves both body and mind. This means the new approach also needs to be nuanced and rearticulated because extra dimensions and movements that intercultural phenomenology implants complicate the approach as well as provoke unprecedented questions and considerations in post-intentional phenomenology itself.
The visualization of this phenomenological research methodology (see Figure 1) illustrates its cyclical processes. The two wide yellow arrows represent the philosophical perspectives that ground and also act in intercultural post-intentional phenomenological research. The discussion articulated in the philosophical grounding chapter corresponds to these yellow arrows. The narrow blue arrows represent three pivots in post-intentional phenomenological research: theories, post-reflexing, and phenomenological materials. The circular arrows in the center represent the cyclical patterns of this research approach. Even though each of the yellow and blue arrows does not interact—connect, clash, disconnect—with the other in the visual, the actual process of post-intentional phenomenological research is much more complex and messy than the process illustrated in the visual. At certain phases of a study, research activities corresponding to each pivot may proceed separately; for example, a partial review of literature about theories and philosophy may occur before conducting research. However, these activities can be
combined or modified as the study develops. One may begin post-reflexing while reading studies about a theory. Gathering phenomenological materials can occur while post-reflexing about a phenomenological attitude. During a post-reflexion, one may decide to take up a different theory instead of the other one that they considered a good fit for analysis. Engaging in this exploration process, researchers can include other methodological approaches and can join in post-intentional phenomenological study if they consider it helpful in understanding their phenomenon of interest and/or crafting a text. So far as a general description of intercultural post-intentional phenomenology, each pivot will be articulated more in depth in the following sections.

**Post-reflexing.**

The self-reflexive process highlighted in intercultural phenomenology is a core part of post-intentional phenomenology as a form of post-reflexion. Vagle (2018) defines post-reflexion in post-intentional phenomenology:

> Post-reflexing is not about setting aside our prior knowledge, assumptions, and beliefs about the phenomenon, but about exploring how they play a part in producing the phenomenon. It asks the post-intentional phenomenologist to try to *see what frames their seeing*—to try to locate and name their assumptions of what is normal and what surprises them. Post-reflexing happens before, during, and after phenomenological material is gathered. (p. 153)

As intercultural phenomenology calls for self-reflexion to not remain a cognitive enterprise, post-reflexion needs to push its boundaries as an ethical and political practice, meaning this process should involve self-transformation and care for others. In this regard, this dissertation study takes up post-reflexion and its role as a space and ongoing
practice for self-understanding and reflection on the decisions and actions one takes. Beyond this level, it should also include reflection on the responsibility and act of care for other people.

Building on the post-reflexion suggestion in Vagle’s (2018) approach, post-reflexion must begin with the very first step of a phenomenological study and continue with every process. The initial post-reflexion statement presented later in this chapter exemplifies a post-reflexion practice that proceeded at the beginning stage of this dissertation study. This statement is similar to researcher subjectivity statements that many qualitative researchers use to identify their positionality as researchers: “Sometimes, subjectivity statements appear to be once and for all, and are not revisited throughout the research process. In post-intentional phenomenological research it is important to continue to revisit, throughout the study, what you write in this statement” (Vagle, 2018, p. 155). Post-intentional phenomenology suggests researchers pay attention to the following aspects during their post-reflexive practices:

1. Moments when they/we instinctively connect with what they/we observe and moments in which they/we instinctively disconnect;
2. Our assumptions of normality;
3. Our bottom lines, that is those beliefs, perceptions, perspectives, and opinions that we refuse to shed; and
4. Moments in which they/we are shocked by what they/we observed (Vagle, 2018, p. 154).

From the intercultural phenomenological perspective, post-reflexion is an inquiry which is grounded in the understanding of the human being as a being of truth and justice
and also a philosophical practice which cultivates flesh to better sense other people and communities. Responsibility and care for others not only means a reflection on what an individual did to others on a daily basis; while this is also a valuable reflection, it rather means maintaining a critical perspective and practice on oneself and society, considering others and other communities and examining intentional relationships and responsibilities from the renewed definition of a philosophical attitude. This post-reflexion helps a researcher understand their intentional relationships as an ethical subject while also allowing a researcher to make social changes in direct and indirect ways.

Theories.

In terms of a literature review and theoretical framework, post-intentional phenomenology encourages a researcher to partially review literature and think with theories rather than conduct a heavy review of literature and tune one’s viewpoint and analysis to theories one draws on. This approach enables researchers to follow “lines of flight”–factors that make changes and/or allow changes in status quo–in how they move and take different shapes because theories in this methodology do not play a role as a border or framework which defines or limits the possibility of an inquiry in post-intentional phenomenology. However, the intercultural consideration of phenomenology informs us that the field of philosophy is prevalently Eurocentric; as theories and ideas are rooted in these philosophies, we have to pay attention to how the “lines of flights” which take off and lead us to the new space are intentionally related to dominant and oppressive power structures. For instance, we can distance ourselves from being immersed in the Europeanized/Westernized intellectual world by thinking with non-European/Western philosophies, theories, and ideas. We also have to strive to create a
space in which different forms of wisdom are valued the same as intellectualized and theorized ideas. These attempts can be used in the literature review process by including non-Eurocentric theories or challenging the dominant narratives in the world, such as with post-colonial studies and the notion of cultural hybridity. Also, in the stage of exploration of the phenomenon, we can do this by thinking with various forms of knowledge and wisdom rooted in different cultures and thinkers.

Considering the goal of the literature review in post-intentional phenomenology and intercultural phenomenology, the previous chapter on theoretical grounding is not an outcome of a review of literature where “explain[ing] or predict[ing] might take place” (Vagle, 2018, p. 142) based on existing studies. Instead, the chapter is a production of the beginning stage of this phenomenological study with theories and ideas that I engage to “see what frames my seeing” (Lather, 1993) as well as to unlearn dominant oppressive perspectives that have been influenced by white supremacy and Euro-/Western-centrism. Following Vagle’s (2018) suggestion to “not spend extensive time reviewing literature before conducting the study,” I began a partial review of literature focusing on (critical) whiteness studies (e.g., Leonardo, 2013; Matias, 2016; Sleeter, 2001; Yoon, 2012, 2018) to better understand the dominant and oppressive power structure and system in the U.S. before designing this study. Then, I started the review of literature of another three areas of study—Postcolonial Theory (e.g., Bhabha, 1994/2004; Kanu, 2005; Lugones, 2010; Said, 1978; Spivak, 1978, 1985; Viruru, 2005), Feminist Theory (e.g., Anzaldúa, 1990; hooks, 1981/2014; Lorde, 1984/2007; Minh-ha, 1989) and Intersectionality Theory (e.g., Asher, 2019; Collins & Bilge, 2016; Cho et al., 2013; Crenshaw, 1991; May, 2015)—to situate the phenomenon of the hegemonic insider-outsider within sociohistorical contexts.
Even though post-intentional phenomenology does not recommend extensive literature review, I consider this process an important practice to acknowledge precedent works, stories, lives, and wisdom that have been grounded in my scholarship and teaching practice.

In the cyclical processes of exploring the phenomenon, the literature that I reviewed in the theoretical grounding chapter as well as the philosophical grounding chapter is the basis of the processes while various new theories and studies came into play as this study continued. In other words, I draw connections with theories and philosophies as I collect and read phenomenological materials as well as during post-reflexing, and vice versa. Instead of choosing “particular theoretical concepts and/or ideas” (Vagle, 2018, p. 158) that I want to “think with” the phenomenon of interest, I consider all the texts—theories, ideas, and philosophies—that helped in this cyclical process of understanding the phenomenon of hegemonic insider-outsider as potential sources for data analysis and crafting a research text. This approach is inspired and influenced by Lee’s (2002; 2006; 2008) philosophical writings with theories and ideas proposed and developed by multiple thinkers and scholars. Lee (2006) values thinking “through” an outside/margin of a theory or philosophy because this perspective acknowledges the limited validities of theories and philosophies that are dependent on certain contexts and conditions. No theories or philosophies can elucidate universal truth alone; however, many theorists and philosophers tend to be exclusive to other theories and philosophies that challenge the interiority and universality in their domain of thought (Lee, 2006). Thinking through outsides or margins is an approach that includes thoughts that might not “align well” with a theory and/or philosophy to which one is drawn (Lee, 2006). This
is a practice of creating and developing a new territory beyond the original thoughts because this is not an approach of equating or interiorizing one’s thinking into existing boundaries (Lee, 2006). In this respect, Lee (2006) describes one of his books, *Nomadism*—written based on his lectures on Deleuze and Guattari’s (1987) book, *The Thousand Plateaus*—as a record of his reading of Deleuze and Guattari’s thoughts from which he attempts to create a mixed and modified territory as his thinking meets with Deleuze and Guattari’s thoughts. Following this perspective, I consider different theories and ideas that I bring to this dissertation study as entrances for potential territories that I attempt to create through this study. This approach also aligns with post-intentional phenomenology in that it asks researchers to be “open, flexible, and contemplative” in their phenomenological study (Vagle, 2018, p. 136).

**Phenomenological Material.**

In post-intentional phenomenology, researchers gather phenomenological materials to study their phenomenon of interest as lived. Phenomenological material is similar to data in other research methodologies. Post-intentional phenomenology encourages researchers to gather data using various techniques, not only the data collection techniques that are popularly used in qualitative research—such as interviews, observations, and field notes—but also other approaches, like “artistic forms such as drawings and paintings” (Vagle, 2018, p. 86).

In this dissertation study, I gathered phenomenological materials through artifacts of course activities and assignments, classroom observations, field notes, and semi-structured interviews. This gathering of phenomenological materials occurred in Fall 2019 when I taught this course and continued after the semester concluded. During the
semester, I collected student assignments and other productions from pedagogical activities and conducted video recordings of the classroom. In addition, I wrote field notes during and after the class to record certain moments, questions, and thoughts that I captured while I was teaching. I carried out semi-structured interviews after the semester was completed. In the phase of designing this study, I planned unstructured interviews as a format of participant interview because unstructured interview is encouraged in post-intentional phenomenology due to the fact that “it tends to be most dialogic, open, and conversational” (Vagle, 2018, p. 86). I brainstormed some questions in case my participants preferred to start their interview with a question posed by the interviewer. As I progressed through interviews with my participants, most preferred to start with a topic or a question that allowed them to start thinking and sharing about. I still tried to maintain the interviews as “dialogic, open, and conversational”; I let my participants share as much as they wanted and take natural conversational directions. In the “Data Source” section later in this chapter, I will provide more details on phenomenological materials I gathered for this study.

**Methods.**

Post-intentional phenomenology allows other methodological approaches to join the researcher’s exploration of a phenomenon. I value this generative space of post-intentional phenomenology that allows researchers to make decisions regarding how they will capture and theorize what the phenomenon produces. Vagle (2018) states that “the practice of a post-intentional philosophy is to remain open, flexible, and contemplative in our thinking, acting and decision making” (p. 135-136), meaning that this research
methodology encourages a researcher to distance themself from dichotomous thinking and practice.

For my phenomenological exploration, I employ discourse analysis and narrative inquiry to better understand preservice teachers’ lived experience, which is embedded in their interviews and written assignments, and to include the students’ and my own embodied knowledge, which often has not been much articulated or theorized. Discourse analysis provides a theoretical lens to understand language resources that students bring to the course as well as allows the recognition of multiple dimensions that their verbal and textual discourses represent (Bakhtin, 1981; Gee, 2014). I also call upon the capacity of narrative inquiry to focus on validating and generating questions from individual people’s experiences and also on understanding the stories on various levels (Clandinin & Huber, 2010). Within what these methodological approaches together generate, I am most drawn to the work of Moraga and Anzaldua (1981/2015) which tries to dismantle elitism and racism prevalent in society. Their work pushes the rigid boundaries of those whose stories are considered valid and reliable in academia and encourages participants to share various forms of knowledge and beliefs, especially those which have been invalidated or denigrated by Western-centered and colonial perspectives.

**Context for Phenomenological Material**

The context for phenomenological material in this study is an introductory elementary teacher education course at a midwestern research university. The course focuses on understanding various aspects of elementary schools, elementary teaching, and the role of the teacher, which include the social contexts influencing students and their families, as well as educational policies. This is one of the required courses for
Elementary Education majors who plan to pursue their academic and professional careers as elementary school educators. As the teacher education program pursues preparing preservice teachers to become leaders and advocates for their students and communities, this course has been developed as a beginning part of the collective journey. This is the description of the course:

EDU110 is intended to be a beginning course for undergraduate students considering a career in the field of education or a Foundations of Education major. The class examines various aspects of elementary schools and elementary teaching, including school organization, contemporary students and families, standards, assessment, policy, culture and diversity, and the role of the teacher. Issues of equity and equality are addressed throughout the course. The course includes visits to educational settings. (Course syllabus, 2019)

The section of the course for this study is one of three sections which are taught on the same day. Each section is taught by different instructors, and specific course structures and assignments differ while sharing the same general structure, textbooks, core assignments, and schedule. The section I taught during the semester I generated data met twice a week in the afternoon, on Tuesdays and Thursdays at 12:45 pm, and each class meeting lasted 75 minutes. It was the fourth semester that I taught this course. I had gradually revised and developed the course assignments, projects, and activities for the last three semesters while maintaining the general topics discussed in the course and the course structure, which had been established by previous instructors and the department.

The university can be considered a predominantly white institution (PWI) as over 64% of the enrolled students at the university in Fall 2019 were white while 0.27% were
American Indian, 10.92% were Asian, 5.95% were Black, 4.83% were Hispanic, 7.36% were international students, and 4.41% were multi-racial (UMN Office of Institutional Research, 2019). The elementary teacher education program during this semester reflected the overall demographics of the university in that approximately 60% of the student population was white. The EDU110 classes that I have taught usually had higher than 60% of white students, as the classes had 1-5 students of color in a class size of 17-30 students. I expected similar student demographics and class size for Fall 2019; however, this semester turned out to be a smaller class size with a higher percentage of students of color. The course consisted of two Asian American students, one Hispanic student, five white students, two international students and an instructor, and one student who identified as multiracial.

The selection of this research site is closely tied to my identity as a teacher. The classroom is a space where various educational activities take place as well as where students and teachers with different identities interact and build relationships. For teachers, the classroom is one of the most mundane settings where they can observe and understand their students’ learning processes and interactions with their peers and, at the same time, the most powerful space where they can make changes in their daily practices with their students. Even though teachers have certain freedoms to choose which grade level and/or subject(s) they teach for a school year, they have little control over choosing what students they will teach. The students that teachers meet are often simply given to them; some may call it luck or a coincidence of meeting certain types of individual students as well as combinations of groups of students. In Korean culture, we call this
kind of human relationship, connection, or encounter *inyeon*,\(^5\) referring to having little control over who we are going to meet. This word also refers to the relationships between individual people or things that are initiated by certain causes and likely to have certain effects. When I was teaching in South Korea, my colleagues often considered their designation to students as *inyeon*. This cultural understanding of human relationship tends to help teachers to humbly accept their placement while reminding them to cherish their relationships with individual students. It was my intentional decision to choose my own classroom as a research site for this dissertation study because this is a space where justice-oriented teacher education takes place while I establish pedagogical and human relationships with my students. Regarding the purpose of this study, my own classroom at a university allowed me to capture the moments of students being hegemonic insider-outsiders through various class activities and assignments as well as interactions, actions, and reactions taking place in the space. The selection of this research site also allowed me to be a participant of this study rather than just an observer in the classroom. Other than these decisions that I made for my research, who would be in the classroom and who might have participated in my study were out of my control. I considered it up to my *inyeon* with my students.

Several of my participants were not elementary education majors; there were students who were considering switching their major to elementary education, who were on a teacher education track but not in elementary education, and who were still exploring their future careers and potentially considering working with children. As I

---

\(^5\) This word is rooted in Buddhist philosophy; however, it has been developed and commonly used in Korean culture to refer to predestined relationships between people, not necessarily related to the belief of rebirth in Buddhism.
have taught this course several times, I was aware of this possibility when I designed this study. I tell my students every semester at the beginning of this course that, no matter what major or job they choose, they will still play important roles in elementary education in various ways and from various positions depending on their jobs, relationships, and interests—for example, as a citizen, caregiver, community partner, sponsor, and/or decision maker—while teachers still work most closely with children in the classroom. In this respect, I included all students as potential participants of this study because it is crucial for every member of society to understand and acknowledge their privilege, oppression, and power implicated in the positionality relating to social structures and systems for more equitable and just education. I also considered that excluding students based on their current undergraduate major would limit the scope and possibility of who can be considered “prospective teachers/educators” since college students may not stick with their current major or dream job as they pursue further education and career paths.

**Study Participants**

Potential participants for this study consist of the students in the course, up to 11 students who are enrolled in Elementary Education 110, EDU110. The initial collection of phenomenological material focused on all the participants through class discussions, assignments, and projects which take place in this course. Students who agreed to participate in an interview were invited to semi-structured interviews for further reflection and/or story sharing of their experiences in the course. All 10 students provided consent to participate in this study in a protected consent process that was conducted at the end of the course. This process will be discussed in detail in the “Position as
Researcher” section. In Table 1 and the following paragraphs, I introduce my participants who participated in productions and provocations of the phenomenon of the hegemonic insider-outsider in EDU110. Due to analytical decisions and foci—explained in the following sections—some participants may show up only a few times or not at all throughout this dissertation while some participants may show up much more frequently. However, I introduce every participant in this section to provide a holistic illustration of demographics of the educational space while providing a description of individual students as well. I use pseudonyms to protect identities and the privacy of participants, except myself, Youn. Along with the introduction of participants, I provide a drawing of the classroom space (see Figure 2), focusing on the seating arrangement. While there were sometimes changes in student seating, this drawing is based on the impression that I captured and reflected on throughout the semester in my reflexive journal and field notes.

**Table 1**

**Participant Demographic Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (Pseudonym)</th>
<th>Pronouns</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Language Spoken at Home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youn</td>
<td>She/her/hers</td>
<td>Asian/Korean</td>
<td>Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becca</td>
<td>She/her/hers</td>
<td>Asian/Chinese</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>He/him/his</td>
<td>Asian/Chinese</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco</td>
<td>He/him/his</td>
<td>Hispanic/Mexican American</td>
<td>Spanish and English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>He/him/his</td>
<td>Asian/Hmong American</td>
<td>Hmong and English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choua</td>
<td>She/her/hers</td>
<td>Asian/Hmong American</td>
<td>Hmong and English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaylee</td>
<td>She/her/hers</td>
<td>White/American</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Youn

This class was my fourth semester teaching the EDU110 course at the university and also my fourth year in the U.S. Before I came to the U.S. for the doctoral program, I was an elementary school teacher in a metropolitan city in South Korea. I recall that my three years and six months as a classroom teacher were some of the best times in my life. As a student, especially in elementary and middle schools, I was often ostracized by certain student groups – so-called “insiders” – in the classroom. In this regard, school is an ambivalent space to me. Due to this schooling background, I am sensitive to detecting power dynamics and exclusions amongst students.

Becca

Becca took this class while in her first semester at the university as well as in the U.S. Becca introduced herself as being from Southern China. She tried to be a good student for teachers and parents and perform excellently academically while trying not to hang out (too much) with those who were considered troublemakers because her teachers and parents worried about their potential negative impact. Becca was a psychology major but had not decided what she wanted to be after college. As the semester went on, she started thinking about working with children as a school counselor in China after getting
her master’s degree in the U.S. Watching Chinese TV shows was one of her favorite ways to relax and relieve homesickness.

**Joe**

Joe attended private schools throughout his schooling years before coming to this university. He started elementary school at the age of five, which is earlier than most other children in China. Joe attended a Christian high school in New Jersey, but he emphasized that he has never believed in God. Joe was a science major when he was in this course and still figuring out what he wanted to do with his life. As a student, Joe described himself as optimistic as he was not too strict on himself in academics; therefore, he did not get disappointed when he did not get the highest grades on exams. Joe was interested in watching NBA games and listening to hip-hop music.

**Francisco**

Francisco attended schools in a predominantly white district in the suburb of Starlake City in the U.S. He grew up in a household where Spanish was the primary language. Francisco spent several years in the English learners’ program in his elementary school, and he considered it a helpful transition process. Francisco took many honors and AP courses as he enjoyed academic challenges. While he was often the only Hispanic student in his advanced classes, Francisco did not feel too isolated until the 2016 election of President Trump. Francisco was an elementary education major when he was in this course. He already wanted to be a teacher who would create a safe learning environment before taking this class, but Francisco became more interested in justice-oriented education to empower students and communities who are often underserved and underrepresented in this country.
**Gary**

When Gary was taking this course, he was considering changing to philosophy from an Asian language and literature major to teach philosophy/ethics in high school. After this semester, Gary decided to remain in his current major and pursue an English Language Learners (ELL) teacher career since a philosophy course that he took in the fall 2019 semester was very different from what he expected from a philosophy class. As a student, Gary maintained high academic achievement, but school education did not help him figure out his cultural identity as an Asian American, which he was most interested in exploring. Gary observed that the current education system fails to create students as thinkers. In this regard, as a future teacher, he wanted to support students to think critically and deeply about something that matters to them.

**Choua**

Choua was in the college of education but had not declared her major when she was taking this course. Her dream career was working with the government to help people. Choua described her high school as a community where she felt welcomed and empowered by the programs implemented in the school as well as by people who had similar cultural backgrounds. Based on her positive experiences and memories in public schools, Choua was interested in resources and programs that support students who may not get enough support from their home as well as creating a caring learning environment. A Korean variety show, *Running Man*, is Choua’s favorite TV show to watch. She considers it self-care since she can just laugh and not think about things that bother her.
Kaylee

Before starting college, Kaylee and her family had moved from state to state five times. Her family was successful finding communities to belong to wherever they moved, which Kaylee called “bubbles.” As a student, Kaylee experienced both public and private education systems. Kaylee made more connections with her teachers at public school; however, she considered that teachers in her private school treated her with more respect, as if she were an adult. Kaylee described general perspectives she was learning in the courses in college as different from what she had heard at home growing up in a politically conversative family. However, she tries to listen to and respect everyone, even if their thoughts might be different from her perspectives.

Sara

Sara described her schooling experience as “not always the best.” Sara had difficult times as she was excluded and bullied by classmates who she considered friends. Those experiences made it challenging for her to maintain a good social life in school, though she still cherished learning and other educational experiences she had in school. During high school, she met teachers who had her back when she was struggling with relationships with friends. They were good listeners and reminded her not to forget the beauty and strength in her. Those teachers are living inspirations for Sara to be a good teacher in the future. Sara was interested in creating a safe and caring classroom environment in regard to the current education system that does not educate students to peacefully co-exist but rather promotes competition amongst students.
George

It was George’s first semester at the university, as she had just transferred from another university. At the time of this semester, George was also in the process of changing her psychology and German majors to an education major. As a student, school was fairly easy for George until her junior year of high school because what she had been learning in school had not challenged her much. George was influenced by her family members who were educators, and they made her consider teaching as an exciting, important, and honorable career. However, she was also concerned about how teachers were not appreciated in society with lower salaries and not much respect from the public. George was interested in changing the narrative of white supremacy in the school system and also supporting children of color and their communities.

Anna

Anna grew up in a culturally diverse school community, except for two middle school years she spent in a more culturally and racially homogenous school. Anna described her schooling experiences as educationally positive but emotionally tough because she found herself having lower self-esteem, which made her compare herself to others. In this regard, Anna believed that schools should talk about mental health issues and support students. Anna was also interested in diversity and equity issues in education, and believed that the current education system needs to recruit and educate teachers to provide equal opportunities for all children as well as be allies and advocates for students. One of Anna’s role models is her father, who is an elementary school teacher at the school from which she graduated, and she occasionally visits his classroom to volunteer.
Lena

Before college, Lena was taught in her schools that being different is not good, especially in terms of race and culture. Lena went to the same high school as Francisco. Lena described the course discussions on issues of race and racism, especially about whiteness, as something that made her feel uncomfortable, but she considered the uncomfortable feeling as positive, motivating her to learn more about the topics. Meanwhile, her family’s Christmas tradition of inviting people to have Christmas dinner together has influenced Lena to feel comfortable interacting with people who have different racial and cultural backgrounds. As a future teacher, Lena prioritizes supporting students to succeed regardless of their backgrounds as well as making school fun.

Paige

Paige described having gone to school with a diverse student body as having shaped her to value different perspectives. She considered that students learn better when they experience different perspectives because the perspectives teach important lessons and will widen students’ world perspectives. Paige loved her schools, but schooling was not easy for her because she had to deal with various issues during the school years. Even though she maintained high academic achievement as well as enjoyed learning, she experienced bullying and self-esteem issues. Meanwhile, she established close relationships with her teachers, and they are Paige’s role models who inspired her to be a special education teacher who is a resource and inspiration for her future students. Paige withdrew from this course after she attended class on October 10, 2019, in the seventh week of the semester.
Phenomenological Material

Researchers make decisions on what phenomenological materials they need to gather to explore the research topic. Vagle (2018) suggests that researchers who study a phenomenon “find the best way to study [the] vibration” (p. 86) of a phenomenon. The word “vibration” implies that a phenomenon and the meanings of a phenomenon are not static but rather dynamic and shifting (Vagle, 2018). Even though there are no specific types of material that ought to be gathered as phenomenological material, phenomenological scholars note that it is important to maintain an open mindset in the process of gathering phenomenological material (Dahlberg et al., 2008; Koopman, 2015; Vagle, 2018; van Manen, 2014). Dahlberg et al. (2008) encourage phenomenological researchers to take up various approaches “found in everyday life and in other research
approaches” (p. 171) such as interviews, observations, and field notes (as cited in Vagle, 2018). Keeping these suggestions in mind, I chose interviews, observations, field notes, and course artifacts as phenomenological materials that help me to explore the phenomenon of interest in this study. As phenomenology is an inquiry of understanding the meanings of the world through people’s lived experiences, I aimed to gather “lived-through phenomenological material” through these approaches (Koopman, 2015). In the following sections, I introduce and discuss phenomenological materials that I gathered for this study. I include a description of post-reflexion processes in this section, even though post-reflexion has its own domain in post-intentional phenomenology.

**Post-reflexion**

Post-intentional phenomenology considers the researcher an important part of the study regarding how the phenomenon is manifested to the researcher and how they capture the productions. Following a suggestion in Vagle’s (2018) approach, I planned for and implemented post-reflexion to begin with the very first step and to continue with every process of this study. I also tried to maintain post-reflexion as an on-going practice and a space of self-understanding and transformation to cultivate cultural flesh to acknowledge the world beyond the partial world to which I am accustomed based on my own culture as well as the dominant cultures.
During the semester.

During the semester, I used three journaling methods for post-reflexing after teaching the course: the online journal application Day One, a physical notebook, and video/audio recording. After teaching each class, I kept post-reflexive journals on my digital notebook using Day One as a quick way to record key manifestations and emotions before conducting weekly post-reflexion. For post-reflexing on the digital app, I planned and performed writing in a conversational voice, as if I were having a conversation with myself or my spouse. Choosing this format of writing has the advantage of saving time and space to explain contextual information because I proceeded in this post-reflexion with the assumption that the intended audience already had a certain level of shared experiences and understanding of the field. Some of the reasons that I chose this specific application are that it has the functions of adding weather and location at the moment of journaling as well as inserting photos or other attachments.

This stage of post-reflexion was also done in a video or audio format in which I recorded myself verbally reflecting on the teaching, observation, and other related experiences and thoughts. I did not write in a notebook much for post-reflexing on my classroom experience; however, I preferred to record in the notebook when I wanted to use drawings for the process. For deeper reflexion, I conducted post-reflexing on the post-reflexion journals in which I wrote after teaching each class for a week. I used the same methods for this process but tried to deepen and expand this practice as a reflexion on the phenomenon of interest not limited to the classroom experiences and observations. I planned and completed this phase of post-reflexion during the weekend because I
considered the weekend the time I could fully be present for the process. Following Vagle’s (2018) suggestion for this process, I included sections such as connect/disconnect, assumptions of normality, bottom lines, and moments in which I am shocked (p. 154). Throughout my post-reflexive practice in this dissertation study, I used both English and Korean languages.

**After the semester.**

I collected student-specific phenomenological materials when the semester was completed. This phase of post-reflexion took place during the phenomenological material collection process from consenting student participants and their course artifacts. During this phase of study, my process was similar to that of my post-reflexion during the semester. The phenomenological material collection process did not occur on a weekly basis; I took brief notes while reviewing students’ course artifacts and preparing semi-structured interviews. When I had conducted a certain number of artifact reviews and interviews, I completed post-reflexion for deeper reflection on the phenomenological materials. The post-reflexion materials and other productions I completed during the semester were recursively visited during this phase of post-reflexion.

**Phenomenological Materials**

Most phenomenological materials that I gathered for this dissertation study are not developed for this research. Course assignments and activities are pedagogical materials that I have changed and developed to support my students’ learning in the EDU110 course based on the anchor course syllabus that has been developed by the department and previous instructors who have taught this course. During the semester, I mainly gathered materials produced during the course. Course artifacts include lesson
plans and presentation slides I created for each class session. I also saved course readings and news articles that I or my students selected for course activities. I considered that the students’ and my decisions on what to read and address in the course inform various aspects present in this course–the dominant social context, white supremacy, and individuals’ interests. Students submitted their written assignments through an online course platform provided by the university. Most reflexive notebook assignments were submitted during the course meetings due to the handwritten and/or drawing component of these assignments. When I saved course artifacts and assignments on a secured drive on my personal computer, I organized course artifacts in chronological order and assignments by themes. The following are brief descriptions of course assignments and other materials selected as phenomenological materials:

- Course materials and artifacts:
  - Course syllabus
  - Course texts and textbooks including *Troublemakers* by Carla Shalaby and *Multiplication Is for White People* by Lisa Delpit
  - News articles and slides selected and prepared by each student for their current event presentations
  - Presentation slides for each class session
  - Artifacts created during the class which include drawings, group posters, graphic organizers, and worksheet responses

- Course assignments and projects:
  - Personal reflection: This assignment is assigned at the beginning of the semester. Students are asked to articulate their personal philosophy of
education based on their schooling experiences and understanding of current educational issues.

- Reflexive notebook assignments: This series assignment, which consists of eight reflexive notebook assignments, is based on the course text including *Troublemakers* by Carla Shalaby and *Multiplication Is for White People* by Lisa Delpit. These assignments ask students to engage in reflexive activities based on 3-5 questions after reading a section of the book or other text/media that they choose. Students are encouraged to complete these assignments in various ways other than an APA-style essay. Some of these reflexive notebook assignments become groundings for more conventional academic assignments and projects. These assignments were scanned and saved in PDF format during the semester, and the original copies were returned to the students.

- Conversation with a student assignment: This assignment asks students to engage in a conversation with a fellow student around an educational issue and/or event. After having a conversation, students write a paper discussing their interpretation and analysis of the conversation experience.

- School visit paper assignment: This assignment asks students to critically think about the relationships between their positionality and being a teacher to students. Students are asked to visit a classroom or a community site and write a paper discussing their observations and what they learn about themselves and themselves in relation to others.
- Lesson plan project with children’s literature: This is a group project in which students design and present a lesson to the class at the end of the semester. Students are asked to choose a topic/issue and relevant children’s literature for this project. They are also asked to present the chosen topic/issue with discussion questions and activities.

I also made video recordings of the classroom to help my classroom observation process. To record multifaceted classroom interactions, I set up my camera to capture an entire classroom in terms of scene, speech, and interactions (Rymes, 2016). From my previous experience of classroom discourse analysis, I was aware that the video recordings may not clearly capture discrete speech events when multiple people speak at the same time, such as in small group discussion. To complement this aspect, I made notes on what I noticed while listening to small group discussions, interactions, and/or any moments manifested to me or specific utterances by students.

I conducted semi-structured interviews during the following semester. I interviewed 10 students between January 24 and February 7, 2020. I sent invitation emails to students who agreed to participate in the interviews with a brief survey asking preferred pseudonym, interview space, and available dates and times. The interviews were initially planned as unstructured interviews without prearranged questions. However, while I was meeting with the first participant for this interview process, I considered that participants might feel less burdened if I prepared a few broad questions and topics. In this respect, I listed potential topics and questions based on what I had been pondering and desired to discuss further in regards to what participants had shared previously and how they had performed during the course. I maintained the interviews as
dialogic and open, not interrupting or (re)directing while participants were sharing their stories and thoughts (Vagle, 2018). In terms of interview sites, each participant chose a place to meet; the sites included coffee shops, a library study room, and my office at Frost Hall. I recorded each interview with participants’ approval using a voice memo function on my phone, protected with a password; then I transferred the recording file after each interview to the secured drive on my laptop and deleted the file saved on my cell phone. I transcribed audio recorded interview materials using the online transcription service Temi, and I reviewed and revised the transcribed interviews for accuracy. Below in Table 2 is a tentative organization of phenomenological materials in regard to research questions for further analysis.

Table 2

Tentative Organization of Phenomenological Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Phenomenological Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (1) How might the hegemonic insider-outsider take shape for students in a justice-oriented teacher education course? | • Reflexive notebook assignments  
• Artifacts from the course  
• Audio recordings and transcripts from semi-structured interviews |
| (2) What role does the hegemonic insider-outsider play in a teacher education course? | • Reflexive notebook assignments  
• Researcher’s field notes on classroom observations  
• Video recordings of classroom sessions |
| (3) What does it mean to explore the experience of the hegemonic insider-outsider in the context of a teacher education course? | • Reflexive notebook assignments  
• Conversation with a student assignment  
• Researcher’s field notes and post-reflexion materials  
• Audio recordings and transcripts from semi-structured interviews |
(4) How does the experience of the hegemonic insider-outsider change over the progression of a semester-long course that promotes critical self-reflection and the examination of social context?

- Reflexive notebook assignments
- Conversation with a student assignment
- School visit paper assignment
- Researcher’s field notes and post-reflexion materials
- Materials created by students during the lesson plan project with children’s literature
- Video recordings of classroom sessions

**Analysis of Phenomenological Materials: Exploration of the Phenomenon**

**Engaging with Phenomenological Materials**

As Vagle (2018) notes, it is difficult to separate the analysis phase from the phenomenological material collection process. While I was gathering phenomenological materials, the analysis of the materials was already beginning in various ways. Even though I read student assignments and participated in and observed classroom interactions as an instructor, these processes still can be considered as analysis of phenomenological materials because they helped me to have a better understanding of and insights into how the phenomenon of hegemonic insider-outsider is produced and enacted in the classroom context. Post-reflexion was another analysis process that was implemented from the very beginning of this study. Knowing this cyclical nature of post-intentional phenomenology study, like many other qualitative studies, it is difficult to describe the analysis of the phenomenology as a discrete process taking place after completing phenomenological material collection. For instance, what I happened to produce as a part of analysis could become another set of phenomenological materials for further analysis; storied phenomenological materials focusing on a character is an example. In this respect, what I discuss in this section should be understood as the
process of analysis which produces different forms of phenomenological materials that can be used in future analyses of phenomenological materials in this research.

I employed and maintained a “whole-part-whole” analysis method that consists of holistic readings, line-by-line readings, and subsequent readings throughout this dissertation study (Vagle, 2018, p. 110). Holistic reading is a reading of phenomenological materials to have a broader understanding of the materials, whereas line-by-line reading refers to a careful and close reading while engaging this process with note-taking, highlighting, and capturing excerpts. Vagle (2018) articulates subsequent reading as a reading across multiple phenomenological materials, looking for tentative themes, patterns of meaning, and/or meaning units (p. 111). In the early stage of my reading, I advanced through several rounds of holistic readings and line-by-line readings while post-reflexing on my experiences of reading the materials. I highlighted parts that resonated with me and took notes on questions, related topics, and other connections that I made during the readings. Before starting subsequent readings, I recognized themes and patterns that are made and unmade as I reflected on what I had read. This led me to think about arranging reflexive notebook excerpts based on emerging themes and patterns that I noticed. The reason I started from reflexive notebook assignments over other course artifacts is that they opened up various insights into the phenomenon of hegemonic insider-outsider that are closely related to my participants’ lived experiences. I used an online app called LiquidText for this process; this app allows users to take excerpts from the original documents and paste them to a workspace as well as return to the original document by clicking an excerpt. I was able to move around the excerpts and organize different arrangements as I engaged in reading the materials over time. I used this app for
the beginning phase of phenomenological material analysis, as it helped me to organize materials across participants and engage with them in a fluid manner. Below in Figure 3 is a screenshot of my reflexive notebook reading process with *LiquidText*.

**Figure 3**

*Screenshot of Phenomenological Material Analysis Using LiquidText*

Alongside analyzing reflexive notebook assignments, I started the analysis of interview materials by listening to audio recorded interviews with and without a transcript. The interview transcripts were organized by participant, and I kept this format until I completed the fourth reading. As I started the subsequent reading process, cross analysis across participants and materials, I revisited reflexive notebooks, interview recordings and transcripts, field notes, and post-reflexion materials and organized them by tentative themes that I named “entrances” to the phenomenon. I created tables in a Microsoft Word document and sorted phenomenological excerpts based on the entrances.
The reason that I named each theme “entrance” rather than keeping them as themes is that the word “entrance” gave me more freedom to organize phenomenological materials without being too concerned about each excerpt fitting a specific theme. If I considered an excerpt helpful to look into certain aspects of the phenomenon, I tentatively assigned the excerpt to a related entrance. In other words, an entrance signifies the action of “entering” a space for an exploration of the phenomenon, focusing on a certain theme or topic while the outcomes—phenomenological production—might vary. For example, I assigned an interview excerpt to an entrance named “normalized oppressions and exclusions,” but the spatiality of an educational issue manifested more as I analyzed this excerpt over time. Through this approach, I was able to engage with analysis of phenomenological materials in a rhizomic\textsuperscript{6}—multiple, non-hierarchical—manner without being constrained by aligning my analysis to the limited themes and topics. After finishing the first couple rounds of reading/analysis of phenomenological materials by theme, I moved my post-reflexion space from the same Word document to the workspace where I organized the material excerpts by entrances. I created a table of entrances (see Table 3) consisting of spaces for excerpts from materials, post-reflexion, and research/theory; through this process, I brainstormed ideas for crafting a phenomenological text, including what stories and/or themes to represent.

\textbf{Table 3}

\textit{Post-intentional Phenomenon Exploration Template}

| Entrance name: | Possible stories/themes to represent |

\textsuperscript{6} Deleuze and Guattari (1987) describe how “any point of a rhizome can be connected to anything other, and must be. This is very different from the tree or root, which plots a point, fixes and order” (p. 7).
Excerpt from the materials | Post-reflexion | Research/theory
--- | --- | ---
1 | | |

**Storying and Restorying: Narrative Approach**

In the early stage of crafting a text based on the analyses that I had done so far, I experienced a kind of disconnection and stagnation as I was trying to write discussions based on the entrances that helped me to explore the phenomenon with multiple analytical foci. I experienced the disconnection in that different kinds of lively and dynamic aspects of phenomenological materials that had value started to diminish with the approach. I also recognized myself forcing connections between different pieces of analysis to construct a plausible and logical flow of discussion. During a conversation with one of my advisors and a friend about the progression of my dissertation study, I realized that the previous direction was not the best approach to highlight lived experiences and prompt generative dialogue and questions in regard to the phenomenon. Instead I chose a narrative approach–storytelling method–as a way to situate myself and the reader to a phenomenological discussion. This approach helped me to illustrate phenomenological examples (van Manen, 2016) with rich descriptions of the meanings through the participants’ lived experiences and reflections (Wang & Geale, 2015).

Inspired by Shalaby’s (2017) chapter organization and writing that introduce the reader to the issues and discussions through stories of a character by chapter, I outlined my narratives by each participant who I selected as focal participants. When I was negotiating which participants to represent in my study, I wanted my approach to create
potential stories of empowerment for the students, especially those who share similar identities and/or cultural backgrounds (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990). I intentionally chose students of color as main characters in my narrative because I wanted to highlight stories of students of color who navigate and negotiate their complex identities and positionalities in a teacher education program while directly and indirectly in contact with white students and whiteness. I sketched stories focusing on five participants, including myself, in regard to the narrative purpose of the lived stories and research stories to be explored in this study (Vickers, 2010).

The stories shared in this dissertation are tentative productions that were storied and restoried based on my participants’ lived experiences as I engaged with them through my interpretations and emotional engagement (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990; Vickers, 2010). Even though achieving the truth and reality based on factual materials and experiences is not an object of narrative inquiry, I feel obligated to acknowledge and be responsible for fictional aspects of stories, as they were told and retold throughout various stages in the research process. In this respect, I decided to refer to my participants represented in the stories as characters; their utterances, interactions, and other performances illustrated in the stories correspond with phenomenological materials shared by participants and those I collected. However, I made some changes to the structure of factual components as I wrote the narratives, and it was an intentional choice to construct plots negotiating different temporal locales and spatiality present in the lived experiences (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990). This change is relevant to what Connelly and Clandinin (1990) describe about story and restory:
We restory earlier experiences as we reflect on later experiences so the stories and their meaning shift and change over time. As we engage in a reflective research process, our stories are often restoried and changed as we, as teachers and/or researchers, “give back” to each other ways of seeing our stories. (p. 9)

**Analytical Foci: Space, Inyeon, Desire**

I proceeded into the analysis of storied phenomenological materials after completing a draft of stories. Narrative structure was not used in this phase of analysis; instead, I aimed to provide possible interpretations and meanings of stories by developing conceptual dialogue through different theories and perspectives (Lee, 2006). I used a discourse analysis approach to understand the relationship between power and discourse (Foucault, 1971; 1977) and multiple dimensions of discourse practices (Bakhtin, 1981; Gee, 2014) that are represented and implied in the stories. The discourse analysis approach enables researchers to investigate and problematize linguistics practices in relation to social, cultural, and historical contexts (Blommaert & Bulcaen, 2000). The insights provided by classroom analysis also guided the understanding of classroom-specific speech events and interactions that occurred during teaching and learning processes (Gee, 2011; Rymes, 2016; Staats et al., 2006). The discussions that started with an analysis of a certain speech event often played a role in opening up deeper and broader dialogues regarding how the phenomenon of hegemonic insider-outsider manifested and took shape.
Deleuze and Guattari’s (1987) theory of assemblage led me to consider that different analytical discussions can be generated depending on what assemblage I make with the stories of the characters. In other words, the organization and structure of stories and analyses of the stories can generate different meanings and contexts as a whole study. Considering these aspects, I determined three analytical foci based on what has manifested in the prior analysis processes: space, inyeon (interconnectedness of human relationships), and desire. Each analytical focus takes up an analysis chapter, and I assigned a set of stories by character(s) to each chapter. The analysis of space chapter is based on Youn, Becca, and Joe’s stories; the analysis of inyeon chapter is grounded by Francisco and Gary’s stories; and Choua’s stories open up the analysis of desire chapter. For each chapter, an analysis of story is followed by each story; through this structure I aim to provide an in-depth discussion for each set of story and analysis. Depending on the reader’s choice, they may read these analysis chapters chronologically; otherwise, they may choose to develop their own interpretations first by reading the stories before proceeding to the analytic discussions of the stories.

**Researcher Positionality**

In qualitative research, “nothing can be accomplished without subjectivity” (Giorgi, 1994, p. 205). Phenomenology is an inquiry through the lived experiences of individual people in that the phenomenological materials are “lived through by” or are “experimentally given to” someone (p. 6); therefore, phenomenological inquiry cannot be accomplished through pursuing objectivity or be based on object data (Koopman, 2015).

---

7 This theory describes the connections and integrations in systems; arrangements and connections of a collection of things generate certain meanings and contexts within a system. It also implies a new attitude and perspective of viewing things or events (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987; Lee, 2002).
Giorgi (1994) observes that objectivism has influenced the belief that a researcher can achieve validity and rigor through eliminating their subjectivities in their research. Instead, Finlay (2009a) argues that “research can never be a ‘value-free’ zone–researcher subjectivity is always present” (p. 13), and researchers, especially those who conduct qualitative research, need to critically reflect on and engage with their subjectivity on what they study and what is studied of them. Regarding the hermeneutic characteristic of post-intentional phenomenology, a researcher’s lifeworld(s) that informs their past knowledge and experiences is crucial guidance to study the meanings and interpretations of a phenomenon through participants’ lived experiences (Neubauer et al., 2019).

Finlay (2009a) describes researcher subjectivity as “our ‘closedness’ and our ‘openness’ to the world”, that “our pre-conceptions both blinker us and enable insight” (p. 14) into what a researcher aims to study. In this respect, positioning the researcher as a subjective being not only helps me to be critically self-aware of my own subjectivity, but also allows the reader to have a better understanding of where certain perspectives, motivations, and values implicated in this study are rooted (Finlay, 2009b). Following Vagle’s (2018) guidance on post-intentional phenomenology, I started with writing an “initial post-reflexion statement” at the beginning stage of this dissertation study that focuses not only on my “personal beliefs and perspectives, but also what frames my perspectives, beliefs, and perception” (p. 155). In the “position as a researcher” section followed by the “initial post-reflexion statement,” I expand on this reflection in regard to the overall research process of this study.
**Initial Post-reflexion Statement**

I describe my positionality in different ways. After I became accustomed to the language of academia in the U.S, especially in the field of education concerning critical approaches, I reflected on my positionality: I am a middle-class heterosexual cisgender woman from South Korea who identifies as an educational researcher, teacher educator, and a former classroom teacher and former member of a teacher’s union in South Korea. I had hardly been considered a social minority before coming to the U.S. Despite that my participation in the teacher’s union had threatened some of my family members and my position at work in various ways, this had not much led me to have a critical understanding of systemic oppressions in South Korean society.

After having experienced being considered and positioned as a minority due to my skin color, English proficiency, and status as a student visa holder, I have become more aware of social marginalization and oppression featured and hidden in numerous ways. I have also learned that there are always certain experiences and voices that are considered “valid” struggles accepted by society. For example, my experiences of being harassed in the U.S. are often considered trivial or less significant than other people’s experiences, which seems to be related to the racial issues that are much discussed in society. Meanwhile, I acknowledge much privilege that is effective in both or either the U.S. and South Korean societies and how privilege participates in reproducing dominant social values and structures in society. Recognizing the contradiction that I inherently and unavoidably hold, I feel compelled to critically understand the various dimensions of people’s intersectionality and power dynamics which simultaneously exist and are at play in society. I take up the phenomenon of the hegemonic insider to understand and validate...
the complex and dynamic nature of social practice which has framed my sight and the sight of preservice teachers.

**Position as Researcher**

In this dissertation study, I am an instructor of this course and also an observer and researcher conducting this study. Regarding the purpose of this study and the phenomenon of interest, I am another participant of this study while holding greater institutional power in the course. In the phase of gathering phenomenological materials, I conducted the phenomenological material collection procedure carefully to minimize students’ anxiety and feelings of obligation to protect them from feeling pressure that participation in this study was potentially linked to their grades in this course. I provided explicit information about this research and its relationship to this course at the beginning of the course. I demonstrated an overview of the research processes and detailed information regarding participant autonomy. My initial plan was not to introduce the name of the phenomenon, the hegemonic insider-outsider, to the students because I thought this could potentially influence productions of the phenomenon as students might be conscious of the ways in which they are participating in the course activities. However, I chose to introduce and briefly explain what the name of the phenomenon means to my students because I am obligated to provide clear information to the potential participants regarding what will be studied through their lived experiences. Students were encouraged to participate in this research, but I was explicit that their participation was not expected with their enrollment in the course. While providing this information in a verbal presentation and in a textual format through a consent form, I kept myself uninformed of participants and participation status until after the final grading for this
course was completed and submitted. I did this by having students to fill out the consent form in the last class meeting, when they filled out the course evaluation form. I was not present in the classroom during this process and the consent form was held in the department office mailbox until the semester was completed.

Acknowledging my subjectivity as a researcher-participant-instructor enables me to recognize the tensions that I need to consistently navigate as I conduct this dissertation study. There were times when I experienced dilemmas as I navigated the different positions and roles, especially when my desire as a researcher manifested stronger than other desires. I have noticed moments when I felt disappointed when I did not observe what I expected for student assignments and course discussions. Sometimes, I was tempted to make changes in my instruction to induce certain productions that I wanted to see as a researcher. Selecting my own classroom as a research site required even more self-awareness in the decisions I made as a researcher, participant, and/or instructor.

Throughout the semester, I tried to be vigilant in reflecting on the following aspects as I taught, gathered phenomenological materials, and interacted with students: What do I anticipate finding and viewing from my students’ lived experiences (for my research)? What are discourses or moments that I wish had happened (to include in my phenomenological material)? What emotions or feelings did I feel while I reviewed and graded my students’ work (in regard to the focus of the study)? Stating in the IRB form that I would minimize the potential influence of conducting this study in my own classroom is another reminder that I should be mindful of how my researcher-self influences my teaching practice. This self-attention and reflexive practice are what Finlay
(2003) considers a process to “move beyond the partiality of our previous understandings and our investment in particular research outcome” (as cited in Finlay, 2009a, p. 16).

In my observations, my instructor positionality and role constrained me from noticing certain power dynamics and interactions that took place when I was paying attention to other aspects or moments in the classroom. Even though no researcher can capture every moment and aspect happening in the classroom, my observation tended to center on pedagogical foci for which I aimed in each class session or activity. Sometimes I was caught by certain feelings or emotions due to a student and did not make other observations except what I noticed and felt about the student. At first, I considered this kind of observation as a limitation of an observation conducted by the instructor-researcher; however, from the phenomenological perspective, this observation is a valuable lived experience that informs what took place in a mode of being in the world (Heidegger, 1985). van Manen (2007) describes phenomenological understanding as pathic knowing—an experiential knowing or knowing through intuitive practice; I, as a researcher who takes a phenomenological approach, am encouraged to value the pathic dimension of knowing, such as “corporeal, relational, temporal, situational, and actional kinds of knowledge that cannot necessarily be translated back or captured in conceptualizations and theoretical representations” (p. 22).

When I conducted semi-structured interviews after the semester was completed, I considered the cruciality of understanding and acknowledging how my participants perceived me as an interviewer. Taking up interview as a social practice that is co-constructed between an interviewee and an interviewer (Talmy, 2010; 2011), not only the relational aspects between my participants and myself, but also other contextual and
relational aspects could potentially influence the interaction needed to be considered (van Manen, 2007). Even though EDU110 had ended, and I had little authority and power over students’ academic records, I noticed that the instructor-student relationship established during the semester was still present in our relationship as an interviewee and an interviewer to some extent. During the interviews, my participants provided responses that echoed what we had read and discussed in the course. Sometimes they provided “honest” thoughts and feelings on the topics addressed in the course, and then they acknowledged what they shared was not how they were supposed to think and feel based on what they had learned in the class. Depending on participants’ positionalities and how I was perceived by them, they differently positioned me in their response. Some participants regarded me as an insider of their cultural and racial group, whereas some positioned me as a foreigner, but not a person of color who shares the same oppression and exclusion of people of color in U.S. society. There were also moments that I did not agree with what my participants shared during the interviews. However, following Vagle’s (2018) suggestion on interview in post-intentional phenomenology, I showed an agreement first by nodding and/or saying, “I see”, “Okay”, or “that makes sense” and asked for more information about what they just shared. Even though I was not agreeing with what the participants were saying but agreeing on the phenomenon they were opening up through their lived experiences (Vagle, 2018, p. 91), I sometimes felt that I missed a chance to trouble an oppressive, exclusive, and/or racist remark.

My subjectivity has also shifted from time to time depending on local, national, and global contexts that I was situated in and/or were manifested to me. Several major social and political issues, including the COVID-19 pandemic and the U.S. 2020
presidential election, have occurred in the U.S. and in the world since I have started designing this dissertation study. As a social majority in South Korean society, my position and safety have been barely influenced by the political climate in South Korea. I had the privilege of not having to think about my positionality and political issues unless I intentionally paid attention to the topics. When I was gathering phenomenological materials in the Fall 2019 and Spring 2020 semesters in the Midwest U.S., I was naturally drawn to the topics of race and racism as well as other issues of oppression because the discourses easily resonated with me. I did not feel like post-reflexing was a task for a research study; I enjoyed and appreciated this reflexive process because I have needed a space to express my frustration and anger with racism as well as to record and name things that I experienced and felt on a daily basis. However, when I tried to continue this process during summer 2020 when I visited South Korea for four months, I found it very difficult to engage in the emotions and feelings as I have done in the U.S. One day in August 2020, I was reading my phenomenological materials and post-reflexion materials at a coffee shop in Seoul, and I felt disconnected from what I was reading. As I looked around the coffee shop, there was no way I would be racialized or minoritized by other people or treated differently due to my perceived positionality, except my positionality as a heterosexual female. Interestingly, I found myself to be more empathetic toward my white participants who tended to consider engaging in justice-oriented work as an optional activity to be (or to be seen as) a more socially cognizant citizen while not engaging on a deeper level beyond a cognitive engagement. The reflexive work that I have done for this dissertation study in the U.S. is the processes of knowing through “in-being” (Heidegger, 1985) that happened as I lived my life as a social minority, whereas
reading the materials in the coffee shop in South Korea, I remained at an intellectual level of getting cognitive insights. Finlay (2009a) suggests that researchers also need to be attentive to “how the research is being produced in a particular social context” (p. 16). Thus, I consider that the productions I record and share in this dissertation have been influenced by my researcher subjectivity that has been shaped differently based on the space, time, and power that are manifested in the moment.
Chapter 5. Analysis of Space

On my way to teach EDU110, I pass by the artistically-shaped alumni center and the architecture department building with clean glass walls and soothing lighting. As I walk toward Frost Hall, I see three big trees right across from the architecture department building that signal seasonal changes. The plentiful green leaves quickly change their color to red and orange from the beginning of the fall semester, soon to become fallen leaves before November arrives. When the streets leading to Frost Hall and the trees surrounding have been covered with snow multiple times, it is a sign that the fall semester is almost over. Frost Hall is located at an edge of campus; it is a brick building that used to be a secondary school. I know that no one really considers Frost Hall to be their favorite building on campus, as several of my students have told me that they did not expect to take classes in this “old high school-looking building” because the campus tour only showed them other buildings that look more like “college buildings.”

The top floor of the building tends to be hotter than the lower floors in summer. My EDU110 class was assigned to room 313; it is one of the largest classrooms in Frost Hall but does not have the best facilities. We had to turn off the air conditioner because it drowned out our discussions—the air conditioner seemed to be older than most of my students and even myself. My students and I joked about this classroom, that this ill-equipped classroom represents the reality of the public education system in the United States. As Frost Hall 313 is the classroom space where my students and I meet and spend time for the EDU110 class, it is one of the main (physical) spaces where the phenomenon of the hegemonic insider-outsider in teacher education takes shape.
In this chapter, I illustrate the tentative manifestations and productions of the phenomenon of the hegemonic insider-outsider in teacher education, focusing on the spaces that are in relationship with the phenomenon. The purpose of this chapter is to provide an overview of the production and exploration of the phenomenon through stories of characters, then engage in a conceptual dialogue about (or analyze) the spatiality of the phenomenon with philosophical ideas and theories. Three characters pivot the stories in this chapter—Youn, Becca, and Joe—and each of the stories introduces multiple spaces and spatiality that are interwoven in the production of the phenomenon of the hegemonic insider-outsider. Through a narrative approach, I aim to provide vivid illustrations of the phenomenon as they manifest and take shape across boundaries, such as durations of time and space, as well as different interactions and emotions. It is important to reiterate that the analyses presented in this chapter are not “about” the characters or the spaces; instead, the phenomenon and its intentionalities are illustrated through the stories of the characters and spaces represented in each section. I craft this chapter and the two chapters following in a composite version of findings and analytical components in a traditional five-chapter dissertation. This organization is intended to put the storied phenomenological materials, theories, philosophical concepts, attitude, and analysis into a dialogue not only as I craft this text, but also as the reader reads this record of the tentative features of the phenomenon of the hegemonic insider-outsider.

Youn

*Entering the space*

“Feel free to let me know if you have any difficulty understanding my English.” I feel like my accent stands out even more as I stand in front of a predominantly white
undergraduate classroom. The university frequently sends out emails to international graduate students advertising workshops to learn the “unwritten rules of English communication” and “English pronunciation for Academics.” Despite the affirmation and encouragement that I received from my mentors and colleagues that I am qualified to teach this course, I have been feeling that there is always a big hole that I will never be able to fill: my English with a Korean accent. Limited English proficiency is like a defect to be ashamed of but can be accepted when it is generously validated by native English speakers. Regardless of what I teach and how I teach my course, I receive comments on my English once in a while, such as “Youn’s instruction is very clear despite her accent” and “Your English is great as an international student.” As I spend more time teaching in this institution, I have learned to be excessively prepared, kind, and patient in teaching to supplement my “imperfect English.”

On a Thursday afternoon, Paige stays after class. “You know, I think you talk too much about race in this class. There are more important things in education other than race stuff.” Then she cites the verbatim of the official course description from the university website, noting that nowhere in the description is the word “race.” As I start to explain why it is important to learn and talk about race and racism in education, she cuts me off and says, “I’m from a diverse background, and I have many Asian friends. And my friends said that they’ve not experienced any racial discriminations in school.” I am at a loss for words. “I still like this class, and I like you as my professor, but I just wanted to be honest that I felt really frustrated while I was reading the Troublemakers8 book,” she

---
continues. A reflexive notebook assignment she submitted last night clearly reveals how Paige reads the book. “I have also seen people of different races act differently on purpose to make the teacher mad and then use the ‘race card’ to try to get the teacher in trouble, but no one ever talks about that side of the story.”

“Okay, thanks for letting me know how you feel about this class,” I smile at Paige, even though I feel like every muscle in my face is twisting awkwardly. I ask if she has read the course syllabus, which explains why and how this course is structured this way.

“No, I have not. But I will read it.” The course syllabus, including the department and the program’s vision statements emphasizing the commitment to racial, cultural, and linguistic justice, was not effective in this moment to legitimize my teaching focus on race and racism.

Contemplation of the space

In their book *A Thousand Plateaus*, Deleuze and Guattari (1987) illuminate two types of spaces with distinctive attributes: a smooth space and a striated space. They describe a smooth space as a nomadic space in which movements and flows can head in any direction. This is a space of multiplicity in which a general operational rule allows exploration, and “one repeatedly overlays upon each point of smooth space” (p. 372). In contrast, a striated space is a space of governance in which movements, flows, and individual people’s lives are tied to certain directions and rules. This is a space of homogeneity in which operations reproduce certain procedures and processes. A smooth space or a striated space is not defined based on its outward features (Lee, 2008). This can be described as a space of Dao, following the natural order of the universe that is
opened toward any possibilities and any directions (Lee, 2008). Deleuze and Guattari (1987) elucidate:

A smooth space is occupied by intensities, wind and noise, forces, and sonorous and tactile qualities, as in the desert, steppe, or ice. The creaking of ice and the song of the sands. Striated space, on the contrary, is canopied by the sky as measure and by the measurable visual qualities deriving from it. (p. 479).

An institutional space, such as my University classroom, cannot be simply described as either a smooth space or a striated space, since it is situated at the intersection of various ideologies, histories, politics, and cultures. Despite numerous aspects and factors for consideration, the institutional space of the university described in the story is close to a striated space in which the operations are highly influenced by whiteness and white supremacy. The workshops designed to support international graduate students are based on the proximity of certain languages and accents to the English that white middle- or upper-middle class Americans speak. Their approach focuses on helping international students to learn the “unwritten rules of English communication,” and “English pronunciation for Academics” is an accommodation-oriented policy that is in contrast with the pluralistic and liberated approach that promotes multilingual approaches (Wright, 2005). This does not challenge or try to transform the linguistic ideology of the institution that is constructed with and reinforces the racialization of language (Park & Wee, 2012; Rosa & Flores, 2017).

In this space, as an international graduate instructor, I was not only easily positioned as deficient due to my English fluency and accent, but also likely to project and internalize white supremacist values in my teaching practice. As Ahmed (2007)
states, non-white bodies become hyper visible when they fail to “fade into” a white space. She observes that the moments these bodies are out of place are a political issue rather than a personal problem; this means that the racialized position of an international instructor—which is different than that of my white and native English-speaking colleagues—is associated with the politics of the institutional space that reproduces whiteness (Amos, 2016). On the other hand, the story also implicates another space that my mentors and colleagues create that validates her experiences and qualifications as an instructor. Since this space opens up multiple possibilities and directions that I could take in my instructor role, this space is close to a smooth space. As we can infer from the commitment addressed in the course syllabus, “The Department of Curriculum and Instruction is committed to promoting social justice and dismantling racial, socioeconomic, gender and language injustices in education” (UMN Curriculum and Instruction, 2021), this space works against the oppressive and dominant university system and structure: this is a conceptual space and also a collective line of flight that aims to dismantle the oppressive system while advocating for individuals who are less likely to be heard. Despite this space, the institutional space as striated is more manifested and influential in the practice of teaching in English in a predominantly white institution.

While Deleuze and Guattari’s (1987) concept of space seems to be dichotomous, it is crucial to note that these different types of spaces overlay and overlap, and that one type of space can be captured by the other. This contrasting relationship is neither permanent nor stable; therefore, the spaces illustrated in this study are tentatively captured, and their characteristics are always in motion (Lee, 2002). In terms of
understanding the department and the program with which I am affiliated, these spaces can be understood in multiple ways, depending on analytical foci and scope. Considering the university as a system, these spaces are another level of systems and structures under the broader educational system. As the department and the program follow certain policies and guidelines provided by the university, these spaces are close to a striated space in which a certain level of authority and power are granted to individuals based on their positions in the system, while their performances are expected to follow certain processes and procedures. In this regard, I hold certain authority and power as an instructor because my position is granted by the university system. This authority and power include access to student information to a certain extent, for example, grading students’ work, which becomes part of students’ official academic records and contributes to the curriculum design and assigning of texts for a course. Students are also expected to perform their student roles within this institutional space in respect to the university’s policies on and expectations of student performance.

Meanwhile, the department and program can be conceptualized as another space that is distinctive from the striated space: an educational space toward diversity and social justice. This space is represented by the mission statements of the department and the program. The Department of Curriculum and Instruction states,

The Department of Curriculum and Instruction is committed to promoting social justice and dismantling racial, socioeconomic, gender and language injustices in education. We actively work to eliminate barriers and obstacles created by institutional discrimination. We are committed to developing future teachers, practitioners, technologists and researchers who are equipped to identify and
challenge systems and structures of racism and oppression in their field(s),
locally, and globally. (UMN Curriculum and Instruction, 2021)

The Elementary Teacher Education program vision statement states,

Graduates from our elementary education programs recognize schools as places for engaging children and communities in justice-oriented work. They are deeply engaged with children, communities, colleagues, and the field of education as advocates and leaders. Our graduates value an ethos of vulnerability, recognizing their knowledge and pedagogical skills as wide-ranging, ever-evolving, and in collaboration with students. They are part of a growing movement that disrupts the status quo in public education and that works to build a just future. (UMN Elementary Teacher Education Program, 2021)

As indicated in both statements, another space framed and intended by the department and the program heads toward a smooth space which disrupts and challenges the status quo in education and in the barriers created by institutional racism and discrimination. In this space, justice-oriented pedagogy is encouraged and celebrated by the collective desire and vision of the program; therefore, individuals with minoritized positionalities are more likely to feel safe and welcomed.

The course text selected by the program and the instructor strengthens the smoothness of the space by creating a discursive environment to be critical and thoughtful of the status quo. The book *Troublemakers: Lessons in Freedom from Young Children at School* is one of EDU110’s course texts intentionally chosen to help students think about racialized schooling experiences and envisioning freedom in education. This space can be perceived as a smooth space which empowers different possibilities and
ways of anti-racist and justice-oriented pedagogy, whereas the same space can function as triggering, revealing white fragility for those who have been practicing colorblindness their whole lives. Paige does not perceive the classroom space as a space that works toward more equitable and just education but rather a space which consumes time and resources for less important things. As introduced above, Paige shared in her assignment:

If I was completely honest this book has been frustrating for me to read. I understand that race is a huge problem in our society, but I also believe it isn’t the only problem of why the kids in the book get in trouble… I have also seen people of different races act differently on purpose to make the teacher mad and then use the race card to try to get the teacher in trouble, but no one ever talks about that side of story (Reflexive notebook, 10/01/2019).

Her response to the course text and discussion, “talking too much about race” and “using the race card to get white teachers in trouble,” was an expression of anger and frustration, which are part of a range of defensive responses of whiteness (Bonilla-Silva, 2006; DiAngelo, 2018). According to DiAngelo’s (2018) conceptualization of white fragility, Paige’s white fragility seems to be triggered by discomfort and anxiety, as the course challenges the sense of racial superiority that she has not explored or acknowledged. Her references to “coming from a diverse background” and “having Asian friends” are another example of her defensive reaction to the discursive space that she has experienced during the class and through reading the textbook. While not fully described in the story above, Paige “vomited her emotional reactions” (p. 71) to the instructor regarding her uncomfortable feelings with the course topics and discussions before and
after classes, as well as in her written assignments, until she withdrew from the course in week 7 (Matias, 2016).

My interaction with Paige demands further inquiry into the attributes of the classroom space in which my teaching and the students’ learning and interactions take place. It is a classroom where a justice-oriented teacher education is introduced and implemented by the instructor and the curricula developed by the program—the course syllabus and textbook can be considered collaborative lines of flight to transform the status quo in education. In this respect, these efforts lead the classroom into a smooth space for more equitable and inclusive education. Simultaneously, this space interacts with the white supremacist culture not only because this class is still a part of the broader institutional system and society, but also because different lines of whiteness and white supremacy move through this space. The lines include individual people’s presence and utterances that are implicated with whiteness and white supremacist culture. These lines often attempt to “remove the power away from someone who critiques whiteness and put it back into the hands of whiteness itself” (Matias, 2016, p. 71). The attributes of this teacher education course are shifting and tentative as they contact, connect, overlap, and even overlay with different spaces and lines. Some facets of this space that are captured and discussed through my story offer examples of the manifestations of whiteness and white supremacy that are rooted in the ideologies and cultures of broader U.S. society, such as institutional racism, linguistics ideology, and white fragility (DiAngelo, 2018; Leonardo, 2013). Concurrently, it also shows that whiteness and white supremacy govern—explicitly and implicitly—individual people’s interactions, performances, and positionalities; I adjusted my teaching to supplement her English proficiency while, in
contrast, Paige seemed to feel justified in refusing to engage in the course topics (Crowley, 2016; Lynch, 2018).

**Becca and Joe**

*Empowering a Voice*

The class is divided into groups for a group discussion, and Becca is placed into the same group as Paige. It is difficult to clearly hear what they are talking about, but Paige nods with a big smile on her face whenever Becca speaks. Her exaggerated reaction seems unnoticed by another student in their group. When it is their group’s turn to present, Becca shares a summary of their group discussion. She glances at Paige while she talks, and Paige looks at her with an affirming look and smile as Becca finishes her presentation. As Becca sits down in her seat, Paige gives her a thumbs up and says, “Good job!” Becca responds, “Thank you!” As she turns her body to the instructor, Becca’s proud and blushing face is noticeable. This is the first time that Becca has presented to the whole class.

*Rethinking Empowerment*

I reflected in my journal that day as I was glad to see that Paige encouraged and supported Becca in speaking in front of the whole class; I considered Paige’s approach as a kind and encouraging gesture. Even though later Becca did not remember this specific moment when she worked with Paige, Becca described classmates she worked with in small groups as patient and kind because they were trying to understand what she wanted to say: “They knew that English is my second language” (Interview, 02/07/2020). Yoon (2012) notes that an enactment of whiteness does not always provoke negative emotions and “can operate in situations with positive emotional affect” (p. 604). The “whiteness
process” is inherently paradoxical because multiple interests and ambivalent white identities are associated in the construction and enactment of the “strategy of maintaining white privilege” (p. 596) (Lensmire, 2010; Yoon, 2012). Whiteness process is a social process that operates not only to hinder equal opportunities and power distributed to students of color but also to elevate the power and position of white students (DiAngelo, 2006, p. 1983). This process may manifest in less overt ways than a white teacher’s well-intended action being explicitly race evasive or discriminatory to students of color; however, more covert versions of this process are difficult to notice as they often belie a white supremacist undertone (Yoon, 2012).

What manifested to me at first was not the whiteness process that Paige performed during her group work time but the positive emotions that I inferred from Becca’s facial expressions and tone of voice as well as my own satisfaction as a teacher coming from my desire of “getting more students to talk” in teacher education. Yet, as I revisited and re-read this moment of classroom interaction, it became obvious that racialized and linguistic power dynamics played out between Becca and Paige. Lain (2018) suggests acknowledging that U.S. culture is inherently racialized enables us to better notice that “there may be more hidden racialized interactions within the classroom” (p. 788) than an instructor can recognize. Racialized interactions and power dynamics can take place in any classroom setting, not only when the class discusses race-related topics, but in every moment of interaction as long as the societal norm of white privilege, including colorblindness, are maintained (Apfelbaum et al., 2008; Lain, 2018). For example, the class discussion pattern that white students speak first and leading a group conversation is common in classroom discourse, regardless of discussion topics (Sensoy
& DiAngelo, 2014). Yet, white students’ silence also barely creates a safe space for students of color, but rather “function[s] as a power move” that maintains and produces whiteness and white supremacy (Sensoy & DiAngelo, 2014).

Paige had held more power than other group members throughout the interaction that I initially captured as a moment of lively and respectful discussion. Paige took control of measuring the quality of thoughts that Becca shared in her group and deciding what to be shared in the presentation (Field note, 10/01/2019). It is evident that a student with particular positionality, who is white and speaks English with Native proficiency, took up more power and space than other students, limiting the possibilities of contribution for these other students (Lain, 2018). Miller and Harris (2018) discuss how white teachers’ beliefs and actions about helping students of color often causes them to fall victim to the “white saviority” (p. 3) that results in satisfying their own narcissistic desires of saving students of color (Matias, 2013). White saviority is not a field-specific topic and discourse in the field of education; the media has presented and reproduced racial prejudice and white privilege through different storylines and settings (Cammarota, 2011). In a study about the concepts of the white savior and white allyship in Hollywood and education, Cammarota (2011) captures how the film The Blind Side (re)produces the discourse of white saviority in which “a white person guides people of color from the margins to the mainstream with his or her own initiative and benevolence” (p. 243).

A white savior regards people of color as incapable of achieving on their own and helping themselves. The frame of achieving and self-help for a white savior operates in a white supremacist worldview that manifests in various forms that include, as we see in the story, infantilization of a person of color. What is unique about Becca and Paige’s
interaction is that Paige is not only a white savior, but also a “native speaker savior” (Jenks & Lee, 2020). In an English Language instructional space, a native speaker savior helps a non-native English speaker in instructional activities but often assumes that the non-native English speaker is not as qualified as a native English speaker to excel in learning due to their limited English proficiency. Scholars and activists (e.g., Cammarota, 2011; Crum, 2019; Jackson et al., 2020) distinguish a white savior from white ally and white accomplice in that a white ally joins “in solidarity with people of color to struggle collaboratively against those institutions that maintain oppression” (Cammarota, 2011, p. 244). Crum (2019) concerns that white allyship can exist as “spectator solidarity” (p. 32) that does not directly challenge oppressive power structure and systems. White accompliceship is an action-oriented stance that goes “a step further than allyship” with “more direct and overt action” (Jackson et al., 2020, p. 3). Jackson et al. (2020) elucidate:

The key differences between being an ally and being an accomplice are that accomplices accept personal risks by: jeopardizing their comfort; endangering their livelihood; compromising their physical safety; and, in some cases, gambling their freedom—all in support of marginalized groups of people. (p. 3)

Cammarota (2011) addresses that “Solidarity involves sublimating one’s ego and status so that people of color can provide empowered leadership in movements of liberation. A reduction of status requires challenging the very institutions and practices that proffer white privilege and power” (p. 244). Keeping this in mind, white solidarity is necessary to be taught and practiced for educational spaces that concern with liberation movements. It is an action-oriented practice that asserts their power to create spaces for people of color while taking the risks of losing their power and comfort created by white
supremacy (Crum, 2019; Jackson et al., 2020). The skewed power relationship and interaction illustrates that Paige did not take any risk of giving up her power and comfort by creating a space for Becca to present for her group. It was absent in Paige’s kind gesture to help Becca that the reflective consideration and practice of how her own whiteness “creates and sustains oppressive structures and practices” (p. 36). Therefore, Paige’s action failed to create any impact to challenge whiteness and white supremacy present in the classroom space; instead, her white saviority invested white supremacy by maintaining and operating her white privilege in the group work (Crum, 2019).

The theory of whiteness and white saviority helps us to pause and think about the context of which this interaction happened regarding what is normalized and maintained in this space. Phenomenologically speaking, this is also a practice of epoché, Husserl’s phenomenological attitude, which suspends us from making judgments based on familiar values and embodied knowledge to enable us to understand a phenomenon in an “open, flexible, and contemplative” manner (Lau, 2016; Vagle, 2018, p. 136). Paige’s actions of white saviority and native speaker saviority were not considered disturbing in this context in that another group member did not seem to be bothered by the interaction between Becca and Paige. As the instructor, I was also oblivious to this whiteness process in the first place in that I initially reflected on the moment as a powerful one in which a classmate created space for another classmate without the instructor’s specific guidance or request. I reflected in my post-reflexive journal (originally in Korean and translated to English):

Today, I learned that a classmate can make a positive impact in another student’s learning process by creating a space for the student to shine, and I guess this
would be different to the student than when a teacher creates the space. I was not very satisfied with Paige’s assignment that I read before today’s class because it does not contain any deeper and critical reflection. (As you know, this is a student who told me that “I talk too much about race,” and I’m trying really hard not to hate her.) However, as I see today in the classroom, Paige suggested Becca take a main role in the group work, and it made me rethink about her, that she might be a warmer person than I thought. What she has done today is not only create an encouraging space, but also create a humane space for a classmate to feel safe to try something that she has not done before. (Post-reflexive journal, 10/01/2019)

In my reflection, I considered “trying not to hate her” and viewing Paige with a different viewpoint than “a student who refuses to engage in critical thinking” as a critical self-reflection of unlearning my negative emotion and feelings associated with the student; however, I failed to recognize white supremacy and native speaker saviority in the scene. In this respect, this excerpt implies the value of theoretical and philosophical frameworks that guide reflective practices without losing sight as it moves toward transformative and equitable action. Without self-understanding and critical reflection, one’s perspective and action may still (re)produce oppression and exclusion even if one believes they are engaging in a justice-oriented practice.

Deleuze and Guattari’s (1987) concept of “body without organs” illustrates the importance of examining how a movement exercises and constructs practices, discourses, and space. A body without organs is a structure or a space without imposed organizations in which various desires and capacities reside; based on desires, this body produces organizations through shifting the distribution of power and capacities. Therefore, this
body is not an empty body. While the authors emphasize the resistance and transformation of the status quo through making a body without organs, they also warn that this resistance could lead to “empty and cancerous bodies” (p. 508) which draw lines of death and abolition when the movements do not have specific directions or have wrong directions.

Becca’s performance and achievement in the scene can be understood in a more complicated way when we consider the spatiality of the classroom and the lines going through the space. At the personal level, Becca’s attempt to deliver a presentation to the whole class can be considered an attempt to draw and take a line of flight—as she tries something that she has not done before—allowing changes in herself and her performance in the class. Nevertheless, acknowledging the presence of whiteness in the space, Becca’s line of flight is likely influenced by institutional whiteness and oppression. Becca’s quote from an interview captures that she needed to attune herself to fit into the institutional system:

I preferred to listen and take notes during a class. But when I decided to study abroad [in] the U.S., I thought that I can’t participate and contribute in class if I don’t talk. So, I try to talk with my professor and classmates more. (Interview, 02/07/2020)

Even though it is difficult to trace when and how exactly Becca’s desire to speak more in the classroom started and took shape, the excerpt implies that she has been trying to adjust herself to the U.S. institutional norm before starting school in the U.S. Becca’s line of flight meets and intersects with a line called Paige as they interact in a small group discussion. Becca’s desire to participate and contribute more in class is impacted by
Paige, who is willing to help her present in front of the whole class. The lines and their movements took shape and manifested in a positive way—Becca presented to the class, and her facial expression looked excited and proud—at the moment; however, whiteness and racialized power dynamics are still implicated and reproduced in this process and the outcome. Whiteness operates in paradoxical ways in the teacher education space; Paige may not have realized that she fell victim to the white savior complex, or she may have even believed her action to be equitable and empowering as the course promotes. Meanwhile, Becca may have felt empowered by Paige’s exaggerated reactions, not knowing that racial and linguistic hierarchy and whiteness were reproduced and perpetuated in the process of their interaction.

*English Name*

Without instruction for a specific group arrangement, students tend to stick with the same person or people during discussions. Becca usually sits by Joe, who is another Chinese international student. They seem to have active discussions when they are partners. They usually move their chairs closer to each other and start a conversation. From time to time, they cover their mouths when they talk in Chinese. On this day, after reading an article about this topic, the classroom discussion is about why it matters to say students' names correctly. Joe raises his hand and says, “No one says my name correctly in America, so I chose to go by my English name while I am here.”

Kaylee, who is sitting next to Joe, asks, “How do you pronounce your Chinese name?”

“Weilong,” Joe answers.

“Oh, I can’t say that,” Kaylee shakes her head.
“I told you, so that’s why I use my English name.” Joe awkwardly laughs and turns his body to the other side.

After class, Joe and Becca stay and help me clean the classroom. “I am tired of correcting people whenever they say my name wrong,” Joe murmurs.

“And it’s embarrassing, too,” Becca agrees.

**Alienated Name**

This story starts with an illustration of Anglocentrism manifested in this space; Becca and Joe’s gestures, body positions, and voice levels during this interaction show how they perceive the classroom space, that speaking in Chinese is not very welcomed. The metaphor of the U.S. as a melting pot reminds me that this space is rooted in a historical and political sentiment of U.S. society that immigrants are expected to learn and speak English and adopt American cultures to belong here (DiAngelo, 2018). Speaking English as a norm has not been challenged and disrupted enough for Becca and Joe to freely voice their language despite the fact that this class is making a list of class norms, including linguistic justice and welcoming diversity. In a white space in which everything is influenced (and governed) by whiteness—a form of striated space—languages other than English, especially the form of English spoken by the white middle- and upper-middle class, are likely to stand out and “look out of place” if they fail to fade into the space (Ahmed, 2007). In contrast, linguistic justice in the classroom may look in a way like the space acknowledges “the identities associated with a language” and cultivates norms and practices that value linguistic diversity (De Schutter & Robichaud, 2015, p. 91). Furthermore, it also recognizes language as not just a means to communicate with people in the same language group, but rather a “means to realize
themselves” and the world (De Schutter & Robichaud, 2015, p. 91). For Gadamer (1976), limiting one’s language is the same as limiting the entrance into “knowledge into universe” because language and linguistic practice are a means “to grow up in the world” (p. 64). De Schutter and Robichaud (2015) also consider that our perception and understanding of the world require language because “the language we speak in a sense discloses the world to us in a situated way” (p. 91).

The moment of Becca and Joe’s communication in Chinese implies that the Chinese language is an important means to construct their horizon in this learning space (Gadamer, 1975). Especially considering that they have spoken and learned in Chinese for the majority of their lives, the Chinese language is an imperative part of their identity and worldview. However, a different linguistic practice than English that is consistently and covertly governed by whiteness and white supremacy is present in this context. As we see in this story, even though no one told Becca and Joe to lower their voices when they speak in Chinese, they chose to shift their posture and voice tone when they are not communicating in English. This is a demonstration of how whiteness functions to maintain the space in a certain direction–a form of a striated space for white supremacy–despite various efforts to transform the space into a smooth space for different linguistic and cultural practices. Meanwhile, Becca and Joe’s language practice can be viewed as a space that is co-created by the two people to construct their horizon with the Chinese language. Still, this space remained quiet and isolated to a corner of the classroom (since Becca and Joe usually sit in a corner of a large group table); this might be their intentional and unintentional choice for this symbolic non-white body–the Chinese language–to be less visible in a white space (Ahmed, 2007).
Having an English nickname in class is another choice that one would make to better “fade into” a white space (Ahmed, 2007). Before I learned how to say Becca and Joe’s Chinese names correctly, they requested that they be called by their English nicknames. Their request was not unusual because I have taught several international students who preferred to use their English nicknames in my course. As a person who uses a shortened Korean name, I understand why Becca and Joe chose to be called by their English names instead of their Chinese names. Many of my students are reluctant to say my name, Youn, even though I shortened my name to make it easier to be pronounced by Americans. Kohli and Solórzano (2012) argue that the cultural disrespect regarding names is “racial microaggressions—subtle daily insults that, as a form of racism, support a racial and cultural hierarchy of minority inferiority” (p. 443). These students choose to change their names to avoid potential moments of embarrassment and insult by mispronunciation of their names; however, these decisions continue the history of racism in schools that try to assimilate students to the dominant white culture while perpetuating a racial hierarchy (Kohli & Solórzano, 2012). Their decision is related to the internalized racism of “the belief, values, and worldviews of the dominant culture” (p. 448) causing them to feel pressure to change their names in the classroom setting, as people fail to correctly pronounce their names (Kohli & Solórzano, 2012). Huber et al. (2006) observe that school systems and curricular prioritizing of white middle- and upper-middle class history, customs, and viewpoints have systemically and structurally perpetuated a racial hierarchy. Within this system, not learning and incorrectly pronouncing students’ names is one of many forms of racism that students of color experience on a daily basis;
therefore, it makes it challenging for students to fully cherish their non-Anglicized names and identities.

The prevalence of Anglocentrism—a form of whiteness and white supremacy—in U.S. society also permeated into this course, even though it is explicitly framed and constructed as a “justice-oriented learning space for prospective teachers” in the course syllabus, course readings, and department and program mission statements. This course session was specifically framed for students to think about and discuss the importance of learning and saying students’ names correctly. For a while, the discussion seemed to reach an agreement that “not saying students’ names correctly is disrespectful to the students and their culture” and “they will learn and say their students’ names correctly.” However, as Joe shared why he chose an English nickname instead of his Chinese name, the conversation shifted and was interrupted by the following interaction. Kaylee took on the challenge of saying Joe’s Chinese name, Weilong, by asking him to pronounce it, but she gave up right away as she recognized an unfamiliar sound in his name. Not only her utterance of giving up on saying Joe’s Chinese name, but also her body movement, shaking her head as if she just heard something that she would never (be able to) pronounce, is a form of rejection to Joe’s cultural values and his heritage. Kaylee is a student who claims to be comfortable with diverse cultures and languages as she went to high school with classmates from many different countries. Kaylee shares her experience of navigating different cultures:

I'm very accepting of everyone. I think that I'm good at interacting with them [people from different backgrounds] because my goal is never to offend them. I know there [are] cultural beliefs or differences that even if I said something that I
wasn't trying to offend, I could potentially offend them because of their background. But I think that I'm pretty good at keeping myself reserved when I talk to people that I know could potentially be offended by something. (Interview, 01/31/2020)

Despite that Kaylee believes herself as accepting of everyone, her avoidance displays that the name “Weilong” is outside of her comfort zone as well as displays her limited tolerance toward cultures with which she is not familiar (Kohli & Solórzano, 2012). In this subtle moment, her action did not align with her goal of not offending other people with different cultural backgrounds; Kaylee may have not been aware of this issue or not considered her action to be offensive to other people. Even though Kaylee was the one who failed to pronounce the name, the person who seemed to be impacted by this interaction was not Kaylee, but Joe. Kohli and Solórzano (2012) observe that this form of microaggression occurs when people are “unaware of the issue or even a phonetic limitation” (p. 458) in their ability to pronounce certain sounds. This subtle interaction illuminates that the efforts to make the classroom an inclusive and equitable space for multiple cultures and cultural identities—a form of smooth space—could be impacted and potentially hindered by whiteness processes—rejecting unfamiliar cultural aspects—that is not only enacted and catalyzed by an individual person, but also normalized in the space.

*Sensitive Conversations*

My teacher said I should not talk and share political news via text messages or on social media; the police will check my phone when I come to China. So, we don’t talk about political topics very much. Since we use WeChat, the police can check
the conversations. My parents send me messages about the news that the police is monitoring our cell phones.

Becca and I are meeting at a coffee shop located near the campus after the fall semester in which she took EDU110. Our conversation starts with catching up on our winter break and the recent outbreak of COVID-19. As our conversation moves into the situations in each of our countries, Becca says that she does not know much about the details of the current situation, especially regarding how the government is dealing with it. She adjusts her posture as she shares, “I am still worried about my family, but I think they are healthy now.” I shift our conversation topic toward the class. Her shoulders relax as she seems to be more eased as we start to discuss the assignments and activities that we did last semester.

I ask her if she would share more about the tension between Northern and Southern China. Throughout the course, I noticed that Becca discussed several times the tension between the people from the North of China and the South of China, especially when the course was addressing racial issues in the U.S. “There has been a stereotype about people from the North of China, that they are not gentle, and they often talk to others with very loud voices just like having an argument,” Becca explains. I ask if she has learned about the history or any reasons behind this in school. “No, not much. Because in China, the textbook can’t tell much [about the issues]. We just—I just heard from my parents or grandparents, but they just mentioned a little bit.” She continues, “I just know this situation, but I don’t know the exact reason. I don’t know.”
“I see,” I nod slowly while I think about the next question. Becca starts speaking as the silence lasts longer, “I guess it’s just because we don’t have many conversations about these kinds of things.”

**Implicated Spaces**

The significance of this moment of interaction was not manifested at first because I reflected on this interview as “not fruitful” since Becca did not share more about the regional tension in China that she had addressed during the course. In a reflexive notebook assignment, Becca shared that she wants to explore more about the tension and stereotypes between the North and the South Chinese people for a future assignment, “Conversation with a Student.” She considered the topic a “popular and controversial issue in China but because of some reasons there is little news that reports this topic” (Reflexive notebook, 10/03/2019). I anticipated that Becca would discuss more about “some reasons” why the issue is not addressed in the media, even though it is popular and controversial in China, because she indicated that she wants to “think about this issue in various ways and perspectives” (Reflexive notebook, 10/03/2019). Yet, her discussion on the topic was focused on the cultural differences and stereotypes between the people from the North and South of China and did not include articulation about the sociohistorical aspects of the issue. Becca’s “Conversation with a Student” assignment shared and analyzed her experience of having a conversation with a Chinese student about the controversial topic; she illustrated that the student who participated in the conversation—who is a second-grade student from the South of China—looked comfortable sharing his observations and thoughts on the topic with Becca, who is also from the South of China. She wrote that, even though the student did not seem to have much bias on people from
the North of China, he still noticed differences in people’s accents and was aware of stereotypes associated with the people. Becca also seemed comfortable sharing the examples of biases associated with people from different regions of China with the interviewer and even quietly added that she considers some of the stereotypes associated with the region as reasonable. In the assignment, Becca concluded with the statement that teachers should treat every student with respect and understanding regardless of their regional backgrounds, and as for students, learning about different cultures is important for “mutual respect and harmonious integration of nationalities” (Conversation with a student, 11/03/2019).

In understanding interviews as a qualitative research method, Talmy (2010) suggests that it is crucial to contemplate the meanings and processes behind the shared information by a participant in regard to “how information is negotiated and shared.” This perspective considers interviews as a social practice in that the meaning and interpretation of responses are co-constructed through the interactions and relationships between the interviewee and the interviewer (Talmy, 2010, 2011). From this perspective, Becca’s short answers, her hesitancy of sharing information, and her thoughts on political and historical issues need to be re-viewed with other aspects that might have influenced Becca’s engagement in the interview rather than regarding these aspects as a gesture of indirect refusal to provide more information. Meanwhile, I ask myself an ethical question as Becca’s anxious and hesitant look manifests when certain topics are brought up: Is my belief in justice-oriented pedagogy and research skewed to a certain perspective and limited context while putting my student into a confused state and/or a potential risk by imposing certain values and asking difficult questions? These questions are relevant to
orient ourselves to acknowledge the plurality of lifeworld; through this approach, we can better understand the phenomenon of the hegemonic without being captivated by egocentric and exclusive perspectives.

Throughout the semester, the questions of “Is it right to teach international students to follow the U.S.-based, justice-oriented approaches?” and “How should I respond to the international students’ concerns that are caused as they navigate the approaches mainly developed in the U.S.?” continuously arise in my reflexive journal. I have reflected on these questions not only considering my international students, but also because my own positionality as an international student has complicated my conceptualization of justice-oriented educational understanding and practice in different spaces with multiple positionalities. A tendency is manifested and takes shape in my review of Becca’s discursive practices: she tends to be more hesitant or cautious when providing responses related to social and political topics, especially related to her home country, whereas she gladly and readily shares stories and thoughts on other topics. Therefore, exploring the spatiality of the phenomenon may provide some insight into which spaces are implicated and how in the production of the phenomenon, especially when we expand our attention beyond the location “here” based on the temporality of “now” (Asher, 2009). The spatiality concerned in this exploration focuses on how Becca perceives relevant spaces in her practice, what her relationship(s) with the spaces are, and how the spaces are present in her process of negotiations and sharing responses. Thus, the positivistic question of “whether what Becca shares and believes is fact or not”—which questions the facts of the spatiality—is not an interest of this phenomenological exploration.
International students maintain links between multiple spaces and agencies associated with the spaces; this means that a Chinese international student maintains their connection with their home country and agency while they establish new relationships and membership in the U.S. (Raghuram, 2012). From a geographical viewpoint, Collins (2011) suggests that international students can be considered temporary migrants who are different from those in long-term settlement, such as permanent migrants. The relationality and temporality of temporary migrants in a space are different from those of permanent migrants because their mobility patterns tend to be more frequent, and they maintain relationships with multiple spaces at the same time. Temporary migrants also shape their lives based on the spatiality of a space where they reside; however, their home—not necessarily where they come from, but the place they consider home—is always implicated in the lives and practices that they establish in a new space (Anzaldúa, 1987; Collins, 2011). An international student often needs to negotiate or bridge different knowledge and values when they engage in conversations and course topics in the U.S. setting because knowledge is not “a pre-given entity without spatial moorings or investments” but situated in a certain context (Raghuram, 2012). In this respect, Becca needed to make several decisions regarding various aspects associated with a different spatiality to respond to my questions about the COVID-19 situation at home and the regional tension in China. Hail (2015) shares that Chinese international students often feel obligated to represent positive images of China to people from other countries because the information they share will be an impression of their home country. He also observes that his participants who are Chinese international students are very cautious of sharing complaints about their country; they are aware of the interviewer’s positionality
as an American who may have a different understanding and perception of their home country (Hail, 2015). This study implies that an interviewer’s (perceived) positionality is another aspect that has an impact on an interviewee’s response.

As I review phenomenological materials produced by Becca as well as my field notes and journal that I wrote about her, I notice that she positioned me differently depending on the topic; for example, in our conversation about Asian students in an American university or other topics related to Asian cultures, she considered me an insider by including me as one of “us.” However, Becca seemed to position me as an outsider in these particular questions about the COVID-19 situation, the historical and social tension in China, and also regarding this specific interview setting. To mention a social discourse at that time, this interview was conducted when the discourse about COVID-19 had just started formulating; the media in many countries—including the U.S and South Korea—expressed their unfavorable perception of China since the country was known as the origin of the virus (You, 2020). Considering these possible factors which may have influenced the context and the relationships implicated in this interview, Becca seemed to perceive me as a former instructor and an interviewer for a research study rather than a friend with whom she sometimes has lunch. Even though we met at a coffee shop, which Becca chose as a comfortable space for her, her posture, gestures, and responses tended to be more formal than other times when Becca and I had conversations informally, such as after class or at a local Chinese restaurant before the pandemic.

The different degrees of freedom of expression that are protected in different contexts are another aspect that Becca had to navigate during this interview. This issue is directly related to the perception of her own safety when she returns to her home country.
In the story, Becca expressed a concern in regard to talking about political news and expressing her thoughts on those topics by sharing the information about the police surveillance of WeChat that she heard from her teacher and her family. She repeated similar information again when I asked her if she knew any historical and social backgrounds on the tension between Chinese people from the North and the South. Several days before Becca and I met for this interview, a news report stated that a Chinese international student in the same university as Becca was sentenced to prison in China due to his postings on social media (Faircloth, 2020). According to the news reported in *The StarTribune*, this student was charged for “provocation” because the posts that he tweeted while he was in the U.S. included images and comments considered as denigrating to the Chinese president. Even though Becca did not mention this specific news, this incident represents and implies that Chinese international students may need to navigate the political climate and interpretation of freedom of expression in their home country. Meanwhile, this story also describes the moment that Becca tried to provide more of a response in regard to why she did not have more information about the sociohistorical tension. This can be viewed as Becca’s reconciliation of different demands of her Chinese identity with her other identities as a student, friend, and interviewee (Hail, 2015). On the other hand, it might be simply because the moment of silence lasted too long, and it made Becca feel that she needed to share more.

In his analysis of a space with Deleuze and Guattari’s (1987) concept of space, Lee (2008) states that a nomadic space could also become a space of settlement for people stuck in the current state while not being able to take any lines of flight. It suggests that a smooth space is not a permanent smooth space for any person; therefore, a
smooth space needs to keep engaging in the process of transformation (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987; Lee, 2008). Becca’s story reveals that a justice-oriented space and approach centered in the U.S. setting and its values might not be liberatory to a person who does not share the same worldview and values. I wonder if Becca would have shared more stories and thoughts on the topics if it had been an informal conversation in which she did not have to worry about providing “official knowledge” related to China and Chinese people or be concerned about her safety in her home country. This conversation as a research interview—which is more likely to be perceived as a formal discourse setting—may have (re)constructed the spatiality of interaction as a striated space in which certain ideologies, power, and norms are manifested and more actively enacted in shaping Becca’s discourse practice (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987; Foucault, 1971). One may simply consider Becca’s home country a striated space which governs its citizens’ actions and speech by laws and social discourses, which then influence her freedom of expression while she is in the U.S. However, the space that prioritizes certain people’s perspectives, knowledge, and histories is not a smooth space, either, because other people’s lifeworld(s) is likely to be judged and translated from the dominant perspectives in the space. Understanding the spatiality of the phenomenon described and produced in this story gets more complicated as we acknowledge the Chinese history of dealing with colonial powers over 100 years, the U.S. being one of the major ones (Callahan, 2004). As Becca navigates her response in regard to multiple spaces and her relationships with these spaces, the phenomenon is produced at the intersection of numerous historical, social, political, and personal lines running through the space, not to mention that the
interviewer’s South Korean positionality also adds another layer of complexity to the spatiality of the phenomenon.

**Undisrupted Discourse**

Joe and I meet in a study room in a campus library. After we quickly catch up about our winter break, the interview starts with a question about his overall experience in the course. His playful attitude quickly changes to a more serious tone as I press the record button on my phone. Joe describes his classmates as “nice and collaborative, and trying to do some work” and the course as not very difficult other than reading assignments. When the class addressed the topics of race and racism in schooling, Joe often reflected on his high school experience in New Jersey in which he was not treated fairly due to his race and ethnicity. I ask Joe if he would share more about those moments that he shared in his reflexive notebook assignments. “They weren’t actually that racist, though. I think it’s just how I feel about others. I think about how other people judge me, but actually, they are not even thinking about me. I think it’s just me thinking too much about what other people think [about me],” Joe responds.

Joe describes race as “very arbitrary,” that he “found out” as he stays here longer that there are many races and people from different cultures in the U.S.: “I thought that there are only white people and Black people here.” After sharing his experience of “learning race in the U.S. context,” Joe adds, “I think that almost every Chinese is racist.” He brings up his stepbrother who attends a university in Illinois as one Chinese person who says racist things. “I think I’ll just show it to you. I can’t explain,” Joe hesitantly shows me a meme that his stepbrother sent him as a “funny joke.” The meme is a racist meme that contains a derogatory description of Black people. “He’s in Illinois now and
also went to high school here, but he’s still like this.” Joe shakes his head. I ask how he responded to the message. “He’s been like this all the time, so I didn’t want to argue with him. So, I said, ‘ha-ha, that’s funny.’ I know that he’s kind of stubborn, so I just didn’t want to preach about the equity of people to him. I knew that he wouldn’t listen, so I just let him be like that.” He explains that he tries not to talk much about his learned knowledge in the U.S. because it would be considered patronizing, as well as not all knowledge and experience that he acquired in the U.S. would work in a different country.

**Ironic Production (1)**

An irony of justice-oriented education in many teacher education programs in the U.S. is that, despite their effort to recruit more students of color and/or students from different backgrounds, the curricula still focus on educating white female prospective teachers to be more aware of their positionality and the issues of race and racism (Philip, 2014). Philip (2014) expresses concern that teacher education programs seldom support students of color to build an immune system for the “overwhelming presence of whiteness” (Sleeter, 2001) in the classroom. Joe also observed that the EDU110 course still focuses on teaching “white teachers to not become racist teachers,” but he expressed that he is still glad to have a chance to learn and reflect on his racialized experiences in his high school (Personal conversation, 11/28/2019). In assignments and class discussions, Joe has extensively reflected on his high school experiences and draws connections with what he has learned from the media through NBA games and hip-hop. In a reflexive notebook assignment, Joe opens up on his experience of being racially discriminated against by his soccer coach in high school:
I got cut from my high school soccer team in my sophomore year. I felt like it was because I’m Asian because I was apparently so much better than some kids that were not cut. It was hard to tell if it’s discrimination because my coach told me the reason why he cut me and it made sense to me. (Reflexive notebook, 10/01/2019)

This assignment was framed to tackle implicit racial biases based on their lived experiences and the understanding that the field of education is dominated by middle-class norms and white middle-class educators. Students were asked to complete this assignment after reading the two chapters of Troublemakers, “Sean: On Being Willful” and “Marcus: On Being Good.” Joe’s response illustrates how racism operates in a covert way in a school in which the coach provided a plausible reason for the decision to sound reasonable and not racist, while it was still difficult for Joe to tell whether he was discriminated against due to his race. Even though Joe did not name this specific experience as racial discrimination in this assignment, he became more and more confident in naming moments that he experienced or witnessed racial tension, racial discrimination, or white supremacy.

In an observation assignment that proceeds at the beginning of the semester, Joe was already aware of people’s race and ethnicity, though it did not go beyond the level of noticing racial differences and the tendency for people to hang out with the same race group (Reflexive notebook, 09/26/2019). As the semester went on, Joe deepened his interest in understanding power dynamics and student groups in the classroom based on race and ethnicity (Reflexive notebook, 10/03/2019). He explicitly used language such as “whitewashed” to describe students in his high school who “try to be white and only talk
to white people” compared to other students of color who are proud of their cultural and ethnic background (Reflexive notebook, 10/03/2019). Joe did not make a clear connection between students’ racial identities and being “cool kids,” but his description in an assignment illustrates racialized interactions and relationships that he observed and experienced in school: “if I am the only Chinese kid, I usually get left out. If there are two or more Chinese kids in the classroom, it’s most likely that we are going to only talk to each other.” By drawing connections with course readings, Joe has maintained his interest in understanding and discussing the topic of student groups in the classroom that are racialized and also have not been disrupted by his teachers and school (Conversation with a student, 11/03/2019; School visit paper, 12/03/2019).

Considering Joe’s performance and engagement in the course work, EDU110 was successful in guiding and supporting him to reflect on and name his racialized experiences while expanding the perspective to the related topics and issues of race and racism in education and society. However, as the story describes, Joe was not persistent with what he has done in the course in regard to addressing and reflecting on his lived experiences with the understanding of race and racism in U.S. education and society. Joe expressed uncertainty about his understanding of “racialized experiences” by taking back his previous interpretations of the issues as “individual level issues” that were caused by him being overly sensitive about other people’s perceptions of him, not by a racist society and other people. To consider the context of this conversation, even though this interview was introduced and framed as an interview about Joe’s experience in EDU110 in fall 2019, the special and temporal aspects of this interview were still very different from how he experienced EDU110 during the semester. Joe might have felt less obligated to
explicitly address the course topics as he had done in the fall semester, or the interview space, a study room at a campus library, might not have been perceived as a safe space to talk about the topics of race and racism, especially since other people outside the study room could still hear our conversation. It is also possible that Joe’s understanding and memory of the shared experiences has shifted after the course ended. These are some possible aspects that might have influenced Joe to (further) embody and/or express internalized racism—the acceptance of dominant and oppressive ideologies—that is implied in his response and attitude (Kohli, 2014). Numerous factors and possibilities might have shaped Joe’s specific response; however, the “overwhelming presence of whiteness” in the institution and teacher education program must be acknowledged as a basis for the understanding of multiple issues that are involved and implicated in the described moment in the story (Sleeter, 2001). The first part of this story illustrates Joe’s change in his understanding of the experiences as a sudden and unanticipated move. As an interviewer and the instructor of the EDU110 course, I also anticipated that Joe would share more stories about his racialized experiences and understandings when I brought up the topic. It would be hasty, however, to conclude that the efforts Joe made during the semester were “undone” after the semester was completed.

Joe’s expression of internalized racism had been brought up several times during the course discussions, even though they were not manifested and did not take shape as “internalized racism” for a while. With the spatial understanding of the “overwhelming presence of whiteness” in teacher education, and after noticing Joe’s sudden shifts in his response, I started back tracing the phenomenological materials related to Joe, and this became a practice of re-reading the materials with a different perspective.
Phenomenologically speaking, this is a practice of “tracing from the middle” and being attentive to “made and unmade” intentional relationships (Vagle, 2018). This process sheds light on other aspects of Joe’s classroom practice, that even though he actively engaged in processing his experience with discrimination and being left out due to his race and ethnicity, this did not transfer to a reflection on his racialized identity, internalized racism, and his own participation in racism and whiteness.

Sometimes Joe disrupted the dominant discussion on race and racism centered around Black and white history and tensions, noting that the discussion did not consider discrimination between people of color. At the moment, I considered his action as a legitimate challenge because it is true that this course does not address cultural and historical tensions among people of color (Field note, 10/10/2019). However, considering other phenomenological materials produced by Joe before and after he made this comment, this point was likely made based on his observation of “Asian students being discriminated [against] by Mexican and Black students” in his high school, with little acknowledgment of the history and politics of racism and whiteness in the U.S. The following excerpt from Joe’s analysis of a video illuminates his understanding of racism:

I think one of the topics we’ve talked about and can relate to these scenes is stereotypes or discrimination. Just because B Rabbit was a white boy, the minority in the neighborhood, all the Black people had the thought that he couldn’t rap because they thought that rapping is a Black thing. Stereotypes based on people’s race are very common in society, and people sometimes break those stereotypes. In this movie, B Rabbit shut down the voices about white boys can’t rap by making Papa Doc [have] nothing to say in the battle. Stereotypes are often
the reason people make judgments about others, and I think we need to eliminate as many of them as possible. (Reflexive notebook, 10/07/2019)

This assignment was designed to practice “critical observation” to recognize the limits of understanding based on an observation as well as to identify links between individual people’s actions and the social structure and system (Stevens & VanNatta, 2002). While Joe drew connections with the topics of stereotypes and discrimination, his analysis of the scenes and the characters are not supported by the sociohistorical understanding of racism and racial stereotypes associated with the characters. Joe describes the characters’ racial backgrounds and stereotypes related to rap music; however, racial tension between Black and white people as well as the racialized history of rap music were not discussed (Sullivan, 2003). This is an example of the “overwhelming presence of whiteness” (Sleeter, 2001) not only in teacher education, but also in overall society, that it is easy to fall into a trap of whiteness, being colorblind while talking about race and racism. Philip (2014) discusses how teacher education structured for white teachers does not “sufficiently address their [students of color’s] unique needs as teachers of color” while white students are likely to attain “increased awareness of whiteness and its intersection with their identity and role as teacher” (p. 236). In this regard, ironically, Joe has been impacted by whiteness even when he was engaging in the justice-oriented educational topics in EDU110 class. Since the course did not provide a space for Joe to learn about and discuss his identity and positionality as a Chinese international student, he had little chance to increase his awareness of whiteness and racism with a relevant sociohistorical understanding. Therefore, Joe’s response and the shift in response that implies internalized racism can be viewed as a manifestation and/or production of whiteness
process that has languished Joe’s potential growth in developing critical consciousness through a deeper understanding of history, society, and himself (Philip, 2014).

**Ironic Production (2)**

In the second part of this story, Joe’s comment, “I think that almost every Chinese is racist,” seems to be quite abrupt because he was sharing about his process of learning different races and cultural backgrounds existing in the U.S. This utterance can be understood as Joe’s acknowledgment of the prevalence of racism in the Chinese context in regard to the topic, whereas it also plays a role as a connecting remark which situates the following story of Joe’s stepbrother. Even if Joe’s “I think that almost every Chinese is racist” comment might have just intended to indicate a social phenomenon that he has observed, he stealthily positions himself as more racially conscious by critiquing his stepbrother’s racist joke that was shared with him via text message. Meanwhile, his following comment on his stepbrother, “He’s in Illinois now and also went to high school here, but he’s still like this,” indicates that Joe considers that one would be more likely to be racially conscious and aware of the issues if they spent a longer time in the U.S., as he has become more aware of the issue as he stays in the country longer. However, when I asked him how he reacted to the racist joke, intending to ask if he had done anything to disrupt the production of racist remarks, Joe reasoned several difficulties to legitimize why he chose to respond with an affirmation instead of arguing with his stepbrother. According to this story, Joe perceived his stepbrother as stubborn; therefore, he considered it not worth it to point out the meme as discriminatory and explain why we should not consider that kind of denigratory meme as funny. In this interaction with his stepbrother, racism was (re)produced and not troubled because Joe accepted the racist
meme as humorous, which is what the stepbrother might have anticipated as Joe’s response. Considering Joe’s confidence in addressing the topics of race and racism during the course work in EDU110, his decision in this interaction can be viewed as a cowardly move since he did not challenge the racism to avoid conflict with his stepbrother.

Leonardo (2002) states that whiteness is prevalent in many spaces, not limited within domestic borderlines: “multinational whiteness has developed into a formidable global force in its attempt to control and transform into its own image almost every nook and cranny of the earth” (p. 32). In this regard, the dilemmas that Joe shared as the difficulties of addressing politics and social issues with other people, including his stepbrother, are likely to be intertwined with whiteness in different contexts. Bonnett’s (2002) concept of symbolic whiteness is helpful to articulate whiteness and white supremacy implicated in Joe’s dilemmas as they are tied to multiple cultures, ideologies, and histories that are associated with different spaces: the U.S. and China, at least. As Joe illustrated through his comment on Chinese people and the story of his stepbrother, anti-Blackness seems to prevail in Chinese society. Sautman (1994) observes that an anti-Black sentiment started to manifest in Chinese society at the end of the 1970s, when the tension and conflict between African international students and Chinese students provoked and strengthened anti-Blackness among Chinese people. In the 1980s, anti-Black biases were represented in Chinese media, and Chinese intellectuals introduced and reproduced the discourse of racial inferiority of Black people, including scientific racism influenced by Western views of racial hierarchy (Sautman, 1994). According to Sautman (1994), the social perception of Chinese peasants with darker skin as well as the economic levels of countries are intertwined with the construction of anti-Black racism in
Chinese society. Meanwhile, white and pale skin used to be a representation of higher social status because the image of “white face” is associated with intellectuals who spent most time indoors for scholarly endeavors, not manual labor (Sautman, 1994).

Considering this brief historical context of anti-Black racism in China, not only Joe’s stepbrother, but also Joe himself is likely to have been influenced by anti-Blackness and the Chinese version of white-skin superiority before coming to the U.S.

In this regard, if Joe was to disrupt his stepbrother’s racist joke, he would not only have had to consider racism in the U.S. context, but also would have had to tackle the anti-Black racism that Joe and his stepbrother have embodied and practiced in China. If anti-Black racism had been normalized in their relationship and discourse, the process of disrupting racism in their interactions is more complicated because Joe also has to unlearn racism within his relationship with his stepbrother. To reiterate the lack of attention provided to students of color and international students in the program, the teacher education focusing on white teachers’ identity and reflective practice does not provide adequate support for Joe to navigate and challenge whiteness and white supremacy in different spaces and relationships that transcend the U.S. context (Philip, 2014). Joe described a possible disruption of anti-Black racism in response to his stepbrother’s joke as “preach[ing] about the equity of people”, and the “preach[ing]” would be based on Joe’s learned knowledge in the U.S. context, possibly what he learned in the EDU110 course. The word choice, “preach,” implies a negative connotation that Joe’s explanation about the equity of people would not be appreciated but rather would be considered annoying or pompous when shared with his stepbrother.
In a similar vein, Joe’s explanation about why he tries to remain silent instead of utilizing his understanding of race and racism issues is linked to the shifting positions and perceptions of one’s knowledge and the use of knowledge in different contexts. During the interview, Joe expressed that he would not challenge political discourses that he does not agree with unless he has enough knowledge to defend his viewpoint:

For those big topics like politics or racism, if it’s on the internet, I wouldn't go off [on] other people because I know that there are always people who are going to say bad things. They can always fight you back if you say something. So, I think it's not helpful to say something online, and also, it's because I don't have that much knowledge about those topics, so I couldn't be the one standing out to defend a side of it…My immigrant status is another point that I don't want to make any trouble here. Even if it's in China, people say something that I don't agree with. Honestly, it's very common that people in China talk about some bad things. So, I can say that I'm already used to it. I said, those people who are trying to say those things that I don't agree with, they know [about the topics] a lot more than me. So, I would just stop trying. (Interview, 01/25/2020)

This interview excerpt and the last part of this story together illuminate the issue of power and global whiteness that are implicated in the position of Joe’s knowledge and the use of the knowledge in different contexts. While Joe’s positioning of the U.S.-based understanding of race and racism would be considered patronizing in his interaction with his stepbrother, he pointed out his lack of sufficient knowledge to defend his perspective in different discursive settings, including online spaces. This illuminates the ambivalence of an international student’s knowledge acquired in the U.S.: on one hand, Joe’s use of
U.S.-centered knowledge in a Chinese context is a whiteness process through using (symbolic) white supremacist power implicated in the knowledge that Joe has learned from his education in the U.S. On the other hand, Joe’s knowledge and his ability to utilize knowledge in political discourses do not possess the same level of privilege when they are situated in a different context, such as an online space, especially when Joe holds a more precarious position as an international student. Foucault (1977) articulates the relationship between power and knowledge:

> It is not the activity of the subject of knowledge that produces a corpus of knowledge, useful or resistant to power, but power-knowledge, the processes and struggles that traverse it and of which it is made up, that determines the forms and possible domains of knowledge. (p. 28)

Considering this relationship, the presence of multinationalism and the multiplicity of whiteness and white supremacy plays a substantial role in determining the position of Joe’s knowledge and what impacts the knowledge (can) produce in a space (Bonnett, 2002; Leonardo, 2002).

As discussed earlier, anti-Black racism in Joe’s interaction with his stepbrother was not disrupted as Joe prioritized his relationship with the stepbrother by avoiding potential argument. Using the concept of line of flight (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987), the potential or capacity of Joe disrupting the racist remark can be considered a potential line of flight that breaks through the interaction and broader spaces occupied by whiteness. However, even before the line of flight is drawn, the possibility was diminished due to the “overwhelming presence of whiteness” that not only failed to prepare Joe to commit to the difficult practice and make decisions through navigating various identities,
relationships, and power, but also blocked his sight of a more socially just decision and practice. Then, what are some possible productions if the line of flight was successfully drawn and took off at the moment of the interaction? This means Joe expressed his disagreement with the racist meme and addressed the issue of racism with his stepbrother. As this line of flight takes off, Joe’s stepbrother’s racist joke is challenged because the remark is not accepted by the counterpart in the interaction. It also unsettles the culture of racism that has not been troubled when Joe and his stepbrother have interacted. Of course, the line of flight not only produces positive effects; as Joe is concerned, a tension and/or conflict might occur between the two. Deleuze and Guattari (1987) alert that a line of flight does not guarantee positive effects and outcomes because it could become a negative flight and/or be captured by other lines; therefore, we should be attentive to other productions that might (re)produce other forms of injustice. Symbolic whiteness is a kind of negative production; if Joe’s line of flight is produced and operated based on U.S.-centered knowledge without proper understanding and a mediation process with local history, culture, and knowledge, the utilization of the knowledge inevitably creates impacts of whiteness and white supremacy in relationships and spaces. It means that the line of flight which aims to challenge racism might ironically produce another form of whiteness if it focuses on a single context.
Chapter 6. Analysis of Inyeon

In my early schooling, no school year was ever easy on me. Experiencing difficulties in navigating relationships made me perceive school as an uncomfortable and hostile space. Even though making friends was hardly an issue for me, I struggled with maintaining good relationships with some of my classmates. I was a child who wanted to be acknowledged and beloved by many classmates and teachers; therefore, it was even more unbearable for me to undergo tension and exclusion from the people who I wanted to have on my side. My mom strived to help me be comfortable going to school because the bad experiences made me dread it. She did not hesitate to visit my teachers to better understand my issues in school as well as contact classmates’ parents to mediate in my relationships with them. In the meantime, she advised me to let go of friendships and other relationships that did not work despite my best effort to improve them. She also encouraged me to practice forgiveness and sharing in my daily life, even if I did not benefit from these decisions. As I have grown, I have come to know that this insight is inherited wisdom from my mom’s mother, my grandmother, who still reminds my family to do good deeds not only for ourselves, but also for others, without expecting anything in return. My grandmother acknowledges that we as humans have very little control over our lives, but those actions are factors that we can produce with a small effort and may potentially contribute to a community or even to broader society.

This perspective from my mom and grandmother has not only influenced me to cherish my relationships with other people, yet not be obsessed with them, but has also shaped my worldview to be in awe of a world that I can only partly view and understand. In South Korea, we call this cultural perspective *injeon*. South Korean people commonly
use the word inyeon to simply refer to the relationships between people and connections with other objects. It also denotes the history of or reason for an event or phenomenon. Inyeon is also frequently used as material in writings and TV shows in South Korea; they often portray the characters’ predetermined or precedent connections in the past or a past life and their destined relationships in the present. The usage of inyeon has been developed as a cultural expression that is broadly used by South Korean people regardless of their ontological and religious beliefs, though the term is rooted in Buddhism. In Buddhist philosophy, inyeon refers to causes (direct causes) and conditions (indirect causes), a perspective based on Karmic continuity (Kang, 2009; Lusthaus, 2002). Kang (2009) elucidates:

All phenomena arise from multiple causes and conditions, which in turn derive from other causes and conditions. A cause can be a primary substantial cause or the material “stuff” that comprises any object (e.g., the apple seed is the primary substantial cause of the apple tree) or a secondary instrumental cause or the effective factor that makes something happen (e.g., the planting of the apple seed in good soil). Conditions are different from substantial causes because they provide the supportive context for the causes to bear fruit (e.g., fertile soil, adequate hydration, optimal sunshine). (p. 78)

Even though the illustration above clearly distinguishes causes and conditions, their roles and operations are barely obvious to our perception because what we experience/perceive is usually the fruits of causes and conditions (Lusthaus, 2002). From this viewpoint, causes and conditions, or direct and indirect causes, correspond with the concept of intentionality in post-intentional phenomenology that “runs through relations and are
constantly constructed, de-constructed, blurred, and disrupted. Intentionality, then, is running all over the place, all the time—at times with clarity, but most often in the gnarliness of life” (Vagle, 2018, p. 130).

In this chapter, I analyze the phenomenon of the hegemonic insider-outsider focusing on inyeon: complicated lines of relationships (Lee, 2008). Lee (2008) annotates that these lines are usually created (caused) by certain events and factors, then diversified, becoming new lines by other multiple causes and conditions; these lines constitute the present (manifested phenomenon) (Lee, 2008). The three stories pivoted on two characters—Francisco and Gary—will introduce the reader to the discussions of various causes and connections revealed in an educational space. This chapter maintains the same structure as the other two analysis chapters in that discussion sections are followed by each story. Considering the definition of inyeon, I acknowledge that the concept originated in Buddhism, and South Korean people’s usage of inyeon, is also rooted in the influence of Korea’s Buddhist culture and history. Therefore, one may interpret inyeon with Karmic continuity depending on their beliefs and thoughts. However, considering the foci of this dissertation as well as my own ontological and epistemological perspective, this chapter focuses on discussing direct and indirect causes and connections in a teacher education space and how they are interconnected with histories and society.
Francisco

*Proximity to Lines: Class Discussion on Immigrants and Immigration*

“How did you/your family come to be in the U.S.?“ Norah, the guest speaker for the session, introduces the question on the slide. George says she is not sure about when her ancestors came to the U.S. “I know that my mom’s side is Norwegian and my father’s side is from Germany. I heard that my father's side was here since the colonies, but I don’t really know.” Kaylee shares that “I don’t know where my family came from. I guess England or Scotland?” As she concludes her remarks, Kaylee utters that she never really thought about her ancestry until now. When it is Francisco’s turn, he calmly shares that both of his parents are from Mexico and they came to the U.S. a year before he was born. As the class discussion shifts to talking about an assigned reading about the stories of immigrant students and families, the space fills with the phrase “I feel sad,” uttered by students including George, Kaylee, and Lena. Francisco does not talk much other than pointing out that society tries to assimilate immigrant students and families by using the phrase “melting pot.”

Francisco remembers the day after the 2016 election as “extremely isolating. I had never felt like an outsider until that day.” Regardless of his citizenship and his family’s immigrant status, people made assumptions based on Francisco’s ethnicity and first language. The themes and questions addressed in his assignments and projects are centered around the topics of immigration and race. He shares that he never discussed these topics as he was growing up, even though the issues related to the topics “hit close

---

9 This question was developed by the guest speaker, Norah, based on the students’ immigration backgrounds and status. All students in this course were descendants of Asian, European, and Latinx immigrants and international students from Asia.
to home.” Francisco plans for his “conversation with a student” assignment to have conversations with his cousin about immigration and race. He acknowledges the complexity of having a conversation about these topics as his whole family is implicated in the topics, especially in this specific political climate. Francisco anticipates the possibility that the themes might bring up “some painful feelings and memories” to his cousins as “they all belong to a racial minority.” When I ask him if he has any concerns regarding the assignment, Francisco assures me that he is not too worried about upsetting any family members as he is close to them.

**Lines Linked through Memories**

The topic of the class session introduced in the story is “immigrant students and families,” and the guest speaker, Norah—who is Indian American and was working on her doctoral dissertation research about second-generation teachers of color in the U.S.—assigned students to read a chapter from *Latehomecomer* by Kao Kalia Yang and watch a YouTube video titled “The Immigration History of the U.S.”[^10] I noticed that the atmosphere of the classroom silently stirred as several students’ facial expressions and postures changed subtly when Norah posed the question, “How did you/your family come to be in the U.S.?” This type of question is usually asked to people of color and/or people who speak English with an accent, and is barely asked to white people (Cheryan & Monin, 2005; Field note, 11/07/2019). Having taught this course three times, I was acquainted with a course discussion pattern in which immigrant students and families are considered as in need of help to better adapt to the dominant U.S. school system, culture,
and language, which are rooted in white supremacist norms (Post-reflexive journal, 11/07/2019). The discussions on this topic are usually geared toward demanding more “information about the Other” rather than “how they see themselves” (p. 9) to better work with immigrant students and families (Kumashiro, 2000). I assumed that many students, especially white students, might have expected that the class discussion was going to be about immigrant others, not about themselves (Post-reflexive journal, 11/07/2019).

This story introduces students’ different modes of engagement, emotionality, and perceived proximity to the topics of immigrants and immigration. The first impression I received from the moment described in the first half of this story was a vivid dichotomous discourse pattern between students of color and white students (Field note, 11/07/2019). When students were asked to share their responses to the question, “How did you/your family come to be in the U.S.?” Choua, Gary, Becca, Joe, and Francisco—students of color—each provided a brief but clear explanation of the regional and temporal context of their and/or their families’ immigration. On the other hand, Anna, George, Kaylee, and Lena—white students—had limited or little understanding of their families’ immigration backgrounds. Sara—mixed racial background from a white father and Latinx mother—had much more information on her mother’s immigration story than the information on her paternal side. This feature also aligned with the overall discussion pattern observed in this session in which white students responded more promptly when a question was posed, but their responses were not personal or reflexive. Even though not many students of color voluntarily spoke to share their thoughts, they addressed complex and complicated issues involved in immigrant people and communities, acknowledging
that their lived experiences as an immigrant and/or a child of an immigrant family are closely tied to the topic that we were discussing (Post-reflexive journal, 11/07/2019).

In this classroom space, countless lines—intentionalities/inyeon—were brought in by the presence of individual people. These lines include relationships among people and objects, sociohistorical factors, causes, and desires that are associated with the students, the instructor, and the guest speaker. The lines that were directly and indirectly in connection—direct and indirect causes and relationships: inyeon—with immigration and immigrants were interacting and intersecting with other lines in this educational space, even though these lines and their relationships had not been considered significant until this class paid attention to this theme. The lines that gathered and interacted in this course crossed different spaces and times—it is impossible to fully trace their paths and origins—and they would ramify and disperse into divergent directions through course activities and interactions happening in this class (Lee, 2008; Vagle, 2018). It is important to acknowledge that the divergent directions not only lead the lines to become positive factors for more just and liberatory actions, but also drag mindsets and actions toward maintaining and producing white supremacist views on immigrants and immigration. Depending on one’s positionality and interests, some people might be more proficient in noticing the relationships and connections between these lines and also strive to generate more positive impacts on the lines and their movements to be transformative for social equity, whereas these connections and processes are not as easily manifested to other people. For example, for students who had more direct experiences with immigration (e.g., Francisco), these experiences help them to be aware of their relationship to the issues because their communities and their lives have been impacted and shaped by social
discourses and policies around this topic. In contrast, many, if not all, white students might feel it more challenging to encounter and identify racialized lines and their associations due to whiteness—as a social power and ideology—that operates as a “coping mechanism for them” (Leonardo & Zembylas, 2013, p. 154). Whiteness leads white people to view themselves as non-racialized and non-cultural beings; therefore, these lines often slip through the cracks of colorblind ideology without being properly captured and interpreted (Matias & Zembylas, 2013).

This class session was specifically intended to motivate and guide students to draw and potentially take lines of flight–create changes and influences–toward transformative practices by understanding self and society in regard to understanding and working with immigrant individuals and communities. Phenomenologically speaking, understanding self and society is a practice of paying attention to one’s embodied lines–intentionalities/inyeon: how they are interconnected to the topic of immigration and immigrants–and also a process of interpreting the intentionalities/inyeon from sociohistorical perspectives as they are manifested. In this respect, Norah’s question, “How did you/your family come to be in the U.S.?” attempted to make students encounter their intentionalities as immigrants or descendants of immigrants. This question also troubled the settler colonial norm that non-Indigenous people “can rightfully own indigenous peoples’ land” (Smith, 2012, p. 69) and white normativity where whiteness is “a determination of prevailing norms” (Ward, 2008, p. 564) that are pervasive in educational spaces (Viesca et al., 2013).

For Francisco, however, this question might be one of many similar questions he had been asked or messages he had heard living in the U.S. as a person of color. Even
though I knew this question was introduced and asked for a pedagogical purpose to engage the students in the topic in a reflexive manner, I still wondered if Francisco also felt tired of hearing and responding to this question like I did. In my experiences, when other people ask this question, it usually conveys the meaning that I do not look like a person who belongs here. Cheryan and Monin (2005) state that these types of questions “serve as palpable reminders of identity denial, of the fact that one is being relegated outside one’s in-group because one does not fit the picture that is America” (p. 717). From a phenomenological viewpoint, the questions could function as a direct or indirect cause that leads one to encounter and acknowledge the intentionalities (Lusthaus, 2002): how they are implicated and in relationship with the exclusive and white supremacist perception of American identity. In the fifth week of this semester, Francisco shared in his assignment about a moment he was regarded as not American enough by others not only due to his race, but also his first language:

My Spanish speaking ability can also sometimes be problematic. My first language is Spanish, so I am really used to speaking it. At my job, I work with a lot of people who also speak Spanish, so we often speak it. However, customers often get mad because they assume that we don’t speak English. It always bothers me that people perceive us as not being American enough even though our country has no official language and supposedly celebrates diversity. (Reflexive notebook, 10/01/2019)

This excerpt shows that Francisco experienced the denial of his identity at his workplace by the customers who emotionally reacted–by getting mad–to the Spanish-speaking staff. Francisco’s comment “it always bothers me that people perceive us as not being
American enough” exemplifies that Francisco had already recognized and addressed his inyeon with the issues even before this class talked about the theme. In Francisco’s narrative, the customers’ emotional reactions to the Spanish-speaking staff were one of the causes that led Francisco to encounter and interpret a facet of existing anti-immigration sentiment and English centrism that was associated with his positionality and identity.

What Francisco experienced was not only due to multiple factors associated with the individual customers’ affect caused by the Spanish-speaking staff, but also was tied to the sociohistorical marginalization and exclusion of immigrant communities rooted in a persistent racial formation (Dick, 2020; Omi & Winant, 2015). These were constructed through systemic approaches in which “US citizenship and immigration laws have worked to construct whiteness as a core feature of national belonging” (Dick, 2020, p. 2). In addition to the exclusive laws and policies, white supremacist and Neo-Nazi groups’ rhetoric, such as describing migration to the U.S. as invasion, has constructed and reproduced xenophobic and anti-immigrant discourse in society (Campbell, 2015; Srikantiah & Sinnar, 2019). Srikantiah and Sinnar (2019) consider the beliefs of white nationalism to be a strong basis of exclusive and racist ideology: “[white nationalism is a] belief that national identity should be built around white ethnicity, and that white people should therefore maintain both a demographic majority and dominance of [a] nation’s culture and public life” (p. 197). All of these sociohistorical processes and individual people’s actions have generated multiple causes that preserve and secure whiteness and white supremacy to this date.
In this vein, the 2016 U.S. presidential election that Francisco remembered as the first time he felt “like an outsider” at his school was not an unforeseen outcome but rather a manifestation and production of whiteness and white supremacy that have been “strategically left as sub-text” (p. 3) before this election (Dick, 2020). In other words, this social event is one of the outcomes produced by interactions and intra-actions of different lines that shape and are shaped by whiteness and white supremacy—represented as xenophobia, white nationalism, anti-immigration sentiment, etc.—within a certain political climate. The following excerpt from Francisco’s reflexive notebook narrates his realization of his background and racialized experiences before and after the election:

Growing up, I never really thought about the way my race affects me. Now that I am older, I have come to realize that my background not only impacts who I am but also the way people see me. The day Trump was elected as president was one of the most difficult and disturbing days of my academic career. At school all day, people came up to me and asked if my family were ready to get deported to Mexico. People just assumed that because I am Mexican and because I speak Spanish that I am not American enough or a good citizen. That day was an extreme isolation. I had never felt like an outsider until that day. (Reflexive notebook, 10/01/2019)

Francisco’s narrative illuminates his process of realizing that his background was racialized and his identity and experiences are shaped by racialization. It displays that Francisco had encountered multiple lines that influenced his cultural and racial identity as he was growing up, and the 2016 election was when Francisco experienced the cruel and dehumanizing production and manifestation of white supremacy. However, the election
not only manifested the lines of whiteness and white supremacy to Francisco, other Mexican Americans, and Mexican immigrant communities in ways that deny their rights and humanity; Trump’s presidential campaign and public discourses ignited by his white supremacist speech had also justified many people’s racist perspectives and actions against people of color and immigrant individuals and communities (Dick, 2020). The racist speech and comments were based on the long history of white nationalism and xenophobia in the U.S.; they function as direct causes that promoted people, especially those who had been cautious of expressing their racist undertone, to take up white supremacist and oppressive lines—such as histories and perspectives: other existing causes—and feel legitimized when they put their racist desires into actions (Dick, 2020; Schubert, 2017; Srikantiah & Sinnar, 2019). Francisco’s experience also demands us to acknowledge that the school site in the narrative failed to educate students to unlearn their white supremacist perspectives on people of color and foster genuine care for other people (Arce-Trigatti & Anderson, 2020).

Unlike the disrespectful people in Francisco’s narrative, the students in this class seemed to be respectful of other people and tried to empathize with immigrant students’ and families’ experiences introduced in the text. However, Matias and Zembylas (2014) suggest teacher educators “reconsider ‘truthfulness’ of emotions” expressed by prospective teachers, so we can “notice that the emotional responses of students and teachers are often associated with emotional diminutives which, although performed in one way, may in fact mask other emotions that are socially unacceptable or politically incorrect” (p. 320). As I started to think and wonder about students’ mode of engaging in this topic, “I feel sad” comments uttered by several white students with variations such as
“I feel bad” became strange to me. It became strange because I feel as though these students’ verbal accounts of their feelings were too superficial, and their bodily expressions together revealed their distance from the experiences and emotions.

When Becca shared her connection with a character in Latehomecomer, that the story reminded her of feeling lonely in her dorm room despite her roommate due to a language barrier and homesickness, I thought that one cannot simply feel sad or bad if they truly empathize with the character who recently moved to the U.S. It was as though white students’ emotional lines were not making meaningful connections with other lines linked with immigrant students. This reminds me of Matias and Zembylas’ (2014) concept of white emotionality in that whiteness “normalizes white emotionality as nonracial and erroneously ‘translates’ disgust for people of color to false professions of caring and empathy” (p. 321). The authors elucidate that white emotionality also functions to reproduce and maintain whiteness through keeping emotional distance and covering its real effect with expressions of empathy and care (Matias & Zembylas, 2014). This perspective suggests that the students’ emotion shared in regard to the story of an immigrant student was actually a representation of their detachment to the issues of which they failed to acknowledge how they directly and indirectly participate in perpetuating the oppression of immigrant communities (Ahmed, 2004; Matias & Zembylas, 2014). In this scene, the inyeon of whiteness and white supremacy manifested as white emotionality, and concurrently, white emotionality obstructed these white students from realizing their embodied whiteness and how it operated to perpetually otherize immigrants (Sowards, 2019).
In contrast, as described in the story, Francisco held complex and complicated connections and emotions—intentionalities/inyeon—to the themes related to immigrants and immigration. His account of the topics, that they “hit close to home”, also illuminates his close proximity to the issues. During the interview, Francisco shared that he was influenced the most by his parents in terms of cultural values and memories he keeps and cherishes as a Mexican (Interview, 02/04/2020). Cree (2011) addresses that remembering is a process of developing cultural values, and “memory provides continuity to the dislocations of individual and social identity” (p. 3). In other words, the memories and cultural values that Francisco had inherited were “cultural flesh” that helps him to develop “a state of mind and of carnal dispositions that allows [him] to have the sensibility of cultures” and issues involved in his own community as well as others (Lau, 2016, p. 190). Francisco was also willing to share his stories as a Mexican American in the classroom so other people could learn from his experiences:

Because I know that since my experiences are different, a lot of people can learn from them. So, I really like sharing about how my background is different and how my culture has shaped who I am, but also how at the same time I've grown to like to adjust [to] the two cultures, which I also think is a really interesting experience that's different from a lot of people [in Minnesota]. (Interview, 02/04/2020)

Meanwhile, Francisco also acknowledged painful emotions and traumatic memories that could arise in a conversation on this topic. When he was planning his “conversation with a student” assignment with his cousins on topics of immigration and racism, Francisco proceeded with the following consideration:
My whole family is from Mexico, but I don’t think that the students [his cousins] understand how my family got here so I will probably keep the conversation away from that. I also don’t know if any of them have had any incidents [related to the topics] so I don’t want to potentially make them upset. I know that my age and background influence my beliefs, but I want to let them develop their own.

(Reflexive notebook, 10/03/2019)

This is an example of genuine care for the students with whom Francisco was going to have a conversation for the assignment. Francisco prioritized the students by respecting their emotions and memories while he was still passionate to conduct this conversation because “it hits close to home” and he believes that “if these topics are discussed at a young age, it will help with making people more aware and open-minded” (Reflexive notebook, 10/03/2019). This means, as Ahmed (1999) puts it, Francisco understood that remembering the immigrant experience is an embodied experience of discomfort because it involves “the failure to fully inhabit the present or present space.” Since Francisco understood the burden of remembering and being aware of one’s racialized identity, he also empathized with people in his community who “find it easier to just ignore race” (Interview, 02/04/2020), even though Francisco still believed that ignoring race is “damaging because you are ignoring everything about the person’s background and why a person is where they are” (Interview, 02/04/2020).

The perspective of inyeon–direct and indirect causes–encourages me to contemplate the phenomenon of the hegemonic insider-outsider in such a way that what I observe in my students’ learning as manifestations are produced by multiple relationships and causes that play into an educational space. This viewpoint emphasizes that what we
see at this present time is just a partial phenomenon because not all relationships and factors take part in producing a phenomenon simultaneously. In other words, even if certain lines already exist and move through a space, the impacts they generate may take different durations until they become identifiable to a researcher. Thus, the engagement of white students (e.g., George and Kaylee) in the topics needs to be understood as representations of relationships and causes affected by whiteness and white supremacy manifested in the moment. However, it should not be regarded as though these students were not developing any meaningful connections and reflections that call for transformative actions. Even though little has been revealed for the time being, any inyeon generated and developed in this course could become more meaningful and decisive factors for self-understanding and transformative actions in the future.

Nonetheless, it is still imperative to recognize that engaging in the labor and taking on the burden of learning and remembering ethnic and cultural backgrounds and history are optional tasks for social majorities while social minorities “rarely have the power to voluntarily choose” (p. 159) to opt into or opt out of this undertaking (Leonardo & Zembylas, 2013). As illustrated through Francisco’s narratives, the tasks are specifically imposed on people of color by white supremacist society, but it is also taken up as a practice of caring and remembering their families and communities who share collective memories and emotions of immigration (Ahmed, 1999). In contrast, as white students described in this story exemplify, white people barely need to reflect on their cultural and ethnic background to establish their identity because the normalization of whiteness has continued to essentialize American culture and national identity while excluding the Other (Arce-Trigatti & Anderson, 2020; Walton et al., 2018). Considering this context,
teacher education is one of the few spaces that could demand white students experience discomfort by knowing and acknowledging the sociohistorical lines and relationships that their ancestors and they have created, reproduced, and secured in regard to the Other.

*Latent Possibilities of Critical Lines: The Final Project*

It is late November, and the class is having a workshop for their final project. “So, we are designing a lesson and teaching it to this class?” As I reply “Yes” to him, Joe turns to Francisco and says that it would be better for them to find another topic. I ask them what they are considering as potential topics. Francisco says they are just sharing what each of them is interested in, but they are having a hard time coming up with a topic that connects to the course readings and the children’s literature they chose. “We are interested in talking about different languages and things like that, but we cannot think of good lesson activities,” Joe says while he browses the stacked children’s books on their desk which they borrowed from the library. I advise them that they can also consider using video clips for a class discussion. After spending some time gathering resources online, they seem to narrow down the topics. “I wish they had English subtitles,” Joe murmurs as he shows a video to Francisco. At the end of the class, they decide to meet outside class to decide their topic and finalize their lesson activities.

“The hardest thing was choosing the topic and the subject to begin with because I know his experiences coming from China were probably very different. I don’t know how the topics are addressed in different places.” Francisco shares that the project went well as they aligned what they wanted to address in their lesson presentation. Their presentation is about bullying, and they prepared a couple of videos talking about how to react when a teacher detects bullying or exclusion in the classroom. One of their videos
reminds me of an old life insurance commercial in which a white man in a suit introduces “golden rules” for bullying prevention. When Francisco and Joe put a discussion question up on the slides, “What are some possible reasons why someone could become a bully and bullied and what can we do to help them?”, other students start talking about various reasons for students being bullies and getting bullied. However, none but Sara seems to draw a direct connection to race and how students differently experience schooling depending on their racial and cultural background. “I was bullied for no reason, maybe because I am not white like my friends [were],” Sara said.

Unbloomed Critical Lines of Inyeon

Local Lines.

In the project illustrated in the story, the children’s literature lesson presentation, students were asked to develop and teach a lesson based on a children’s book they chose as a group. This project was one of the last course activities for EDU110. As an instructor, I had the opportunity to understand how students’ intellectual learnings transferred into a more practical format through decision-making processes accompanying the development of the project. We spent two class sessions workshopping to exchange ideas and develop a lesson plan before each group presented their lesson in the allotted 30 minutes. As a class, we toured the Frost library before having the workshop sessions, introducing students to the children’s literature library located in Frost Hall. Mia, a library coordinator who was a graduate student in literacy education at the time, guided our tour and modeled a read aloud—which was a required component of the project—to the students. After the tour, students had approximately 15 minutes to explore the library to browse children’s books for their group project. At the end of the
class, many students checked out at least one book to bring to their group workshop session. Like other students in different groups, Francisco and Joe picked up several books related to the potential topics they wanted to address. The books they borrowed included stories about people communicating in different languages and experiences of living in new places. Below is an overview of this project, an excerpt of the instruction provided:

For this assignment, you will choose book(s) from a selection of children’s books. You will complete a read-aloud, and with your pair/group’s chosen “current event/news,” guide us through higher-order thinking questions in relation to your book, with the goal of engaging students in complex thinking about difficult topics through the use of children’s literature. It could be a topic we discussed in this course AND/OR a social issue (bullying, racism, race, trauma, students with special needs, discrimination of any kind, gender and sexuality, etc.). (Children’s literature project instruction, 11/14/2019)

During the time at the Frost library, it seemed that Francisco and Joe had a good start on brainstorming ideas based on themes related to their interests and lived experiences (Field note, 11/14/2019).

Until this project, these students had not interacted with each other closely except a few times during small group discussions. To describe their relationship from the perspective of inyeon, “their inyeon had not been in touch with each other,” meaning that they did not have an occasion to get to know each other and build a relationship on a deeper level. Therefore, this project was one of the first opportunities for Francisco and Joe’s inyeon to be in touch with each other. As illustrated in this story, Francisco and Joe
spent quite a long time sharing their ideas and interests before they began talking about
the structure and details of the lesson (Classroom recording, 11/21/2019). As an
instructor, I gauged this moment as a necessary process of navigating multiple lines–
experiences, relationships, history, power, capacity, etc.–that each group member’s
presence brought into the space. I also evaluated that Francisco and Joe were taking a
sincere approach rather than hurrying to complete the project for credit (Post-reflexive
journal, 11/21/2019). I provided the suggestion of “using video clips for a class
discussion” as a response to Francisco’s comment “We are interested in talking about
different languages and things like that, but we cannot think of good lesson activities”
(Field note, 11/21/2019). Since their inclination toward a lesson on different linguistic
backgrounds was apparent to me at the moment, I was not aware of the possibility that
Francisco and Joe could be unconfident about pushing ahead to the topic they tentatively
decided upon. I believed that suggesting a specific resource and an example for their
activity design would be helpful for them to move forward.

On the presentation day, the fact that Francisco and Joe did not stick with their
initial plan did not surprise me. The way they demonstrated the lesson led me to perceive
the outcome as an unexpected shift because the lesson did not seem to include critical
components and their lived experiences that the team had been discussing (Post-reflexive
journal, 12/05/2019). For instance, in the early stages of the project, they expressed their
pursuit of a lesson informed by their lived experiences as people with minoritized
cultural, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds in the U.S. (Field note, 11/19/2019). It does
not quite correspond with the manifested outcome that the group produced; however,
Francisco’s project reflection states that his group sought to incorporate critical
perspectives and approaches to their lesson on bullying. His explanation of the motif “community building in classroom” demonstrates that he was aware of structural racism that affects different students and how they experience their schooling (Project reflection, 12/12/2019). This means that their decision to create a lesson with the new topic, “bullying”, was not a turning point in which they renounced the aspiration to develop a critical lesson that addresses issues of power, race, and other sociohistorical aspects involved in the topic; his reflection also demonstrates that Francisco wanted to design a lesson that would lead his classmates to think about and discuss positive ways to support both the bully and the bullied by extending the discussions that we had had in this course (Project reflection, 12/12/2019). This information reveals that Francisco and Joe’s desire that they wanted to accomplish in their lesson was not supported or discouraged during the development stage.

In the post-reflexion process, I started to admit that I was projecting an excessive expectation on these students. I have realized that what I was anticipating them to achieve was influenced by my imagined ideal that was constructed based on their growth and achievement in this course (Post-reflexive journal, 12/23/2020). Even though this course has done more than a little for these students’ learning and growth, it is important to validate Francisco and Joe’s independent learning process they pursued due to the limitation of this teacher preparation program. This independent learning includes various sense making processes of the learned knowledge and experiences in relation to their own experiences, histories, emotions, and relationships that were barely discussed in this course (Philip & Zavala, 2016). In this vein, my anticipation of Francisco’s group’s success in developing a culturally responsive and/or intercultural lesson—to their cultures—
did not align with the pedagogical support they have received. With this
acknowledgement, I reexamine my initial interpretation of the interaction during the
workshop time. The amount of time that Francisco and Joe spent exchanging their ideas
can be also interpreted as a signal that they were struggling to find an intersection
between their ideas and interests. Francisco’s comment that “they were having a hard
time choosing a topic that connects to the course readings and children’s literature” (Field
note, 11/21/2019) additionally displays that what they were seeking was not only an
intersection between their ideas, but also an intersection between different components of
the project instruction. To sum up, Francisco and Joe were assigned to find an
intersectionality and to work at the intersection in the middle of entangled lines with little
guidance and support.

Shah’s (2008) explanation of the complexity and difficulty of intercultural
cooporation is helpful to grasp the challenge that the two students were expected to
overcome. The author addresses that intercultural relations and cooperation are difficult
and complex endeavors because they are intertwined with the histories and power
dynamics of different cultural groups. Even though a sense of solidarity is valued in
intercultural alliances to organize social movements and activism, understanding and
addressing differences of power, privilege, and status are crucial to develop sustainable
relations and cooperation (Purkayastha, 2012; Shah, 2008). This perspective encourages
us to be cautious of overlooking unique identities and experiences that each line has
embodied before and after being present in an educational space, in addition to studying
overall features and movements of multiple lines. Similarly, the use of the categorization
of “students of color” in teacher education without further elaboration on the variety of
experiences and positionalities within the category is problematic (Purkayastha, 2012).
Pérez (2020) observes that when people use the label “people of color” to simply indicate nonwhite individuals, the differences and complexities of people and groups in the category are often flattened and simplified in discourse. During the course, as an instructor, I elaborated on the definition of “white”, “whiteness”, and “people of color” to my students, noting that these terms not only categorize people based on their skin color but also indicate their sociohistorical and political identities and experiences in U.S. society (Post-reflexive journal, 09/03/2019). It was my attempt, as an instructor, to inspire students to take up these terms in a more complicated and nuanced way with the understanding of the role of white supremacy. Over the course of the semester, students revisited the definition of these terms in different contexts. If this class was successful in inspiring my students to see themselves and their classmates differently as unique social and historical beings, they could have been able to start noticing and acknowledging multiple racialized threads–inyeon–that their classmates and they have embodied.

**Global Lines.**

Reflecting on the course content and activities provided in EDU110, however, I observed there was little chance for the students to learn and discuss the differences and complexities of racialized identities and challenges that were encompassed in the category beyond the definition. For example, while Francisco focused on addressing and learning issues related to his identity and experiences as a person of color, specifically as a Mexican American, the scope of these processes was limited to his own ethnic and cultural community and their experiences. In this context, Francisco’s comment “The hardest thing was choosing the topic and the subject to begin with because I know his
[Joe’s] experiences coming from China were probably very different. I don’t know how the topics are addressed in different places” (Interview, 02/04/2020) displays his limited prior knowledge and experience to work with his partner, who had a different ethnic and cultural background. The time they spent exploring different topics could have been a chance for them to learn about each other’s differences. However, even if they were able to attain more information about each other, this process proceeded upon the preconceptions Francisco and Joe had about each other’s ethnicities and cultures, including prejudice and “cognitive modality” (p. 79) influenced by white supremacy and colonialism (Lorde, 1984/2007). Francisco’s comment also contains a clue indicating that he made an assumption about Joe’s previous knowledge and understanding of the topics mainly based on the partial information of Joe “coming from China.” In addition to the fact that they had not had a chance to closely work with each other until this project, Francisco and Joe had barely shared their life stories and other details of their identities and experiences in whole class discussions. Therefore, it is plausible to argue that Francisco’s assumption of Joe’s realities was likely to be constructed based on a vague speculation on an international student and/or a Chinese student rooted in the history of Orientalism (Bhabha, 1994/2004; Said, 1978; Viruru, 2005; Weis, 1995).

In a study about international cultural exchanges and tension, Pitts and Brooks (2016) point out that students cannot develop critical cultural consciousness and understanding of other cultures through mere intercultural collaboration and cultural exchange opportunities offered in a higher education institution. The authors further elaborate that these opportunities will only reinforce prejudice toward other cultures and dominant power relations that serve white supremacy and U.S. centrism (Pitts & Brooks,
2016). This kind of outcome is far from the desired production of intercultural cooperation that Bhabha’s (1994/2004) notion of third space illustrates because the (re)negotiation of individual and collective identities, values, and perspectives was missing in the process. Postcolonial scholars emphasize the importance of uncovering and unlearning “neo-colonial” relations and institutionalization to stop the reproduction of historical inequalities and oppressions (Bhabha, 1994/2004; Lorde, 1984/2007). What Francisco shared during the interview about his educational experience provides that he had wittingly and unwittingly compromised and practiced dominant norms and discourses to survive in the racialized education system and society (Mason & Ngo, 2019):

> My perspective is always different from theirs [other classmates]. So, I had to learn to adjust, not just looking at it from my point of view. Because I know growing up from a minority, my experiences are really different than what someone else would experience. In a way, I had to learn to not just look at things from a minority point of view. I had to adjust to seeing things from multiple points of view, but it wasn't too difficult. (Interview, 02/04/2020)

This excerpt shows that Francisco’s minority positionality and perspectives pivoted in expanding his spectrum of understanding perspectives and experiences that were different from his own. It also aligns with how Francisco approached cultural differences that he confronted. Francisco notes that he expanded his knowledge about other cultures and clarified any confusion by “asking [for] more information about their differences” (Interview, 02/04/2020). As we see, Francisco went through a form of self-transformation or an alignment process due to his different perspective compared to that of the social
majority. In spite of Francisco’s effort, his approach is difficult to consider as a liberative action because it did not acknowledge and disrupt white supremacist and colonial ways of understanding and discourses that have operated in Francisco’s learning and growing. Francisco created new lines and developed relations and connections to different cultures and other differences, but these generative processes proceeded without disconnecting and discarding the majority of oppressive components and power.

In understanding the phenomenon of the hegemonic insider-outsider through Francisco’s story, it is imperative to observe his performance as a sociohistorical production. Thus, Francisco’s story needs to be addressed in relation to the system and structure of education and society that led him (and his partner Joe) to carry out such practice rather than interpreting it as a performance caused by an individual’s deficit and fault. The current education system can be identified as a complex assemblage (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987) that operates to serve white supremacist and colonial interests and agendas (Kanu, 2005). Even though higher education institutions often state a desire to promote diversity and internalization in their strategic plans, they are couched within intellectual norms and the notion of advancement constructed upon European ethnocentrism (Kanu, 2005; Viveiros de Castro, 2015). In this environment, global power relations and the othering process are also reinforced despite various assets of diversity and internationalization that students bring to the educational space (Pitts & Brooks, 2016; Viruru, 2005). Specifically, higher institutions’ neoliberal understanding and approach to diversity and internationalization, as well as other sociohistorical issues, perpetuate tensions and prejudices among different cultures, experiences, and educational backgrounds (De Lissovoy, 2013; Pitts & Brooks, 2016). An excerpt from Joe’s project
reflection provides an example of how global power relations were maintained and reproduced in the work of their group:

Francisco had a lot of ideas and was willing to share them out. We exchanged many ideas and found out that we had many similar ideas about the topic. He was also effective in finding related videos and pictures about the lesson; he found both of the videos and all the pictures that we used in the slides. (Project reflection, 12/12/2019)

As I reread this part of Joe’s reflection, two questions have appeared in the process. The first question is about the homogeneity of ideas shared in their workspace. The other question is about the power dynamic between the two students regarding the context of this course. I read the part “we had many similar ideas about the topic” as Joe’s expression of pleasure from noticing similar ideas for a lesson on bullying rather than a sense of frustration with indistinctive opinions. However, if we take account of Francisco and Joe’s different backgrounds, the shared ideas do not seem to contain their unique insights derived from their lived experiences. This realization led me to consider a point addressed in Montgomery’s (2009) study about cross-cultural interaction in universities. The author emphasizes the importance of opportunities to learn and discuss the complex “tensions that relate to culture, social status, and educational background” (p. 259) because they generate various preconceptions or prejudices toward other cultures and backgrounds (Montgomery, 2009). With Bhabha’s (1994/2004) concept of third space and hybridity, this process is a crucial foundation for the students to develop hybrid identities that enable them to resist and unlearn white supremacist and colonial knowledge and practices (Asher, 2009). Pitts and Brooks (2016) analyze that intercultural
interactions between home students and international students tend to proceed and evolve with preconceptions and misunderstandings of differences because universities do not allocate resources for a dialogue that examines power inequalities and cultural dominance in intercultural cooperation. This means that both Francisco and Joe were likely to be present and interact in the workspace while keeping the rigid borderlines created through the dominant discourse of society and cultural experiences limited to their own cultures. With this consideration, the homogeneity of ideas can be described as a manifestation of knowledge that serves the dominant ideologies. The different lines of knowledge linked to Francisco and Joe remained hidden and silenced, rather than non-existent, because this education space was not equipped for these lines to appear and make productions over the dominant power.

My second question was evoked from the quote “he [Francisco] found both of the videos and all the pictures that we used in the slides.” This outcome does not align with their early stage of project development that sought to balance their input. I wondered if this result is relevant to Pitts’ and Brooks’ (2016) observation that home country students’ voices are more influential in intercultural cooperative processes compared to international students’ input. The authors report that this common tendency is related to the power and cultural dominance rooted in the global white supremacy transmitted in interpersonal interactions and relationships (Pitts & Brooks, 2016). Once we acknowledge that whiteness and white supremacy operate in symbolic ways beyond the basis of race (Christian & Namaganda, 2018), it becomes clear that U.S. education has constructed and positioned an American home student to hold more privilege than an Asian international student. This is not simply because the home student’s position is an
insider/member of the society, but also because the home student possesses more
knowledge and experiences that are normalized and valued in the context. In Francisco’s
group, Francisco’s educational experience—spending more time in the U.S. schooling
system—and citizenship status—U.S. citizen—are closer to what would be considered
“normal” in the U.S. educational context. Therefore, Francisco’s insights and knowledge
are more likely to be accepted by the dominant perspective. When Francisco and Joe had
to make final decisions for their lesson, Francisco’s ideas were likely viewed as more
reliable and safer to present to their classmates because they were more “American” than
Joe’s opinions.

Here, it is worthwhile to validate the safety concern that may have led Francisco
and Joe to choose a “safer” direction that would not stir whiteness and white emotionality
(Amos, 2016; Matias, 2016). The safety issues include any risk and possibility of
experiencing denial, retaliation, and ostracism from their (white) classmates that
Francisco and Joe could experience after their lesson presentation (Amos, 2016). Amos
(2016) elaborates that a classroom in a white supremacist society is hardly a safe space
for students of color to speak up against whiteness and racism not only due to the
presence of white bodies, but also the presence of whiteness (Amos, 2016; Sleeter, 2001,
2017). Under this condition, therefore, the project’s requirement to “teach a lesson to the
class” must have been a difficult undertaking for students of color, especially if a group
wanted to address the issue of race and racism. To design and teach a lesson, Francisco
and Joe had to predict their classmates’ reactions and responses to their discussion
question. These are additional lines that were to be identified and incorporated in the
project, and they include lines that reinforce whiteness and white supremacy. In this vein,
in the story, Joe’s clarification question to the instructor, “So, we are designing a lesson and teaching it to this class,” can be interpreted as a gesture that recognizes any consideration and adjustment they had to make in regard to the intended audience. Leonardo and Porter (2010) remind us that students of color “may suspend their memory of white aggression in order to start anew, of renewing their hope that this time it will be different. Then they are reminded of the pattern they know so well and their disappointment haunts them” (p. 151). When Francisco started working on this project, he might have had to suspend his memory of white aggression to create the lesson for which he aimed. However, if/when his classmates, in general, were manifested as a form of whiteness rather than as allies, it became a factor that reminded him of the pattern and emotions that he knows so well.

Lastly, the classmates’ input during the lesson was one of the last chances that the various critical lines—possibilities and potential that the group created and possessed—could provoke and produce an empowering outcome(s). However, as described at the end of the story, the classmates’ participation also failed to spark a critical conversation on the topic of bullying. At the moment, the critical lines that were not supported by the teacher education remained not (yet) able to generate a deeper discussion about how bullying is linked to power dynamics, classroom management, and race and racism (Allen, 2010).

**Gary**

*Perspective that Inyeon Creates: Response to the School Visit Assignment*

Toward the end of this course, students are instructed to plan for their visit to a community or a school site for an assignment named “school visit assignment paper.”
This assignment can be described as a culminating assignment because students are expected to bring their learned knowledge and insights to their classroom observation and analysis of the visit. As preparation for this assignment, I ask students to proceed with self-reflection and preparation for their classroom visit which includes research of the site and community/neighborhood, reflecting on their own positionality, and taking an observation focus regarding the course topics. Gary writes in his preparation reflection, “I’m not sure if I want to focus on the students’ race, ethnicity, religion, etc. Not because they are unimportant, but because I won’t be able to assume the students’ identities correctly because that might cause problems if I wanted to divide my school visit paper based on such information.” Then he writes that he would use umbrella terms to describe students but was still concerned about the issues of inaccuracy: “I think this might lead to some issues as well. There may be inaccuracies but I’d take those over wrongly assuming a student is race X but they are actually race Y.”

Gary’s concerns about misidentifying students’ cultural/racial backgrounds have been raised several times before this assignment. One day in the fifth week of the semester, he shares an experience of being misidentified in an East Asian culture course: “The professor guessed my last name ‘yang’ as ‘양’ where the ‘a’ made an ‘ah’ sound. Because of the situation and class topic, I didn’t think to correct him, especially not in front of 100 other people.” While Gary seems to be careful of identifying other ethnicities and racial backgrounds, he tends to describe his culture and people who have a similar ethnic background more decisively, with confidence: “When discussing positionality and identity, all of me is relevant to this visit. […] the only thing that would offset me as an outsider is that I am a college student.” Gary expects that he would “blend in almost
immediately and should have minimal impact on daily class function.” He shows
confidence in understanding a possible classroom interaction: “I should be able to pick up
on when students are speaking another language [. . .] I say this because the majority of
the students at the school are going to be Hmong.” He is assured that he also should be
able to understand the class hierarchy and determine who stands in which position in the
classroom.

**Taking Responsibility for Inyeon**

In his book *Lee Jinkyung’s Philo-Cinema*, Lee (2008) characterizes inyeon as a
vestige of the past that binds the present and also an extension of the present that shapes
the future (p. 221). As he examines a movie titled *Ashes of Time* through the concept of
inyeon, Lee (2008) points out that inyeon is often a factor that makes people obsessed
with their past experiences, memories, and emotions. It also hinders people from being
present in the moment with what they encounter as they live because they try to hold on
to the past and the present to pass by. Through stories of different characters featured in
the movie, the author illustrates different roles and functions of inyeon in individual
people’s lives and relationships and emphasizes the importance of having an autonomous
attitude toward inyeon. Remember that inyeon is direct and indirect causes that are given
to us as well as produced by us individually and collectively as new seeds of causes; thus,
the autonomous attitude is acknowledging the given conditions and taking responsibility
for creating new circumstances and possibilities for the better. Lee (2008) describes that,
through an examination of a character named Hung Chi, this attitude is one way to
achieve liberation within entangled inyeon that does not deny or refuse the given
circumstances but rather takes the past experiences and memories as sources of insights
and motivations toward a better life and future. Another way of liberation, introduced through a character named Huang Yaoshi, is accomplished through erasing (bad) memories of the past by drinking a magic wine.

Lee’s (2008) gaze of inyeon illuminated in his examination of the movie is helpful to delve into the manifested moments in Gary’s story with a more complicated understanding of “how things are (inter)connected” in a teacher education space. The author’s examination of how different characters respond to the given circumstances and relationships is especially applicable for a post-intentional phenomenological reading of Gary’s and other students’ engagement in the “school visit assignment paper” project. While the author’s discussion centers around individual characters’ actions and their interpersonal impact in a given context, I aim to develop Lee’s (2008) approach with a sociohistorical understanding of individual students’ positions, experiences, and potential ties to the future. From this perspective, I do not consider Yaoshi’s decision not to remember his past connections as a liberatory action. Even though his decision may bring him the feeling of freedom from his past memories and relationships temporarily, it is an irresponsible action of disregarding traces that he participated in producing and fueling to operate in a space and among people.

In my reading of Gary’s story, Chi’s humble attitude toward inyeon and pursuit of righteousness is juxtaposed with Gary’s lived experiences as a Hmong American in the midwestern U.S. and as an aspiring teacher for Asian English Learner (EL) students, as represented in the course work and a research interview. Gary is a student who was determined in his goals regarding why he wants to be a teacher and what kind of teacher he wants to be. Even though he was still navigating what subject area he wanted to major
in, at the time, Gary’s motivation and goal were firm in that he wants to “create students who can think critically and deeply about something that matters to them” (Personal reflection, 09/12/2019). Gary elaborated on his schooling experience in that he was not able to see himself in materials taught in schools, which led him to recognize critical problems in the current education system and engage in questions about the education system:

I didn’t feel like the material was me; the material didn’t help me figure out who I was or what culture meant. I believed I would never have the answers to my questions because all I knew was that “the mitochondria are the powerhouse of the cell.” Perhaps maybe knowing only the mitochondria has led me here [soon-to-be participating in teaching] [. . .] I believe that our current educational system fails to successfully create thinkers. We fail to engage and intrigue the minds of the future. Hopefully I’ll be a part of the change that leads to a more thoughtful and educated future. (Personal reflection, 09/12/2019)

This excerpt from Gary’s personal reflection assignment completed at the beginning of the semester provides a glimpse of Gary’s inyeon with school education. Gary’s reflection corresponds with what Kohli (2009) addresses: “Most Teachers of Color enter teacher preparation programs with a wealth of knowledge about race and educational inequality” (p. 245). This insight displays that Gary also entered a teacher preparation program with a personal experience and understanding of racialized curricula and dominant perspectives in school education that were detached from him—his background, interests, and worldview (Kohli & Pizarro, 2016). In addition, Gary’s reflection “Perhaps maybe knowing only the mitochondria has led me here” shows that he is aware of the
reality that mastering that type of knowledge was still necessary to enter a teacher education program in a public research university of a state, even though the information about mitochondria was not helpful for questions that mattered to him (Apple, 1991).

Kohli (2009) highlights that “Through personal encounters, Teachers of Color are often already aware of the trauma that racism can cause students” (p. 236). However, despite the experiences of the racial minority, teachers of color are “valuable assets to the fight for educational justice” (p. 250), though their insights and strengths are often overlooked and devalued in teacher education programs (Kohli, 2009). As Kohli (2009) describes “racial minority teachers as insiders to the experiences of racism in school” (p. 250), it is critical to zoom in and acknowledge a teacher of color’s viewpoint addressed in teacher education. Gary’s reaction to the assignment “I’m not sure if I want to focus on the students’ race, ethnicity, religion, etc.” (Reflexive notebook, 11/05/2019) should, therefore, be interpreted as a provocation of his lived experience as a student of color in the racialized education system. As illustrated in the story, Gary’s concern about his assignment has a connection with his past experience of being misperceived in an Eastern Asian culture class. Gary shared the incident in his earlier reflexive notebook assignment that asked students to reflect on “moments when you feel that you were misunderstood, judged, excluded, and/or feeling left out due to other people’s assumption about you (your language, religion, race, ethnicity, appearance, gender, and/or social class).” Below is Gary’s description of the moments when people incorrectly assumed his ethnic background and pronunciation of his name:

I did have an instance where a professor read my last name “wrong”. [. . .]

Because of the situation and class topic, I didn’t think to correct him, especially in
front of 100 other people. [. . .] I don’t remember which class but there was one in
which we reflected on when people [had] gotten something wrong about me. I
wrote then, that having my name pronounced wrong actually kind of hurt
emotionally. I think that’s when I began to appreciate my name more. (Reflexive
notebook, 10/01/2019)

In the context of the course that teaches about East Asian culture, the professor presumed
that either Gary’s last name, Yang, was an English spelled Korean last name ‘양’ or that
it is acceptable to pronounce any last name spelled “Yang” in a way with which he was
familiar. Either way, it shows the professor’s cultural insensitivity in his not making an
effort to ask and learn the pronunciation of his student’s name. As Gary recognized
through a reflective opportunity provided in a class, this experience remained in his
memory tied to a hurtful emotion. The experience itself is one thread of Gary’s inyeon
with racialized education. The related and provoked emotions, feelings, memories, and
thoughts—such as the hurtful emotion—are other lines of inyeon that are (potential) sources
of Gary’s knowledge and perspective on education that enabled him to discern potential
harm and problems of practice in a teacher education program.

Gary’s concern about misidentifying students’ racial, ethnic, and cultural
backgrounds was a response to a reflexive notebook assignment that asked students to
describe a site that they chose to visit, reflect on their positionality relevant to the visit,
and explore what kind of interactions/situations they are interested in focusing on for this
assignment. Before he stated his concern, Gary wrote that he wants to “focus on how the
teacher interacts with their students.” He specified, “I want to be able to figure out what
their lesson plan was and how student input was implemented during the lesson. I want to see how the students interacted with the lesson plan as well” (Reflexive notebook, 11/05/2019). The considerations with which Gary proceeded in the planning and preparation stage of the assignment illuminate that he recognized the necessity of understanding individual students’ backgrounds to properly examine and discuss the teacher and their students’ interactions. According to Kohli (2009), teachers of color’s schooling experience, having dealt with racism, enables them to “identify their responsibility and agency in interrupting racial injustice” (p. 245). Since Gary was familiar with educational activities centered on the experience and needs of white people, the responsibility and agency that he had with students of color would have manifested when he was envisioning his visit and the work he was going to produce (Burciaga & Kohli, 2018; Goodwin, 2004).

Gary’s insight demands us to take into account potential harm that this type of assignment—an assignment based on a one-time visit and observation—can cause and perpetuate in teacher education. Burciaga and Kohli (2018) argue that racial bias is reinforced in teacher education programs by privileging Eurocentric and neoliberal perspectives in the curricula. Because the programs often need to squeeze various requisites into the limited schedule of their curriculum, they do not allocate enough time and effort to understand diverse cultural norms and performances that require deeper engagement, observation, and reflection. Considering the sequence of this EDU110 course, this assignment was developed for students to get a view of classroom practice and interaction based on what they have learned and discussed in this course. As elementary education majors will have chances to work with classrooms in their future
student teaching experiences in the program, this course mainly focuses on introducing various topics and practices in elementary education. However, in spite of the intention, students were likely to participate in reinforcing colorblindness and/or cultural stereotypes in some way by completing this school visit assignment.

On one hand, if students write the paper without considering and mentioning students’ racial, ethnic, and cultural backgrounds, they are taking part in sustaining racism and colorblindness in pedagogical practice. In this class, this was a route that many (white) students had taken for this assignment by including minimal discussion of race and racism. The majority of these students started their reflection by listing a few aspects of their positionality and background, then continued and concluded the paper after barely addressing the racial and cultural composition and how it is manifested in the classroom. On the other hand, even if students were to write the paper with racial and cultural aspects in mind—such as Gary accomplished—they had to make assumptions and judgments about students’ backgrounds based on what they were able to see and notice during the visit. Since most students had little prior understanding of individual students until the visit, they would have had to identify students’ positionalities relying on limited information from their one-time visit and/or superficial interaction in the classroom. This approach is also problematic, as Gary mentioned, because there is a risk of misidentifying students’ identities, and a further examination based on this incorrect information is an act of reproducing cultural stereotypes, and is also likely to produce a fraudulent understanding of the students, teacher, and school community.

Given that colorblindness does not acknowledge an enduring operation of racism, I found a similarity between the students’ approaches that overlooks or denies the impact
of racism, like how Yaoshi moved away from his past memories and relationships through not remembering the past. The sense of freedom that Yaoshi attained by forgetting his past decisions, actions, and relationships is no more than an avoidance of inyeon that is still tied to him, regardless of his memory. Similarly, if one feels like racism does not exist anymore or race and racism are a trivial issue in education, they have yet to learn and recognize how they are bound to the history of racism or simply disregard the reality that makes them uncomfortable. Below is an example of a student’s, Lena’s, note in the planning stage of the school visit paper assignment that reveals her colorblind perspective and belief in meritocracy:

There are also some things [of being white] that could hurt me. For example, to some students, being white means that success was just handed to me. The word entitled comes to a lot of people’s minds when they think of white people. However, with such a young group of kids, I don’t know how much of a negative impact it would have on them. (Reflexive notebook, 11/05/2019)

Freire (1970/2000) argues that ignorance maintains oppression over others; therefore, paying attention to the oppressive aspects and examining our position in the system of oppression are a vital basis to intervene in the system. However, the kind of perspectives shown through Lena’s writing refuse to acknowledge and remember the history of white supremacy and whiteness they have embodied. While many white people enjoy white comfort by remaining indifferent to their inyeon with white supremacy and racism, the lines of inyeon associated with racial oppression continue to function to preserve, diffuse, and strengthen their oppressive power in education and society.
Gary’s aspiration to become a teacher to Asian American students has a resemblance with Chi’s decision to move forward with every inyeon of him. As Chi undertook all the good and the bad from his past and present relationships, Gary accepted his complex connections to the Hmong culture and community including cultural traditions and values with which he does not agree. During our conversation about how his cultural background has influenced or motivated him, Gary responded, “my motives are driven by the fact that I stand against my own culture, my own tradition.” He mentioned several cultural expectations that he does not support:

I think in most Asian cultures, you are bounded [sic] by duty to respect the elders. You have to listen to them, not exactly have your life controlled by them, but that’s kind of the idea behind it, and I absolutely hate that. [. . .] I think one of the cases in my culture [is that] it’s taboo or it’s wrong to date someone of the same last name. Because I’m one of those people who believe if you really love that person, then nothing can stop you or nothing should stop you from loving that person. And then in my culture, they’re saying it’s “no, you can’t do that. It’s wrong.” (Interview, 01/29/2020)

As noted above, Gary felt conflicted when his values and perspectives clashed with a cultural norm and expectation in his family. Later in the conversation, Gary also shared that there were many occasions that he felt guilty when he thought about his parents. Since his decisions will impact his parents’ reputation in the wider community, Gary worried about his parents being ostracized from the community due to his decision that does not align with the community’s norms and values. Meanwhile, Gary also observed that “the Hmong community is becoming more and more distant from each other”
because of generational and cultural tensions, and it made him “feel guilty being against” his own cultural norm (Interview, 01/29/2020).

Even though Gary stated that “standing against” his own culture motivated him to be the kind of person he is now, it should be perceived that Gary has complex attachments, connections, and also responsibility to his culture and community. These complex connections that Gary has with his culture, community, and racialized education system are the basis of his insight that detected the limitation of the assignment. In their study about the capacity and commitment of teachers of color, Kohli et al. (2019) suggest looking into whether a teacher education program provides adequate support and pedagogy that builds on prospective teachers of color’s assets and needs. They inform that teachers of color usually have to find a space outside their teacher education program to process learning and reflection needed to become the teachers they want to be, including unlearning internalized racism (Kohli et al., 2019). In Gary’s case, he utilized the reflexive notebook assignments as a space to express, ask, reflect, and analyze his experiences, observations, and perspectives related to the topics addressed in this course. One manifestation in my reading of Gary’s course engagement was that he showed a great confidence in identifying issues in Hmong culture and understanding individual students’ performances and status in a classroom with a Hmong student majority. In addition to the illustration in the story, below is an example quoted from Gary’s school visit paper assignment:

I should be able to pick apart the class hierarchy and determine who stands where and why. I should be able to see who is the “troublemaker,” quiet person, loud
person, etc. This is because I was once in their seats. (School visit paper, 01/21/2020)

This attitude is in contrast to Gary’s attitude toward other cultures as he was cautious of generalizing his experiences of different cultures and acknowledged the partiality of his knowledge and understanding. For example:

I felt like he was almost looking down on me. I think it might be because he was six or seven years older than me. I kind of have a lower view of myself when dealing with people that are a little bit older than me. So that might be the reason why I just felt that way. […] I can't or I won't generalize it to the general Korean population because I haven't met a lot of native Korean. (Interview, 01/28/2020)

My intention is never to minimize the value and power of Gary’s insights and experiences. Instead, my analysis is an attempt to find a view of Gary’s lines of inyeon that were affected by racism and could exert influence on his educational practices. As Philip et al. (2017) address, teachers of color could “unintentionally reproduce dominant narratives while attempting to challenge them” due to internalized racism that is difficult to avoid embodying in the racialized and white supremacist world. Thus, Gary’s confidence in his understanding of the Hmong culture and community may “reproduce or create new forms of racialized oppression by engaging in friendly-fire racism” (Philip et al., 2017, p. 73) if he does not recognize and unlearn internalized racism (Kohli, 2012, 2014). In reference to Lee’s (2008) elaboration on inyeon that could hold one back from moving forward, internalized racism is threads of inyeon that impede Gary from being an empowering teacher to Asian EL students. Similar to other teachers of color’s stories that Kohli (2014) shares, Gary’s schooling experiences also reveal that he had repeatedly
confronted “experiences with racism and feeling racially inferior” (p. 375). For instance, Gary had heard comments such as “an Asian boy wants to be white” and “he would want to be surrounded by white Americans” regarding his academic and friendship pursuits and decisions he made (Personal reflection, 09/12/2019). This connects to Anzaldúa’s (1987) borderlands experience, that people who live in borderlands encounter tensions arising from two separate communities as they navigate and fit into the distinct cultures and norms. Since his schools had not helped him to “grasp at his culture and who he is” (Personal reflection, 09/12/2019), Gary had little chance to “critically deconstruct his experiences with injustice in schools and internalized racism” (Kohli, 2014, p. 380).

Throughout the semester, Gary maintained critical engagement in the course assignments–such as reflexive notebook assignments–by rereading, reflecting, examining, and critiquing his past experiences and surroundings. However, admittedly, those assignments did not equip him to unpack racist ideologies that he had internalized to live, survive, and succeed in this society. I wonder how his view of his culture and community would have been different if Gary was able to investigate racist ideologies that influenced his perception of them. According to Kohli’s (2014) study, learning one’s own history and culture from a non-West/Eurocentric perspective enables teachers of color to develop pride for their communities and racial identity. Gary would have been able to rethink his past experiences and perspective and re-evaluate his culture from a different vantage point. As inyeon is an extension of the present that shapes the future, this course stimulated Gary to pay attention to his inyeon that are linked to his past experiences and relationships; he revisited and pulled out his stories as valuable sources to address educational inequality and provide insight for change. Yet, this class failed to
guide Gary to discover and reinterpret cultural and historical threads of inyeon that might bring him joy, power, and pride in his future endeavor against institutional racism and reimagining schooling.
Chapter 7. Analysis of Desire

A TV show, Extraordinary You, that was broadcast in 2019, portrays a character named Danoh and her attempt to change her given circumstance and destiny after she gains an awareness that she and many others are just side characters in a made-up world. Even though Danoh is the main character of the show, she does not play a main role in the world featured in the story based on a comic book entitled Secrete. Before she gains the awareness, Danoh does not know that she could hope to be liberated from the writer’s control over her life and fate. As she keeps wondering why other “extras” and she are supposed to make every move to support the main plot of the story centered around the main characters, Danoh starts to view the given conditions differently. Although she acknowledges that the writer’s control is too strong to defy—just like the dominant and oppressive power and system in a society—she still strives to make choices to change her life to become more meaningful to her. One of the actions she takes is naming an extra character, Number 13, who the writer did not assign a name. She starts calling the student Haru, and Haru becomes a meaningful person to Danoh, even if Haru still remains a nobody in the made-up world. Starting with this episode, this show features two extra characters’ desires, challenges, and emotions at the center of the true plot.

By this show focusing on Danoh, what happens to the main characters of the fantasy world becomes no longer a significant interest to the viewer. I find this approach to not only enable the featuring of the two extra characters, Danoh and Haru, by relocating them to the center of the narrative, but also to offer a chance to view normal and natural—designated by the writer—as abnormal and strange from Danoh’s standpoint. Admittedly, this setting reproduces other extra characters by focusing on Danoh;
however, I still consider this attempt powerful because it calls out the normalized
dominant power—the writer of the fantasy world—and makes the viewer think about the
writer’s perspective and decisions that constructed the settings. Danoh’s questioning of
the status quo generates new possibilities for change and becoming. Also, her naming of
an unnamed character manifested to me as a phenomenological moment in which Danoh
discovers her intentionality—desire—toward the student and validates it by calling him
Haru. Number 13 becomes a significant person as Danoh recognizes and names him.
Chunsu Kim’s (n.d.) poem “The Flower” illustrates this phenomenological process
beautifully and vividly:

**The Flower**¹¹

Before I called her name,
she was nothing
more than a gesture.

When I called her name,
she came to me
and became a flower.

Like I called her name,
will someone please call my name
that suits my light and fragrance?
I, too, long to come to her
and become her flower.

We all long to be something.
You, to me, and I, to you,
long to become a gaze that won’t be forgotten.

In this chapter, I invite the reader to engage in the phenomenological process of
discovering and naming multiple desires in this teacher education space. Based on

---

¹¹ Translated by Uchang Kim: https://koreanliteraturenow.com/poetry/excerpts/kim-chunsu-flower
Deleuze and Guattari’s conceptualization of desire, I challenge the understanding of desire as an absence or lack, or its common association with sexual and corporeal interest. Tuck (2010) elaborates on Deleuze and Guattari’s desire as the following: “For Deleuze and Guattari, desire is not an absence—not something that is blocked or missing, so therefore wanting. It is not a hole, not a gap, not a lacking, but an exponentially growing assemblage” (p. 639). From this perspective, desire can rather be perceived as potential and possibility. Two stories pivoted\(^{12}\) on Choua will introduce the reader to the discussion of multiple desires that I have come to notice in an educational space.

Specifically, what I intend in this chapter is a twofold process: first, looking at desires as generative forces and flows. This process is similar to what *Extraordinary You* attempts: offering a viewpoint that is different from a general perspective. Second, finding and discovering multiple desires in this space and naming them. This is comparable to how the producers locate Danoh—an extra character—at the center of the plot as well as Danoh naming Haru and building a relationship with him. Considering the multiplicity of desire, I acknowledge that I cannot highlight every desire in this chapter. As I zoom into certain desires and their manifested relationships, other desires and other aspects of desires inevitably remain unnoticed and not discussed. However, as *Extraordinary You* exemplifies, I want the reader to consider this chapter one attempt to provide a clearer description of normalized dominant desires and undervalued desires in this teacher education space.

\(^{12}\) I use the word “pivot” here to mean that Choua is the main character of the stories that illustrate how the hegemonic insider-outsider takes shape by Choua and others. The stories are not “about” Choua.
Choua

*Hidden Desires: Cultural and Ethical Orientations*

Choua always arrives early to the classroom and helps me put tables together to make a large group table for 11 people. “How are you?” she usually asks before I do. Choua is a good listener, but she does not share her stories very much during class. During the interview, Choua shares her ambivalent feelings about sharing her stories in classes, especially when it comes to her cultural background: “At first I thought that they are really interested in my cultural background. But sometimes they keep asking me questions that make me think ‘do you really not know anything about this?’ I’m like ‘are you really interested in learning about my cultural background?’” She considers it a positive change that people are willing to learn about other cultures, and she wants people to know about her cultural background and experiences. However, Choua also feels frustrated and upset when others try to comprehend her culture from their standpoints and judge her cultural practices and customs: “It’s difficult to explain my culture to others. I also worry about whether I’m correctly representing my culture, you know. Also, I do not always agree with my culture. We also clash in my community, and there are people who do not practice traditional things anymore.”

When I ask her what motivates her to be a teacher, she shares in a determined voice, “I really like focusing on giving to the community. It’s like taking your time and doing nice things or volunteering for stuff, even though it doesn’t really benefit you.” Choua considers giving back to the community to be the main motive in her teacher education: “I know some people don’t do that. Why do you think, it’s like, if you give, [you] need something back? You don’t always need to get something back.” She is calm,
but the melancholy in her voice is still noticeable as she continues, “I feel like people don’t care about that anymore. It’s like everything you do, [you] have to get something back, and it sucks. You don’t have to gain back. I want to change that mindset in education.” When Choua adds that something we potentially gain back from giving might be hidden or invisible at the moment, it reminds me of my grandmother who asks me to do good things for other people without thinking of gaining something from the actions. I ask what might influence and motivate her to be a certain kind of person, and Choua shares that her religious belief is an important basis of her moral values: “I practice shamanism, so I believe in spirits and all that. Being a shaman pushes me to really cherish my family because that’s what we’re all about is family. Even when someone dies, we go visit them.”

**Mapping Desires**

If I had not interviewed her for this dissertation research, I would have remembered and interpreted Choua as a student who did not show much interest in developing her learning and engagement in racial and cultural issues in education. In a course assignment, for example, Choua expressed that she feels sad to see students, especially students of color, who do not try more and harder and end up dropping out (Personal reflection, 09/12/2019). Based on my limited understanding of Choua and relying on the given information in the paper, my first reading of this reflection made me wonder why she did not have much to say about racism and inequality in the current public school system as a student of color (Kohli, 2009; Kohli & Pizarro, 2016). Her viewpoint on students of color’s efforts in their schooling conveyed in this assignment, as well as in other assignments, also concerned me that Choua believed the myth of
meritocracy (Delpit, 2012). During the semester, as an instructor, I focused on encouraging her to reflect and elaborate more on racial and cultural issues in education and society. My comments on her assignments were centered around asking Choua to address more about critical issues that we discussed in class as well as correcting some of the words she used, such as “colored people” instead of “people of color.” Admittedly, my own teaching philosophy and understanding of what critical engagement could and should be in teacher education was the basis of this pedagogical approach with Choua. As Philip (2014) elaborates in his study on Asian American prospective teachers’ heterogeneous perception and understanding of their racial identities, I tried to unlearn the assumption that students of color are automatically “down” with racial dialogue and developing a critical consciousness on race and racism.

The story above, constructed based on Choua’s narrative shared in the interview, opens up multiple desires that she did not explicitly express during the coursework. My reading of phenomenological materials produced by Choua completely shifted after I completed this interview with her. With the mixed feelings of surprise, gladness, and regret that I experienced during and after the interview, Choua’s desires conveyed in her narrative became more clear to me. I was surprised to encounter her enthusiastic presence in engaging in a conversation about topics of culture and race which contrasted with her minimal articulation during the semester. I was glad to know that Choua was aware of the issues addressed in the course—because I was concerned about this throughout the period of the course—which means she was not indifferent to the topics. My regret came from the fact that my pedagogical approach could have been more properly adjusted to Choua’s
interests and needs; I wished I had had a better understanding of her cultural and ethical
desires before the semester was over.

Zembylas’s (2007) pedagogy of desire provides valuable insight into
understanding multiple desires in an institutional space, such as a teacher education
classroom, and how different desires are valued or suppressed in the space. Zembylas
(2007) develops the pedagogy of desire based on Deleuze and Guattari’s sociopolitical
notion that desire is a generative force and flow that “is continuous and is always
becoming” (p. 336, emphasis in original). He elaborates on the pedagogy with
Pignatelli’s subject of desire in education: the “pedagogy of desire that extends the
surface of pedagogical relations ‘beyond the limits of what seems reasonable and
apparent as it acknowledges variant, multiple, shifting expressions of pleasure and pain,
generative memories, possible futures, and buried, harsh injustices’ (Pignatelli, 1999)”
pedagogy enables us to examine various norms and assumptions in teacher education and
to map “new landscapes of possibility for political resistance and transformation of
oneself and one’s world without being confined in repressive discourse” (p. 335). With
this approach, I aim to interrogate Choua’s desires as a “historical practice” (Zembylas,
2007, p. 338, emphasis in original) that is intertwined with other desires, social powers,
and relations in teacher education.

**Cultural Desire.**

During the interview, Choua’s cultural desire was expressed in the form of
wishing to disseminate information and stories about Hmong culture to her classmates.
The story describes Choua as willing to share her experiences as a Hmong person to her
classmates when they asked about her cultural background. She considered the questions, at first, as a gesture of really being interested in knowing and learning about Hmong culture (Interview, 01/29/2020). Choua said, “I enjoy that they are curious about [my culture], but sometimes I’m like ‘have you thought about doing some research [before asking questions] or did you not learn anything about this in high school?’” (Interview, 01/29/2020). As we can see, she was glad to see people wanting to learn about her culture, and it led her to share stories about Hmong culture and her lived experiences as Hmong. However, Choua became skeptical of some of her classmates’ sincerity in learning about her culture after encountering repeated questions about her cultural background without proceeding with minimal prior research and an effort to know about the topic. Choua addressed this earlier in the semester: “when I try to explain my culture to others and they do not understand why we do [certain] things, I often tell them without realizing ‘because you are not Hmong you wouldn't understand’ and people get offended and [sic] misunderstood me” (Reflexive notebook, 10/01/2019). During our interview, Choua did not specify in which course and when she encountered such moments, other than that she did not have to explain her cultural background to others frequently before she came to college.

Choua’s experience in college that contrasts with her high school years led me to focus on how her cultural background and experiences are positioned differently in these institutional settings. According to the story, in college, when her classmates asked about her cultural background, Choua had a chance to talk about the topic. Even though the classmates were in the position of asking for information from Choua, they were not appreciative of the information that she provided nor ashamed of their ignorant attitude
toward another’s culture. They seemed to take Choua’s labor of sharing her stories and knowledge for granted. It displays that Hmong culture was minoritized and marginalized by the oppressive power at play in the system, and the university failed to trouble the dominant power and foster an inclusive environment where all cultures are respected and valued equally. On the one hand, for instance, if Hmong culture had held a dominant position in the context, Choua would not have been asked to explain her cultural background as it had been in her high school. On the other hand, if it had been an environment where every culture is equally respected, the classmates’ approach would have been more sophisticated and respectful even if they were not familiar with Choua’s cultural background and experiences. However, in the reality where racism and white supremacy are prevalent, racial and cultural hierarchy were maintained and reproduced in individual students’ interactions and relationships.

If we look into power relations between Choua and her classmates, it is evident that Choua was not the person who took the initiative in sharing information about Hmong culture. It was her classmates who had the power to control the space through demanding Choua talk about her culture and experience and judging her cultural practices through their fixed perspectives. In this space, Choua’s desire was enacted as a generative force to disseminate the correct knowledge and stories of Hmong culture. However, racism and white supremacy represented and (re)produced through her classmates’ demeanors during their interactions hindered the desire from producing at its full capacity and potential to become a liberative action (Post-reflexive journal, 01/29/2020).

If we hold the Lacanian perspective that views desire as a drive to fulfill a “lack” or “absence” toward wholeness and completeness (Zembylas, 2007, p. 335), then
Choua’s desire cannot be understood beyond the existing image of wholeness and completeness of a culture and its status. What would be the wholeness and completeness that this desire aimed for if a kind of lack or absence made Choua wish for Hmong culture to be better known and properly recognized? Is the U.S. dominant culture of white, middle-class, and European descent the ideal that Choua’s desire aims to achieve? Considering the sociopolitical dimensions where the desire was situated, the desire to share stories of her cultural practices and customs and to want people to better understand Hmong culture is associated with the cultural marginalization rooted in white supremacy. Admittedly, the desire is linked to the current position of Hmong culture that is minoritized by white supremacy and racism. Choua pursued the desire as she was longing for a different reality, wanting people to better recognize her culture; however, it must not be interpreted as a desire that is rooted in a lack of Hmong culture. Not having as much oppressive and dominant power and status compared to the dominant white culture is absolutely not a lack and absence of a culture. Therefore, when we are confined to the notion of desire as lack, the meaning of Choua’s desire would be merely interpreted as her drive to overcome the lack of reality, and we will miss other significant meanings and orientations of the desire.

Zembylas (2007) points out that this notion of “desire as lack” leads us to be caught up in a fantasy that is not real and creates a false image that hinders us from recognizing possibilities that we already possess. Zembylas (2007) elaborates:

Since fantasies do not correspond to anything in the real, desires rely on lack; it is this lack which ensures that the object of our desire will always elude us. This is because the wholeness and completeness we are looking to the Other to give us is
impossible, says Lacan, since it came to us from an image (Felman, 1987). (p. 335)

On the other hand, Deleuze and Guattari’s (1987) notion of desire as an “autonomous and productive force” enables us to look at “networks of power and circuits of desire” in the university setting (Zembylas, 2007, p. 335-336). It offers a space to examine how Choua’s desire was positioned and operated in the institution as well as other systemic and structural forces that impeded the operation and expression of the desire. Additionally, Tuck’s (2010) understanding of desire based on Indigenous knowledge systems broadens our viewpoint that desire is not only sociopolitical, but also generational. Tuck (2010) introduces,

Desire, for my part, accumulates wisdom, picking up flashes of self-understanding and world-understanding along the way of a life. This wisdom is assembled not just across a lifetime, but across generations, so that my desire is linked, rhizomatically, to my past and my future. (p. 645)

With this, we can start looking into Choua’s desire as a sociopolitical and generational desire that maintains links to the past and the future of herself, her community, and broader society (Tuck, 2010, p. 645).

Choua’s desire generated an action of bringing in Hmong culture to the space with a hope of making the culture properly acknowledged, appreciated, and shared in society – not through the “white supremacist gaze” (hooks, 1995, p. 62). Based on Tuck’s (2010) elaboration, I interpret that Choua’s desire was fueled by inherited wisdoms and power from her ancestors and community that resisted white supremacist and racist desires against her culture. The university system was where Choua found it challenging...
to pursue the desire, not only because of the oppressive desires and forces that tried to subjugate her desire, but also because there were so few people of color on campus that she could unite in pursuing her desire. She mentioned that a student support program for students from disadvantaged and underrepresented backgrounds was one of the few spaces where she saw other students of color on campus, while there were only a couple of students of color in most of the courses she took. This means that there were fewer chances to find comrades who shared the same or similar desires that resist the white supremacist approach and understanding of cultures (Lee, 2008). In this kind of space, Choua was likely to bear even more of a burden of representing her culture.

This difficulty is illustrated at the end of the first part of the story, in which Choua encountered a dilemma when she was to explain her culture to others. As an insider to her own culture, Choua was aware of the multiplicity and multidimensions of Hmong culture and her experiences as a Hmong (hooks, 1995). To better understand the dilemma that Choua encountered, the simplistic understanding of “culture” that was normalized in the given context is helpful. Alvaré (2017) articulates this problem of cultural essentialism:

Culture is conceptualised as timeless and monolithic, an adaptation to fixed political and economic structural conditions. Since cultures are assumed to be both essential and homogenous, any individual member of a culture can be considered to be an “authentic” representative or embodiment of that culture. (p. 36)

As Alvaré (2017) states, these essentialized assumptions are often projected onto people of color and their cultures. Choua might have also recognized these assumptions of her and Hmong culture when she received the questions about her cultural practices and
customs. However, because Choua knew very well that Hmong culture cannot be monolithic and fixed as people may assume, explaining her culture to others could not have been an easy task. Choua indicated during the interview that she “agrees with some of the things in [her] cultural background and there are some things that [she does not] agree with” (Interview, 01/29/2020). This implies that she held a complicated stance and viewpoint on Hmong culture. The fact that Choua practiced a cultural custom in her family does not mean that she agrees with the custom; at the same time, maintaining a critical stance on cultural practices should not be simply viewed as Choua hating her culture. Due to the complexity and multiplicity of which Choua was conscious, she was cautious about the possibilities of misrepresenting her culture to other people (Interview, 01/29/2020). This understanding demands a nuanced interpretation of Choua’s desire to promote a better recognition and understanding of Hmong culture to more people. The desire is not simply about having people learn and know about Hmong culture; it also wishes for her culture not to be “essentialized nor exoticized” by individual people and society. A Trinidadian teacher’s response (cited in Alvaré, 2017) to their essentialized and exoticized culture in a professional development program is a powerful reminder of what an essentialized concept of culture fails to grasp: “We are just a simple people doing what ordinary people do” (p. 45).

Related to the Trinidadian teacher’s point on cultural representation and understanding, the white supremacist desire and power reinforce inaccurate and exclusive understandings of the ordinary features of other cultures and desires of their communities (Alvaré, 2017). Based on this insight, I returned to Choua’s assignments and reread to find her cultural desires conveyed in her writings, as I had previously missed noticing the
connotations. I realized that my expectation of a well-articulated discussion and reflection on her racial, social, and cultural identities and experiences (Reflexive notebook instruction, 2019) was not very different from the essentialized understanding of culture. I kept looking for critical discussions on culture that addressed unique cultural practices and customs, struggles, and pain that people of color and their communities experience (Watkins & Noble, 2019). Due to this limited understanding and approach, the ordinary cultural experiences and insights that reveal Choua’s desires slipped past my eyes. For example, during the semester, I concluded that she did not deeply consider cultural and racial issues of students and classroom interactions when she was preparing her school visit assignment through a reflexive notebook assignment. However, as I reread her assignment with the new awareness, I was able to recognize that Choua succinctly expressed her observational foci that were relevant to her desires linked to her culture and community. Choua wrote,

Because I am a minority, I understand that other students struggle and would not be all the same level. I can see the determined young ones who are eager to learn and help their fellow classmates. [. . .] Coming from a big family and the oldest, I can see that a lot of kids would want to be in charge of many things. They are very caring children but would like to be [in] charge of groups and people.

(Reflexive notebook, 11/05/2019)

What she was interested in observing for her school visit assignment was different from many dominant narratives in teacher education, such as how students of color are treated differently by their teacher or how racism is enacted in the classroom. Choua also did not use much vocabulary explicitly indicating that she was addressing the issues of race and
culture, other than the word “minority.” However, if we acknowledge her relationship with her culture and community and broaden our understanding of culture and cultural practice, this excerpt can be read as a composite of Choua’s various desires associated with her cultural practices tied to her roles and viewpoints as a family member, a community member, a future educator, and a former K-12 student in local schools (Paik et al., 2014). In other words, her insider view and experiences with family, community, and educational backgrounds enabled her to notice these aspects in education that might not be discernible to others. Based on this, her desires generated the forces for her actions; the assignment is one of the actions that the desires produced.

**Ethical Desire.**

The second part of the story introduces the reader to Choua’s axiological orientation. Wilson (2008) highlights that our knowledge and social practices cannot be separated from our relationships to this world. These relationships include one’s spirituality that is “[the] internal sense of connection to the universe” (Wilson, 2008, p. 90). From this viewpoint, one’s spiritual belief—not limited to religious background—is an important basis to understand one’s values, motivations, and needs. Prima (2014) reviews the idea that understanding students’ axiological orientations enables identifying value-based priorities in school settings. Meanwhile, teachers can develop a “philosophical-pedagogical strategy” (p. 13) which differentiates instructions and the division of educational resources that support individual students’ growth in embracing values and motivations they cherish (Prima, 2014). Reflecting on my own teaching practice as a teacher, my own axiological orientation was never separable from the way I take on education and my belief of how education should be. While it is a strong foundation of
my teaching and learning, I barely have had a chance to openly discuss it and learn to explore my ideas because addressing this topic was considered taboo in most educational spaces both in South Korea and the U.S. This conversation is even harder for people whose ethical orientations are not rooted and confined in a specific religious teaching or theory that is familiar to many people in the context, as these alternative beliefs and perspectives could be more easily considered illogical, idiosyncratic, or even dangerous from the dominant perspective (Allen, 1992; Jaimes-Guerrero, 2003; Lugones, 2007). Due to these circumstances, students’ reflections and elaboration on questions that ask “Why do you want to be the kind of teacher that you hope to become?” are often limited in providing examples of their teacher role models or describing how they see teaching as a good fit considering their personality and experiences, such as rewarding nannying and tutoring experiences.

In the given circumstances, Choua’s response about her axiological orientation that she shared during the interview offers an additional lens to better recognize her desires that were not revealed as much previously. When Choua disclosed her ethical values and her practice of shamanism that explain how this background influenced her to do good deeds, additional dimensions of Choua’s desire started to reveal themselves more. I already knew that Choua was a warm-minded person who cared for other people’s well-being and humanity from her personal goals and through my interaction with Choua and reading her assignments during the course. However, I still wondered how she was able to maintain such an attitude in this individualistic society and institution where “self-reliance, independence and personal goals” (p. 2) are prioritized and valued (Cortina et al., 2017). The interview reveals that Choua’s ethical desire that
motivated her to take time and actions for other people was not driven by an egocentric or materialistic desire to gain something back by doing. This contrasts with individualistic and capitalistic desires which represent the dominant U.S. ideologies that focus on accumulation of material wealth for one’s own sake (Miller & Josephs, 2009).

In our conversation, Choua talked about how what we can see and know immediately are not all that exist in this world, including people’s connections with other beings, both human and non-human. This perspective is quite different from the dominant ideologies in the U.S. that prioritize graspable causality and are confined to an individualistic worldview. What Choua meant by doing good things and helping the community does not mean that she intended the potential beneficiaries of the actions to be people in her own community. Choua elaborated:

Why do you think, it's like, if I give, I need something back, but you don't always need something back? You always get more knowledge from other people.

Especially, you should not just only help your own community, your own cultural background, but should help everyone who are [sic] not in your culture background. I feel like people don't care about that anymore. It's like everything you do is to get something back, and it sucks. You don't have to gain [anything] back. (Interview, 01/29/2020)

In his comparison of the dominant U.S. values and “some other traditional countries’ values”, Kohls (1984) juxtaposed the U.S.’s individualism with some other countries’ value of “group’s welfare.” While his analysis is not completely invalid, Kohls (1984) failed to grasp ontological and epistemological perspectives of many other ethnic and cultural groups that are different from his own. As discussed earlier, Choua’s desire is
rather opposite to individualism, but this does not mean that she prioritized her own cultural group’s welfare. As we see in the excerpt above, Choua did not limit the scope of her actions and responsibility to her own community. Even though she did not elaborate on her “hidden motivation” (Interview, 01/29/2020) further, this response tells us that we cannot recognize her ethical desire properly if our perspective is confined to a “single life world” (Lau, 2016).

Based on this understanding, my reading of Choua’s desire expressed in her assignments can be more nuanced and broadened in a rhizomatic way (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987; Lee, 2002; Vagle, 2018). Here, I provide an example from the reflexive notebook assignments that Choua completed earlier in the semester. For this assignment, I asked students to make a focused observation of people’s interactions in a space, and Choua conducted this assignment at a local café. She wrote, “I noticed that people are too busy to interact with others. Electronic devices have taken over and pushed us away from interacting with others” (Reflexive notebook, 09/26/2019). While this can be simply read as Choua’s observation of human interaction at the café, it also provides a glimpse of her desire to care for other people and how this space was unfavorable to that desire. Her observation focused on how utilizing electronic devices makes people in the same physical space indifferent to each other. I wondered if this café’s conflicting atmosphere with her and her family’s values provoked Choua to pay attention to the lack of interaction in the space. Choua explained that her family prioritized sharing resources and helping their neighbors, and those actions were settled in her family’s everyday life. She gave an example of her and her siblings shoveling snow for an elderly woman who lived next door. Knowing the work they provided was not a one-time volunteer service, I
consider that the effort would not be possible without a caring connection with her neighbor. This also shows that the desire to care for others is normalized and promoted in Choua’s family and community.

The café, on the other hand, is not a space where such a desire is fostered and appreciated. Despite the lack of interactions she observed, Choua still perceived the space as a welcoming environment for a place to study, talk, and relax. It shows that Choua was also influenced by the atmosphere of the space in which individualism is normalized and expected by individual people staying in the space. She acknowledges that she is oblivious to other people and her surroundings when she is in a space like this café: “it amazed me to see what everyone was doing, as I do not often sit down and actually see what people do” (Reflexive notebook, 09/26/2019). Choua did not feel troubled enough to pay attention to those details before she conducted this observation for the assignment. In this space, the desire to care for others may operate in a very limited sense because people mainly focus on themselves and their own purpose of coming to the space. Due to the normalized system of this space, some caring gestures could be considered inappropriate and “too much” while staying indifferent might be considered a gesture of respecting others’ space. As I reread this assignment, I thought about how prevalent this type of space is in society. Then, I quickly admitted that it is much harder to find a space that is not individualistic and capitalistic. If we consider how the word “community” has been overused to describe an ideal space with humanity, connection, and a caring atmosphere, we can see how dehumanizing this society has become by chasing individualistic and capitalistic desires.
Irreconcilable Desires.

Choua indicated during the interview that her spiritual background—shamanism— influenced her to cherish her family even more. She explained,

I’m shaman [she practices shamanism], and that’s why I believe in spirits and all that. Being a shaman really pushed me to cherish my family, because we’re all about family. Even when someone dies, we go visit them and attend a funeral. We do a lot of things as a family, like gatherings. (Interview, 01/29/2020)

This quote displays Choua’s perspective on familial relationships, that a family does not just consist of relationships established based on blood-relation, marriage, and partnership in the present life. The connections transcend the present life as they are still interconnected through spiritual power and relationships. Her family, especially her parents, has a huge impact on Choua’s different desires, from cultural and ethical desires—as discussed earlier in this chapter—to academic achievement. As much as Choua cherishes her family, what her family members pursue in their lives cannot be separate from her, especially if directly related to her. According to Choua, her parents put a great deal of emphasis on their children’s education and having a better life through education. Her parents believe that a public school education can give their children more opportunities to succeed in society which “they did not get when they were younger” (Personal reflection, 09/12/2019). Choua put much effort into her academia to earn better grades, especially because she did “not want to disappoint [her] parents” (Personal reflection, 09/12/2019). At the beginning of her schooling, the public school system made a mistake of putting Choua into an ESL program based on their assumption of her as a student of color when she was in elementary school. Even though she still remembers
that blunder, she rather perceives her public education as a space and system that provided realistic academic support such as a college readiness program—that she most needed. She also considers public education a safe space and community where she had no problem finding people who looked like her, who she could easily relate to, and who had similar backgrounds and goals (Interview, 01/29/2020).

Public education—from elementary to high school—was a space where Choua’s desire for academic achievement was prioritized and supported. Choua acknowledges that her schools often taught content that did not really matter to her, and teachers failed to help her engage in the topics (Reflexive notebook, 10/15/2019). Still, they provided practical support for Choua’s desire, which was entering a good university and making her parents proud of her. I consider that this is why Choua mainly remembers public education as an empowering space. At the same time, it enables me to better understand why it was challenging for her to have a critical view when the EDU110 course asked her to examine problems in the public education system. As an instructor, I presumed that Choua would be aware of the issues and could easily engage in a critical understanding of public education based on her racialized schooling experience as a person of color. If this course instruction was inclusive of Choua’s desire intertwined with her public school experiences, this could have become a form of pedagogy of desire (Zembylas, 2007) that offers a space to deepen her reflection and understanding of her schooling experience in relation to the broader structures of the education system and society implicated in her education.

Meanwhile, Choua felt that she was losing a close connection with her parents as she pursued the desire of academic achievement that also makes her parents happy and
feels rewarding (Interview, 01/29/2020). She shares that a gap between her parents and herself had already begun even before Choua entered college, and it is related to homework. Although her parents were willing to help with assignments and understanding topics learned in school as much as they could, she started to feel that academic topics were not something that could be discussed at home:

I shouldn’t be saying that because even though they don’t have higher education, they might still have something valuable to say about it and how they feel about [the topics]. But I just choose not to [discuss schoolwork] because…I don’t know.

Maybe it’s not what we can discuss and there’s other things we can discuss.

Choua recalled that, as she started thinking that she could not ask for help with homework from her parents, it caused a disconnection between Choua and her parents. When she was describing her judgment that her parents could not help her with homework, she described this reality as “weird.” Then, she added, “I know I can have less burden [if they help], but they can’t really help me.”

As she was talking about this, Choua’s voice was calm and I was able to notice that she was very cautious of describing the situation related to her parents (Post-reflexive journal, 01/29/2020). Choua’s careful attitude in describing the current situation manifested to me because I can relate to the difficulty of sharing a story about parents in the context where different forms of wisdom and knowledge are not properly appreciated (Minh-ha, 1989). Within this space, her parents can be perceived as not smart enough while their lived experiences are denigrated as invalid by the dominant perspective (Grande, 2018; Minh-ha, 1989). As if she were aware of this, Choua made her point clearly by articulating that she respects her parents, and they are the ones who want to
and do help her to be at a better place. Choua also validated her parents’ insights and knowledge in that they know much more than she does and she is still growing by learning from them (Post-reflexive journal, 01/29/2020). The conflicting desires in this situation can be better understood with the understanding of the represented and valued knowledge in school education. This provides a critical point that the gap between Choua and her parents was not caused by their desires conflicting with each other. Even if they attempt to narrow the gap through making the effort at an individual level to improve their communication approach, the gap cannot be closed because it is most impacted by the structural issue of education that does not value knowledge that matters to students.

Choua’s point that her parents “might still have something valuable to say about it and how they feel about [the topics]” reveals that Choua might have come to know that her parents’ perspectives and feelings about the topics are probably different from what the school expected their students to know, including in this teacher education program. Here, Foucault’s (1971) perspective of how knowledge production and representation is exclusive to people who hold the power, and vice versa, is helpful to understand the relation between knowledge and the desire of white upper-to-middle class dominant culture. MacGilchrist et al. (2017) argue that the knowledge represented in school curriculum implies the message of which knowledge is considered necessary to maintain and increase the power of the socially dominant. This is not only a matter of what content is introduced and how much space the content takes up, but also which perspectives and emotions are validated in the curriculum. From this viewpoint, the problem that widened the gap between Choua and her parents regarding homework was not caused by the parents’ lack of knowledge and insights on what she learned in school. As Choua
assumed, her parents may have knowledge and insights on topics that were addressed in school, even if they might not be familiar with all of them. To be specific, it is a twofold issue of the school curriculum that was produced by the socially dominant’s desire: first, the topics and themes in school curriculum are exclusive to the dominant. In addition, even if curriculum topics are inclusive to a wider range of people, the perspectives and interpretations reflected in textbooks and pedagogy are still usually skewed toward white upper-to-middle class emotions and perspectives (Hudson, 2003; Kanu, 2005).

Overall, Choua’s desire for academic achievement and her parents’ desire for Choua to have a satisfying life operated in the same direction. Their desires have a commonality in that both are tied to their love and care of each other as a family: Choua’s desire to make her parents proud motivated her to try hard in her studies, while her parents’ desire for Choua to have better opportunities in life was the driving force that prioritized education and provided necessary support. However, when these desires encountered and were influenced by the dominant and oppressive desire operating in the education system, it created ironic productions. Due to the dominant power occupying education, Choua’s desire also directed her to seek and prioritize knowledge and perspectives that would be helpful for her success in education. During this process, she inevitably learned and embodied the dominant perspective and values. Because a great deal of her parents’ knowledge and viewpoints tied to their lived experiences have not been documented and represented in the curriculum, what they know regards the knowledge that is not helpful for their daughter’s schoolwork (Broadbent, 2007; Kim, 1997; Kwon, 1998). The school system failed to provide an education experience that incorporated knowledge and perspectives that matter to Choua and her parents. She
mentions that she still keeps conversations about what she learns in college from her parents. It is usually her classmates in college with whom Choua has conversations on topics addressed in classes (Interview, 01/29/2020). This shows that the trend was maintained in this teacher education program, even if the program explicitly seeks educational changes inclusive of every cultural, racial, and linguistic difference. Thus, the gap had not narrowed, and the disconnection continued.

**Unnoticed Desires: Intersectional Feminism**

In a corner of the classroom, Choua is working on a group project with Anna and Lena. Anna shows several children’s books that she borrowed from the department library as she talks to Choua and Lena. After a short conversation, the group seems to settle on a topic. Each of them returns to their laptop and starts browsing resources for their project. I walk to the group’s table and ask how it is going and if they have any questions. Lena proudly says, “We are good!” Anna adds, “We have a topic, but we still want to be inclusive for all people.” At the end of the class that day, the group reports that they have decided to do a lesson about “intersectional feminism”. The lesson presentation starts with Anna’s introduction to the definition of intersectional feminism. Then Choua does a read-aloud of the book *Hidden Figures*. As Lena introduces and leads the next discussion activity, she shares her experience of “speaking up” for a woman’s right at a football game. Their lesson plan shows that they equally divided their roles in which each person leads two activities; however, Anna and Lena do most of the talking while Choua’s role was mainly reading the script. The group members reflect on how they like their topic, especially because it is inclusive and complicated while other groups’ topics are simple.
“Anna came up with the word ‘intersectionality’, and I also thought that was a good one,” Choua said. I ask if she is already familiar with the concept of intersectionality. Choua learned about the concept when she was a senior in high school but still considers it a brand new concept for most people. She describes intersectional feminism as “open-minded feminism” and agrees with her team members that other classmates could learn the important concept through their lesson. As I ask more questions related to intersectional feminism and the project, Choua mentions that she does not have many chances to talk about this topic other than with her classmates. “It’s not something I naturally talk [about] to my friends or family unless we don’t have any other things to talk about,” Choua quietly laughed. Then she shares that there are moments when two different values clash as she listens to her parents; feminism is not as simple in her real life. “When I went out, often my mom would tell me, ‘That’s not ladylike; you are supposed to stay home and help me cook.’ Then I would get upset and I would tell my mom that ‘we're in America and we have the same rights as men.’” Choua knows that her decisions and behavior—such as not staying home very much—would impact her family’s reputation: “Growing up, I realized that reputation is a lot actually. Even though I don’t agree with the sexist aspects of the culture, I don’t really want to do anything that would hurt my family and my family’s reputation, especially my parents’ names.”

**Dominating Desires: Final Project**

In her article “Why Doesn’t This Feel Empowering?”, Ellsworth (1989) provides a critique on popular critical pedagogical approaches commonly used in education for social change. She argues that these approaches still reinforce existing oppressive and
dominant relations in classrooms if “assumptions, goals, implicit power dynamics, and issues of who produces valid knowledge remain untheorized and untouched” (Ellsworth, 1989, p. 297). This also happens in teacher education classrooms. For students and educators who have experience with justice-oriented teacher education, encountering pedagogical moments that are not empowering or inclusive is not a rare experience despite that the addressed topics were supposed to be liberatory (Ellsworth, 1989). This group presentation was one of those moments I encountered in this teacher education course. Even though Choua and her group members addressed the topic of intersectional feminism, their lesson presentation did not appear to be empowering and inclusive to women of color as it was meant to be. The discordance between what the group intended by choosing the topic and the actual outcome of the group work appeared as an ironic feature of the presentation, and it became even clearer as I kept reflecting on the moment. Based on this manifestation, I started paying attention to multiple desires operating in this group’s processes and shaping the outcomes. Ellsworth’s (1989) question “Why doesn’t this feel empowering?” is a helpful guide for this exploration as it directs me to discern and zoom into the relevant desires amongst numerous desires at play in this teacher education space.

Desire to Be Efficient

I describe the first manifested desire as a desire to use the given time efficiently. This desire is illustrated in the story by the group’s quick progress to the next step after spending only a few minutes discussing possible topics for their lesson. To reiterate what Deleuze and Guattari (1987) argue as the attribute of desire, a desire is a flow of possibility, and its attribute is determined by what it is assembled with. From this
perspective, the desire to produce the best outcome within the given timeframe is not problematic in itself, but the meaning and role of this desire could take on an oppressive form as it is assembled with perspectives and values linked to dominant ideologies. In other words, the group’s decision of how they were going to spend the given time was determined by which social values and perspectives this desire was assembled with. In Choua’s group, this desire enabled the group to settle on a topic after a short conversation. By quickly moving on to the next steps, this group advanced further in the progress of preparation than any other groups. At the moment in the classroom, this visible progress status also gave me a sense of security because I perceived it as a signal that their group work was on track. However, this group’s pursuit of the desire of time efficiency generated an effect that hindered the team members from considering different possibilities for their project as well as taking time to reflect on their progress so far. I also recognized that there was an absence of a deeper conversation to unfold interests and desires that each group member had in mind.

At first glance, one might view that the group members deepened and complicated a topic through exploring different ways to make the topic, intersectional feminism, more inclusive of all people. With additional information provided by Choua and Lena, however, it is clear this concept was introduced by Anna, and the group decided to go with the topic even before they understood what intersectional feminism means (Interview, 01/20/2020; 01/29/2020). This indicates that their agenda of making their lesson inclusive of all people did not apply to their relationships and processes within the group. The inclusivity within the team was barely acknowledged and prioritized in their process. Considering how this desire was sought by the group, I found
that this desire has a close relationship with neoliberal logic prevalent and dominant in the current education system (De Lissovoy & Cedillo, 2017). Neoliberal ideology prefers educational practices that produce visible and quantifiable outcomes—such as achievements measurable with standardized tests—with minimal effort and resources in a short period of time (De Lissovoy, 2013). Due to this systemic force, students are expected to produce quality work within a given timeframe by their teachers and curriculum, and usually the given time is not long enough for students to explore various ideas deeply as well as incorporate different people’s viewpoints in the cases of group work. Considering these aspects, the desire of time efficiency pursued by Choua’s group was not a unique inclination specific to this course and project. This desire of time efficiency in education was socially constructed as an ideological pursuit that asks students to produce a visible outcome based on the rubric if they want to succeed in the current education system. Within a neoliberal educational space, extra time and resources to achieve other values and aspects not included in the rubric—such as diversity and inclusion among team members—are likely to be considered a waste of time. Therefore, students often choose to go with an idea suggested by a group member without further research and discussion unless other group members have strong feelings or opinions about the idea. Even if Choua or Lena had different thoughts on intersectional feminism, it was probably easier for them to follow the idea proposed by Anna, unless they noticed critical problems with the topic.

Considering the definition and context of intersectional feminism, by choosing the topic, Choua’s group had full potential to make the group lesson inclusive and empowering to every member in the group. As I reviewed in Chapter 2, intersectional
feminist movements have strived to disrupt exclusive conventions in feminist movements and organizations dominated by white middle-class heterosexual women (e.g., Byrne, 2015; hooks, 1981/2014; Lorde, 1984/2007). These feminists’ goal was not only to include women of color’s stories in the feminism movement, but also to create a space that acknowledges their complex positionalities and relationships within society as well as within their own families and communities (hooks, 1981/2014). In this respect, the group members could have taken this group project as an opportunity to transform existing dominant and oppressive power relations and structures through acknowledging and continuing the work that intersectional feminists have done (Cho et al., 2013). Instead, they moved on to researching and talking about different lesson activities for their presentation without taking time to learn more about intersectional feminism, even though the group members did not have a good understanding of what intersectional feminism is. By taking this route, their process did not involve bringing in different stories of women of color to their lesson, and it failed to become a mutual learning experience about activist movements led and developed by Black women, Indigenous women, Third World women, and other women of color. Needless to say, Choua’s feminist desire that clashes with her other desires and values related to her culture and parents was not unpacked and validated in this process. The group’s neoliberal desire for time efficiency motivated them to spend more time researching ideas and information that could be directly used in their project outcome and related to their grades. I observed this in the classroom in how they worked individually with their laptops, although they still stayed at the same table, and exchanged information they found in their searches.
As we can see, the desire for time efficiency took shape and generated its effect as it was assembled with neoliberalism in education and also pursued by students who embodied such values through their educational experiences. While the group was following the desire without unlearning oppressive ideologies embedded in this desire, other liberatory desires implicated in intersectional feminism were not acknowledged and incorporated in the group work, such as a desire to disrupt oppressive relations and a desire to center women of color’s stories in social discourse.

**Desire to Be Superior**

Another desire manifested in this group’s project is the desire to be superior to other people. It appeared in two forms in the classroom setting: a desire to make their project better, and a desire to show social justice competency. Before discussing how these desires manifested in this group work and why they failed to make the presentation empowering, it is important to distinguish this desire to be superior from a desire to be better. The biggest difference between “to be better” and “to be superior” is that one has to be always conscious of other people’s status and perceptions when they measure their success and achievement to be superior. Yoga practice might be a good example to explain this difference. In my yoga practice, my yoga instructor emphasized that it is important to focus on myself and my own pace instead of comparing myself with other people’s progress. The instructor encouraged me to make the effort to be better in every moment I practice yoga, but she always reminded me that the effort I make to be better is not to look better nor to become better than someone else. This yoga teaching exemplifies that one can be better at something without comparing themselves to other people or being acknowledged by others. In contrast, when one tries to be superior to other people,
they can never be free from the eyes of other people and also perceive others as potential
competitors and objects to oppress. At the same time, their internal and other invisible
values and abilities become less important than other visible and displayable abilities and
assets.

Desire to Make Their Project Better.

The desire to make their group’s project superior than other groups’ was evident
in Lena’s reflection on the final project and also in Anna’s reflection. During the
interview conducted after the semester was completed, Lena remembered her group’s
project as satisfactory because she considered her group to have addressed more complex
issues and to have been inclusive compared to other groups’ “plain” topics, such as on
bullying and disability (Interview, 01/30/2020). What was interesting to notice is that
Lena did not remember the exact term of intersectional feminism even after she
completed the project on this topic. Still, it was obvious that intersectional feminism left
an impression on her in that the topic was a good choice to fulfill the group’s desire to
improve their initial idea of feminism:

I couldn’t remember if it was interracial or intersexual. We were originally just
going to do feminism but when we were looking at books, we found the Hidden
Figures one. So, we were like, oh, we can even narrow this [the topic of
feminism] down a bit more. Cause I had never heard of intersectional racism.
That was something totally new to me. I think that’s why we chose it too, because
we would be learning along with everyone else. We could have just gone [with]
racism, like [we could] have done this plain[ly].
This excerpt shows that the group’s encounter with *Hidden Figures* a story of the Black women mathematicians who played an imperative role for NASA to accomplish their projects—inspired them to consider the topic of intersectional feminism as a better topic not only because they could narrow down their scope, but also they considered this topic as innovative. In my interview with Anna, I was able to sense her satisfaction and pride with the final project in her voice when we met at a local coffee shop. She uttered, “We picked the idea because we wanted to reflect a very real issue and also to be inclusive of everyone” (Interview, 01/24/2020). Anna mentioned several times during the interview that she wanted to make the lesson inclusive of everyone, and she considered intersectional feminism as the right topic to achieve this goal. She continued, “I think that intersectional feminism is something that you haven’t really heard that word a lot” (Interview, 01/24/2020). As illustrated, similar to Lena, Anna’s satisfaction with the group project was also associated with her feeling of achievement that her group was able to introduce a topic that was not only inclusive of everyone, but also unfamiliar to her classmates.

To better understand their desire, we must pay attention to how Lena and Anna perceived their topic compared to other groups’ topics. Similar to Lena’s reference to other groups’ topics as “plain,” Anna indicated them as “basic.” Anna explained, “we saw that everyone else was doing important topics, but they were basic topics. They do need to be talked [about], but they’re just the ones that everyone picks [as their topic] immediately” (Interview, 01/24/2020). The way Anna and Lena labeled other groups’ topics represents that their group’s desire to be better in the project was based on competition with other groups. It implies that they perceived choosing a topic that was
not “basic” and “plain” was an indicator of the success and superiority of their project. For this reason, while they focused on their achievement compared to other groups, they limited themselves from developing the project even further based on the group members’ capacity and potential. I felt as though, while observing their lesson presentation, this group stopped their progress as soon as they felt reassured that their topic was good enough compared to other topics (Post-reflexive journal, 12/03/2019). For example, even though Anna shared that she wanted to acknowledge women of color in feminist movements (Interview, 01/24/2020), this intention was barely incorporated in their final presentation. The group did not even address women of color’s achievements and their unique struggles illustrated in the book they chose, other than Choua conducting a read-aloud of this book to the class.

The capacity of the group’s desire to make their project better was limited and set up to (re)produce oppressive practices as it was assembled with competition-based education culture. According to Wilkins (2012), learning experiences based on competition have shaped students to prioritize competitive strategies in their academic performance and internalize the “individualized conception of success and competition” (p. 776). As a student who has also strived to survive in numerous competitions throughout my schooling experience, I can relate to the feeling of security that these group members might have experienced when they confirmed their topic of intersectional feminism seemed superior to other groups’ themes. In the education system where competition is the main basis of measuring success and achievement, it is extremely challenging not to compare ourselves with other people and also envision that we can excel together with our classmates. Acknowledging this reality reminded me of how
Sara—a student in the EDU110 course—talked about a critical problem of school education in that her schools only taught her to perceive her classmates as competitors, while they never taught her to imagine the possibility that every student can succeed without failing other classmates (Interview, 02/06/2020). Of course, competition can be a motivating factor for learning more deeply about certain subjects or topics. Unfortunately, this was not the case for Choua’s group if we look at the lesson activities included in the group’s presentation (Lesson plan, 12/03/2019). They were mainly based on the understanding of feminism in a broader and conventional sense and rarely articulated the complex and unique realities of women of color which intersectional feminism has strived to achieve (Anzaldúa, 1990; May, 2015).

**Desire to Show Social Justice Competency.**

The group’s desire to show social justice competency provides an additional example of how the desire to be superior shaped the group’s cooperative work as seemingly unempowering. It is important to clarify that what I aim for in focusing on this desire is not to argue that white students’ goals and efforts to be socially just educators were motivated by being seen and acknowledged by others. Instead, I am interested in exploring how whiteness and white supremacy hinder these students from developing social justice competency. I do not think that white students intentionally engage in justice-orientated teacher education just to show their competency in understanding and addressing social inequities to their instructors and classmates. Yoon’s (2012) “whiteness-at-work” concept is helpful to view the desire to show social justice competency as a systemic desire rather than understanding it as an individual agenda depending on each student’s values and choice. In this article, Yoon (2012) delves into
how whiteness is collectively constructed by multiple people despite their intention to be equitable and empowering to people of color. In this group’s case, whiteness-at-work is a useful framework to understand the group’s collective pursuit to excel in their project by focusing on why Choua and other women of color’s stories did not become a center of the lesson about intersectional feminism.

Related to how racism and white supremacy work in society, the racial hierarchy enacted in Choua’s group did not appear as distinct features until I conducted several rounds of reading and analyzing related phenomenological materials, including the classroom recordings (Huber et al., 2006). As the story describes, Choua’s role was conducting the read-aloud and reading prescribed scripts for an activity. Even though Anna and Lena’s roles were not very different from Choua’s, their overall presence looked quite different from how Choua was present in the space. However, I found it challenging to explain Choua’s position during the project solely based on how many roles she had and what she did in the group. For example, when I looked at the group’s lesson plan, Choua, Anna, and Lena divided their roles “equally”; each group member was supposed to lead one to two activities, and it was implemented as planned. In terms of physical presence regarding how much classroom space each group member occupied and used, Choua’s presence was not very different from the other group members’ because Anna and Lena also mainly stayed in the same spot in the classroom throughout the presentation. However, how Choua was significantly different from the other two group members is that nowhere in the lesson presentation were Choua and her stories represented.
When Anna started the lesson by introducing the definition of intersectional feminism, she incorporated her understanding of why she considers this topic to be important and where she finds the value of this concept. Lena, similarly, began the first discussion activity by sharing her story related to feminism which occurred over the weekend. In the lesson, she told the class that she wanted to share a proud story of a “feminist” action she took to save a girl from her drunk father at a football game. Lena illustrated that she saw a drunk man yelling at his daughter to not go to college because “women do not need higher education.” She helped the girl by separating her from her father and told her that women can do whatever they want, including going to college. Lena remembered the story as a “good one” to include in their lesson because the story was relevant to their topic and also a nice transition to the activity she led (Interview, 01/30/2020). On the other hand, I had difficulty finding Choua’s viewpoint and stories anywhere in the lesson even when she was reading the book aloud and leading the second discussion activity. Although Choua’s voice filled the classroom space as she read and talked, it manifested to me that the voice was produced merely because it was her designated role. It illuminates that the presentation the group produced with their intention to be critical and socially just (re)centered white students’ perspectives and stories while being exclusive of Choua and other women of color’s desires.

Considering this teacher education program’s emphasis on diversity, inclusivity, and social justice, we can infer that the students’ motivation to be inclusive of all people was not just rooted in their ethical desire to be good people. Related to the institutional norm that students’ learning outcomes are expected to be measured and reported in a short period of time, not only does the program try to measure students’ development of
critical awareness based on course work, but this also makes students perceive critical consciousness growth as a measurable academic achievement (Mills & Ballantyne, 2016). Within this system, students often feel obligated to prove their growth and critical awareness in their assignments and classroom practices to succeed in their classes (Mason, 2016; Philip & Zavala, 2016). For this reason, as Jones (2019) observes, students perform racially and culturally-just dispositions to portray themselves as critically minded while maintaining the dominant and oppressive power and position they have. As we see in Anna and Lena’s performance in the presentation, they maintained and enjoyed their white privilege in representing the perspectives and experiences they considered legitimate. It shows that neither Anna nor Lena was willing to use their power and privilege to create a space to learn about and discuss the complex positionalities and struggles of women of color. In addition to not recognizing their lesson as mainly about white feminism after their presentation, they viewed including a book about women of color and naming their project “intersectional feminism” as critical enough to prove their social justice competency that was appreciated in this course. With Malik’s (2020) description of white privilege as a distraction for challenging racism and examining power, these students’ desire to be inclusive of all people was distracted by their own and systemic whiteness and white privilege at play in the educational space. They simply took inclusivity as adding everyone into a conversation while missing the point that they must disrupt the status quo and acknowledge multiple ways of living as women (Jackson et al., 2020). In this process, their desire to be inclusive of all people shaped and was enacted as the desire to show social justice competency, although it was assembled with institutional and individual whiteness and white supremacy.
Since Anna and Lena were confined to their own life world and failed to recognize the different life world that Choua lives, by following the dominant institutional and personal desire, the group lost a chance to make the project an opportunity for Choua to share her experiences and thoughts related to feminism (Lau, 2016). Even though the topic and book they chose to address during their presentation were great mediums to initiate conversation about women of color’s feminist movement and how it is different from mainstream white feminism, as I have discussed so far, the desires pursued by this group—especially by Anna and Lena—were not interested in acknowledging and generating support for Choua and other women of color’s feminist desires. If one were to ask why Choua did not try to share her unique perspective and experience as a woman of color with her group members, that question does not acknowledge the overwhelming presence and power of whiteness enacted in education and society (Yoon, 2012; Sleeter, 2002, 2016). To briefly respond to Ellsworth’s (1989) question “Why doesn’t this feel empowering?” posed at the beginning of this section, intersectional feminism was used as no more than a tool for white desires in this group work. Intersectional feminist desires are incompatible with white desires as linked with whiteness and white supremacy. Therefore, the white students needed to give up their comfort and privilege to pursue empowering desires for people of color. Instead, by covertly transforming the social justice desire into a favorable means of the dominant desires, they were not only able to show their social justice competency to the class, but also secure white dominance and superiority.
Chapter 8. Insights and Implications

I started this research with contemplations and questions about why prospective educators’ confidence and enthusiasm toward becoming socially just educators often do not transfer effectively into equitable and inclusive teaching and learning practices. In the introduction chapter, I talk about the limitation of simplistic representations of the ways to become an ethical and socially just person and educator in textbooks and class discourses that fail to fully address the complexity of becoming that kind of person in reality. I had assumed that these kinds of simple approaches perpetuate the problems related to the gap between theory and practice in teacher education. As Mason (2013) states that simple stories have their uses (p. 156), I came to admit that if the textbooks overwhelmed students with intricate explanations and examples, they would have not even had the confidence and courage to try. However, these simple stories and steps need to be challenged and complicated after they successfully complete their role to inspire preservice teachers to be on board, invested in becoming equitable and inclusive teachers. To better understand the complexity of preservice teachers’ learning and practice in a teacher education program, I have looked at the phenomenon of the hegemonic insider-outsider through an intercultural perspective with multiple stories of characters focusing on three different analytical foci.

I could have picked different stories and organized this dissertation differently. However, I intentionally chose the five students of color’s experiences and voices to be the center of the narratives. As a phenomenologist, course instructor, and international graduate student, I have experienced and observed that students of color and international students’ perspectives and needs are barely prioritized and supported in many teacher
education courses. Despite this acknowledgement, the courses I taught were not very
different from many other teacher education courses that (re)center whiteness in an effort
to disrupt whiteness. “It is inevitable to focus on white students when attempting to
disrupt whiteness”–I have heard this numerous times since I became a teacher educator,
and I also justified my own teaching practices in this manner as I could not think of
alternative ways to conduct my teaching. Looking back, my decision to pick stories of
students of color and international students may be related to the regret, frustration, and
also hope coming from reflection on the limitations I have recognized. I could not simply
let go of these feelings and the fact that my classes also failed to provide adequate
support for the strengths and needs of individual students of color and international
students. Concurrently, I was hopeful because their stories gave me ideas and confidence
for change and envisioning possibilities in education.

By taking this route, I attempt to challenge the simplistic assumption and
expectation that having more teachers of color in schools will naturally solve their
diversity and equity issues. I have argued that whiteness and white supremacy were
maintained and reproduced in this classroom even though more than half of the student
population were students of color. White students did not have to give up their whiteness
and white supremacy to work with their people of color peers and the instructor. At the
same time, students of color do not naturally know how to cooperate with other students
of color whose ethnic and cultural backgrounds are different from their own.
Furthermore, I also hoped to illustrate U.S. students’ relative insider and privileged
position compared to the international students in the U.S. classroom that is linked to
U.S. centrism–such as U.S. citizenship and U.S. schooling experiences–and symbolic
Anglo centrism—such as English language fluency—implicated in their interactions with two Chinese international students. I suggest that teachers should not expect the potentials and capacities that students of color possess to automatically make them empowering educators through teacher education focused on white students. Concurrently, white students’ cultural competence is not increased naturally by spending more time and building relationships with people from different cultural backgrounds.

As a writer and a reader, I prefer to write and read stories with happy endings, but as you can see, this dissertation does not consist of the kind of stories that give the reader feelings of relief and satisfaction in the end. Instead, I want this study to be an invitation to the reader to understand and interpret the entangled reality of preservice teachers’ learning practice through the different readings and discussions. I especially hope to tell stories that have not been told much, like the hidden center of an entangled ball of yarn, but are closely interconnected with the very issues of teacher education. For this reason, I purposefully chose stories that have the power and potential to provoke awareness and prompt further examination and discussion about the complex realities of preservice teachers’ learning practices.

**Review of Findings**

In this section, I will review the findings of this study by each analysis chapter, considering the research questions. The four research questions I posed at the early stage of this research are as follows: 1) How might the hegemonic insider-outsider take shape for students in a justice-oriented teacher education course? 2) What role does the hegemonic insider-outsider play in a teacher education course? 3) What does it mean to explore the experience of the hegemonic insider-outsider in the context of a teacher
education course? 4) How does the experience of the hegemonic insider-outsider change over the progression of a semester-long course that promotes critical self-reflection and the examination of social context?

In chapter 4, my analysis of the phenomenon focusing on space suggests that whiteness and white supremacy as the dominant ideology not only govern the teacher education space, but also influence other related spaces beyond the classroom. I highlight in the chapter that the presence and enactment of whiteness and white supremacy shape individual people’s positions and interactions within the space. At the same time, the individual and collective efforts to make the space more liberative such as department- and program-level initiatives and discursive spaces created based on the course topics and texts—encourage students to engage in thinking and practices they have not processed before. These efforts also exist as factors that shift people’s insider-outsider status in the program.

These efforts provoked a variety of reactions from the students, including the emotional response to the readings and the instructor as described in Youn’s story. Some other students showed the misalignment between their intellectual and practical pursuit in their practice of microaggressions or exclusions of people of color while saying they want to become equitable and inclusive educators for all students. In this analysis of space, I also describe the limitation of U.S.-centered teacher education courses that rarely consider and address issues outside domestic borderlines. While this course was centered around U.S. ideology and sociopolitical approaches, Becca and Joe had distanced themselves from the issues addressed in this class not only because they did not see themselves in the matters, but also because they felt their safety would be threatened if
they followed suggested approaches. Meanwhile, domestic students did not have opportunities to think about their American positionalities and their power within the broader contexts and how they are implicated in global issues.

In chapter 5, I illustrated connections and relationships between the phenomenon of the hegemonic insider-outsider and various sociohistorical aspects using the concept of inyeon. With this concept, I aimed to argue that all people maintain direct and indirect connections with social and historical issues even if they do not recognize that they have these relationships. Specifically, I interpreted that white students not knowing their sociohistorical connections with immigrants and immigration is related to the whiteness process in the U.S. (Roediger, 1991). Additionally, I wanted to highlight that people of color’s choice of active remembrance of their immigrant stories and participation in the related social discourses–through Francisco’s story–should be viewed as a form of activism that takes responsibility. I argue that their decision must not be viewed as a phenomenon taken for granted in relation to their outsider positionalities.

Based on the story of Francisco’s interaction with Joe in their final project, I illuminate the complexity of intercultural cooperation. Focusing on how their project ideas take shape and un-shape throughout the duration of the project, I aimed to capture that their initial goal to make something meaningful for each of their backgrounds and interests produced multiple possibilities but were eventually discouraged by multiple factors. This story is relevant to the unreasonable expectation of people of color’s cooperation that they will co-produce something diverse and equitable just because they have shared experiences and perspectives as people of color. In the last section of this chapter, I provide a different reading of a preservice teacher of color’s confidence and
understanding as an insider of his community and the school from which he graduated. While it is crucial to acknowledge a student of color’s insider view of a racialized schooling experience, as Kohli et al. (2019) argue, this insider view is incorporated with internalized racism and other dominant values that students of color inevitably embody as they live and try to survive in school and society.

In the last analysis chapter, I focused on illustrating Choua’s desires in the first section and a couple of dominating desires in the second section. While I was writing this chapter, I had to adjust my understanding of “what is manifested” in a phenomenological study, because Choua’s desires were desires “manifested vaguely” compared to other desires that manifested more vividly. However, these vague manifestations motivated me to focus on Choua’s desires that were not prioritized in teacher education. I interpreted Choua’s cultural and ethical desires as the strong foundation and drive in her education, relationships, and life, while their expressions were rather suppressed in teacher education. I focused on the ironic expectation of preservice teachers of color to become empowering educators for their own communities and other communities of color, while teacher education provides identical educational experiences for both white preservice teachers and preservice teachers of color. There was little room for Choua to claim her desires.

In the second section of the chapter, I focused on how students collectively pursue dominant desires while keeping other desires silenced and unnoticed. As I have taught this course for several semesters, I have noticed that many students take up social justice competency as something they need to prove through using social justice related vocabulary and theories, though their practice remains almost the same. Based on
Choua’s story of working on the final project with two white students, I illustrated the dominant desires that actively shaped their processes and outcomes presented to me. The group’s decision to choose intersectional feminism as their topic did little to guide their project to be equitable and inclusive but mainly was used as a tool to fulfill dominant desires to prove their superiority over other groups and to indicate to the class that they tried to make the project inclusive of all people.

**Social Justice Teacher Education**

In my recent conversation about a teacher education course that I co-teach with a colleague, my colleague and I talked about the dilemma of recentering whiteness to disrupt whiteness in individual white students and the education system while leaving students of color in the margin. We agreed that this issue will only continue if we keep justifying it as inevitable for a program at a predominantly white institution. In respect to this issue, I urge that teacher educators who participate in teaching and program development make practical decisions to initiate change for every preservice teacher rather than sideline the concern. Based on this phenomenological exploration, I would like to share a vision of teacher education that might generate practical conversations calling for change and action.

Considering the complexities of every preservice teacher, it is critical to provide individualized and differentiated support for students in their navigation and negotiation of power dynamics and tensions. For students of color and international students, it is important not to assume that intercultural cooperation and liberatory practice will happen automatically as they work together in the same group and class. Even though it is still crucial to acknowledge their different cultural backgrounds and experiences as powerful
resources for intercultural cooperation and anti-racist work, teacher education programs need to distribute resources and provide realistic support for the work. Considering that students of color have inevitably embodied internalized racism and other dominant values as they live and survive in society, it is necessary to provide opportunities for them to examine and unlearn those aspects in their educational practices and daily lives.

As I have illustrated in this study, the teacher education program was often hostile to expressions of different cultural and geographical experiences and perspectives. Along with ongoing efforts to disrupt whiteness and white supremacy in individual students and the education system, it is important to address the problem of centering U.S. perspectives and values in educational discourses. Even though the main focus of the program has been on preparing teachers for schools in the U.S., not all preservice teachers enter the program with similar ideas for their future careers. A handful of students potentially plan to teach abroad and/or return to their home countries after they finish their degrees. If we consider how their learned knowledge and experiences will be utilized in different contexts, educating future teachers limited to the U.S. dominant perspectives and values is concerning. This issue is also relevant if we consider the reality that many students in the local elementary schools also have different cultural, geographical, and linguistic backgrounds. Teachers need to be capable of understanding different perspectives and values that students hold and develop their pedagogy in regard to this multiplicity, even if it might conflict with their views and what they value. This is also a critical foundation for teachers to be advocates for their students and their communities.
At the same time, I suggest teacher education to be mindful that teaching approaches foster inclusive and diverse classes that celebrate different cultures. It is important not to allow the approaches to produce ironic outcomes that result in non-dominant cultural traditions and perspectives becoming hyper visible and further othered by the efforts. As I pointed out in this study, insiders rarely receive requests to explain their insider backgrounds and perspectives. On the other hand, people frequently ask outsiders to translate and explain their cultures with little hesitation as it is an expected job for people with non-dominant backgrounds. I argue that translating and explaining cultures should be properly appreciated and should not be taken for granted as labor that many people of color endure. Meanwhile, I encourage teacher educators to reimagine inclusive and diverse teaching and classrooms where everyone is treated like insiders and can position themselves as insiders.

This study also has implications for practice-based justice-oriented teacher education. I suggest teacher education to frame and highlight preservice teachers’ engagement and interactions in university courses as another important facet of practice as an educator, beyond intellectual and theoretical learning, to use in their future classroom practices. As I discussed in this study, looking at how preservice teachers learn and interact in a teacher education course illuminated numerous aspects that are linked with their attitudes, perspectives, values, and struggles. Some students conveyed and reproduced dominant values and perspectives through actions they believed to be respectful, and some students unintentionally excluded their classmates by performing certain gestures and body postures they might not even remember. These are the kinds of subtle behaviors that preservice teachers are likely to perform in their future classrooms,
and their students will be impacted by these subtle moments which seem too trivial and quick to describe and point out. For this reason, I suggest future research to pay more attention to preservice teachers’ presence and interactions in university courses and examine their meanings and relationships with broader educational issues in elementary schools.

Yet, it is important to also acknowledge that the information revealed to teacher educators is always limited and partial, and students navigate and negotiate much broader and complicated areas and relationships than those addressed in a course. My study reveals that students’ performances and responses in a course are already framed by the context and expectation of the course. What we see in teacher education courses is just a fragment of students’ multifaceted positions, relationships, and interests. Each student goes through their own process with learned knowledge in teacher education courses in relation to a variety of aspects in their lives. My students mentioned several times during the interviews that they often felt disconnected and conflicted with their families, friends, and other loved ones as they attempted to have a conversation about the topics and also tried to pursue the approaches and values encouraged in college. This case is not limited to white students from conservative family backgrounds but applies to everyone in different ways and to different extents.

Considering the process as an inevitable but valuable process to become an equitable and inclusive teacher, it is imperative to properly respond to the dilemmas that students encounter. I propose teacher education programs treat these struggles as practical and realistic issues that should be discussed in teacher education courses. These concerns should not be left as big questions mainly discussed on a philosophical and theoretical
level or only in a retrospective and reflective manner. A teacher education program needs to be a safe and generative space for preservice students to process different and conflicting values and relationships in their lives, such as within families and communities. In that process, one possible teacher educator role would be guiding them to pose questions that matter to them and discuss the questions individually and together with other students who may be going through similar processes.

Lastly, I suggest teacher educators be prepared to respond to the question “why do we need to be ethical and socially just people?” In my research process, students indicated that their motivations and ideas for being ethical and just are closely linked to their religious and/or spiritual beliefs and perspectives. At the same time, some expressed that they have considered this topic and question as taboo and are rarely asked to unpack and openly discuss them in the classroom. The question might be considered a big philosophical question; however, I believe that this question is powerful and also a practical question that can guide preservice teachers to establish grounds and pivots for their practice and ongoing growth as educators and human beings. In this study, I briefly discuss this topic through introducing Choua’s religious and spiritual backgrounds. In my future research and practice, I hope to explore preservice teachers’ diverse axiological orientations that are linked to their religious, spiritual, and/or cultural beliefs and values, as well as how these connections are tied to their understanding of what it means to truly care for other people (Lau, 2016; Wilson, 2008).

**Intercultural Philosophical Approach in Teacher Education**

As I started seeking the possibility of intercultural phenomenological research, my main goal was to create a space to bring in knowledge, ideas, and wisdom that I
believe to be true and valuable but which could be considered as not academic or valid, such as inherited wisdom from older generations. As Wilson (2008) and Tuck and Yang (2012) articulate, academia has been developed by enforcing dominant ontological, epistemological, and axiological perspectives for scholars and colonizing different ways of being and ways of viewing the world. Different perspectives have been considered invalid and not scientific enough to be discussed in academia. By developing this research approach, I hoped to claim that this knowledge and these ideas are still true and valuable without the validation of well-known (Western) scholars’ speech and writings, and also without excessive translation of their meanings into English.

I could not have started this journey if I had not found Lau’s (2016) work on the intercultural phenomenological approach and if Vagle’s (2018) post-intentional phenomenology had not offered me the generative space. Lau’s (2016) work provided an inspiring foundation to reimagine post-intentional phenomenology from an intercultural perspective through various ways of thinking about intercultural phenomenology. Its articulations on the multiplicity of lifeworlds and cultural flesh (Lau, 2016) offered valuable insights for me to choose a way to tell stories and interpret characters’ lived experiences. Specifically, I tried to be transparent about the partiality of my view and the understanding that the stories I share in this study—which might be based on different lifeworlds of the characters—are narrated and interpreted based on my own perspective and lifeworld. Based on this acknowledgement, I welcome and encourage the reader’s different interpretations of the stories. The concept of cultural flesh was something that I have kept in mind throughout this study. I strived to develop my cultural flesh of understanding other lifeworlds and lived experiences, and I also consider it to be
something every preservice teacher should practice to become an equitable and inclusive teacher.

This intercultural philosophical research approach enabled me to center the cultural concept of inyeon as one of the central foci for analysis as well as my students’ cultural and ethical perspectives. I was comfortable and confident in introducing the concept and the perspective in this study; at the same time, this research process has made me realize the necessity of further developing the intercultural philosophical methodology. For my future research, I am interested in seeking possibilities for developing the methodology based on different regional philosophical ideas or even cultural perspectives that have not been considered or named “philosophy.” As I took inyeon as a concept that represents my ontological and epistemological viewpoints and used this concept to pivot this research, I also hope to consider the creation of a research methodology that incorporates students’, teachers’, and their communities’ different perspectives of viewing and being in the world.

As stated earlier, I wished to talk about knowledge, ideas, and perspectives that are not easily and perfectly translatable in English without excessive translation and explanation to make sense to a U.S. audience. However, I still chose to provide translations and explanations of inyeon in English by citing literature to illustrate the concept better. Considering this limitation, I propose future research that thinks about and tries various approaches to have the reader experience the ideas and perspectives rooted in different cultures and geographical regions before reading translated—but still missing precise meanings—descriptions of them.
Conclusion

In this dissertation, I hope to provide insights into some of the complicated power dynamics and tensions involving various contexts, positions, and ideologies in teacher education. Through this phenomenological exploration, my understanding of individual preservice teachers’ learning practices has shifted and deepened as I looked into the phenomenon of the hegemonic insider-outsider. I hope that the shared narratives about characters and analyses of each story provoke different ideas and emotions in the readers for further engagement with the stories and related issues.

Overall, I observed that the status of insider-outsiderness is shifting moment by moment depending on how one is situated in a space as well as how one positions themselves in different spaces. In the context of teacher education, whiteness and white supremacy are powerful factors that shape, determine, and maintain the phenomenon of the hegemonic insider-outsider. What I found most fascinating about this phenomenon is that people tend not to recognize their insiderness among their multifaceted positions and roles. It is not very surprising that people have barely reflected on their insider positions if we consider how the dominant ideologies and values constitute “common sense” (Gramsci, 1971) in a group and society. Cultural hegemony means shaping aspects and positions that align with common sense to be natural, normal, and default.

If hegemonic insider-outsider is better understood, I envision that the dominant and simplistic narratives in education and society can be challenged and replaced by complicated stories and perspectives that have been underrepresented and marginalized. Meanwhile, it can be also helpful to (re)imagine our ways of knowing and being that are
conscious of direct and indirect, as well as visible and invisible, impacts that we may
(re)produce in our daily practices and relationships.
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Appendix A. Interview Questions

I’m interviewing you today to learn more about your learning experience in CI1001 Introduction to the Elementary School in the fall 2019 semester. This study is my dissertation research which is a partial requirement for a doctoral degree at the University of Minnesota. I aim to understand the hegemonic insider-outsider through your lived experience not only in the course, but also as a human being in this society. Your confidentiality will be maintained through the use of a pseudonym for your name in any writing in this research study.

During this interview, please let me know if you want me to repeat or reframe a question. If you prefer not to answer a question, you can say “I would like to pass on that question.” Also, the recorder may be turned off at any point, upon your request. As this is an unstructured interview, feel free to share any stories and ideas that you feel like sharing.

Do you have any questions before we being the interview? [After responding to questions, if there are any] I am going to turn on the recorder as we begin the unstructured interview.

1. How was your experience in CI1001 last semester?
2. What are some takeaways from the course? Why?
3. How would you define teacher’s role and responsibility? How have those changed while and after taking this course?
4. How would you define insider-outsider in the society? Or in the school?
5. When do you consider yourself as an insider/outsider (in the society/school/family)?
6. What makes you an insider/outsider in certain context/moment/time?
7. Have you experienced the change of your insider/outsider-ness (depending on space/time)?
8. What do you think about certain people taking up more space (physical and conceptual) than other people?
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advisor/Investigator Departmental Affiliation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Number: 612-655-8227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address: <a href="mailto:mason@umn.edu">mason@umn.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Information About This Research Study

The following is a short summary to help you decide whether or not to be a part of this research study. More detailed information is listed later on in this form.

What is research?

The goal of research is to learn new things in order to help people in the future. Investigators learn things by following the same plan with a number of participants, so they do not usually make changes to the plan for individual research participants. You, as an individual, may or may not be helped by volunteering for a research study.

Why am I being invited to take part in this research study?

I am asking you to take part in this research study because you are enrolled in the course CI1001 Section 003 Introduction to the Elementary School in the fall 2019 semester. In addition, you are invited because this course plans and aims to engage in the conversation and reflection from justice-oriented and culturally relevant education perspectives.

What should I know about a research study?

- Someone will explain this research study to you.
- Whether or not you take part is up to you.
- You can choose not to take part.
- You can agree to take part and later change your mind.
• Your decision will not be held against you.
• You can ask all the questions you want before you decide.

**Why is this research being done?**

This study is designed to be the dissertation research as a partial requirement of doctoral degree in elementary education at the University of Minnesota. This proposed study aims to understand the phenomenon of hegemonic insider-outsider through students’ engagements in a semester-long course that promotes critical self-reflection and social context examination. More specifically, this study seeks to understand various forms of domination and exclusions in society and asks what it means to be a hegemonic insider-outsider. The research questions guiding this study are as follows:

1. How might the hegemonic insider-outsider take shape for preservice teachers in a justice-oriented teacher education course?
2. What role does the hegemonic insider-outsider play in a preservice teacher education course?
3. What does it mean to explore the experience of the hegemonic insider-outsider in the context of a teacher education course?
4. How does the experience of the hegemonic insider-outsider change over the progression of a semester-long course that promotes critical self-reflection and the examination of social context?

**How long will the research last?**

I expect that you will be a part of this research study for approximately a year, spanning from the Fall 2019 semester to the Spring 2020 semester. Regarding the course-based activities and assignment, you will be asked to participate for approximately fifteen weeks in the Fall 2019 semester. Unstructured interviews will be conducted in the Spring 2020 semester; you may be invited to the interview during the spring semester. Each interview will take from thirty minutes to one hour and you may be contacted for an additional interview if I have further questions as I proceed to the initial review of the primary interview data.

- **Fall 2019 semester:** Course work-based participation (class discussions/interactions and assignments).
- **Spring 2020 semester:** Unstructured interview, additional invitation will be sent after the fall 2019 semester is completed.

**What will I need to do to participate?**

You will be asked to provide permissions for the following things:

- Video/audio recordings of class interaction which may include your voice and image.
• The use of course assignments you will complete and submit for this course.

In addition,

• You may be invited to a thirty minute to one hour unstructured interview during the spring 2020 semester.

Is there any way that being in this study could be bad for me?

This is a minimal risk study. However, you may feel uncomfortable knowing that the recordings attained from our classroom discussions and the work that you will be submitting would be considered as potential data for this study. To reduce this discomfort, you can request any of your work to be not included in this study. Regarding the recordings, you can turn off or move the devices if you feel uncomfortable having your discussions or activities recorded. You can choose not to answer any questions that may be asked during the interview. To protect your information and privacy, I will store data securely and use multiple layers to remove your personally identifiable information.

Will being in this study help me in any way?

There may be no benefits to you from your taking part in this research. I cannot promise any benefits to others from your taking part in this research. However, possible benefits to you and others include the improvement of the quality of interactions among students and the instructor in the course. Also, the experience of participating in this study may offer insight into your lived experience not only as a student in a teacher education course, but also as a member of the society. The potential findings of this study may be able to provide implications to teacher educators regarding their student support in teacher education program.

Detailed Information About This Research Study

The following is more detailed information about this study in addition to the information listed above.

How many people will be studied?

I expect about eight people here will be in this research study out of the eleven people in the entire study, taking into consideration the number of students enrolled in this course.

What happens if I say “Yes”, but I change my mind later?

You can leave the research study at any time and no one will be upset by your decision.
If you decide to leave the research study, contact one of the investigators, Dr. Annie Mason or Younkyung Hong, or your academic advisor so that the investigator can stop attaining data from you as well as will not use data already attained from you.

Choosing not to be in this study or to stop being in this study will not result in any penalty to you or loss of benefit to which you are entitled.

**Will it cost me anything to participate in this research study?**

There will be no cost to you for any of the study activities or procedures.

**Whom do I contact if I have questions, concerns or feedback about my experience?**

This research has been reviewed and approved by an IRB within the Human Research Protections Program (HRPP). To share feedback privately with the HRPP about your research experience, call the Research Participants’ Advocate Line at 612-625-1650 (Toll Free: 1-888-224-8636) or go to [z.umn.edu/participants](http://z.umn.edu/participants). You are encouraged to contact the HRPP if:

- Your questions, concerns, or complaints are not being answered by the research team.
- You cannot reach the research team.
- You want to talk to someone besides the investigator.
- You have questions about your rights as a research participant.
- You want to get information or provide input about this research.

**Will I have a chance to provide feedback after the study is over?**

The HRPP may ask you to complete a survey that asks about your experience as a research participant. You do not have to complete the survey if you do not want to. If you do choose to complete the survey, your responses will be anonymous. If you are not asked to complete a survey, but you would like to share feedback, please contact the investigator or the HRPP. See the “Investigator Contact Information” of this form for contact information and “Whom do I contact if I have questions, concerns or feedback about my experience?” of this form for HRPP contact information.

**Will I be compensated for my participation?**

If you agree to take part in this research study, you will receive $25 for your time and contribution.

Yes, I agree
No, I disagree
The researcher may contact me to invite to participate in an interview in spring 2020 semester.

If yes, please provide the following contact information:

Email address: _________________________

Phone number: ________________________

** There will be additional compensation for the interview participation.

Your signature documents your permission to take part in this research. You will be provided a copy of this signed document.

_______________________________________________  ________________
Signature of Participant                          Date

_______________________________________________
Printed Name of Participant
Appendix C. Recruitment Script

This recruitment script will be used with the verbal presentation of introduction of this research during a class session.

Hello, my name is Younkyung Hong. I am a doctoral candidate in the Curriculum and Instruction, and also your course instructor for CI1001 in fall 2019 semester. I plan to conduct a research study understanding the hegemonic insider-outsider in a teacher education course, and I am inviting you to participate in this study. You all are eligible to participate in this study as you are enrolled in this course regardless of your current major.

If you agree to participate in this research, there are two things that I will ask for your permission regarding conducting video/audio recordings of class discussions and the use of assignments that you will be completing and submitting for this course. I may place electronic device(s) for video or audio recording to capture moments in this course. The course assignments that you will be developing throughout this semester can be used as potential data for this study as well. Unstructured interviews will be conducted during the spring 2020 semester. I will send an invitation for the interview after the fall 2019 semester is completed. Additional interviews could be requested if I will have further questions. You can choose whether you will participate in the follow-up interview. Your participation will be greatly appreciated because it will help me to better understand the hegemonic insider-outsider through your lived experiences and the idea that you will be further developing in this course.

Participation in this study is voluntary. Also, you can stop participating in this research anytime and no one will be upset by your decision. Any of your identifiable information will be stored in my personal laptop with password lock and will be deleted as soon as I finish data analysis. Pseudonym will be used in data throughout the duration of this study. You may choose not to answer any questions or provide information. More detailed information is on the consent form which you can take a closer look.

The copy of the consent form has been provided today. However, the consent form will be completed during the course evaluations and sealed in an envelope. The envelope will be held in the department office or by a faculty member, depending on the circumstance of the department, until the course work and evaluation are complete. No student-specific data will be collected during the semester. Do you have any questions for now? If you have any questions or concerns regarding this research and research participation, you can contact me or my advisor Dr. Annie Mason. The contact information is provided on the consent form.

Thank you very much for your time!
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Annie Mason
612-655-8227
mason@umn.edu

Dear Annie Mason:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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<th>Initial Study</th>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title of Study:</td>
<td>A Phenomenological Exploration of the Hegemonic Insider- Outsider in Teacher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Annie Mason</td>
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Driven to Discover℠
The IRB determined that this study meets the criteria for exemption from IRB review. To arrive at this determination, the IRB used “WORKSHEET: Exemption (HRP-312).” If you have any questions about this determination, please review that Worksheet in the [HRPP Toolkit Library](#) and contact the IRB office if needed.

This study met the following category for exemption:

- (1) Research conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings, involving normal educational practices. (Both the procedures involve normal education practices and the objectives of the research involve normal educational practices)

Ongoing IRB review and approval for this study is not required; however, this determination applies only to the activities described in the IRB submission and does not apply should any changes be made. If changes are made and there are questions about whether these activities impact the exempt determination, please submit a Modification to the IRB for a determination.

In conducting this study, you are required to follow the requirements listed in the Investigator Manual (HRP-103), which can be found by navigating to the [HRPP Toolkit Library](#) on the IRB website.

For grant certification purposes, you will need these dates and the Assurance of Compliance number which is FWA00000312 (Fairview Health Systems Research FWA00000325, Gillette Children's Specialty Healthcare FWA00004003).

Sincerely,

Jeffery P Perkey, CIP, MLS
IRB Analyst