

The Pennsylvania State University

The Graduate School

College of Education

**MAKING TROUBLE: PROFILES OF RESISTANCE  
BY MINORITIZED COUNSELOR EDUCATORS**

A Dissertation in

Counselor Education and Supervision

by

Javier F. Casado Pérez

© 2017 Javier F. Casado Pérez

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements  
for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

May 2017

The dissertation of Javier F. Casado Pérez was reviewed and approved\* by the following:

Richard J. Hazler  
Professor of Counselor Education  
Professor in Charge, Counselor Education  
Dissertation Advisor  
Chair of Committee

JoLynn V. Carney  
Associate Professor of Counselor Education

Katie Kostohryz  
Assistant Professor of Counselor Education

Jacqueline Edmondson  
Professor of Curriculum and Instruction

\* Signatures are on file in the Graduate School.

## ABSTRACT

Faculty diversification continues to be an issue across academia. With glacial speed, minoritized faculty join the ranks of tenured professors. The continued homogeneity among faculty at research-intensive predominantly white institutions (PWIs) is preserved by systemic inequalities and structural practices that generate barriers to success for minoritized faculty; most poignantly, institutional forms of social and cultural oppression. Counselor education is not beyond the reach of this reality, with existing literature giving voice to the oppression and marginalization experienced by minoritized counselor educators in counseling departments. While research in both higher education and counselor education describes the coping and survival strategies minoritized faculty utilize to survive the tenure-track, achieve tenure, and succeed in academia, little knowledge exists surrounding the change-making strategies these faculty engage in.

More than just survival and coping, minoritized faculty also balance resistance to oppressive organizational cultures and pressures to adhere to a marginalizing status quo. Acts of resistance elucidate and challenge structural and interactional forms of oppression that limit the success of minoritized faculty and situate them at the margins of academia. More and more, resistance emerges as a common experience and practice among minoritized faculty, but understanding the role and function of resistance in the lives of minoritized faculty, including minoritized counselor educators, remains unclear. Critical race feminist theory helps us to understand how and why structural oppression and systemic inequities continue to exist. I provide an introductory critical race feminist analysis of research-intensive PWIs in the United States and review existing research with minoritized faculty working to thrive therein.

Through critical in-depth phenomenological interviewing, I investigate the lived experiences and enactment of resistance for minoritized counselor educators. Phenomenological

profiles are then co-constructed with pre-tenure minoritized counselor educators (N=6) at research-intensive PWIs institutions through a rigorous three-part interview procedure and reduction strategy. I present these profiles in their entirety and discuss them in a critical race feminist theoretical context. Participant profiles reveal common experiences of oppression and marginalization, and strategies utilized in acts of resistance to endure despite difficult and ostracizing situations. For participants, resistance included both overt and strategically covert disruption and destabilization of inequitable or discriminatory organizational cultures.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements .....	vii
Dedication .....	viii
 CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION .....	 1
Faculty Diversity in the United States .....	3
Turning a Critical Lens to Counselor Education .....	5
Survival and Resistance in Academia .....	7
Statement of the Problem .....	9
Benefits of Critical Qualitative Inquiry: Unifying Oppressed Voices .....	11
Purpose of the Study .....	13
Research Questions .....	14
Significance of the Study .....	16
Delimitations and Limitations .....	17
Definition of Key Terms .....	20
 CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW .....	 24
Discrimination in the Professoriate .....	24
Critical Race Feminist Theory .....	28
The Status Quo   The Hegemonic .....	32
Evaluation of Research .....	34
Structures of Oppression in Academia .....	34
Survival and Resistance in Academia .....	40
Institutional Oppression in Counselor Education .....	43
Conclusions .....	45
 CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY .....	 48
Critical Race Feminist Research Lens .....	48
Research Design .....	49
Research Questions .....	50
Participants .....	51
Procedures .....	53
Research Focus and Data Analysis .....	57
A Note on Positionality .....	57
Data Analysis .....	58
Validity .....	60
 CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS .....	 63
Hyacinth .....	65
Eartha .....	74
Hope .....	84
Deacon .....	95
West .....	102
Jade .....	111

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION.....	120
Inheriting Resistance.....	121
Passing on Resistance.....	125
Strategies of Resistance .....	127
Sustained Service .....	128
Self-Love .....	129
Mentoring as Resistance.....	132
Taking Risks.....	134
Being Unapologetic .....	138
Coloring/Queering the Lens .....	140
Resistance as Shared Struggle .....	145
The Self-Interview.....	149
Conclusions.....	151
Implications for Counselor Education.....	153
Future Research.....	156
REFERENCES .....	159
APPENDIX A: Exemption Determination .....	175
APPENDIX B: Informed Consent for Research.....	176
APPENDIX C: Interview Protocols.....	177
APPENDIX D: Participant Memoranda .....	179
Hyacinth .....	179
Eartha .....	179
Hope .....	180
Deacon.....	181
West.....	182
Jade.....	182

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to acknowledge the engagement, investment, and contributions of the participants in this inquiry. Despite fear and emotional difficulty, they face inequity and oppression head on speaking not only for themselves, but for those that come after them.

Without their willingness to participate and openness to sharing this dissertation could not exist.

Second, I would like to acknowledge the ongoing support of my dissertation committee members. Richard J. Hazler, who, with patience and loving sternness, guided me from idea to idea, walked with me through failures and accomplishments, and sat at my side through a few *particularly* trying times. JoLynn V. Carney, who taught me that leadership, supervision, and discipline can be synonymous with collaboration, observation, and flexibility. Katie Kostohryz, who helped me understand that being sensitive is a strength, that relationships can do much more than heal, and that sometimes rocking the boat means being ready for the boat to rock back.

Jacqueline Edmondson, who opened my eyes to the landscape of higher education, and confronted me with the question, “What is the point of higher education? And for whom?”

Special thanks to my cohort, James, (JP), Lauren, Victoria, Naorah, Astrid, Shannon, Clewi, and Gitima. I certainly would not have gotten to this point without our Thursday Nights. Finally, an especially heartfelt thanks to Wil, my therapist who has kept me sane throughout the doctoral experience; and Anne DeLessio-Parson who challenges me to think greater and aim higher, and has taken on the small burdens and great joys of carrying forward this dissertation.

## DEDICATION

To Mom.

You always get up no matter what knocks you down. You are my inspiration and my motivation to be a better person. You support, push, and – when necessary – threaten Ben, Angie, and I to be good people and follow our dreams. You make our struggles your struggles and have no time for excuses. Every milestone I have reached in my career has been because of you. In the moments, I have feared applying for the next program, a job, or even asking someone out, you have always been there to tell me, “Javi, the worst they can say is ‘no.’” And every time I have thought of quitting or giving up, I have heard your voice, “¡Fulinga! Yo no te crié para que te rindas.”



## CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Who we are as educators is inextricably linked to how we do what we do. Tennant, McMullen, and Kaczynski (2010) demonstrate that developing teaching excellence is inextricable from identity work. To understand teaching excellence, we *must* understand the pedagogic and educational identity of the educator. The importance of the relationship between educator identity and pedagogic practice is present throughout the ideological foundations of modern higher education's scholarship of teaching from Dewey (1938) to Shulman (2004a, 2004b). Tennant and colleagues (2010) found that for expert educators "there is no ideal university teacher to which new teachers must conform" (p. 45), and that educator identity formation is always in relation to place and time. Becoming an educator involves a reflexive process, a process that is negotiated and renegotiated, that is personal and individualized, and that is a dynamic relationship between sense of self and social environments (Tennant et al., 2010).

The snag? Tennant and colleagues acknowledge that this process is subject to dominant organizational discourses that predefine what a 'good' educator is (Tennant et al., 2010). Dominant narratives that support or stifle an emerging educator's identity, sense of self, and social environment by communicating a pre-determined ideal university teacher. Leading scholarship has demonstrated how these dominant discourses are written by the historical and epistemic foundations of the academic institution, sustained by sociopolitical and cultural forces therein, and are especially salient in research-intensive PWIs (Gasman, Abiola, & Travers, 2015; Harper, 2012; hooks, 2003; Monzó & SooHoo, 2014). For example, these same foundational forces continue to be reified and perpetuated in the 21<sup>st</sup> century through the socio-economic governing force of neoliberalism (Levin & Aliyeva, 2015). Driving faculty behaviors like

hyperproductivity and competition and values of commodification and privatization (Giroux, 2014; Nishida, 2016), which carve out gendered and racialized lines and continue to exclude minoritized ways of knowing and being.

Research scholars across academia have demonstrated how minoritized faculty – faculty of color, women faculty, faculty with disabilities, and faculty with sexual or gender diversity – most often fall outside of this socially constructed ideal, experiencing marginalization and oppression from academic success (Chesler, 2013; Churgay, Smith, Woodard, & Wallace, 2014; Nishida, 2016; Turner, González, & Wong (Lau), 2011; Vaccaro, 2012). Counselor education does not escape the influence of these institutional phenomena, with evidence of minoritized counselor educators (MCE) being forced to navigate unequal barriers and forms of oppression both departmentally and institutionally (e.g. Alexander-Albritton & Hill, 2015; Haskins et al., 2016; Lerma, Zamarripa, Oliver, & Cavazos Vela, 2015). In two groundbreaking studies, Cartwright, Washington, and McConnell (2009) and Constantine, Smith, Redington, and Owens (2008) ignited the conversation by capturing the experiences Black faculty in rehabilitation counselor education, counseling, and counseling psychology had of racial microaggressions, and how these experiences restricted and suppressed their academic success. These studies have been cited 49 times since their publication according to their publishing websites. Yet, only five of those times were in counseling-related journals, and there has been little evidence of the conversation spreading across Counselor Education. In this dissertation, I aim to reengage this conversation and elevate the voices of MCEs who not only survive in research-intensive PWIs, but do so while resisting institutional discourses that are marginalizing and oppressive. I do this by co-constructing profiles of resistance with participants through critical in-depth phenomenological interviews.

### **Faculty Diversity in the United States**

The diversity of faculty across higher education continues to be extremely limited in the United States (US), despite evidence of the vastly positive effects diversity has on institutional achievement and student learning outcomes (see Dancy & Jean-Marie, 2014). The Chronicle of Higher Education (2016) publishing a special report specifically on the racial, ethnic, and gender makeup of faculty in 4,300 institutions and featured articles on the diversification of faculty. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (2013), only 21.5 percent of full-time faculty positions in the US are held by faculty of color; males of color holding 20.9 percent of all positions held by males and females of color holding 22.2 percent of all positions held by females. Women hold less than half of all full-time faculty positions, and no data has been collected on the national level for faculty with disability or sexual and gender diversity. The American Council on Education (2016) reports that administrative and leadership positions continue to be disproportionately held by white males. This white male dominance (Cannella & Perez, 2012) has not changed much in the last two decades, with university and college presidents of color (male & female) in the US rising from 8 percent in 1986 to just 13 percent in 2011 (Gasman et al., 2015).

Colleges and universities in the US have historically been and largely remain segregated, reflecting society at large (Monzó & SooHoo, 2014) and engendering the labels: predominantly white institution (PWI); Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU), and Minority-Serving Institution (MSI). In discussing PWIs, critical race and feminist scholars have discussed how these predominantly white spaces produce and reproduce organizational cultures that perpetuate white supremacy, patriarchy, and capitalist ideologies through structural practices and systemic inequalities that invalidate the experiences of minoritized faculty and discount the very

real and present effects of racism and sexism in academia (Cannella & Perez, 2012; Dancy & Jean-Marie, 2014; Harper, 2012; Monzó & SooHoo, 2014). Facing what can feel like insurmountable odds and inequities at research-intensive PWIs, many minoritized faculty choose departure, some prior to tenure, some from academia altogether (Dancy & Jean-Marie, 2014). In fact, faculty of color are more commonly found at HBCUs, MSIs, and community colleges (Dancy & Jean-Marie, 2014; Gasman et al., 2015). Many US institutions, and especially some research-intensive PWIs, are haunted by roots that were sown in the white supremacy, patriarchy, and colonialist Christianity central to the foundations of the US education system.

By revealing the oppressive status quo that exists in academia and revealing the influence of historically rooted imperialist white-supremacist capitalist patriarchy (hooks, 2003), critical race, feminist, queer, and disability scholars have begun to disrupt any idea that minoritized faculty are free to be who they want to be. Instead, these scholars reveal a different reality, where minoritized faculty must continuously struggle against oppressive and marginalizing organizational cultures communicating that they are *the other* (Madrid, 2004), and icy climates that make it clear they do not belong (Chesler, 2013; Turner et al., 2011). Minoritized faculty face a reoccurring performance in which they are judged each day, overtly or covertly, by colleagues, administrators, and students on how well they conform to a socially constructed ideal norm of white heterosexual able-bodied maleness (Cannella & Perez, 2012; Chesler, 2013; Griffin, Bennett, & Harris, 2013; Kachchaf, Ko, Hodari, & Ong, 2015; Kelly & McCann, 2014; Nishida, 2016; Turner et al., 2011). For minoritized faculty, every day involves the decision to survive these oppressive performances or act in resistance to them.

### **Turning a Critical Lens to Counselor Education**

As a continuously emerging discipline with roots in vocational and school guidance, psychology, and education, Counselor Education scholars continue discover and rediscover the uniqueness of counselor education and what it means to educate counselors (Calley & Hawley, 2008; West, Bubenzer, Cox, & McGlothlin, 2013). These discoveries have included the need for discipline-specific instruction (Barrio Minton, Wachter Morris, & Yaites, 2014; Malott, Hall, Sheely-Moore, Krell, & Cardaciotto, 2014; West et al., 2013), the developmental milestones in emerging counselor educators (Dollarhide, Gibson, & Moss, 2013; Gibson, Dollarhide, Leach, & Moss, 2015; Milsom & Moran, 2015), and the need to strengthen multicultural education (Malott, 2010; Malott, Paone, Maddux, & Rothman, 2010; Seward, 2014). More recently, this process of discovery has taken a more critically conscious turn as counselor education scholars recognize the influence of structural and systemic oppression on MCEs' experiences, counselors-in-training, and counselor preparation (Chang, Crethar, & Ratts, 2010; Haskins & Singh, 2015). For example, Haskins and Singh (2015) point out that work around multicultural competency has historically functioned to help mostly white counselors-in-training develop increased cultural awareness and evaluate constructs like racism and white privilege; meanwhile, ignoring the lived experience and embodied knowledge of minoritized counselors-in-training within those very counselor education training programs.

In the ongoing effort to distinguish the counselor education paradigm (Ratts & Wood, 2011) from psychology and social work, scholars advocate for the inclusion of multiculturalism and social justice not only into pedagogic practices or specific courses, but into the nature of counselor education programs themselves (Haskins & Singh, 2015; Odegard & Vereen, 2010). This shift would redefine training programs and recognize the dynamics of diversity and ongoing

social inequalities encountered by both counselors-in-training, counselor educators, and clients alike. Such training programs would centralize the need to continuously challenge oppressive and marginalizing systems on classroom, community, and societal levels.

Beyond enhancements in pedagogy and training, shifts toward more purposeful social justice education and programs helps to shed light on the differential experiences of MCEs. More and more, critical counselor education scholars have demonstrated that MCEs do not experience their training programs and careers as educators in the same way as their more privileged counterparts (Alexander-Albritton & Hill, 2015; Haskins et al., 2016; Lerma et al., 2015). As Marbley (counselor educator) stresses, higher education is a terrain where identity is predefined by those with privilege and power, and where the idealistic melting pot of identities tends to exist in and is conditioned upon white and patriarchal spaces (Marbley, Wong, Santos-Hatchett, Pratt, & Jaddo, 2011). This means that for MCEs the integration of their non-majority social identities must happen in accordance to the predominant, or default, Whiteness and maleness already in existence there. This critical counselor education literature is not only important for the discipline, but connects the experiences of MCEs to those of minoritized faculty throughout academia.

Counselor education has a long-established relationship with diversity issues, multicultural education, and social justice advocacy that is reflected in educational standards (CACREP, 2015), competencies (Ratts et al., 2015), and mission statements of the discipline (ACA, 2016; ACES, 2015). The CACREP educational standards for counselor education doctoral students includes multicultural education, and the multicultural and social justice competencies (Ratts et al., 2015) makes explicit that one of the roles of the professional counselor is action and advocacy against social injustice. These commitments to social justice

and the educational foundations in multicultural competency situate both professional counselors and counselor educators in a unique position to challenge structures of oppression and marginalization that affect their clients and communities. As we turn the lens of multiculturalism and social justice toward counselor education, these communities *must* include academia.

Oppressive organizational cultures (Lester, 2008) that demand faculty perform roles in restricting ways stifle the creativity, achievement, and overall academic success of minoritized faculty. As counselor education continues to distinguish itself as a discipline committed to multiculturalism and social justice competency, the pressing need is there to advocate and take action in protecting those most vulnerable even within the walls of academia. Research demonstrates that MCEs continue to struggle and resist oppressive organizational cultures. More problematic still, they continue to feel the need to seek mentorship outside of counselor education and rely solely on themselves (Cartwright et al., 2009; Haskins et al., 2016; Lerma et al., 2015). Diversity in counselor education faculty continues to grow, but the speed of growth is reflective of academia at large. Increasing the number of minoritized faculty in a program is not enough, however (Gasman, Kim, & Nguyen, 2011; Monzó & SooHoo, 2014). Counselor education as an academic discipline must be prepared to recognize that institutional and cultural barriers exist for minoritized faculty; that the oppression of minoritized faculty affects and reflects upon counselors-in-training and their practice; and, that institutional support and leadership is critical for creating lasting change (Jones, Hwang, & Bustamante, 2015; Louis et al., 2016).

### **Survival and Resistance in Academia**

Critical Black feminist scholar bell hooks (1990a, 2003) referred to the continual endeavor of challenging ideologies of domination and structures of oppression as **resistance**.

hooks (1990b) explained that through **true speaking**, resistance through speech that reveals hidden inequality and oppression, the marginalized can challenge power and give voice to their own liberation. Hinchey (2010) defined resistance as an unwillingness and overt refusal to go along with dominant discourses that oppress or maintain the status quo, recognizing the invisible structures that exist to limit and control the minoritized. While researchers have found that resistance can occur *through* advocacy (Beale, Chesler, & Ramus, 2013), the construct is *more* than just advocacy. Advocacy is characterized as a process of identifying areas where appropriate interventions can be taken to empower and generate systemic change for others, including, in counseling, our clients (Ratts et al., 2015; Toporek, Lewis, & Crethar, 2009). In a way, advocacy works *within* the existing system. Beale and colleagues (2013) found that procedural challenges to admission policies, hiring practices, and promotion and tenure processes that disadvantages minoritized educators functioned as forms of resistance through advocacy.

At the same time, resistance is a more personal act, an act taken on by an individual to confront and question oppression and marginalization and bring stark attention to issues of privilege, power, and ideologies of domination (Beale et al., 2013; Freire, 2007; hooks, 1990a, 1990b; Lutz, Hassouneh, Akeroyd, & Beckett, 2013). Instead of affecting change from within the system, resistance works to disrupt the system. For the purpose of this inquiry, I define resistance as spoken or embodied actions, both exceptional and everyday, that challenge oppression and marginalization even in the face of fear or repercussions (Hinchey, 2010; hooks, 1990b, 2003; McKenzie, 2014; Rodriguez & Boahene, 2012). Resistance can range from directly challenging a microaggression, or refusing to laugh at a culturally insensitive joke, to openly attending a rally and speaking out against institutional discrimination. Primed by critical consciousness, resistance



risers in response to oppression, working to transform structures of control, suppression, and erasure (Freire, 2007; hooks, 2003).

Scholars have explored the role of structural oppression and systemic inequality on the success and wellbeing of minoritized faculty (Chesler, Young, & Beale, 2013; Turner et al., 2011; Turner, González, & Wood, 2008) and their experiences of needing to survive and struggle for achievement (Jones et al., 2015; Kachchaf et al., 2015; Kelly & McCann, 2014; Marbley et al., 2011). These themes are reflected in the counselor education literature, where inquiries have also focused on the educational experiences of minoritized doctoral students and counselor educators, and what has supported or hindered their success in academia (Alexander-Albritton & Hill, 2015; Baker & Moore, III, 2015; Haskins et al., 2016; Hinojosa & Carney, 2016; Lerma et al., 2015). Resistance provides a new area for inquiry, where minoritized educators tap into rage (Rodriguez & Boahene, 2012), into anger over historically reinforced injustice, reject powerlessness and act against oppression and domination. Through this inquiry, I will work to further the understanding of individually enacted resistance and the strategies employed therein.

### **Statement of the Problem**

Critical and feminist scholars have demonstrated continued disparities in: students' ratings and opinions of minoritized faculty, student and colleague respect for minoritized faculty, role and performance expectations upon minoritized faculty, and representation of minoritized faculty in higher education faculty and administrative senior positions (Chesler, 2013; Dancy & Jean-Marie, 2014; Gasman et al., 2015; Griffin et al., 2013; Turner et al., 2011). These scholars have been seminal in illuminating how minoritized faculty (including white female faculty) experience academia differently than their white male counterparts.

Scholarship focused on educator experiences with students has generated the

understanding that minoritized faculty are more likely to have their authority challenged and be rated more severely by students, and to be expected to carry out more mentoring and services roles while not being rewarded for them (Griffin et al., 2013; Jones et al., 2015; Kachchaf et al., 2015; Louis et al., 2016). Minoritized faculty are also expected to perform ‘professorate’ (Lester, 2008), meaning to fulfill and reenact the socially constructed conception of the professor, which falls along neoliberal white patriarchal lines that prescribe merit to individualism, competition, and intellectual dominance (Denzin, 2015; Griffin et al., 2013; Harper, 2012; Marbley et al., 2011; Monzó & SooHoo, 2014). These performances reinforce hyperproductivity, overcommitment, and overexposure in ways that are incompatible with and – as can be the case for faculty with disability – impossible for minoritized faculty (Joseph & Hirshfield, 2013; Louis et al., 2016; Nishida, 2016).

These revelations have paved the way for minoritized faculty to address marginalizing expectations and to challenge their repositioning (challenges to their expertise and legitimacy) within the classroom through critically conscious pedagogy (Chesler et al., 2013; Fraser & Hunt, 2011; Meyer & Lesiuk, 2010; Rodriguez, Boahene, Gonzales-Howell, & Anesi, 2012). Researchers have also revealed how the social environment of an institution, its organizational discourse (narratives that create or dismantle patterns of oppression) and culture (role expectations, biases, and stereotypes) (Lester, 2008), can support or fracture the social identity of minoritized faculty. Producing “anticipatory vigilance” (Chesler & Young Jr, 2007, p. 13) toward marginalization, cultural taxation, and othering within their own departments. Vigilance that is often warranted. Eagan Jr. and Garvey (2015) found that subtle discrimination had significantly negative effect on faculty of color’s productivity, an increasingly dominating expectation for tenure and promotion across academia (Gardner & Veliz, 2014). A byproduct of

neoliberalism's influence on higher education (Giroux, 2014; Levin & Aliyeva, 2015; Nishida, 2016).

Scholars have made tangible the implicit expectation that minoritized faculty perform in ways that align with oppressive ideologies or risk perishing from the academy (e.g. Gasman et al., 2015; Griffin et al., 2013; Jones et al., 2015; Kachchaf et al., 2015; Lutz et al., 2013; Nishida, 2016; Turner et al., 2011). These critical race and feminist scholars elucidate these organizational structures and their impacts on minoritized faculty, while bringing to light the knowledge gap that exists surrounding minoritized faculty experiences in what critical Black feminist scholar bell hooks (1990) called "space[s] of resistance". MCEs have also begun to turn their attention to the experiences of counselor educators with minoritized social identities (Alexander-Albritton & Hill, 2015; Haskins et al., 2016; Lerma et al., 2015). However, the gap persists in understanding resistance and resistive strategies MCEs utilize against oppressive and marginalizing structures in academia (Cannella & Perez, 2012; hooks, 2003; Lutz et al., 2013). This dissertation will address this knowledge gap by investigating the phenomenon of resistance within the context of counselor education and the implications that new insights have for minoritized faculty more broadly.

### **Benefits of Critical Qualitative Inquiry: Unifying Oppressed Voices**

The focus on the lived experiences and meaning-making of MCEs make the qualitative endeavor especially relevant for building new insights into the phenomenon of resistance (Creswell, 2013a; Maxwell, 2012; Savin-Baden & Major, 2012; Seidman, 2012). Subjectivity, reflexivity, contextualization and cross-contextualization are central to this qualitative investigation. Qualitative research incorporates these into the analysis of data and iterative process of interpreting and presenting results (Creswell, 2013a; Mason, 2002; Savin-Baden &

Major, 2012). The qualitative endeavor appreciates the continuous process of generating individual truths and constructing subjective realities when considering participant interactions with a subject, idea, experience, community, or event. Moreover, qualitative research occurs within the natural setting, the experienced context, of the participants and considers issues that have a personal connection to the participants lived-experience (Maxwell, 2012; Maxwell & Miller, 2008). Inquiry is, therefore, not conducted in an objective sterile environment, but within the environments that participants regularly encounter.

The **critical qualitative inquiry** paradigm (Cannella, Pérez, & Pasque, 2015) is *especially* beneficial when considering the knowledge gap surrounding resistance. Critical qualitative researchers utilize established methodologies from ethnography to phenomenology, but for the purpose of exploring and addressing social justice issues and informing systemic and policy change (Denzin, 2015). Two key principles of critical qualitative research are to centralize the voices of the marginalized and oppressed, and to use the investigative process to make known sites of resistance, change, and activism (Bloom & Sawin, 2009; Denzin, 2015). With a focus on social justice, critical qualitative inquiries (CQIs) are driven by the process of people interacting with others, things, systems, and environments. These interactions inform how individuals are being affected through their experiences with the world around them, informing meaning-making and generating contextualized insights about a chosen phenomenon.

By exploring the interactions between individuals and phenomena, qualitative inquiries, including CQIs, generate what Mason (2002) called cross-contextual generalities, insights that can be transferred across settings, permeating social, professional, or disciplinary boundaries for the benefit of the broader community. Generating cross-contextual explanations broadens the

impact of the investigation and makes the critical qualitative endeavor perfect when seeking to understand MCEs' experiences of resistance.

Qualitative research, including CQIs, investigate the actions individuals are engaged in through contextualization and deciphering meaning, but also through their historicism and activism (Cannella et al., 2015; Maxwell, 2012; Seidman, 2012). The historicism and activism of action is the connection between present behavior and experience, and the historical and social roots of that action. MCEs, particularly those in PWIs, are often faced with continuous challenges to their social identities and educational legitimacy. Like other minoritized faculty, they are confronted with the decision to take action against these challenges, but MCEs are also equipped with multicultural and social justice competency (Haskins & Singh, 2015; Ratts et al., 2015). CQI can help us learn what resistance looks like in counselor education and how it aims to generate change and promote social justice in one sphere of the academe.

### **Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this inquiry is to explore the construct of resistance amongst MCEs. The inquiry aims to shed light on MCEs' lived experiences resisting oppression and marginalization in the academe, particularly research-intensive PWIs. The larger goal of this inquiry is to contribute to a national discourse surrounding the experiences of minoritized faculty by introducing a critical qualitative inquiry into resistance and resistive strategies. The inquiry will aim to further discover what it means to be a minoritized counselor educator and recognize what meaning counselor educators generate around resistance that challenges domination and the status quo. A template adapted from Creswell (2013b) by Savin-Baden and Major (2012, p.102) is used here to summarize the statement of purpose for this inquiry:

The purpose of this critical qualitative inquiry is to further understanding on minoritized faculty resistance and contribute to a national discourse on the experiences of these faculty in academia. I use critical in-depth phenomenological interviews to identify moments of resistance carried out by counselor educators and contextualize these experiences around inequality, empowerment, and social critique in academia. At this stage in the research, I define **resistance** as critically conscious acts motivated by personal experiences and deeply connected to core social identities, such acts challenge structures of oppression and status quo ideologies.

### **Research Questions**

Qualitative research questions are crafted through the identification of subject, topic, problem, and purpose (Creswell, 2013a; Savin-Baden & Major, 2012). Research questions should be centered around what the inquiry is about, these are the questions that the inquiry is designed to address, and should help focus the inquiry and guide its implementation (Mason, 2002; Maxwell, 2012). Maxwell (2012) discusses the iterative interrelationship between the qualitative research question and the qualitative procedure. In this way, the research questions iterated here are influenced by both the phenomenon in question and the method and procedures guiding the design of this inquiry: critical qualitative inquiry (Cannella et al., 2015) and Seidman's (2012) in-depth phenomenological interviewing.

***Research question 1: What experiences have minoritized counselor educators had with resistance?*** Seidman's (2012) in-depth phenomenological method includes an investigation into the participants' life-in-detail, the detailed exploration of the phenomenon in the life and actions

of the participant. I have chosen to adjust this to focus on specific experiences wherein MCEs have taken part in resistance. This variation in Siedman's approach fits with the CQI principle of using "inquiry to reveal sites of change and activism" (Denzin, 2015). Instead of focusing on details about the participants' everyday lives, the critical in-depth phenomenological interview is strengthened by detailing moments when participants have enacted resistance. This research question emphasizes both actions and interactions that accompany resistance, providing valuable insight toward identifying resistive strategies as well.

***Research question 2: How did minoritized counselor educators come to be involved in resistance?*** Understanding the historical context leading up to the phenomenon in question, here resistance, is central to both critical qualitative inquiry and in-depth phenomenological interviewing (Denzin, 2015; Pasque & Salazar Pérez, 2015; Seidman, 2012). Exploring what led to involvement in and acts of resistance helps to compose a more complete representation of the participant and to contextualize the construct of resistive action. Historical and lived experience is at the core of critical phenomenology (CP) and critical qualitative inquiry, as experience, perception, and meaning-making cannot be removed from the historical or sociocultural contexts of the phenomenon (Pasque & Salazar Pérez, 2015; Velmans, 2007; Welton & Silverman, 1987).

***Research question 3: What does enacting resistance mean in the lives of minoritized counselor educators?*** Meaning-making is at the heart of phenomenology (Creswell, 2013a; Moustakas, 1994; Seidman, 2012). How participants make meaning of phenomenon and how these meanings affect their behaviors is significant to most forms of qualitative endeavors, including critical qualitative inquiry (Cannella et al., 2015; Creswell, 2013a; Maxwell, 2012). Through this research question, I seek to understand how participants make meaning out of their experiences of resistance. Understanding how MCEs make meaning from resistance may

generate insights into what motivates and sustains resistive strategies. Exploring meaning-making may also produce new knowledge about the ways that resistance is integrated into the the identities and future career paths of the participant (Seidman, 2012).

### **Significance of the Study**

Various counselor education scholars have highlighted the need for more studies to focus on the experience and nature of being a counselor educator (Barrio Minton et al., 2014; Hall & Hulse-Killacky, 2010; Hunt & Gilmore, 2011; Orr, Hall, & Hulse-Killacky, 2008). These authors highlight the lack of knowledge regarding pedagogic practices that are counseling-specific, vague theoretical foundations for education in counselor education, and little understanding of what excelling counselor educators actually do. West, Bubenzer, Cox, and McGlothlin's (2013) text on teaching in counselor education goes a long way to address these critiques, but neglects to discuss the experiences of educators as members of larger academia.

Counselor education faces a larger deficit in understanding the counselor educator's role as a member of a faculty body within the larger academe. The Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) 2016 standards on counselor education are vague when addressing the preparation of counselor education doctoral students for membership in faculty bodies. In a recent phenomenological study, Milsom and Moran (2015) illuminated significant developmental changes that counselor educators experienced when becoming faculty members, including unexpected isolation and inexplicit departmental expectations. Gibson, Dollarhide, Leach, and Moss (2015) captured an even more relevant response when a participant in their study expressed that "being a professor has been much more surprising to me than being a counselor educator. The politics in higher ed[ucation], I was not prepared for" (p. 122). Within the last decade, attention to the experience of counselor educators



as faculty shifted to issues pertaining to diversity (Alexander-Albritton & Hill, 2015; Cartwright et al., 2009; Constantine et al., 2008; Haskins et al., 2016; Lerma et al., 2015).

While a discipline focused on the training and supervision of professional counselors, counselor education cannot ignore that it exists within the context of higher education. Counselor education is not removed from the organizational cultures that affect higher education and minoritized faculty across the academe. Nevertheless, the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) is silent on this reality, failing to provide direction for how counselor educators can be agents of resistance and change within institutions experiencing repeated diversity issues among the professoriate. This inquiry will begin breaking the silence surrounding these instances of resistance and, hopefully, better situate counselor education as an integral part of change-making in academia.

Resistive strategies are often evident in how counselor educators engage their scholarship, but at times resistance can be more direct. While literature on faculty diversity demonstrates that resistance can exist in service, teaching, and professional involvement (Chesler et al., 2013; Lutz et al., 2013; Turner et al., 2011), this inquiry aims to provide critical insights into specific examples of resistance, and the meaning-making surrounding these experiences. Through this inquiry, I aim to explore these experiences and contribute to both discipline-specific and interdisciplinary knowledge about faculty resisting oppressive structures and organizational cultures that perpetuate poor representation and marginalization of minoritized faculty across academia.

### **Delimitations and Limitations**

This inquiry contains some important delimitations, sampling strategy is key amongst these. This inquiry specifically samples minoritized counselor educators. The rationale behind

this delimitation is that the phenomenon in question and the inquiry's contributions can only be accessed by focusing on the experiences of minoritized counselor educators. Generally, counselor educators are expected to maintain special competency and proficiency in multicultural issues and social justice advocacy (Chang et al., 2010; Ratts et al., 2015; Ratts & Wood, 2011). Beyond contributing to a national dialogue, delimiting the sample to counselor educators may allow this investigation to focus on how competency and proficiency facilitate resistance against oppressive and marginalizing organizational cultures in the academe.

Relatedly, inclusion criteria for this inquiry includes self-identification by counselor educators as having experiences of resisting oppression and marginalization of themselves or those around them. Moreover, while allies and allyship is essential to social change and the success of minoritized faculty in academia, this inquiry focuses on resistance enacted by MCEs. Resistance is an considerably personal act, especially for those with already minoritized identities who face risk in the enactment or resistance (hooks, 1990a, 1990b). For this reason, exclusion criteria include the intersections of historically privileged social identities: white heterosexual cisgender able-bodied male.

Following best practices in phenomenological in-depth interviewing, the target sample size is no less than six participants (Creswell, 2013a; Moustakas, 1994; Savin-Baden & Major, 2012; Seidman, 2012). This delimitation bolsters the possibility for cross-contextual generalities (Mason, 2002), connectivity (Seidman, 2012), and transferability (Freeman, deMarrais, Preissle, Roulston, & St. Pierre, 2007; Savin-Baden & Major, 2012). Extended (60-90 minutes) interviews with participants also facilitate richer and thicker data for more complete participant profiles (Maxwell, 2012; Maxwell & Miller, 2008; Seidman, 2012).

A significant limitation to this inquiry lies in its convenient sampling strategy, which relies on participants volunteering time for participation. This investigation lacks an incentive structure, so considerations were made to condense Seidman's (2012) three-interview procedure and accommodate participant schedules. Thankfully, all six participants agreed to the three-interview process. Throughout recruitment, only one potential participant was unable to commit to the time requirement. With this individual's permission, another participant was recruited.

Purposeful sampling depended on a process of referral, wherein tenured faculty identified minoritized pre-tenure counselor educators they knew to be involved in resistance. This concept sampling strategy leveraged established mentoring relationships, and recruited minoritized junior counselor educators 2-5 years on the tenure track. Research has demonstrated that minoritized faculty tend to be pre-tenure and younger than tenured faculty (Gasman et al., 2015), partially due to recently greater access and representation in academia, so recruiting pre-tenure faculty increased the likelihood of connecting with individuals most affected by oppression. While this recruitment strategy resulted in a racially diverse sample, Latino and Native American faculty were not represented. Participant interviews were carried out primarily through Skype, limiting non-verbal observations and participant focus. This had an especially limiting effect on interviews with participants regularly engaged in professional tasks simultaneous to the interview.

An additional limitation exists in the nature of this qualitative inquiry method. Interpretation remains central to phenomenology, even more so in critical phenomenology (Velmans, 2007; Welton & Silverman, 1987). Critical phenomenology abandons the decontextualization of the participant's experiences and rejects the notion of researcher objectivity especially when investigating phenomenon that also affect the researcher. The study

of experience is a naturally subjective process (Moustakas, 1994; Savin-Baden & Major, 2012). At the same time, I recognize my responsibility in theoretically-informed involvement and engagement with participant stories, paving the way for more holistic analysis of the data. Indeed, Mason (2002) points out that the aim of the qualitative endeavor is to generate new explanations, interpretations, and understandings about the experience of the social world. The qualitative researcher should not shy away or step back from the phenomenon of interest, but step into the phenomenon openly, with extreme interest, and with an awareness of the critical aims of the endeavor (Cannella et al., 2015; Moustakas, 1994). To ensure rigor and trustworthiness, member checking and participant involvement was used in the construction of the in-depth phenomenological profiles.

### **Definition of Key Terms**

**Counselor educators** belong to the professional discipline of counselor education. Doctoral counselor education programs can be accredited by the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Programs (CACREP), and typically provide research, teaching, and academic preparation to counselor education doctoral students. While counselor education programs may vary, counselor educators are most commonly trained in developmental and mental health processes, pedagogical and supervisory practices, and professional leadership. **Minoritized counselor educators** (MCEs) refers to counselor educators whose social identity(ies) belong to historically oppressed and systemically marginalized social groups.

Harper (2012) describes **minoritized** as a term that denotes the socially constructed nature of underrepresentation and subordination within the social fabric of the United States, including academic institutions. Harper explains:

People are not born into minority status nor are they minoritized in every social context (e.g., their families, racially homogenous friendship groups, or places of worship). Instead, they are rendered minorities in particular situations and institutional environments that sustain an overrepresentation of Whiteness. (p. 9)

Minoritized implies a social process of exclusion that marginalizes and oppresses individuals into underrepresented and disadvantaged categories, a process which is historically rooted and institutionalized (Hoffman & Mitchell, 2016). In other words, minoritized individuals are only minoritized because the systems they inhabit at any given time are maintaining white dominance (Cannella & Perez, 2012). I use the term minoritized to indicate counselor educators whose social identities have been resituated into categories of underrepresentation and disadvantage by the social process of exclusion that exists in the fabric of research-intensive PWIs.

For the purpose of this inquiry, **status quo** refers to social and institutional discourse that maintains homogenous categories and lineages of historical privilege. The status quo of academic institutions has historically privileged Whiteness and maleness, through systems of both white supremacy, patriarchy, and, more recently, neoliberalism (Cannella & Perez, 2012; Chesler et al., 2013; Griffin et al., 2013; Monzó & SooHoo, 2014; Nishida, 2016). These hegemonic structures generate their own **organizational cultures** that reinforce insular norms, expectations, and stereotypes (Lee-Thomas, 2008; Lester, 2008). Coincidentally, the organizational culture produced by an institution's status quo ideologies can serve to privilege Whiteness and maleness, or set about destabilizing marginalizing systems, as is the case when institutions explicitly oppose homogeneity and promote diversity, inclusion, and equity-mindedness (Gasman et al., 2011; Harper, 2009; Hoffman & Mitchell, 2016).

Throughout this dissertation, the term *power* is used frequently, so a discussion of its definition is essential. At the same time, the definition of power is a largely debated and contemplated topic; in fact, power is the subject of the *Journal of Political Power* (formerly the *Journal of Power*). Foucault (1980) asserts that power, a process of power-over, can only be considered as it exists in interactions, a dynamic phenomenon and not a stagnant one. Without interaction, power disappears and, therefore, cannot be examined. Alternatively, power can be understood systemically, wherein historical, political, economic, cultural, and social forces have afforded an individual or group power over another individual or group (Allen, 2016). Saar (2010) maintains that understanding power systemically is a continuation of understanding power interactionally, as the system of power can still only be analyzed as it plays out between individuals or groups.

**Power**, therefore, is defined here as a systemically produced power-over relationship that is unequal or illegitimate, but made possible and normalized by the status quo. This definition of power makes it interchangeable with such terms as domination, oppression, and marginalization. **Oppression** is the process of subordination that limits, restricts, and suppresses the individual, social, and political potential and security of minoritized individuals through systemic inequalities, structural barriers, and social control (Freire, 2007; hooks, 2003). **Marginalization** is the process of othering and creating exclusive environments that cause minoritized individuals to feel like outsiders within their own disciplines (Turner et al., 2011, 2008). **Empowerment** is used as the foil to power, and defined as a *power-to* relationship through which minoritized individuals transform themselves, others, and their surrounding environment by subverting and restructuring existing systems of power (Allen, 2016).

I identify the qualitative method for this inquiry as **critical in-depth phenomenological**

**interviewing (CIPi).** Bringing together critical qualitative inquiry (Cannella et al., 2015) and methods of phenomenology (Creswell, 2013a; Moustakas, 1994; Seidman, 2012), CIPi becomes a reflexive procedure that emphasizes the wholeness of the participant and the participation of the researcher as a part of the studied experience (Velmans, 2007). CIPi also integrates the subjective and pluralistic worldview of phenomenology (Creswell, 2013a; Savin-Baden & Major, 2012) with critical social theories (Cannella et al., 2015). CIPi assumes that phenomena cannot be separated from the social and historical context within which they exist (Welton & Silverman, 1987). Like critical grounded theory (Lutz et al., 2013), CIPi works within the politics of resistance, keeping at its center social critiques aimed at interrogating implicit structures of power, oppression, and privilege surrounding the phenomenon in question (Lutz et al., 2013; Velmans, 2007).

## CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

The educator, like the student, enters the classroom with prior knowledge, life experiences, content expertise, and learned teaching practices that affect who they are as an educator, how they teach, and how students learn (Prosser & Trigwell, 2006; Tennant et al., 2010). The educators' emotional state and belief in the worthiness of what they teach serves to stifle or enhance their efficiency and bolster or constrain student learning (Trigwell, 2011, 2013). If an educator *believes* in the value and worthiness of both themselves and the content they teach, then their teaching practice can soar. There is an interplay here between the educator's personhood and the pedagogical content knowledge they hold. Thus, the identity of the educator is everchanging through interactions between the person and place, place and organizational culture, and organizational culture and person. Social theory of learning calls this process the social formation of the person, where the individual must learn to be by belonging, becoming, experiencing, and doing their discipline (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998). In the academy, minoritized faculty experience unique challenges to this social identity formation when their personhood is restricted, and their process of belonging, becoming, experiencing, and doing is marred by an anticipatory vigilance to messages of not belonging, messages that oppress and marginalize (Chesler et al., 2013; Dancy & Jean-Marie, 2014). For minoritized faculty, the reality that the academy legitimizes some ways of being faculty and not others becomes quickly apparent.

### **Discrimination in the Professoriate**

Turner and Myers' (2000) work was pivotal in demonstrating that any success in faculty diversification up until that point was *bittersweet*. With colleagues, Turner set the foundation of minoritized faculty research, advising that the successful diversification of the professoriate has



given rise to themes of isolation and lack of mentoring, occupational stress, institutional racism, tokenism, accent discrimination, challenges to intellect and credentials, and biased recruitment, promotion, and tenure (Turner et al., 2011, 2008). The works of Turner and colleagues functioned as a rallying cry that provided traction for national scholarly attention to the realities faced by minoritized faculty in often icy and often unwelcoming institutional cultures, and how these cultures restrict the success of minoritized faculty and shift them out of larger research-intensive predominantly white institutions (Dirks, 2016; Gasman et al., 2015; Monzó & SooHoo, 2014; Nishida, 2016). Despite this attention, researchers continue finding that minoritized faculty still experience subtle and overt forms of discrimination, often times microaggressions, that detrimentally affect their academic success.

For example, Eagan Jr. and Garvey (2015) found that subtle discrimination as a hindrance stressor had a significant negative effect on faculty productivity, especially for women of color. The scholars also found that while increased stressors resulted in slightly higher research productivity for white men and women, the reverse was true to men and women faculty of color (Eagan Jr & Garvey, 2015). The organizational culture is shaped to provide structural support for majority-identity faculty, this is not the case for minoritized faculty. Nishida (2016) explains how hyperproductivity has become an exceeding and exacting demand in research-intensive, often predominantly white, institutions. The fact that subtle discrimination continues to be an obstacle to productivity for faculty of color directly feeds the problem of pre-tenure departure among faculty of color (Dancy & Jean-Marie, 2014; Gasman et al., 2015). This same self-sustaining cycle of marginalization is repeated across minoritized social identities through the structural and systemic inequities described above.

Unveiling the structural and systemic inequalities that produce oppression and marginalization in academia is a complicated task given national efforts and minimal success in student and faculty diversification. Affirmative Action, for example, is often cited when discussing the need and scarcity of diversity in predominantly white institutions, both on the student and faculty level (Fraser & Hunt, 2011; Gasman et al., 2011; Lee-Thomas, 2008). Critics ask, “Is it not enough that we have affirmative action?” While Affirmative Action must be an irreplaceable and irrevocable part of recruitment and admissions in academia, it has historically benefited white women more than it has benefitted any other minoritized social group (Griffin et al., 2013; hooks, 2003). This is due to historical white male dominance across institutional levels, which, as critical Black feminist scholar bell hooks (2003) points out, have always been more willing to address issues of ‘gender’ before issues of race in institutional entry. I apostrophize gender as to avoid overlooking that issues of gender have traditionally meant issues of females entering the academy, neglecting issues pertaining to gender diverse, transgender, and gender nonconforming faculty. Unfortunately, this bargained approach to diversification and the increased presence of white female educators has not done enough subvert oppressive organizational cultures and their practices of marginalization and exclusion.

Of professors in the United States, 58 percent are white males; and only 6 percent are Black or Latino (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2013). While women now represent almost half of all full-time faculty positions, most are white, and they largely hold the ranks of untenured professors, instructors, and lecturers; they are also severely underrepresented in administrative roles (Gasman et al., 2015; Lutz et al., 2013; Turner et al., 2011). Faculty of color also hold only a fraction of influence in administration; with only 13 percent of college presidents being of color (American Council on Education, 2016). The lack of information on

additional minoritized groups further underscores the depth of the problem; little widespread data have been collected on the national level for faculty with disability or sexual and gender diversity.

At this point, I have discussed how white male dominance has continued because of its maintained overrepresentation across the full professoriate and senior administration, especially at leading research-intensive predominantly white institutions (PWIs). This Whiteness and maleness as the status quo seeds systems of marginalization for all those falling outside of its default central identity. Critical race and feminist scholars across higher education illuminate how ideologies of domination (hooks, 2003) like white supremacy and patriarchal misogyny are preserved through these status quo organizational cultures in the academy that communicate whiteness and maleness as the standard (Cannella & Perez, 2012; Chesler, 2013; Dancy & Jean-Marie, 2014; Turner et al., 2011). These organizational cultures reinforce systems of inequality and structural oppression that inevitable bloom as marginalizing and exclusionary practices, such as: subtle discrimination and microaggressions (Eagan Jr & Garvey, 2015; Haskins et al., 2016; Jones et al., 2015; Louis et al., 2016); cultural taxation, tokenism, and erasure (Constantine et al., 2008; Dancy & Jean-Marie, 2014; Gasman et al., 2015; Griffin et al., 2013; Joseph & Hirshfield, 2013); challenges to expertise, roles, and research (Kelly & McCann, 2014; Marbley et al., 2011; Turner et al., 2008); bias in recruitment, promotion, and tenure (Chesler, 2013; Dancy & Jean-Marie, 2014; Gasman et al., 2011; Lutz et al., 2013); gendered, racialized, and neoliberal meritocracies (Chesler, 2013; Gasman et al., 2015; Griffin et al., 2013; Harper, 2012; Monzó & SooHoo, 2014; Nishida, 2016); and different or unequal treatment and expectations (Cartwright et al., 2009; Eagan Jr & Garvey, 2015; Joseph & Hirshfield, 2013; Kachchaf et al., 2015; Turner

et al., 2011). To make sense of how these various oppressive practices continue to exist, I recruit critical race feminist theory.

### **Critical Race Feminist Theory**

To understand the evolution of marginalizing and exclusionary practices in academia and the continued struggle by minoritized faculty against them, critical race feminist theory brings together history, sociology, and politics. Critical pedagogue and influential educational theorist, Paulo Freire (2007), explained that the first stage in building a critical consciousness of the society around us is by stripping away social illusions to expose how oppression exists in our world, and then committing to the transformation of those structures through *praxis* – reflexive action that is informed by critical consciousness and social critique. In following Freire’s (2007) method for developing critical consciousness, this section unveils oppressive ideologies currently submerged within the fabrics of academia through **critical race feminist theory** (CRFT). These ideologies include: white supremacy and colorblindness, patriarchy, neoliberalism, ahistoricism, hetero- and cissexism, and ableism and saneism.

CRFT is an intersectional interdisciplinary theory that brings together critical theory, critical race theory, and feminist theory with the focus of elevating counternarratives of resistance and empowerment (Rodriguez & Boahene, 2012). Critical race theory gives centrality to race and racism and their continued influence on society. Critical race theory emphasizes how the intersects of race and racism with other social identities (e.g. gender, SES, sexuality, ability) reveals nuanced inequalities and oppression (Griffin, Bennett, & Harris, 2013). While feminist theory challenges male supremacy, systemic patriarchy, sexism and sexual exploitation, critical race theory interrogates dominant ideologies such as white supremacy, ahistoricism and colorblindness, neoliberalism, and false meritocracies (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012; Gasman et

al., 2015; Griffin et al., 2013). These ideologies function only to reinforce the power and dominance of the status quo, perpetuating discrimination, marginalization, and the continued oppression of minoritized peoples (Griffin et al., 2013).

Gasman and colleagues (2013) describe ahistoricism as a willful neglect of history, and colorblindness as an ideology that claims universalism and race-neutrality. Together these two social ideologies perpetuate inequalities by ignoring the historical, cultural, and sociopolitical evolution of race, gender, and class in the US. This is captured in the claim that minority-serving institutions and HBCUs are an example of school choice, or the claim that underrepresentation of faculty of color is not about race, but about standards and an unwillingness to lower standards of scholarly rigor. These ahistoric colorblind claims ignore the history of racism and class inequality in the United States. They draw a false equivalency between standards and underrepresentation, overlooking structural disadvantages minoritized individuals face to educational access and success.

At the same time, neoliberalism as a governing force propels competition, privatization, and corporatization of higher education (Giroux, 2014). Neoliberalism reproduces capitalistic patriarchy through the banking model of education, stifling of academic freedom in place of the assembly line instruction, and increasing reliance on temporary adjunct instructors, which disproportionately disadvantages the women educators and educators of color more likely to end up in these roles (Cannella & Perez, 2012; Freire, 2007; Giroux, 2014). Neoliberalism is embedded in faculty behaviors such as competition, individualism, and hyperproductivity (Levin & Aliyeva, 2015; Nishida, 2016).

Gardner and Veliz (2014) found that institutions striving for market advantage or prestige were most likely to have continuously shifting expectations of promotion and tenure, increased

expectations that faculty excel equally across research, teaching, and service, increased demand for quantity over quality in scholarly productivity, and expectations that faculty would expand public reputations prior to, and *in order to receive*, promotion and tenure. These byproducts of neoliberalism shape an institutional culture that does not benefit minoritized faculty, and often results in their departure from major institutions. For example, Nishida (2016) asserts that hyperproductivity actually perpetuates ableism and saneism by shaping an organizational culture that privileges able-bodied use of technology, rationality and logical thought, self-control, and long-hours of being sedentary.

These institutional practices, shaped by sociopolitical forces outside the institution (Gardner & Veliz, 2014), reinforce a system of false meritocracy that is constructed by the academic elite *for* the academic elite (Griffin et al., 2013). Giving merit to traditionally patriarchal displays of superior intelligence, competition, argument, and challenge, while devaluing displays of collaboration, service, and pursuits outside of academia (e.g. child-bearing and raising children, familial commitments, and work-life balance) (Chesler, 2013; Griffin et al., 2013). Bringing together the rich traditions of critical, critical race, and feminist theories, CRFT critiques these oppressive ideologies not only by casting light on the social inequalities they perpetuate, but also making apparent the reason they exist. CRFT would posit that the oppression experienced by minoritized individuals, especially the often looked experiences of women of color, are a nefarious consequence of sociopolitical forces working to maintaining the status quo (Griffin et al., 2013; hooks, 2003; Rodriguez & Boahene, 2012; Turner et al., 2011).

In academia, patriarchal ideologies also affect the permissible expression of gender and sexuality, similar to white supremacy dictating the permissible representation of color. Toxic masculinity and patriarchy, for example, entangle intellect with traditional presentations of

maleness/masculinity and female/femininity, ostracizing and eccentricating signs of sexual and gender diversity. Stockdill (2012) discusses how patriarchy and homophobia (here: heterosexism and cissexism) in academia were repeatedly manifest in attempts to delink his identities as a queer activist-educator-scholar. Colleagues said they were comfortable with a “gay professor, but [did not] want a gay AIDS activist professor going around and getting arrested” (p. 145). Contrarily, Stockdill proclaims that activism and resistance is the responsibility of minoritized faculty, as to prevent further perpetuation of inequality and marginalization in the university:

The ways queers behave—or misbehave—determines how both straight and many mainstream LGBTQ members of the campus community receive us. There are parallels for feminist, antiracist, and leftist scholars/educators...While still an institution that perpetuates White supremacy, economic injustice, patriarchy, and homophobia, the university has long been a site of exciting struggles...Those of us who have the privilege of gaining entrée into academia have a responsibility to “make trouble,” to agitate change both within and outside the ivory tower. (p. 148)

Similarly, the visual imaging of the professoriate is hued with ableism and saneism. As Nishida (2016) asserts, society, including academia, is filled with social norms and inaccessibility that “allow only certain behaviors, cognitive and mental processes, emotions, and physiques to exist in public” (p. 150). Restricting the opportunity for individuals with disability to move easily across social contexts. Queer theory and disability studies expand the unveiling of oppression taken upon by CRFT, further challenging status quo ideologies that centralize

heterosexuality, traditional performances and presentations of gender, and the ability of body (Dirks, 2016; Lombardi, Murray, & Gerdes, 2011; McRuer, 2003; Vaccaro, 2012).

### **The Status Quo | The Hegemonic**

In CRFT, the term hegemonic refers to dominant or ruling narratives, ideologies, or discourses that shape the culture and beliefs of a society or group (hooks, 2003; Lester, 2008). The hegemonic is fabricated historically and socioculturally through the enforcement and reinforcement of dominant ideologies, normalized and positioned at the center of the social hierarchy. This position of centrality preserves the privilege system (McIntosh, 2004), which confers power and the most resources to those positioned at the center. Here *privilege* is distinguished in two ways: 1) those special provisions and unearned assets socially afforded to dominant identities that assist them in more easily and successfully navigating society, even whilst unconscious of them (McIntosh, 2004), and 2) the ability of those with majority identities to choose whether or not they interact with those that are different from them (Sue, 2010).

In the United States, the social identities that have historically, socially, and culturally been afforded the greatest degree of privilege have been the elite, white, and male. Cornel West (1990) discussed how this privileged and dominant group generates a **white malestream**, where default norms of society align distinctly with whiteness and patriarchal symbolism and all else becomes marginal. Hegemonic, or status quo, ideologies and identities are inextricably linked to the historical context that fabricated them. The dominance of this ideological white malestream has been characterized and expanded from multiple critical viewpoints. Monique Wittig (1990) called the status quo the **straight mind** to capture the disciplines, theories, and current ideologies shaped by a historical othering of the queer, which confers privilege and dominance to the binary, dichotomous, and heterosexual (e.g. forced-choice between male/female as gender on



assessments). Audre Lorde (1990) referred to the status quo as the **mythical norm**, the archetype that lives at the boundaries of consciousness; depicting what minoritized populations recognize not as themselves, but as the white thin heterosexual Christian and financially secure male. Gloria Anzaldúa (1990, 2007) expanded the social influence of the status quo, recognizing a **dominant norteamericano culture** that alienates Chicano-Latino individuals and accented language, marginalizing them to the borders of society and forcing them to exist in the in-between spaces of North American society and their cultural origins.

These critical scholars have helped further understand how these hegemonic tropes continue to shape the realities of individuals whose identities have been historically disadvantaged and marginalized. When hooks (2003) coined the phrase *imperialist white supremacist capitalist patriarchy*, she uniquely captured a hegemonic ideology dominating modern US society. While a discussion of imperialist white supremacist capitalist patriarchy expands beyond the scope of this review, I believe it is important to mention that the phrase captures an ideology alive both outside and within academia. Colonizing intellectual practices of an institution increasingly shaped by neoliberalism while still controlled by Whiteness and patriarchal false meritocracies.

Monzó and SooHoo (2014) call these practices **epistemological racism**, or “the structural exclusion (often unconscious) of racialized and other nondominant voices in institutional decision-making” (p. 149). This epistemological racism combined with subtle discrimination experienced by minoritized faculty create intolerable institutional environments. In these environments, minoritized faculty are continuously reminded that they do not belong. That they are *other*. Being *the other* means feeling unusual, having awareness of being distinctive or unlike, being perceived as unidimensional, stereotypical, and, in some cases, frightening or

scary (Jones et al., 2015; Madrid, 2004). Research into epistemological racism and imperialist white supremacist capitalist patriarchy in the ongoing formation of counselor education could be groundbreaking.

CRFT also elevates **counternarratives**, individual stories of challenge and resistance to these status quo ideologies, and oppressive organizational cultures and structural practices. The existence of these narratives builds critical consciousness through submergence in lived experiences, without taxing minoritized individuals with the burden of proof (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012; Gasman et al., 2015). These counternarratives centralize the voices of the oppressed and challenge marginalization by bringing together othered voices into interdisciplinary communities of resistance (hooks, 1990a).

### **Evaluation of Research**

In this section, I evaluate existing research on structures of oppression in academia that disadvantage minoritized faculty. Following this, I review the research and literature related to the lived experience of survival and resistance among minoritized faculty. I also discuss research conducted specifically in counselor education. I close the chapter by discussing the need for further research into resistance, as survival and coping strategies have been richly examined. Counternarratives of resistance to oppression and oppressive ideologies could benefit not only minoritized counselor educators (MCEs), but minoritized faculty across academia.

### **Structures of Oppression in Academia**

Oppression is an act of dehumanization. Fighting oppression, an act of love (Freire, 2007). As a network of structural or systemic inequalities, oppression and marginalization prevent the minoritized and disadvantaged from attaining any form of individual, social, or political control and threatening the supremacy of the status quo. As stated above, minoritized

faculty face oppression and marginalization through structural and systemic inequalities that can manifest as: (1) Subtle discrimination and microaggressions; (2) Cultural taxation, tokenism, and erasure; (3) Challenges to expertise, roles, and research; (4) Bias in recruitment, promotion, and tenure; (5) Gendered, racialized, and neoliberal meritocracies; and (6) Different or unequal treatment and expectations.

In a phenomenological investigation, Jones and colleagues (2015) found that participants (N=5) felt they were being set up to fail and placed under an institutional microscope.

Participants felt they were being given extra workloads and held to standards that their majority-identity colleagues were not. This subtle form of discrimination through differential treatment is also reflected in microaggressions experienced by minoritized faculty. Louis et al. (2016) found that Black faculty (N=4) in their study felt racial microaggressions were commonplace, and that challenging them was futile. Instead, participants believed they needed to be resilient in the white-dominated space of academia, despite higher levels of stress. Unfortunately, Eagan Jr. and Garvey (2015) found that across 411 institutions, subtle discrimination likely related to institutional and epistemological racism (Harper, 2012; Monzó & SooHoo, 2014) had a significant negative effect on research productivity among Asian American, Black, and Latino faculty, especially for women faculty of color.

**Cultural taxation** is defined as the expectations placed upon faculty members of particular social or cultural groups to bring up and address diversity-related issues at committee meetings or in departments and institutional affairs (Dancy & Jean-Marie, 2014; Joseph & Hirshfield, 2013). In a qualitative investigation with minoritized faculty (N=66), Joseph and Hirshfield (2014) expanded the construct of cultural taxation to include **identity taxation**, wherein faculty members must take on duties or responsibilities—physical, mental, or

emotional—due to their social identity and their belonging to a minoritized group within their departments, schools, or society. The investigators used open and focused coding strategies and NVivo qualitative software to generate participant-verified experiences of peer-to-peer conflict, refocusing their attention on identity taxation as it emerged as a dominant theme. This strategy reflects the iterative nature of qualitative research, wherein the method, theory, and analysis guide each other cyclically (Maxwell, 2012). Cultural/identity taxation has continued to emerge as a common experience amongst minoritized educators (e.g. Chesler, 2013; Dancy & Jean-Marie, 2014; Gasman et al., 2015).

Minoritized faculty are not only pressured with departmental expectations that are culturally taxing and contradictory to the implicit meritocracy existing in their departments, they are also often times tokenized. **Tokenism** denotes the attribution of sameness to someone who has historically been marginalized, neglecting and invalidating differences in experience, as well as issues of oppression and privilege (Kelly & McCann, 2014; Spivak, 1990; Turner et al., 2008). When treated as the token minority, minoritized faculty are expected to speak for their social identity, bring up and deal with diversity issues, and teach diversity-related courses, all while excelling in the same way as their more privileged and less taxed majority identity counterparts (Dancy & Jean-Marie, 2014; Joseph & Hirshfield, 2013). Converse to tokenism, and often simultaneous, **erasure** is the invalidation and indifference toward minoritized faculty's cultural distinctiveness and experiences of social inequality (Constantine et al., 2008). In other words, consideration is not given to the social and societal inequalities experienced by minoritized faculty, despite evidence that they encounter everyday structural and systemic oppression.

Using data from a longitudinal qualitative study, Kachchaf and colleagues (2015) explored the tokenizing influence of the **ideal worker norm** on women of color in STEM

disciplines. The ideal worker norm is an oppressive trope that is gendered male and demonstrates commitment to his job through long hours, unbroken career paths, and constant availability and visibility (Kachchaf et al., 2015). After analyzing themes in interviews with 20 participants, the researchers carried out a lengthier narrative inquiry with three participants who best characterized navigating this dominant ideal. Narratives revealed that the ideal worker norm fed tokenism when women faculty of color were expected to fulfill this norm, while facing regular questions and skepticism about their work ethic, priorities, and accomplishments. Themes for the narrative analysis included having to choose between family and work, navigating reality versus the prescribed ideal, and seeming to never work hard enough no matter how much they did (Kachchaf et al., 2015).

In a constructivist and longitudinally designed qualitative inquiry, Kelly and McCann (2014) sought to explore the experiences of women faculty of color and white women faculty in academia. While the researchers had previously demonstrated that quality positive student interactions had led to women faculty of color and women faculty making it through tenure (Kelly & Fetridge, 2012), this study focused on three women faculty of color who chose to depart the tenure process at a research-intensive PWI. Kelly and McCann conducted 4-5 hour-long interviews per participant over the course of 4-5 years, using multiple rounds of coding and ensuring intercoder agreement. While the sample size is limiting, qualitative research can be conducted rigorously with smaller sample sizes when ensuring that rich data are gathered to facilitate some representativeness of context (Creswell, 2013a; Mason, 2002). The emergent themes revealed that institutional challenges to the participants' sense of acceptance, role, and feeling of institutional fit contributed to the participants' decision to depart tenure. These challenges stemmed from both students, peers, and departmental climate. Demonstrating the

ways in which participants were expected to navigate messages that question their qualifications and the legitimacy of their research, disregard or minimize their social identities and diversity-related issues, and communicate an unwelcoming environment (Joseph & Hirshfield, 2013; Turner et al., 2011).

In addition to these challenges, research has demonstrated bias and unequal treatment of minoritized faculty in recruitment, promotion, and tenure practices (Chesler, 2013, 2013; Dancy & Jean-Marie, 2014; Gasman et al., 2011; Lutz et al., 2013). In a synthesis of existing literature, scholars found disproportionate tenure rates and pre-tenure departure among educators of color (Dancy & Jean-Marie, 2014; Gasman et al., 2015). The ambiguity of the tenure process, common across many academic settings, has also been shown to keenly disadvantage educators of color (Turner et al., 2011). Through CRFT, we can understand the ambiguity of the tenure process as a form of social control that historically functioned to insure excellence and prestige among academics, both fragile notions readily influenced by the hierarchical and oppressive ideologies of the times. This ambiguity only functioned as it was supposed to thanks to the homogeneity of the institution. Today, ambiguity in the tenure process continues to force women faculty and faculty of color into performances that conform with these white patriarchal traditions: avoiding research that is deemed undervalued (e.g. diversity-related and feminist research) (Gasman et al., 2015), constantly working with long hours (Kachchaf et al., 2015), and concealing family issues and events (e.g. pregnancies and illnesses) (Cannella & Perez, 2012; Turner et al., 2011). In some cases, this pressure to perform in ways that conform to white patriarchy has led some women faculty into *hidden pregnancies*, concealing their pregnancies, taking minimal time-off, and returning to work early without disclosing they were pregnant or suitable post-partum recovery.

Critical scholars have argued that these challenges to minoritized faculty, particularly unequal treatment in promotion and tenure, may also be linked to false systems of merit that systemically privilege able-bodied white males by overvaluing traditional displays of scholarly performance (Chesler, 2013; Gasman et al., 2015; Griffin et al., 2013; Harper, 2012; Nishida, 2016). In an interpretive multi-case study, Griffin, Bennett, and Harris (2013) interviewed twenty-eight Black faculty at two research-intensive PWIs. The researchers analyzed their transcripts as co-constructed narratives between the participants and the lead investigator. They used a critical discourse analysis methodology focusing on experiences and language and how these are used to represent identity (Griffin et al., 2013). They found that participants were subjected to organizational messages that devalued teaching and service, while simultaneously expected to be regularly involved in both. Similar to Turner and colleagues (2011), this study found that faculty of color were also expected to differentiate between research topics that were valued and those that were suspect (e.g. marginalization, race, equal rights) while, again, facing the expectation that the latter be their area of study.

For faculty of color, the message seems to be that what they do as faculty should adhere to the white malestream (West, 1990), but that doing so is also a quagmire that carries personal and professional costs. In the ultimate paradox, minoritized faculty are faced with the pressure to conform to white patriarchal standards of scholarship (Chesler, 2013; Griffin et al., 2013), while fearing that doing so, thereby rejecting commitments outside of research, may harm them by going against the contradictory expectations implicit in their departments (Joseph & Hirshfield, 2013). These different and unequal expectations are almost impossible to navigate for minoritized faculty, and often lead to feeling overcommitted, overburdened, estranged, and insecure (Joseph & Hirshfield, 2013). These feelings can have a detrimental effect on

engagement with academia and deteriorate a minoritized scholars' productivity (Eagan Jr & Garvey, 2015).

### **Survival and Resistance in Academia**

Through the lens of CRFT, I have discussed the historically constructed and inherent status quo in academia, particularly in research-intensive PWIs. I have also presented structural and systemic oppression consequential to status quo ideologies (e.g. colorblindness, neoliberalism, ahistoricism, false meritocracy) that maintain white male dominance (Cannella & Perez, 2012) and processes of minoritization (Harper, 2012). This critical analysis of academia continues with an evaluation of research related to how minoritized faculty survive these structures of oppression and how some faculty resist them. In this discussion, I will include research conducted by counselor educators that explore issues of survival and resistance for MCEs.

Survival strategies are those that assist minoritized educators succeed in academia. These strategies have received extensive research, and include: learning the rules of the game, being aware who possesses power, adopting an Americanized personality, working doubly hard, emphasizing one's strengths and establishing some authority and influence, and finding white allies (see Lutz et al., 2013). Resistance, however, is more ambiguous. Freire (2007) explained that resistance is born from oppression through the act of fighting back against the oppressor. Freire called this **praxis**, or resistance that is undertaken through the coming together of action and critical consciousness. hooks (1990) spoke of **talking back**, creating spaces of resistance wherein power and the status quo are challenged. Hinchey (2010) described resistance as the unwillingness to go along, to run counter the dominant current.



While resistance is a more ambiguous construct in the experience of minoritized faculty, which I will work in this dissertation to make clearer, acts of resistance *have* been explored in the literature. Turner and colleagues (2011) found that, while PWIs promoted myths of white male superiority, continued involvement in service functioned as an act of resistance through an unwillingness to conform entirely to the dominant value systems of the academy that overvalue research (Griffin et al., 2013) – explained above to be a false meritocracy. Beale, Chesler, and Ramus (2013) found that resistance can also occur through advocacy, participants in their qualitative interviews expressed that challenging student admission policies, pressuring for increased hiring and support of minoritized faculty, and being decisive about diversity issues around promotion and retention all function as methods of structural resistance. Rodriguez et al. (2012) described how critical pedagogy also functions as an act of resistance, challenging oppressive ideologies like epistemological racism directly within the classroom, while modeling critical consciousness for students.

Jones and colleagues (2015) also found that minoritized faculty benefited from mentoring, which functioned as a form of resistance bidirectionally. By being mentored, minoritized faculty were given access to insights and strategies for survival in academia; and by mentoring, minoritized faculty subverted institutional cultures of oppression by preparing a wiser generation of faculty (Lutz et al., 2013; Turner et al., 2008). In addition, researchers found that support from institutional leadership functioned to bolster participants' resiliency and persistence through the tenure process (Jones et al., 2015). Louis et al. (2016) surveyed the recommendations of participants in a collaborative qualitative inquiry and found that they identified administrative recognition of the detrimental effects of microaggressions as crucial for change to take place. The participants suggested that issues of discrimination and inequality needed to be addressed on

the institutional level, and not solely the individual or departmental. This aligns with existing calls for senior leadership to be held more accountable for the lack of institutional support and minoritized faculty success in academia (Gasman et al., 2015; Hoffman & Mitchell, 2016).

Lutz and colleagues (2013) conducted the most relevant study yet in their critical grounded theory investigation. Critical grounded theory “operates within a politics of resistance and social critique” seeking to unveil oppression, constraint, and marginalization (Lutz, 2013, p. 130). Emerging out of critical qualitative inquiry (CQI) – similar to critical in-depth phenomenological interviewing used in this dissertation – critical grounded theory elevates the voices of the oppressed to theorize the function of survival and resistance in the lives of minoritized faculty. The researchers interviewed 19 participants through average 90-minute interviews focusing on various aspects of their experience as faculty of color. Researchers were thorough and rigorous in the grounded theory analysis, meeting standards of trustworthiness and credibility (Cannella et al., 2015; Lutz et al., 2013). While the representativeness of the study was limited in its predominant focus on women faculty of color, this group has also been found to face a unique set of challenges in academia (Kachchaf et al., 2015; Kelly & McCann, 2014; Turner et al., 2011), making the sample especially relevant.

Lutz and colleagues (2013) found that participants moved through a process of increasing awareness of structures of oppression and status quo ideologies. This process involved a shift toward disillusionment that illuminated the need for acts of resistance. Participants shared that acts of resistance included decoding racism, requiring respect, and demonstrating assertive positive communication. Relatedly, participants engaged in processes of engagement or disengagement similar to Hinchey’s (2010) form of resistance. In these processes, participants shared that they became strategically engaged in activities that promote inclusivity, while

strategically disengaged from activities that promoted marginalization. Finally, Lutz and colleagues found that participants also engaged in outcomes management that limited harm through a hypervigilance toward potential danger—reminiscent of Chesler and Young Jr.'s (2007) anticipatory vigilance—and outward docility (i.e. not appearing angry). Participants balanced these acts of resistance with survival strategies that constituted living their own values and a self-appreciation and self-love (Lutz et al., 2013). While this study explained how survival and resistance might function in the lives of minoritized faculty, the understanding of resistance as a phenomenological and everyday experience needs to be furthered.

### **Institutional Oppression in Counselor Education**

Constantine and colleagues (2008) opened the dialogue within counseling and counseling psychology on minoritized faculty experience through their groundbreaking qualitative study. They found that minoritized faculty in counseling and counseling psychology experienced alternating feelings of invisibility/marginalization and hypervisibility; that they felt unseen by the surrounding institution – unless the need arose for a non-white voice, in which case the participants felt overly sought out. Participants also negotiated their qualifications and credentials being questioned by colleagues, staff, and students—a continued theme in more recent investigations. Constantine et al. discovered that minoritized faculty also experienced a lack of mentoring, difficulties with subtle discrimination, and a need to develop coping strategies to deal racial microaggressions. Cartwright, Washington, and McConnell (2009) extended the work of these researchers by reifying the themes found in the previous investigation, and identifying that minoritized rehabilitation counselor educators also experienced institutional expectations to participate in service to the institution, even while service is devalued, and unequal/different treatment within their organizational culture. As discussed in previous sections,

these two influential studies have served as the foundation of research into minoritized faculty experiences across academic disciplines, and yet are minimally reflected in counselor education literature.

Three further studies stand out as specifically exploring the experiences of minoritized counselor educators (MCEs) in academia. In a qualitative investigation into job satisfaction among female counselor educators, Alexander-Albritton and Hill (2015) found that participants (N=157) had moderate job satisfaction, more so among tenured faculty. The scholars attribute this greater autonomy and lower struggle for retention. Alexander-Albritton and Hill do not provide a critical discussion of their findings, but provide a starting glance at the experiences of women counselor educators. Unfortunately, their study is limited by the overrepresentation of white women faculty at master's-only programs, perhaps demonstrating an example of minoritization of faculty of color within counseling programs.

Lerma, Zamarripa, Oliver, and Cavazos Vela (2015) explore Latino counselor educators' experiences in achieving a doctorate. Twenty-three participants completed a questionnaire and eight individual follow-up interviews. Participants reported that survival strategies for them included familial role models, support during their educational experience, parental expectations, ethnic identity, cultural expectations, and intrinsic motivation. While the study was not specifically focused on resistance, one participant shared that she experienced a "Brown power thing where cultural pride is mixed up in this anger and in this activist persona" (p. 168). This person reflected on the connection between her own identity and her resiliency through the doctoral program. Another participant shared that this sense of a racial identity facilitated a connection with a Black colleague, which provided support and sympathy, revealing a relational survival strategy.

Haskins et al. (2016) explores the experience of Black mothers in counselor education through a phenomenological inquiry. The researchers interviewed eight Black counselor educators using a transcendental phenomenological method and individual interviewing approach. The researchers found that participants perceived their social identities as Black mothers as causing susceptibility to racialized marginalization, professional strains, and struggle to maintain work-life balance. At the same time, even while they also integrated their social identities into their teaching and research, developed a more internalized sense of success, and sought support systems from their departments. In this study, Haskins and colleagues reflect some of the themes present in interdisciplinary research on faculty diversity. Participants reported experiencing marginalization and strains in meeting the ideal worker norm (Kachchaf et al., 2015), while also seeking support from those around them that were trusted. Marbley (i.e. Marbley et al., 2011), found that, as a counselor educator of color, her identity had been predefined as a Black multicultural counseling educator, *before* she had ever even entered the professoriate. Haskins et al. (2016) also found that participants felt they needed to “make their own way” (p. 66) and continuously counter racial stereotypes they were confronting.

### **Conclusions**

Novelist and activist, Alice Walker, calls resistance the secret of joy. Political activist and scholar, Angela Davis, calls the struggle that is resistance the cost of freedom. In this section, I have discussed the established and emergent literature surrounding minoritized faculty and their resistance, survival, joy, and struggle in academia. Lutz et al. (2013) provided a thorough discussion theorizing survival and resistance in the lives of minoritized faculty. They presented an excellent starting point from which to further explore acts of resistance in academia. Participants in the study shared valuable examples where they took action to counter the status

quo and the structures of oppression existing in academia. CRFT demonstrates how resistance may be at the heart of activism, advocacy, and the success and thriving of minoritized faculty. This is impetus to continue investigating resistance as a construct. How is resistance experienced? How do minoritized faculty come to identify with acts of resistance? What does it mean in the lives of minoritized faculty to carry out an act of resistance?

Rodriguez and Boahene (2012) discussed the connection between resistance and rage, arguing that resistance emerges when we reject powerlessness and transform silence into action, into righteous rage that is targeted at structures of oppression and the oppressor. To become involved in resistance is to become an organizational catalyst (Beale et al., 2013), a change-agent that focuses on creating more equitable changes within organizational cultures. To further understand the role resistance in this, we must understand the experience of those that come to be involved in the change-making. Speaking against oppression and marginalization, and challenging the status quo, and making trouble (Stockdill, 2012), all while maintaining their presence and value in the institution. *Tempered radicals* (Beale et al., 2013) that work within academia to challenge oppressive systems, while able to hold their presence and value. Steeled intellectual freedom fighters (West, 1990).

In this chapter, I have used CRFT to draw the connections between the historical, sociocultural, and political threads that run through academia, particularly research-intensive PWIs. I have utilized CRFT to illustrate how status quo ideologies emerge and are maintained, and discussed how they inevitably engender structures of oppression and marginalization. In doing so, I have been able to present the survival strategies that minoritized faculty engage in order to endure in academia. I have discussed some basic forms of resistance, and presented the need to further explore resistance and its role in the success of minoritized faculty and changes in

organizational cultures. The next chapter describes the critical in-depth phenomenological interviewing method, and how this methodology co-constructs profiles of resistance with minoritized faculty, with special focus on experiences of resistance and empowerment (Rodriguez & Boahene, 2012; Turner et al., 2011).

## CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

### **Critical Race Feminist Research Lens**

This critical qualitative inquiry will be guided by a critical race feminist theoretical lens (Rodriguez & Boahene, 2012; Turner et al., 2011). Critical race feminist theory (CRFT) intersects critical theories, critical race theory, and feminist theory to bring crucial attention to issues of capitalism and classism, race and racism, sexism and sexual exploitation, and patriarchy and male domination (Creswell, 2013a; Delgado & Stefancic, 2012; Denzin, 2015; Rodriguez & Boahene, 2012; Turner et al., 2011). CRFT interrogates status quo ideologies that reproduce oppression, such as ahistoricism, white supremacy, colorblindness, heteronormativity, patriarchy, and false meritocracy, with a unique focus on empowerment and *resistance* (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012; Gasman et al., 2015; Griffin et al., 2013; Rodriguez & Boahene, 2012; Turner et al., 2011). CRFT's commitment to social justice is cross-disciplinary in its endeavor to gather *counternarratives* of resistance that challenge ideologies that maintain the status quo (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012; Gasman et al., 2015). It is a poststructuralist and constructivist lens that recognizes the multiplicity and constructed nature of reality and the relativistic nature of phenomenon (Cannella et al., 2015; Creswell, 2013a). In other words, CRFT guides the understanding that truths are constructed, experiences ever-changing, and the object of investigation relative to the perceptions of the individual.

CRFT's principal relevance to this critical qualitative inquiry (CQI) is in its focus on counternarratives, examples and experiences of resistance to oppression and the status quo. Developing greater understanding of resistance necessitates the exploration of experiences wherein educators chose to act against oppression or systems of marginalization. Generating cross-contextual knowledge (Mason, 2002), knowledge transferrable across similar contexts –



here disciplines in higher education – requires an in-depth understanding of meanings constructed around these experiences of resistance, as well as detailed narratives of challenges to oppressive organizational cultures. Developing in-depth profiles will be crucial to understanding how MCEs question and challenge the dominant structures overarching their organizational cultures, even as I appreciate the complete narrative being shared by the participants (Felski, 2011, 2015; Maxwell & Miller, 2008; Seidman, 2012). This interrogates the specific structures affecting the participant, without questioning the veracity of those experiences by maintaining them in-context with the larger narrative. CRFT strengthens the aims of this CQI by constantly centering the voices on the margins, elevating experiences of empowerment, and sharpening sites of resistance (Denzin, 2015).

### **Research Design**

For this critical qualitative inquiry (Cannella et al., 2015), I use critical in-depth phenomenological interviewing to guide the research design. I aim to describe lived experiences of resistance and interpret meaning-making surrounding these experiences through participant profiles of resistance. CQI scholars may utilize varying methodologies (e.g. grounded theory, ethnography, narrative), but what connects them and makes their work critical is the commitment to unveiling and critiquing social injustices and oppressive structures that discriminate and marginalize (Cannella et al., 2015; Denzin, 2015). Critical phenomenology (CP) queries lived experiences and explores meaning-making surrounding those experiences, at the same time keeping participant narratives and themes grounded in sociocultural and political context (Langdrige, 2008; Velmans, 2007; Welton & Silverman, 1987).

Breaking from conventional phenomenology (Creswell, 2013a; Moustakas, 1994), CP works to move past descriptions of lived experiences and toward interpretations of experience

that comment on sociocultural and sociopolitical issues (Pasque & Salazar Pérez, 2015; Velmans, 2007; Welton & Silverman, 1987). CP appreciates that meaning-making is a relative process and experiences are shaped by interpreted perceptions. While conventional phenomenology is invested in description (Moustakas, 1994), CP recognizes that all qualitative inquiry, especially critical qualitative inquiry, is inquiry of interpretations (Cannella et al., 2015; Mason, 2002; Seidman, 2012). In this inquiry, I focus on the phenomenon of resistance and seek to generate critically conscious (Freire, 2007) interpretations by linking experience to issues of social justice, oppression, and empowerment.

Basing research procedures in the tenets of CQI and the critical phenomenological paradigm, I apply Seidman's (2012) interviewing methodology as critical in-depth phenomenological interviewing (CIPI). In accordance with the iterative nature of qualitative research, I use the research lens and design of the inquiry to generate relevant and timely research questions (Maxwell, 2012) that are framed around Seidman's (2012) methodology. Seidman's profile reduction and construction procedures are used in data collection and analysis. As iterative research questions are meant to be open-ended and evolving, the research questions guiding this critical in-depth phenomenological interview were continuously informed by the progression of the inquiry, participant feedback, and emergent themes (Creswell, 2013a; Maxwell, 2012).

### **Research Questions**

***RQ 1:** What experiences have minoritized counselor educators (MCEs) had enacting resistance?*

***RQ 2:** How did MCEs come to be involved in acts of resistance?*

***RQ 3:** What do acts of resistance mean in the lives of MCEs?*

## Participants

After attaining Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval, this inquiry utilized purposeful selection (Maxwell, 2012) with a concept sampling strategy (Savin-Baden & Major, 2012) to recruit participants. Savin-Baden and Major (2012) define concept sampling as a strategy through which the researcher recruits participants that have experience or knowledge of the concept, or are attempting to implement the concept. Thus, purposeful concept selection helped identify counselor educators meeting key criteria including minoritized social identities and experiences enacting resistance to oppression and social injustice in academia. This approach to participant selection provided the richest possible data regarding the central phenomenon in question (Creswell, 2013a; Maxwell, 2012; Savin-Baden & Major, 2012).

Creswell (2013a, 2013b) posits that purposeful selection permits representativeness of context, heterogeneity in the sample, and examination of cases that are uniquely connected to the phenomenon. Inviting MCEs to participate in this critical phenomenological inquiry who possess knowledge of resistance and have challenged the institutional status quo provided a group of voices uniquely suited to the inquiry. Following the critical qualitative inquiry framework, these voices belong to those most likely to experience oppression, and recognizes the centrality and importance of those identities (Cannella et al., 2015).

Selection strategies for this inquiry were measured against Maxwell's (2012) three considerations for selection: knowledge of the study's setting, feasibility of access and data collection, and an awareness of 'key informant bias'. The setting for this inquiry will be CACREP accredited counselor education programs where MCEs are 2-5 years on tenure track, classifying them as emerging or junior faculty (Gasman et al., 2015). Access to the sites and data collection was sought through referral-based invitations into the inquiry. Leaders in multicultural

and social justice scholarship, as well as senior faculty in the discipline, recommended participants into the inquiry. Skype interviews were carried out for data collection, and all interviews were audio recorded. The critical race feminist research lens guiding this CQI helped moderate key informant bias by making heterogeneity and diversity the central premise of the inquiry. Throughout recruitment, I did not aim to gain consensus or homogeneity across participants or participant contributions, but connections and relationships that were generated because of their unique experiences with resistance.

Initially, 23 individuals were contacted or referred for participation in the inquiry. Of these, 14 individuals met the following inclusion criteria: 1) counselor educators; 2) minoritized social identities; 3) 2-5 years on the tenure track; 4) at research-intensive PWIs. Of 14 eligible individuals, seven responded to recruitment attempts. Five participants were successfully recruited into the inquiry, with two unable to commit to the time requirements of the CIPI methodology. One individual at a non-research-intensive PWI made contact with interest in participation, and was recruited into the inquiry to meet the target sample size.

Five participants are at institutions with higher or highest research activity as classified by the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education. One participant is at an institution classified as a Master's Colleges and Universities. All participants are employed at predominantly white institutions as determined by a >50% white student population (Christopher Brown II & Elon Dancy II, 2009) and faculty body (The Chronicle of Higher Education, 2013). Participant ages ranged from early 30s to late 40s. Two participants identify as male, and four as female. Three participants identify as Black, one as Black Caribbean, one as White, and one as East Asian. Three participants identify as Christians, three did not identify religion. Two participants identify as Gay. One participant identifies as having a disability (Bipolar Disorder).

It is worth noting that, similar to Cartwright (2009), this investigation may have been influenced by Stanley's (2006) second insight regarding the sparsity of research on the experiences of faculty of color. Mainly, that minoritized faculty refrain from participating in research on minoritized faculty because their numbers are so small that they may feel easily identifiable. Participant recruitment was a significant challenge to this inquiry, with risk of identification a possible reason for this. For example, Latin@ and Indigenous/Native counselor educators were not represented here as recruitment efforts yielded no eligible participants. Parenthetically, the numbers of Latin@ and Indigenous/Native faculty in research-intensive PWIs is infinitesimal, so participation could have carried greater considerations for risk, privacy, and identifiability. As a result of recruitment limitations, one exception was made to reach the target sample size. While all participants work at PWIs, one participant is employed at a non-research-intensive institution.

## **Procedures**

Data collection followed Seidman's (2012) three-part in-depth phenomenological interviewing with a critical qualitative reorientation. The Seidman approach to data collection was developed to accomplish richness in data and thickness in description by constructing complete participant profiles (Seidman, 2012). I then worked with these profiles to carry out a critically conscious discussion on resistance, meaning-making, and academia. Recruitment began with key informant referral. Leading scholars in multiculturalism and social justice, as well as senior counselor educators, recommended junior faculty actively involved in social action and critical education. These counselor educators were asked to specifically refer minoritized counselor educators that they knew, through mentorship or collaborative relationships, to enact resistance on the institutional level. This purposeful concept selection strategy leveraged the

bidirectionality of mentoring as resistance discussed above (see p. 40), where cultural taxation and a lack of visibility of other minoritized scholars leads to stronger and lasting mentorship relationships. The selection strategy also promoted greater richness and thickness in data, as it provided participants who, simply put, were likely to have a lot to say (Creswell, 2013a; Maxwell, 2012; Savin-Baden & Major, 2012).

Participant recruitment included initial contact through email or telephone call. Participants were informed of the purpose of the inquiry, and were provided with the informed consent for participation (see Appendix B). Because the concept sampling strategy (Savin-Baden & Major, 2012) requires that participants have some knowledge of the concept or phenomenon being investigated, or that they are attempting to implement it, I engaged potential participants in a screening conversation that involved discussing the purpose of the inquiry and their ability to identify experiences where they spoke out or confronted discrimination, oppression, or marginalization within their institutions. Once a participant completed informed consent, we scheduled three interviews to address the focus of each research questions.

Seidman (2012) recommends a three-interview process for conducting in-depth phenomenological interviews and achieving the deep and contextual descriptions crucial to phenomenology. While two potential participants were not able to commit to three 90-minute interviews (Seidman, 2012), all six eventual participants honored the methodology despite demands on their time. In the end, participant interviews ranged from 45-60 minutes for Interview I; 50-65 minutes for Interview II; and 30-60 minutes for Interview III. All participants reported beneficial effects in the interview structure, three participants describing the interview process as “therapeutic.”

The first interview focused on the historical context of the phenomenon. To this end, I focused questions on how counselor educators came to their positions in counseling and counselor education, and how they came to identify with acts of resistance. Participant histories expanded beyond just academic history, and included discussion of earlier life experiences appropriate to the method (Seidman, 2012). Life history interviews were focused on the interviewee's life as it pertains counselor education and acts of resistance in academia, and were semi-structured to gain as much historical context as possible. Participant life histories were vital to situating resistance in the historical and sociocultural context (Pasque & Salazar Pérez, 2015) of participants' current life, and providing a richer critically conscious discussion.

The second interview explored experiences of enacting resistance in detail. While Seidman (2012) recommends that this interview focus on the *everyday* life-in-detail of the participants (roles, functions, tasks, responsibilities etc.), I reorient the procedural methods toward accomplishing a more critical in-depth interview. This means that interview two was guided by CQI principles of revealing the sites of change-making and activism, and generating counternarratives around them (Denzin, 2015). The phenomenological understanding of minoritized counselor educators' detailed experiences enacting resistance is given history by the first interview, and situated in the participant's life by third interview.

Seidman's (2012) third and final interview consists of the participants' meaning-making and reflections on experience. This interview repositions the inquiry in a more future oriented discourse that helps to generate interpretations on how participant experience the phenomenon and make sense of it in their lives (Seidman, 2012). The meaning-making interview rounded out the critical in-depth phenomenological interview process by focusing on how participants made meaning of resistance in their lives (for an example of questions asked in Interview III, see

Appendix C). Meaning-making was evident in the participants' considerations of their life-history and their reconstruction of detailed experiences enacting resistance, and participants readily discussed the ways that resistance connects with their core identities and the essential parts of who they are (Seidman, 2012).

Maxwell (2012) suggests that interviews be influenced by the genuine curiosities of the researcher, and that they are not constructed by directly translating the study's research questions. The construction of the interview for this inquiry followed these recommendations, while also utilizing Seidman's (2012) examples for questions that follow the three-interview process. In addition, I used Mason's (2002) steps for planning a qualitative interview, and established interview protocols based on the scholarship on faculty diversity in higher education (i.e. Kelly & Mccann, 2014). This resulted in semi-structured interviewing that included initial specific and focused questions, followed by more fluid and exploratory conversation (Savin-Baden & Major, 2012; Seidman, 2012).

To achieve maximum saturation (Creswell, 2013b; Savin-Baden & Major, 2012) this inquiry will utilize Seidman's (2012) process for in-depth interviewing. *Saturation* is the point at which investigation and interviewing no longer yields new information or insights (Creswell, 2013b). Achieving saturation is important because it facilitates an exhaustive representation of themes and experiences to be analyzed. Savin-Baden and Major (2012) point out that saturation may be impossible given that there is always new information and experience to discover, and that it may be more important for the researcher to recognize when the inquiry has obtained enough data to be transferrable and valid. Savin-Baden and Major's point was reflected in the procedures of this inquiry, as capturing all minoritized social identities was impossible, but significant transferability and validity of experience was achieved as a worthy starting point.



## **Research Focus and Data Analysis**

### **A Note on Positionality**

Qualitative research scholars make basic the need for qualitative researchers to overtly discuss their relationship to their research projects. Seidman (2012) calls this the autobiographical section, while others call this the statement of positionality (Savin-Baden & Major, 2012) or addressing subjectivity and reactivity (Maxwell, 2012). I believe it is important to note here that the research lens I am adopting for this investigation is a research lens I hold close to my own heart. I identify as a critical race feminist counselor, counselor educator, and supervisor, and highly value those foundations in my academic and clinical practice. In the progression of this investigation, the research design and questions have also become central to my own experience as a future minoritized counselor educator.

In my own experience as an emerging counselor educator, I have been witness to acts of resistance by minoritized and majority-identity counselor educators alike, both within my own department and institutionally. My own experience as a minoritized doctoral student has consisted of interspersed feelings of alienation, rage, and triumph (Lutz et al., 2013; Rodriguez & Boahene, 2012). I have been forced to take a step back as the consequences of a white and patriarchal status quo have come to directly affect me. I have been prejudged and stereotyped, accused of excess collaborations and service, interrogated about racial identity and sexual orientation, and had my expertise inexplicably questioned by colleagues and students. I have been made aware that my experience as a MCE will never be equal or the same as my majority-identity counterparts without institutional change. I navigate a culture that does not always feel my own, and see myself relying more on family and my own pride as a first-generation Puerto Rican student to make my own way through (Hinojosa & Carney, 2016; Lerma et al., 2015)

Appreciating critiques surrounding the notion bracketing oneself (Creswell, 2013a), and the more important necessity that the qualitative researcher be aware of their own bias, I recognize my belief that minoritized faculty inherently experience academia differently than their more privileged identity counterparts. I am also aware of my own identification with acts of resistance, as I have been confronted by moments where I needed to pick my battles (Louis et al., 2016), deciding whether to speak out or remain silent. I recognize my inherent rage at acts of oppression (Rodriguez & Boahene, 2012) and radicalism toward social change (Beale et al., 2013). I suspect that resistance for MCEs will also be characterized by a critical consciousness that is aware of structural oppression and marginalization, as mine is, and committed to destabilizing them. I understand that I am approaching these CIPI with research questions that have yet to be fully explored, and that I experience extreme excitement and curiosity toward the exploration. I also recognize that CQI is about mutuality and pluralism of the inquiry, so it is important not to perpetuate traditionalist notions of research non-involvement and indifference in the investigation (Cannella et al., 2015). Finally, I recognize that resistance is in itself a phenomenon that that may or may not be supported by these CIPI, while also being a phenomenon readily supported by critical race feminist literature.

### **Data Analysis**

Following a CIPI design, this inquiry sought to break away from strategies that decontextualize or deconstruct participant experiences in categories and themes (Cannella et al., 2015; Maxwell & Miller, 2008; Seidman, 2012; Velmans, 2007). Instead, I implemented contextualizing and connecting strategies that keep data together and embedded in the context of counselor education in academia. This form of analysis is done through connecting or holistic (Mason, 2002) strategies for qualitative data analysis (Maxwell, 2012; Maxwell & Miller, 2008;

Seidman, 2012). Instead of coding and categorizing, which can break up and splinter the overall phenomenon (Maxwell, 2012), focus was placed on connections and contextual relationships that made up compelling statements within the interview transcripts.

Connecting strategies for data analysis aim to produce more holistic understandings of the phenomenon, not coded and categorized similarities (Maxwell, 2012; Maxwell & Miller, 2008). When investigating the phenomenon of resistance, which is embedded in fundamentally subjective and contextualized experiences, these strategies are vitally important. Mason (2002) suggests that connecting strategies can be useful when the goal of the study is to gain intricate understanding of a phenomenon, as well as becoming aware of the different elements that make up the shared experience for participants. As critical race and feminist scholars have repeatedly demonstrated a shared experience of oppression, empowerment, and resistance among minoritized faculty across academia. These strategies for data analysis permit a cross-contextual benefits to disciplines outside of counselor education.

I used a critically-informed phenomenological profile construction method (Seidman, 2012), an example of a connecting strategy, to construct participant profiles of resistance within sociocultural, political, and historical context (Pasque & Salazar Pérez, 2015). Seidman (2012) developed the phenomenological profile as a method to integrate the three-part interview into a more complete picture of the phenomenon. The phenomenological profile also facilitates an interrogation of the organizational mechanisms affecting the participant's experience. Phenomenological profile construction begins with data reduction, which consisted of reading transcriptions and bracketing compelling statements that are of particular significance to the research design and questions (Seidman, 2012). Critical scholars have brought attention to the risks inherent in bracketing, especially the effects of interviewer positionality and the difficulty

in stepping back to appreciate the whole narrative (Felski, 2011, 2015; Ricoeur, 1973; Ricoeur & Savage, 1970). For this reason, the profiles were shared with participants for a continuous process of member-checking and validation (Cannella et al., 2015; Creswell, 2013b; Seidman, 2012).

Transcriptions were deconstructed to include just bracketed statements. The remaining statements were reconstructed into a new transcript, and then reduced a second time for statements and sections that were used for profile construction. Initial profiles were shared with participants for member-checking. Feedback was incorporated into the profile, and the profile was reduced a third time. The short-form profile was shared with participants for a second round of member-checks, and the final profiles were generated depicting the phenomenological narrative of the participant (Maxwell & Miller, 2008; Seidman, 2012). The final profiles were structured following Seidman's (2012) recommendations that profiles be written in the first-person voice, flow in order that the interviews are conducted, and that fracturing the chronological order of the transcripts be avoided. This prevents research positionality from entering into the voice of the participant, and that the experiences within the transcripts are distorted and the meaning lost (Seidman, 2012).

### **Validity**

Best-practices in qualitative inquiry consider the social impacts of data collection methods, including interviewing, and advocate that researchers *triangulate* their data using multiple methods for data collection (Creswell, 2013b; Mason, 2002; Maxwell, 2012). Mason (2002) suggests that triangulation can be a valuable way to promote the quality and validity of the study, but that this should not be the *only* way. In CQI, the research must pay special attention to the trustworthiness and authenticity of the data they have gathered, especially given

the critical lens being taken on by the inquiry (Cannella et al., 2015). This investigation utilized various ways to establish trustworthiness and authenticity.

Seidman (2006) argues that the term validity does not adequately capture the “intersubjectivity” (p. 24), what I understand to be the in-depth and jointly-constructed process of the qualitative endeavor. Maxwell (2012) presents an alternative definition of validity as the accuracy or trustworthiness of description or interpretation. CQI scholars also redefine the idea of validity as trustworthiness and authenticity, and describe these constructs as the ability to rely on the data and, therefore, make transferrable conclusions (Cannella et al., 2015).

Trustworthiness for this inquiry was established by using several methods recommended across qualitative research literature. First, Seidman’s (2006) three-interview strategy provides some internal consistencies that facilitate trustworthiness. Specifically, the three interviews triangulate themselves by providing the researcher the opportunity to check interpretations of the data against the content of the other interviews (Seidman, 2012). For example, references to historical events in the participants lives during the third interview, can be checked against in the first life-history interview. Through this process, I was able to determine if my analysis and results of the data could be supported by evidence across all three in-depth interviews.

In addition, trustworthiness for this inquiry was checked using Maxwell’s (2012) checklist for validity. First, *rich data* (Becker, 1998; Maxwell, 2012) will be collected by carrying out in-depth phenomenological interviews following Seidman’s (2006) strategy. This promotes exhaustive data collection that is detailed and thorough enough to provide a full picture of the phenomenon. Second, *respondent validation* (Creswell, 2013a; Maxwell, 2012), or member-checking (Savin-Baden & Major, 2012), will be utilized to validate the compelling events identified in the data. Member-checking increases participant involvement in profile

construction, and provides the opportunity for participants to address inconsistencies and correct misunderstandings. Third, negative cases analysis (Maxwell, 2012; Savin-Baden & Major, 2012) was utilized to ensure that data analysis and results are not random or coincidental (Becker, 1998). Negative cases analysis involves scouring the data to determine if there exist cases that are in opposition to the interpretations being made or the connections being identified. Negative cases were readily included by participants as essential to the profile, and were included in final profile construction. For example, while participants identified with enacting resistance for various reasons, their choice not to do so, or fear of doing so, was also an important part of the profiles. No participant identified as enacting resistance at all times without exception. This process refined the analysis so that it could be representative across profiles with minimal contradictions (Savin-Baden & Major, 2012).

Finally, implicit comparison strategies (Maxwell, 2012) were also utilized to support the trustworthiness of the inquiry. Implicit comparison strategies include the comparison of results to pre-existing studies looking at the similar phenomenon. Results from this critical phenomenology were readily reflective of themes previously established in literature surrounding minoritized faculty, including more recent related studies (Lutz et al., 2013). In addition, results were helped in comparison with quantitative findings surrounding the presence and effects of subtle discrimination on minoritized faculty in academia (Eagan Jr & Garvey, 2015). These implicit comparisons guided not only the analysis, but the discussion of results from these critical in-depth phenomenological interviews.

## CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

In this chapter, I present the findings of the critical in-depth phenomenological interviews (CIPIs) conducted with six minoritized counselor educators. The results of connective analysis strategy are co-constructed in-depth phenomenological profiles (Seidman, 2012) of pre-tenure minoritized counselor educators a research-intensive PWIs. As discussed above, all participants met inclusion criteria except one, participant Deacon is employed at a non-research-intensive institution. First, I introduce participants by their self-selected pseudonyms and describe some demographic characteristics of their institutions. To maintain privacy, specific demographics about institutional classifications and disciplinary specializations is withheld. Second, I present the co-constructed in-depth phenomenological profiles in their entirety. Profiles are discussed in connection to the theoretical framework and research questions in the following chapter.

**Hyacinth** is an Assistant Professor in counselor education at a predominantly white research-intensive institution in northeastern United States. Hyacinth identifies as a straight Black Caribbean cisgender woman in her young-adulthood.

**Eartha** is an Assistant Professor in counselor education at a predominantly white research-intensive institution in southern United States. Eartha identifies as a straight African American Christian cisgender woman in her middle-adulthood. She also identifies as a mother and as having a disability, diagnosed with Bipolar Disorder II.

**Hope** is an Assistant Professor in counselor education at a predominantly white research-intensive institution in midwestern

United States. Hope identifies as a straight East Asian international cisgender woman of color in her young-adulthood.

**Deacon** is an Assistant Professor in counselor education at a predominantly white research-non-intensive institution in southern United States. Deacon identifies as a Black gay devout-Christian cisgender man in his young-adulthood.

**West** is an Assistant Professor in counselor education at a predominantly white research-intensive institution in northeastern United States. West identifies as a straight Black Christian cisgender man in his middle-adulthood.

**Jade** is an Assistant Professor in a counselor education at a predominantly white research-intensive institution in southern United States. Jade identifies as a gay white Christian cisgender woman in her young adulthood.

All six participants took part in the critical in-depth phenomenological interview three-part procedure. All six participants were involved in co-construction of the phenomenological profiles. Participants reviewed initial profiles for representativeness, accuracy of information, and privacy and deidentification. All participants were involved in two rounds of member-checking. After final round of reductions, all profiles were given final approval by participants for publication in this dissertation, use in disciplinary conferences, and to be shared with other participants. Final phenomenological profiles of resistance are presented below.



## HYACINTH

I think so deeply about almost everything. I analyze everything and I am a really deep thinker. I always try to think of every single aspect in a situation. So, hearing in my counseling courses about the holistic view of the client, and that a person is *not* their diagnosis, that was natural to me already. I already had those thoughts and those feelings about people. That's why counseling and counselor education felt natural. I just analyze everything around me, and I've always done that. Being comfortable speaking out came from my parents teaching me that I would have certain challenges that would be different from other people because of what I looked like, and that I should not be afraid to speak up if I truly thought something was wrong. I have always been very open to having certain conversations with people, personally and professionally, and I have made close relationships with others who have been in this field for a whole lot longer than me. They have told me the challenges they went through in hopes that I would not have to go through as much as they did.

I look at the relationships I have with my students, and I want to allow them the space to ask questions and let me know how they are really feeling about the content that they are getting in the class. For me, that ties in to me wanting to speak out because I think that it is important for everyone to be heard. I tell my students this is not about me standing up here like the "sage on the stage" and just telling you what you need to know and what you need to do. I think speaking up and being heard is important. Even if someone has been a counselor educator much longer than I have, does that mean I should not have a voice? Absolutely not, I'm going to speak out. That for me came from my parents.

My parents are both from the Caribbean islands. They both came to the US as teenagers trying to make a better life for themselves and their family members. When me and my brother

come along, they always taught us awareness. Growing up, I attended a school where there might have been two other Black children, and my parents would tell me:

You are different from people, and people might treat you differently. That does not mean you are not as smart. That does not mean you do not deserve to be there, just like everyone else does. If you feel uncomfortable with anything, you can talk to me, you can talk to someone at school. And you can let your voice be heard.

I remember people making comments like, “Oh your hair is different from mine, and it’s not as flowy and it’s not as silky, and your nose...” There so many things that were not a shock to me because my parents had already talked to me about them. So, I knew that I could have my voice heard. I did not have to be rude. I did not have to get aggressive. I could use my words.

I must have been maybe seven or eight the summer my mom took me to get my hair done. I had what I call poetic justice braids, long Janet Jackson braids. I went back to school and I loved my braids and I was so excited about my hair, and one of my teachers, a white woman, said to me, “Wow, what’s all this going on? Well, that can’t all be your hair!?” Her comment was in front of other people and at seven or eight I was shocked. So, at the end of that class I went up to her and said, “You know, that hurt my feelings that you did that in front of other people and I like my hair.” She actually apologized to me, but that was honestly where my resistance started. There were moments of letting my voice be heard and not getting disrespectful, but then I would have moments where I might get a little disrespectful. I may say things without thinking first. When something happens the first time I am able to deal with it, and I say to myself, *‘My parents talked to me about this.’* And I remain calm. But when things *continue* to happen, being as polite is harder.

In my master's program, there was an issue where a faculty member for one of my classes came to me at the end of the classes and said, "You know you're in danger of failing the course." I do not fail courses. I had been to every class. I was completing the work. And when I asked for his reasoning, all he said was, "You don't participate as much as I would want you to." If I am in danger of failing the class then he should tell me which assignments I missed, when have I missed class, or give me a list of things that I need to work on. He could not do that. I had a meeting with the head of the department, the faculty, and myself.

I passed the class.

I was nervous in that situation, but I was more thinking about the long-term effects that this could have if I failed the course. Even if I am scared about something, I will think about the investments I have made, and I will put that fear to the side and do what I have to do. This faculty member was white, and, aside from one other Asian male, all the students were white. So, I wondered, "Is he picking on me? What's going on here?" I did not want to automatically think it was about color, but I think about how his perception of me could be connected to how I identify and the ways that Black Caribbean people are stereotyped. I talk to a lot of friends who are in similar situations and we kind of say the same thing, I do not have the time to sit here waiting for things to get better.

When I was younger, my dad would tell me stories about trying to be successful as a prominent business man and going through so many challenges, "You don't have time to wait for things to get better, you have to continue working hard, let your voice be heard, and do what you have to do, because no one is going to speak for you. Don't wait for that." Now, the messages are not just from my parents anymore, they are from folks who have been in this for a whole lot longer than me. My mentor is a Black man, and even hearing things from him and other folks

say, “You need to be heard, don’t wait. Get it done. Say something when you feel something is wrong.” Being a professional woman of color in this type of research-intensive institution, I think of my mentees and know that I need to have the same open conversation with them as well. There is a whole lot of pressure in this institution. You feel this pressure *every* day. A kind of cloud hanging over your head, even though you have this awesome job, there is this cloud of, ‘*Produce, produce, produce.*’ So, I do research about things that I am passionate about, and that really helps with feeling that I am not doing something for the sake of doing it, but that there is a purpose behind it.

With faculty, there are times when I will get upset about certain things, or I will disagree with them, but overall the relationship is pretty decent. I spend a lot of time working with people in colleges and programs outside of counselor education. Interestingly, I feel that is what we should be doing. This interdisciplinary work. But I always get questions, “Well why are you interested in student development in information technology? How did you get interested in that? What does that have to do with counselor education?” I even believe that sometimes I am getting the message that I should be staying in counselor education. Outside of counselor education the message is, “Oh we need more of you all who are willing to work with us! We need more of that education piece!”

The relationships I have outside counselor education are great, and it is probably easier to build relationships with them than counselor education. Sometimes it is about fitting into this counselor education box. When I talk about mentoring and helping, specifically, women and students of color enter the tech world, then I will get a few more people from counselor education who are on board with it. But then I feel people have assumptions or certain ideas of what I *should* be working on. If I am talking about women or students of color, then the response

is, “Yea, that's really important.” To me, coded language for, “Yea, you should be doing more of that, woman of color.”

Recently, I wanted to start a course on college student development, and I thought it would be important to up the whole proposal for the department, making sure it was detailed, organized, and included facts and figures. A lot of the faculty were on board, but then there were two faculty members who had a look on their face the entire time, and they said to me, “I do not really see the importance of this. We have other seminars for the students. I don't really see why this is important.” They did not look at what I had come up with and had not listened to me, but I explained to them why I thought the course was important. One of them responded by saying, “It seems like fluff.”

And they used that word, “fluff”.

I started a dialogue right then and there in the meeting. I explained that I did not appreciate my work being called “fluff”, and that I felt that I was being treated as if I were in a dissertation defense. Being asked to provide stats and further argument about why college student development is important. They seemed to expect I would not say anything, or maybe that would wait until after the meeting, but I called them out right there. They were not happy and seemed offended, but in that moment, I was not worried about them feeling offended. This was not the first time I had seen them talk to someone this way – I could not be the one who let it go. I thought it was unfair to me and to other people who had gone through the same thing – younger women and people of color that they would speak to differently than each other or older white faculty.

I always tell myself, ‘*You don't have to prove yourself to people,*’ but then I find myself in situations where I am essentially being asked to prove myself. It is being a woman. It is being

young. It is being Black. Their research interests were in neuropsychology and addictions recovery, so there is this attitude about them that their research is very important and other people's research was not as important. I was nervous, but I was more telling myself, "You're on a mission right now Hyacinth, you have to let them know." Interestingly, I was having a conversation with a white female faculty who said that she thought it was awesome because she had her own experiences with the two faculty members. These individuals were also tenured, and one of them probably would have been on my Promotion and Tenure committee, but I felt there was just a bigger issue at the moment. There was risk to saying something, but the same disrespect would continue happening if we do not say anything.

I was working with several colleagues on compiling and editing a book that was based on several projects we had worked on. One of the editors had used a literature review that I had compiled for one of their sections in the book. I had taken a look at what they had used because they had not informed me first and I had been told by another co-writer. I saw that I was not listed as a co-author or contributor for that section, so I confronted the person. Still, I was not added until someone else we worked with on that project backed me up, and he happened to be a middle-aged Latino male. I felt it was so rude and so inconsiderate for him to think that he could use stuff that I had done and I had written, and then simply not include me. There were times before that incident that I would have to ask the middle-aged Latino colleague if he would write an email or spearhead an inquiry, even though I had done the work, just because I knew he would listen to him. The colleague who supported me, he is the type that just feels a need to kind of protect other people, and he had conversations with me one on one and said, "Certain things are going to be a little bit more difficult for you. And if I can help that a little bit, I'm going to."

Students sometimes also disregard my role and expertise, and feel they can just say anything to me. Even something as simple as sending me an email to ask about whether I've graded something, and I will read an email that says, "I have yet to receive my grade." And that's it. I had a master's student in a class the other day, which I understand the class is late, but I am just asking them to stay awake and stay engaged. I had asked this student something and she just said to me, "I'm just not with you right now, I'm sorry." I wanted to tell her to get out, but I spoke to her after class. In that situation, I wondered if this were another faculty member, if the faculty member were older or a white male, would she sit in class and say to them, "Well I'm just not with you right now." A couple years ago, I was teaching a course and I was telling the students that I was going to be away at a conference, and one of the students said, "You couldn't let a sister know!?" And it was a young white female student who said it to me. I was surprised when she first said it. Why would she think that she could say that to me? I looked at her like she had ten heads, asked her, "*What* was that?" Other students were just like, "wow," and she laughed it off.

I did not realize that resisting oppression was something that becomes so much of how you navigate everything in higher education. Growing up, I learned that you have to approach things in a certain way, communicate things in a certain way, and you just *do* it. But speaking to students, speaking to administration, and just learning how to navigate those relationships and the appropriate ways to say things. When I have to be a little bit more assertive, when I should speak up more, when I should not allow things to bother me, it is almost a game that you play and forget that you have been playing it because it is just life. It is just what life has to look like for people of color.

For me.

And it is all different fields, and we all seem to have a similar story when it comes to that. One of my friends outside counselor education said, “Just don’t let it make you angry. Just keep that in mind because it doesn’t have to be you becoming an angry person.” An ‘angry black woman.’ I knew that stereotype existed, but I know I do not have full control over that. I soon as I stand up for myself someone might say I’m angry. I do not want my colleagues or students to label me as the angry Black woman.

That is what resistance means, standing up for something or letting my voice be heard when it comes to something that I feel passionate about. Something that can really affect me. Educating other people because sometimes my resistance is educating someone about the way they are approaching something, or the way they are perceiving me or a group of people. Because I feel if one Black person does something, the perception is generalized to all Black people. Versus if one white person does something, you just look at them as an individual.

Resistance means the bigger picture. That resistance is not just about me. When I think about myself in this role as someone who’s young, who has a doctorate, who’s at a research-intensive institution and a predominantly white institution, I always think about how important it is for me to be some sort of example. When I graduated with my doctorate, one of my cousins called me right after the ceremony, she was crying, and she said, “You did it for all of us. Like that was for all of us. When you walked the stage, we were all walking the stage with you.” That puts a little more pressure on resisting. For me to speak out and, even if the issue is something small, to just say something because this can affect not just me but someone else. When we look at the numbers, when it comes to the percentage of people of color who get a doctorate, how many are in certain institutions, and how many of us actually go on to get tenure? That number is tiny.



When I go up for my four-year review, I'm anticipating they are going to say that I'm not doing really well. And I have heard so many people of color experience that Terrible Review. Then they end up going to another institution and starting over, and when that happens the message is, "*See*, this is why we don't hire a lot of them. *See*, they don't do well here." I think about my mentor, article after article in press and millions in grants, just so they do not have anything to say. When you are coming in as a person of color you're not even on par with everyone else. You have to work hard just to be seen as equal.

For us faculty of color, we have this whole other responsibility of mentoring students of color who just gravitate to us. It is one of my favorite parts about this position, but people don't take that into consideration when it comes to how much time that might take out of a given week. And as a woman of color in counselor education, I am asked to do so many things that won't help me get tenure. I was warned about that before I started, told, "You're going to be asked to do so many different things, just because, and that won't get you tenure." The mentoring piece will always be important to me. Because I know that's what helped me. Mentoring is how students of color get through and graduate. The conversations that I have talking to a master's student who wants to get her doctorate, and the advice I'm giving her and when I have said to her, "This is what you will encounter, and this is what you'll need to do."

## EARTHA

I have always known that I wanted to be a teacher. I originally thought that I wanted to teach high school English, until I realized I would have to work with adolescents all day every day. As far back as I can remember my sisters, who are both younger than I am, and I would sit down after I came home from school and go over everything that I had done in school that day. My mom used to by workbooks for us, and she would make copies of them so I could assign them for homework to my sisters and to the kids in the neighborhood. Teaching has always been a natural part of who I am and what I desired to do.

In my master's program, I had the opportunity to serve as a teacher's assistance for one of the professors. That desire to teach really came back during that process. After finishing my master's, I took a break. I was thinking that I needed some work experience, so I was out for a couple of years working as the coordinator of a job development and placement program, teaching clients how to ask for accommodations and what they needed to do to be successful at work. I thought, *'Maybe I really do want to pursue teaching.'* And I thought that getting the PhD would be a way to make that happen.

This university is actually the third institution where I have worked. When the opportunity to come back to my home state presented itself, I went ahead and applied for the position. This is home and my parents are here and are getting older. I knew that I would be staying here after that. I left behind tenure coming here. I still have people who think that I was absolutely crazy to do that, but I thought, *'You did it in one place, you can do it in another place.'* At my previous institution, we had a checklist that outlined the things I needed in order to ensure tenure. I had a good idea of how many publications I needed, the types of services or committees that I needed to serve on. Here, a research-one institution, there is a greater

expectation for research, but a missing checklist. Things are a bit more subjective instead of objective. I have spoken to a number of people about what they believe I need to achieve tenure, but nobody can really give me a number. I feel I am in a state of limbo, of uncertainty. Based upon the reviews I have gotten over the years, I feel I am well positioned to get through the process this next year though.

This institution is also not very diverse, this a majority-serving institution. One of the drives over the past few years has really been to diversify faculty and the student body. There are few of us in the counseling faculty, and I'm the only African American. As far as our department goes, maybe 4 individuals of color throughout the entire department faculty. There is more representation as far as gender is concerned as opposed to race. We are not as diverse as I would like for us to be, and we do not have a very diverse body of students. The lack of diversity has been very difficult.

There is not a lot of faculty of color within my department that can serve as mentors, so I have had to look across campus for that sort of thing. I have had wonderful mentors within the department, but they do not look like me. There are not a lot of social outlets for minorities here, and one of the few outlets that I have is church – where I get to see more African Americans. I have become active in my sorority again as a way to connect to other individuals, and I am part of a really great running group that is all women. We have an opportunity to get together and talk about things that specifically affect women. I have been a little more intentional because I felt the lack of outlets started catching up with me.

I started to feel just a little overwhelmed because there were no outlets and my primary focus was work. Working all the time, I started to burn out. I started to feel really frustrated with the way things were going and started to doubt whether I made the right decision in coming here.

The first couple of years here I was thinking, '*What in the hell have I done, I can't believe I gave up tenure for this.*' I started going to therapy because I needed to figure out if I had made the right decision or if I was going to stay here. Then what did I need to do to make staying here bearable for me. I had reached a breaking point. I had a really difficult time with students, lots of issues with disrespect.

My mom was a wonderful teacher not just in sitting down and going over homework with us, but in teaching us what it means to be a woman. What it means to be African American. Even now, with me being middle-aged, she continues to teach me what being a mom and an empty nester means. I also remember my fifth-grade teacher, who pushed me to be the best I could be, so I've had positive role models and African American teachers. Here we have had a few students of color come in and interview and anytime they have a student of color come to interview, guess who they come to see? I serve as the de facto advisor and mentor for any and all students of color.

Doing so is wonderful, but also overwhelming because I already have a group of students I advise. To have these additional students who will come and ask questions, or just hang out and talk that can be overwhelming from time to time. Still, I am definitely excited that I do get to serve in that capacity because I know how difficult it can be being the only person or one of the few people of color in this program. Networks are a kind of a way to survive, a mechanism that we can use for support. We see someone across the table or across campus who looks like us and we are going to gravitate towards that person.

I have done very little speaking up unless it's something that I absolutely should have an opinion on or something that I feel comfortable giving my opinion on because I know that it is correct. For bigger issues, I usually use surrogates; these faculty members who help advocate for

me. At my previous institution, I felt more comfortable in speaking up in department meetings, but here it is not the same. Being raised in the South, a woman in the South, the culture tries to teach us to be seen but not heard. We are expected to look pretty, but not have an opinion about anything. One of the things I can definitely say about my mom is that she did not go for that. She taught us that if this is how we feel, then we need to be comfortable in voicing our opinion. So, in some places I am perfectly capable of doing that. At the same time, I am such an introvert and I do not like confrontation. That is coupled with me being untenured, which adds another piece because I don't want there to be any friction. I don't want there to be any hard feelings. I want to make sure there is peace in the world.

But what I noticed is that when we admit students who don't meet the criteria, then that makes my job much more difficult. And these are generally the students who complain about my classes and that I'm too hard, or that my standards are too high. So, for that reason, I have become much more comfortable in speaking up. Both the support I receive from the other faculty members in my program, and that my job is made much more difficult if I do not speak up. We had a student who was coming in to interview for the counselor education program, and, because she is student of color, I was asked to meet with her. The faculty member who sent the email said, "Well we have a student who is coming in who is biracial, and I thought that because you are biracial she might meet with you." And that was a grossly ignorant assumption because I do not identify as biracial.

For the most part, within the program and within the department our relationships have been fine. I feel overwhelmed when I have been around a group of people for too long, so I am usually in my office. That is something that I have talked about in therapy and something that I am trying to make a concerted effort to modify. Actually, there is only one other person who

knows that therapy is something I sought out. I talked to her about it because she confided in me. She is a woman and with there being mostly males in our department and our college, she has experienced some issues with microaggressions and sought out therapy. I remember talking to her one day about the students and how overwhelmed I felt, and how disrespected I felt, and she recommended her therapist.

Seeing this therapist, I was correctly diagnosed with Bipolar Disorder II. I am now taking medications and in treatment. I am able to get sleep the way that I need to, so it has made a world of difference. But therapy has been more about being able to process some of the day-to-day things I have encountered as a faculty of color at a majority institution. I cannot imagine how or where I would be had I not started therapy a couple years ago. I trust the universe and I trust that things will fall into place as they should, but I also want to make sure that as it is falling into place I have a plan to assist it. When I came to this institution, even up to this last semester, students tended to question my grading. I was thinking that I was working with doctoral students and higher level master's students, but I have had a lot of students who complained to our program coordinator about my standards or my grading policy.

I created these very detailed rubrics thinking that they may leave little room for creativity, but they covered my butt when it came to how and why I graded a student on a particular assignment. Nevertheless, I had a meeting recently with a student, a white male, who was in my class last semester and did very poorly on his research paper. Instead of coming to me to talk about it, he went to the program coordinator. I got the sense that he was telling on me, thinking how dare I give him a failing grade on his paper. A few weeks later, I actually let him submit a new paper. I caved because I hate confrontation and he would sit in the back of the

classroom with his arms folded staring me down. I am kicking myself though; I should not have extended another opportunity to him.

The other faculty members in my program have also been absolutely wonderful. One in particular has served as research mentor and has been great in guiding me on how to get research up and started. I have actually mentioned to the department chair that every day I am met with microaggressions, students dismissing me or saying things under their breath. Sometimes I wear my hair braided and they have asked me about the braids or about touching them. I remember meeting with the previous dean for my annual review the first year I was here, and I was taken aback when she kept mentioning that I had previously taught at minority-serving institutions and that the expectations here were *different*.

I was here two years before I started seeing a counselor and was diagnosed. Being able to sit still and get things done and actually being able to think was impossible; before my thoughts were racing so fast that I did not know if I was coming or going. Still, the advice of my co-worker, the faculty member in my department who knows, was not to let anyone know until after tenure because they would use the diagnosis against me. Pre-tenure we do not speak up. We do not talk back. We do not reveal too much about our life. With tenure, there is this freedom to be more authentic. I can talk about these things and I can let others know I am diagnosed with Bipolar Disorder – not sure that I will, however. I think students would hold it against me.

Students always question how and why I graded something a certain way – particularly white males and older white females. I have been a writer all my life. I absolutely love to write, and I know APA formatting backwards and forwards. I know what good writing is and I know what a research paper should look like for a master's and doctoral level student. I try to be very encouraging in the feedback that I give, trying to be nice because I am *pre-tenure*. I need to get

student evaluations. I had a doctoral student last semester, a white male, who used to complain to the other doctoral students that he thought my standards were too high and that I was asking too much of them. He has never had to do this much work in other classes he has taken, and this is a doctoral advanced research class. I wonder what he expected.

Things like these make me second guess what I am doing, or second guess being here. I love teaching, teaching is all I wanted to do, but if I am having to continuously defend myself or deal with students who are lazy and don't want to work, and then blame me for their grades – that makes it really difficult for me to stay here. This student went to the program chair with his paper, and again I got this sense of, *'You're going to get in trouble because I told on you'*. I am disappointed and disheartened, but more frustrated that this has been my experience more than once. I keep telling myself, "Eartha, you can't get upset".

I was teaching multicultural counseling last semester where students are required to do presentations. I had a white female stand up in class and begin her presentation with the n-word. They were all white females, except one individual who is biracial. The student in the class said that at her high school, "We just said it, nigger, nigger, nigger, and it was not a big deal." After she said that I completely shut down. I heard nothing else of her presentation. I immediately thought to myself, *'Are you kidding me? How am I going to address this without showing that I'm angry that people say this word, even knowing its negative connotations?'* I had to make sure she understood how damaging, how ugly, nasty this word is. If she is going to bring this word up, then she needs to talk about the word's history. She just went right through the rest of the presentation. At the very end of class, I stood up and could see the look on some of the students' faces. I said to the class there are some things that are so vile that we don't even say them, and the n-word is one of them.



I think that because I am a female and African American, students view me one way already. I try to remain separated from that because I do not want students to say I am being partial to African Americans or women because that's how I identify. I am very mindful to take myself out of that when we are talking about those types of issues—or there would be tears running down my face and my fist up in the air. To that student's credit she did come and talk to me later and apologized. She also nominated me faculty of the year.

I am also the advisor for a student association and we are getting ready to do a larger event later this year. The student president for the association is a young white woman who decided that, instead of emailing me or talking to me about room reservations or food orders, she would be going to our program coordinator to do that. I have planned these events before. I have handled the logistics for these type events before. But the next thing I know, this student comes to my office and says, "Dr. So-and-So can secure rooms for us." I told her that *I* secure rooms for us, I order the food all the time. I felt slighted. I am the advisor for this group, so why would she not come and talk to me? I feel I am not important enough. I am not going to be capable of doing whatever needs to be done. I am perfectly capable. I have had a PhD for over a decade now. I have been teaching in the field for over a decade. I have been planning these events for ten years. I know a little bit about how to coordinate them.

I know that this student has made remarks about who I am and what I am capable of doing. Other people have come to my office and tell me what is going on, what I need to keep my eyes open for. When I confronted her, she actually cried and apologized profusely. I do not know what else to do other than having the faculty tell them they need to come talk to me, or that they need to check with me to see what I think. The program chair does that, at times. I will come over to his office. But, there are some instances where he will make a decision, and I will

not find out until I am told by students. That – coupled with the students challenging me in classes – makes me pause and ask, what can I do to affect change? Or would I be spinning my wheels if I tried to?

I have been on numerous advisory and dissertation committees. I have also chaired one of each for a student of color. None of the white students have asked me to chair either of these committees. Being pre-tenure, those are some of the things I need to eventually secure tenure. The students say my standards are too high, but, for the life of me, I do not understand. This program does not have any stringent admissions criteria. They apply, they are in. I am hoping to change that eventually. I believe it is *because* the students get in so easily, that in a lot of classes they are not being pushed or challenged, that they struggle with my standards. I have a personal connection to this institution, and one of the things that frustrates me to no end is that they do not expect students to do anything. When I first got here we had quite a few Black females in the program, and even *they* gave me a hard time. The other professors who are white had none of the issues that I had with those students.

White is always right.

When I am on dissertation committees. I expect a good product. I am not going to sign my name to something that is junk. As a result, white students seem to have chosen not to have me on their committees. I know who I am. I know to my core I am a kind person. I will do whatever I can do to help anyone, including students. I have done a better job of balancing that, saying “That is your issue, not my issue, and I am not going to make it my issue.” I think about how I had envisioned my life – knowing all my life I wanted to be a teacher – but I initially never thought of being a professor, and, even when I did, it definitely was not a professor at a majority-serving institution.

Resistance to me means that there is a failure to change even in the face of truth. Even when that truth has been displayed and acknowledged over and over, individuals still fail to make change as a result. I am the object or the person to whom the resistance is focused. I present myself in the classroom and students resist who I am and what I stand for. I am also the change agent – staying there with them, to let them know I am not going anywhere. I think I kind of play both sides there. When I first started teaching, I wanted to make sure all of the students liked me. But there have definitely been issues where I have felt I needed to confront a student or confront an issue. In those instances, where I have chosen to confront, I have walked away from that feeling much better about myself. I feel that I have walked away with that other person having more respect for me. That they recognize I am here to do a job.

And that I do a damn good job.

There is this dichotomy here surrounding me. Students who are severely depressed, and in some cases suicidal, have felt more comfortable coming and talking to me as opposed to the other faculty members. I have had students come to my office and cry. I even keep a box of tissues because that is what happens. For example, to have a student call me in the middle of the night and say, “You have got to come here – I have all these pills laid out here and if somebody does not come I am going to take them and end it all.” Or other students who have been in my office when they said those things and I was able to walk them over to the counseling center. Then, there is this great divide. When the issue is related to how I have judged them, graded them, or how I’m trying to instruct them, then they feel I cannot do those things. That those may be better left in the hands of a white male. And there is no middle ground.

## HOPE

I decided to pursue a degree in school counseling because I loved working with people, specifically with children, adolescents, families, and schools. I wanted to pursue my doctorate because I enjoyed working with graduate level students, and I could still keep that school counselor educator identity. In East Asia, we do not have a profession called counseling or counselor education, so I knew very little about this profession. What I knew was that children, adolescents, and schools need a lot of mental health and academic career support.

Growing up we are constantly compared with other children. All of our grades and all of our behaviors were put in written format and posted on the bulletin boards or school website. I was a very good kid, from the lens of a parent. I was defined through comparison with others, while other parents compared their kids with me. I absolutely did not enjoy that. A natural disaster which occurred in my home country prompted my interests in pursuing counseling as further education. I saw there needed to be stronger support for development of children and adolescents, and to provide counseling services for them. That was what prompted me to search for opportunities and narrow it down to school counseling, career counseling, clinical mental health counseling, and educational psychology.

I did a lot of research into what school counseling really meant, and found out teachers were actually doing the school counseling job, but did not have the title. I finally choose school counseling for my master's, and I really think that was the best decision I ever made. I love working with children. They make me excited. I am interested in getting to know them and their families, in how children differ from each other and the uniqueness of each individual. I love listening to children and sharing their stories. I am always authentic – that is probably one of the reasons that I enjoy this career. In counseling, people understand that you are a human being.

That you are not perfect all the time, and I bring that part of me to wherever I am, both personal and professional.

I had a hard time after obtaining my master's on deciding if counselor education is the field that I was going to be in. I learned that international students had a hard time getting a job as counselors in the United States. That is why I applied for a PhD in counselor education, so that I could still strive to provide the best practice in the field which I am passionate about. I enjoyed the different characteristics of graduate students. I enjoy sharing knowledge with them, not only me being the sage on the stage, but also the guide by the side. I also realized it is not a counselor education problem. It was an issue I would have to deal with across the whole higher education system, whichever area I picked.

To me, speaking out is the nature of counseling and counselor education. Counseling and counselor education is less about advocacy for a particular individual and more about advocacy for underrepresented populations in general. We are going to work with clients who are marginalized, and we are going to deal with students who come from the minority group. Speaking out is more a part of my own professional code of ethics. It is also important to provide a role model. When something happens, how can students handle that issue, instead of saying, "I don't think we're going to be friends, because you said that to me." How you can handle that in a professional way, without letting it impact your mental or emotional health.

I have two extremes of experience with students. I do not know to what extent those experiences are related to my identities as an international woman of color and mother, or related to me being a new faculty. There were a lot of transitions from student identity to faculty and professional identity, but there were many things that went beyond my expectations. One of that was the huge transition from student to faculty role. Directly working with doctoral students

when I had just finished that journey, sitting in their dissertations and providing methodology and literature review support things. I also became pregnant early in my career. I think that added on even more, and I am also different from my colleagues. I was young, a fresh graduate, and an international female of color.

I remember struggling especially with one class. The class was merged into one huge class and there was not only going to be counseling students, but also non-counseling students. That was something that I was not aware of until shortly before the semester started. Due to my pregnancy, I did not teach the full year, so my teaching evaluations reflected not my work, but the work from the individual who covered the class. The evaluations were the worst in my history. That was devastating. The most terrible thing was reading through students' comments in my course evaluations. Things not related to professionalism or teaching, things that were very personal and not appropriate. They provoked me to think about whether or not my identities really played a role, or if it was just that I was starting in my career. I was comparing myself with my colleagues who are more senior white males and the colleagues who are similar to me developmentally, and I felt like I had been treated in a different way by the students.

On their evaluations, the assumptions they made were things like, “How can a person not familiar with the culture be teaching classes like that?” and “Faculty with a school counseling background, how can they teach clinical mental health or non-counseling students?” I do not know how specific that is related to identity, but I do not think they want to be judged for being too personal or judgmental, so they say it in that way. In the past clinical mental health faculty teach school counselors as well, so why is that not a question?

I have had generally positive experiences with colleagues, but I do find that the administrators need constant education on what paperwork I need in order to work in this

country. I have worked very hard and have reached that standard to get this job, but I think that after I started there is very few interactions like, "Do you have any difficulty with applying for your visa? Do you have any difficulty interacting with the international office? Are there any things that we can support?" There is none of that. There is no sort of attending to my international background, and that has probably been the most frustrating part for me. I have to constantly educate them. This is what I need in order to work in this country, and they are confused. I try to communicate these kinds of things to them, and I find I cannot tell the true care or empathy from that. I think for them it is just politics or paperwork, so I am constantly referred to the international office, told, "Yea work with them, deal with them, we don't know." And then the international student office would constantly refer me back to my department for paperwork they needed.

A negative side-effect of this is I constantly blame myself for being different. Because I think that my colleagues do not need additional paperwork, so they do not have to do that for them. They have to work additionally because of me. So, I just feel like I am blaming myself. I feel guilty sometimes because government requirements are things that I cannot control. They are not something *I* require, but needing them makes me feel like they do things just for me. They make me feel like they are doing me a favor. They never made it explicit, but I feel I need to say, "Oh yeah, thank you." I have to constantly say, "Thank you for doing that for me. Thank you for your time. Thank you for your effort." That just leaves a lot of questions to me whether or not we should advocate for international faculty or whether or not we should eliminate the jobs for international faculty because of these kinds of things. I hear those words "advocating for diversity, advocating for international," and I think that is probably a rationale that they bring me to this department. In practice, though, the way they are acting makes me feel like eliminating

diversity instead of advocating for it. The awareness level of competency, they achieved it, but the knowledge level and the action level, I do not think so.

It is frustrating.

Especially when there is very poor communication between the administration and the international office. At my previous institution, I actually had to make the phone calls and figure everything out myself. In the end, I gave up. There were moments when I sent all the information to different administrators, all white, most men, and they dismissed me because they believed they knew better. I had gone through the government website, but they continued functioning under the wrong information. What is more frustrating is that, even when the administration recognized having the wrong information, no actions were taken. There was none – **nothing** – no check-ins or follow-ups. At my current institution, my colleagues are very professional as counselor educators. They are empathetic, they are student centered, they are professional, they are advocating for diversity, and they are doing their jobs. So, when I do not feel they understand my situation as an international faculty, that just makes me wonder, *'Am I wrong? Am I just different? Am I the extra person, or should I just change myself just to please these people? Or should I just stop advocating for myself?'* There is a lack of competency about working with international faculty here too. On one hand, when I have broached the subject of my international status, I have wanted them to know that I have the right information, and on the other hand I do not want to lose the trust between myself and colleagues.

When I broached inconsistencies to the administration at my previous institution, there was a sense of relief. Prior to that I felt vulnerable, and that was also motivation to do something to change it. Afterward, there was a sense of relief because I showed the facts in a professional manner. And I think that part of that relief comes from thinking, *'Well now I've done all the*



*things that I can control, and the rest of the things I can't.* ' I do whatever I can. I do my best because I love my job and I love my students. I want to build something here. I want to own that I am not a guest in the department. I am an owner of this position, so I wanted to write my own book. There was also a sense of pride. I am proud of myself for saying something because not everyone would choose to broach their needs and difficulties. But part of me thought, *'You're in a country that you were not born in, this is not my citizenship, so there's a possibility that wherever you change it's going to be the same system. You have to navigate the same system again, so why not now? So why not do that?'*

I am still aware that I am the minority wherever I go, whether or not I am in the department or counseling conferences. I am still aware of that there are not many Asian counselor educators. That there are not many young professionals who are mothers. So, I still feel like I am different. Out of the few faculty members here, I am the only one that has a child. I am the only one who has that motherhood and professorship balance, and sometimes I feel that I am alone. I feel reluctant to talk with my peers or talk with my colleagues about things that I'm tackling, like my child being sick, needing to send your child to day care, or my partner being on a business trip. I feel nobody here is interested in hearing that. Instead, I turn to others who are not my counseling colleagues to initiate conversations with, since they have similar types of situations.

I do not think we should let the personal identity get into the way, but I do think our personal side interacts with our professional identity. It is healthy to appropriately consult or process some of my difficulties with my colleagues, but, interestingly, I have not had a faculty from the counselor education program ask me, "How's your baby? How's your family?" There is no conversation like that, but there is casual conversation, small talk about pets and travelling

stuff. That makes me wonder, *'Why is it legitimate to talk about pets, but not to talk about children or other loved ones?'*

I really feel isolated. I feel alone. I do find ways to process, and I have a strong personality, which buffers some of those feelings that there is not that safe space for me to navigate that motherhood. I do not perceive sufficient mentoring. The person who is developmentally closer to me, I would count the individual as a support network. This individual is a very strong advocate, and I think if I had to choose a person to listen or talk to, that would be my person. I feel safe with this individual. I still know we are different, we are still very different in terms of background and in terms of professional identity and the ways we are handling students, but I have that trust with the person. I trust the person's professionalism and personal attributes. But in terms of personal things, my stories, my background, and my identities, I do not feel comfortable to speaking with anyone because I did not sense any interest from the environment. It does not matter whose fault it is when there is incompetency regarding international faculty, but that incompetency tells me that my position does not matter to administrators. This is my whole world. It is my profession. I cannot **work** if I do not have that sponsorship. I think that was the most challenging moment for me.

Before my maternity leave I had to take care of all of my advising meetings: I had to make sure that they registered for classes, that documents needed are ready to go, and make sure my classes are ready to go. There needs to be stronger support for new faculty in general. I started with a course with over twenty students from both counseling and non-counseling fields. I started off well and students were really enjoying the course. Then I transitioned to maternity leave. Soon after I left, I found out that the individual they got to cover my course had never taught a master's level class.

It was chaotic.

That was not a maternity leave for me. I was constantly receiving emails from my students saying, “What's going *on*? I did not get my assignments back, or “The instructor is not responsible, and does not seem to care about us. I want to drop out of the class.” That was awful, a horrible experience. Having so many graduate students in one class, and having an individual who had never taught a master’s course before cover it, those did not feel like wise decisions. What was unfair is that it feels like students judged *me* based on that experience, even though I was not involved the entire time. That affected me for a very long time. I did not want to check my emails. I did not want to go back to the office because I felt like people were talking about me.

For that whole semester, I did not want to work with any student from that class because I felt like they were judging me for that one course. And it took me a long time to remediate that. I felt like I had to prove who I am rather than just bring myself. We often say bring yourself, your authenticity to teaching, but for me I felt I had to make efforts to prove that I am good. To *prove*, rather than just be me. I am humorous, I am personable, I am well-educated. But it is not like that, I have to *prove* it. Find out if they see what I am doing this semester because I need them to *see* my teaching evaluations, I need them to *see* my relationship with students.

*I need them to know.*

And that sounds incredible to me.

I need to make a strong presence in the department, rather than being that vulnerable person. I do not want to solidify the “Asian stereotypes” that I can take whatever is given to me and not speak my mind about it. One faculty member, a white female, who was not even the department chair called me and said, “I want to talk to you about your class.” I thought, ‘*Why*

*does that matter to you? How does it affect you? If there is somebody who is going to talk to me about my class that is going to be the chair, not you.'* And for the reason that she wanted to talk, she said, "Your students are complaining about and discussing your class in my class."

And I said, "Why are you the person who needs to talk to me? And not the chair?"

She said, "Well those are some of the students in your class and they said they did not learn as much as they expected" And the students were requesting that she reteach them the information from my course. So, I was very polite because I did not want to jump to conclusions, and I said, "I appreciate you being part of this process, and I appreciate you passing along the information. To be honest, I do not know what I could offer at this moments. If there is anything I can do to help my students, I will do it. I will go back to this class. If you want me to go back and teach I will." And she responded, "No, no, no, no, I just want to pass along information to you. I just want to discuss it with you. I just don't want to lose our students."

But the thing is the *department chair* never reached out to me regarding the experience. I even apologized, saying I felt bad for the students and for the instructor. He actually said to me, "I never had any doubt about your teaching. You're going to be just fine. It does not impact anything." But the other faculty, the way that she approached me, it seemed like she was just protecting and rescuing the students, and it made me feel like blaming myself. I intentionally think I try not to use having a baby as any excuse. I do not think that my baby affects my job, so I constantly work on not having my personal life get into the way of my professional.

Still, I am proud of myself for going through that process and returning with the strong presence. I showed that I also own this department. Not that I am filling a role that you want me to do, but that this is mine. This is my unit. This is my organization, and those are my students. And it is my job to correct them if there is an issue. I still feel how powerfully some of those

experiences affected me. In my work those kinds of experiences made me feel powerful as a person, and also powerless because many of the things are beyond my control. I cannot do much to change them. I cannot change others, the only thing I can do is change myself, or change how I view the world. How I act or behave.

To me resistance definitely means action. You do something. Rather than just being aware and knowing, I *do*. You have to take actions. It also means that once you take that action you are also taking risks. It is likely that people are going to have different views about you. That you are solidifying the image that you are different from other people. Part of me does not feel it is fair. It is not fair for me to deal with some of these things. Academia itself is a lot, pre-tenure itself is a lot. This is the first time that I started standing on my own feet without anyone. I did not have my advisor anymore. I did not have those people were once part of my support network, instead of having that whole support network I am here by myself.

I do have a family. I do have friends, but they are outsiders. They do not understand what academia is. They do not understand what professorship entails. With all of those pressures plus the external things, plus dealing with the visa, dealing with being a mother, dealing with extra administrative work that I never dealt with in the past, it is a lot of things added to the plate. So, I find that I have to take risks. I needed to speak it. Not only for myself, but in the future. Wherever I go I am still under this macro-environment, whichever university I switch to I will probably deal with the same issues. Instead of waiting, why not deal with it now?

I may not be able to change anything, I may still get the same results and decisions, but at least I can still say I tried. And I feel at peace. I think resistance needs not only one individual's efforts. Resistance needs a system. It needs systematic change. Not only people with similar experiences, or people like me taking action and being resistant, but also for people who are

different from me. Those who are making policies and those who have power. Being aware that differences do exist and institutional barriers do exist, and that minority populations from the minority groups are dealing with additional barriers compared with white males, or the majority group. And although changes are not going to happen in one day, we should keep the hope.

## DEACON

I came to counseling sideways. I had worked a lot of odd jobs after college because there was nothing I could do with my undergraduate degree in psychology. I was given a job as an assistant hall director at Saturn College. I liked the work I was doing and wanted to move up in student affairs, Res Life, and perhaps switch to student conduct. I started taking classes to get into the student affairs graduate program, but I realized that was not a good fit for me. I applied for a graduate counseling program instead. I entered with the expressed purpose of staying in student affairs and not being a counselor, and immediately had the idea that I wanted to get my doctorate.

My work situation at the time was not good. The work environment was very hostile, and it became even more hostile when I started graduate school. At the time, I was working at a Historically Black College, and since I did not attend a historically black college and my graduate program was going to be at a non-HBCU, I was seen as an outsider. For the most part, my supervisors were the ones that made it really bad for me. Everyone had said to get my PhD, and I was wavering between higher education or counselor education. I was told to get my PhD in Counselor Education because I would have more job security

I told them that I wanted to go into higher education and administration, then there I was teaching this undergraduate counseling skills course and I loved it. Providing supervision for master's students, facilitating the master's level interpersonal process groups, co-teaching some of the master's courses, and doing clinical work awakened this desire to counsel. And what really solidified me looking for counselor education positions was that when I went to the American Counseling Association conference, another counselor educator said to me, "I know you want to go back into administration, but you would be doing yourself and counselor education a

disservice. There are not that many Black males in counselor education, especially with your background. You have a lot to offer. You would readily find a job.”

I have always had a passion for underrepresented populations and advocating for them, especially African American males in higher education that attend predominantly white institution. Also, advocating for members of the LGBT community, queer persons of color, and persons impacted by HIV/AIDS. As a counselor educator, I can equip my students in being more effective in working with those populations. As well as, ensuring diversity in our counseling programs, and making sure that other persons of color that are in our profession are getting the proper mentoring and guidance that they might not get from white professors.

I am always asked to do different training with regards to teaching counseling skills and teaching cultural sensitivity in various areas, and I think it makes a lot of sense. Right now, my department is mostly white. I am the only person of color in my department, and we are a huge department. And if I get tenure, I will be the first minority to get tenure in the department. In our master's program, we have around two-dozen students. We only have less than a handful of students of color. This is the first year we've had Black doctoral students, and I recruited them.

This department old and white.

I know I have privilege, as someone with a PhD, and I have to use that privilege. I have to leverage that privilege to benefit those that do not have that privilege. Being a mentor and being very deliberate about seeking out those that are coming behind me. Just being intentional in asking, “How are things going? Hit me up if you need me. Send me a personal statement, let me look over it for you. If you need a letter of recommendation, please let me know.” Being that person for them, that go-to person and not hiding the different intersections of me. Not being afraid to embrace my Blackness, my gayness - and putting myself out there. Because a lot of



them do identify as Black gay men and need to see that there's someone out there that supports them. That's the epitome of being Christian. To advocate for those that do not have a voice, and for those of us that have power to use that power to support those that are less than in any way that we can.

There are some of my colleagues who have been wonderful in helping me to get adjusted to being in academia and being at my current institution. There are some that I think do not want me to be here. That is disheartening because academia can be very isolating and white for persons of color. But I am not going to give up. There are students here that depend on me. There are students here that need to see another person that looks like them. Here students get to call their professors by their first name. A lot of students of color are uncomfortable with calling faculty by their first name, and I do not think the program has considered that. They are looking at it from their point of privilege and trying to create this egalitarian environment, but they are looking at it from a white standpoint. Culturally, Blacks are taught to respect their elders, you do not call elders by their first names. Doing so is disrespectful. My students who are Black, they tend to lean on me a lot more. I had a student walk into my office and she say, "Can I just walk in and be Black for a second?"

I said, "Help yourself. I completely understand."

Another student, he is one of the few minority males in our program who is also gay, and there are some things he and I can talk about that he will not talk about with the rest of the faculty. At a faculty meeting, we spoke about him and some of the faculty commented on his personality, and I said, "Well, that's cultural and he's not going to discuss that with y'all." I had to explain that performance persona that he has. I said, "You know what? That comes from being a

man of color in academia that's all white, and in the field of counseling, that is mostly white. Like being a Black man in America."

Some of my white students are OK, but with some – there is a disconnect. I just do not get it. When I am teaching sometimes it seems they think that I am speaking another language, that they do not understand what I am saying. That translates to them saying on my teaching evaluations that I do not deliver concepts well. That they do not feel prepared. But I am teaching the material. I know it is race-related. My last few years have been difficult at my current institution. I am trying my best to fit in to what their idea of a good teacher is, and a lot of times in academia that is what we have to do. You have to fit in where you get in. But the scrutiny I have been under – having half the faculty questioning or wanting to give me feedback on my teaching. I do not like being under a microscope. And they are not looking at the fact that faculty of color tend to get lower teaching evaluations.

My service is not encouraged. They want to see more service to the department and to the program. I am involved and on the planning committees for different disciplinary events and conferences, and they just want to see what I can do for the program and the department. I am not being made to feel welcome by members of my own department. For example, having a different set of rules - things that I am not allowed to do that others are allowed to do. My investment beings questioned. Many of the faculty are cool on the surface, but I do not trust any of them. We have to get their support to get promotion and tenure, and that process alone is...not inviting for faculty of color. One thing I make sure to do, when I go to events where I know administrators are going to be there, I make sure that they see my face. I make sure that I have good interactions with them because I need an ally that is above and beyond my faculty. Especially when I submit my tenure packet. I have my official faculty mentor, but he is a white

and they are going to stick together. These are things that others need to know. I did not hear anything about this when I was a doctoral student. Nobody told me about this kind of stuff when I was a doctoral student.

I was teaching a diagnosis class and talking about culture, and how culture can impact the diagnostic process. I had a student, a white male, openly challenge me and say that I was spending too much time talking about culture. That we could have talked about it in 30 minutes and moved on to something else. I had started off by giving them an example that showed how assessment tools can be biased, and then showed a couple of videos of different professionals talking about cultural bias in diagnosis. He just did not think that was a good use of our time. He said, "I don't like the way this class is going. We're talking about this topic for too long, it could've been wrapped up in 30-45 minutes. This is not what I expected to learn from this course." I was caught off guard. I wanted to cuss his ass out in the middle of class, say, "Well, then you get up and teach this class then." Thankfully, the other students said, "We never get to talk about culture, so we need this."

When I went to the faculty they said, "He's just like that." That is not the support that I need. I told them exactly what happened, and they just brushed it off. That is why I do not trust them. I do not trust them to have my best interests at heart. I get my support then from other faculty members on campus that look like me, or other Black faculty that are counselor educators. That is where I get to vent. If you cannot find support within your faculty, you have got to find it somewhere else. Other folks that have been where you are and you all can work through the struggle together.

At a recent event troubleshooting challenges to diversity in the institution, we were discussing the experiences of faculty of color in higher education. We were all fired up and I

expressed my frustration with my department. The feeling of isolation and being tokenized, and the lack of support. I was the only faculty there from my department, but, nevertheless, when I got back to my department, the chair had heard about what I had said. He, a white male, confronted me about it and, instead, of offering support, said he thought I had all the support that I needed. That I have a mentor—a white woman. I thought, *'For real!?'* I told him, "Well, I don't trust you because you're white. I don't trust any of y'all because y'all are white. I don't have any reason to trust y'all."

He had no choice but to listen to that. I told him that when we have met I have left our meetings discouraged. That he always talks about things I have done wrong, but never of how I have grown or what I have done well with. My heart was racing, but it just came out. I had to get it off my chest, and I am glad I said it to him. We will see what the repercussions are because I have to have his endorsement for promotion and tenure, and, right now, I do not think I will get it. I have to be very cautious about what I say and what I do because it always gets back to them, no matter what. How am I feeling about my position? I wish I knew the answer to that question. I made some strong connections at my current institution. On the one hand, I do not want to leave, and on the other I am ready to get the fuck out of here. I guess only time will tell.

Resistance to me is rage against the machine. Being able to place a monkey wrench in those gears of oppression and holding that monkey wrench there so those gears stop and malfunction, so they never run again. Malfunction to the point that they are beyond repair. Resistance to me is staying true to myself and saying fuck you to everybody else. Making sure that persons of color, whether they are clients or counselor educators, are getting their just due.

My idea of resistance is fighting against the oppression of clients of color and counselors and counselor educators of color. My acts of resistance have modified as I have gained more

privilege. The more and more education I have gotten, the more and more ways I have been able to advocate. Resisting now is being true to who I am in spite of my environment. Being able to effect change in my environment. Writing about my angst. Researching about my angst. My acts of resistance are hopefully going to take me to the presidency of the American Counseling Association where they will improve diversity in counseling and counselor education.

## WEST

My pathway toward counselor education was...a bit circuitous. My master's degree, although not in counseling, had given me enough education to be certified as a school counselor in my state, so I worked in a high school setting as a high school counselor. Around the time my second child was born, who is diagnosed with a developmental disability, I decided that I wanted to pursue doctoral studies in counselor education. I wanted to do research about college access for low income high-achieving students. Once my son was born and received his diagnosis, we watched the dynamics of my family system change. We have an older daughter, and watching their interactions, I became really curious about research in family dynamics as well.

My interest in teaching also came from some family members. Both my own and my wife's. My dad is in full time ministry, which he identifies as a teaching. His mom was a teacher, and he always spoke about her fondly, and my memories of her are very fond, before she passed. So, he always spoke about the nobility of the teaching profession because of how much he loved his mom. He talked about his dad wanting to pursue a college education but never having the opportunity to do so, and him having a college degree, being a second-generation Black man at the time. My main influence, though, came from mom because my mom came from a much more blue-collar family. She is not college educated, her folks are not college educated, and like many of our families who do not have a college education we were oriented toward our careers, with the message for us being, "Get a good job with good benefits!" She would tell me, "Well, you can always be a teacher...You'd be great being a teacher." Maybe minimizing what it takes to be a really good teacher, but also recognizing the value that comes when you work in public education.

As an undergraduate student, I pledged a Black fraternity and I was very active at the Office for Black Affairs where I went to school, a predominantly white school. When I think about my own racial identity development I can remember very specifically those years, watching what I can now identify as likely systemic racism against me or people like me, so those early years of just being connected to a community were really important to me. My first job after my master's program was as Assistant Director of a new cultural center at a major flagship institution, which had been my goal during my master's.

My first year was the year of resistance by Black students that led to creation of an Africana research center. Some very vocal members of the university community, particularly alumni, could not see or could not reconcile that Black students were there at the university because they had a right, were talented enough, and had demonstrated the merit to be there, versus believing they were there solely on their athletic ability. Over the course of the academic year there was tremendous movement that included sit-ins and protests, and all that resistance was happening literally right in my office. I would like to be able to say that in some way shape or form, I helped that, and I certainly was involved in that and in the mentoring of those students of color.

At the same time, I knew other colleagues who were working in student affairs or who wanted to pursue the professoriate, and they were telling me about their experiences, particularly early on in their careers, and I would be like, "Man, are you kidding, those things are happening?" Hearing them voice concerns about mixed messages regarding what tenure would require, and the challenges of being one of few people of color if any, and trying to prioritize how they would spend their time engaged in different forms of service, versus really trying to develop their scholarships and research pipeline based on what they understood to be the most

efficient pathway toward tenure. Now that I'm in the academy working toward the professoriate, I can really appreciate much more some of those challenges that those colleagues were talking about in that point in time.

For example, my fraternity, which is an international, historically black fraternity, is not present where I currently teach. I could be super excited and say, "You know what, I'm going to connect with undergraduate students by helping facilitate a chapter here." Well, I cannot afford to do that! At least not right now because this brother does not have tenure, and, while the message is tenure and promotion is 40% research 40% teaching and 20% service – that is not what it is. I might have people critique how much service I provide, because I am not signing up for committees, but I say, "Y'all want me to write!? Well, let me write. You want me to pursue grants? Then don't ask me to serve on no committees." Still, separating my professional work and identity from my personal life is hard for me.

As we inherit white-supremacist ideas that we can distinguish or separate ourselves in these specific environments, I do not believe that is who I am. I generally do not believe that is how communities of color are in this country. I believe that one thing influences the other, and I am not going to separate the two. I think the institution, higher education, can perpetuate values, even unintentionally, to separate the two. I received feedback in my reappointment papers last year that said, "Hey West, maybe you shouldn't do as much service." I do service in my local community, I am active in my local chapter of my fraternity, and I was told, "Maybe you should give that up." Why the hell would I do that when it influences my teaching? If I am not in a school, then these young men that I see between sixth and twelfth grade that are predominantly Black are going to influence how I teach in the classroom when I am talking about the experiences of Black boys in schools.



All my experiences help me to have the courage to be bold and speak out. Because it takes courage, and being prepared to be questioned about that boldness. Sometimes I fall short of my own expectations, say, “Damn I should’ve said something,” or “You should have spoken up or you should have spoken louder. You should have been more persistent.” But at the end of the day, I am saying to myself, “Did I speak up when I needed to speak up? Did I make myself known? Did I make my ideas known? Did I share my convictions about particular issues? Am I going to be confident and assured in making the case that race matters, gender matters, and all of our other identities – they matter. And am I going to speak up when people want to imply that they’re not as important?”

Recently, a few other colleagues of mine of color wanted to create an environment where students, faculty, and staff could come and talk about whatever we wanted to talk about. Faculty could be there, but they would not be assuming faculty roles. They would be there to listen, learn, and contribute to the conversation. With so much stuff going on politically, we wanted to make sure our learning community had the opportunity to discuss some of these things without the fear of judgement. We announced our plan at the faculty meeting and, unsurprisingly, some faculty responded by saying, “Well, I don’t know, it’s too, the conversation might be too linear, *too* focused on race.”

We spent a pretty good amount of time in the latter part of the summer saying to the faculty that this is what we were going to do and that they were more than welcome to join in the effort. We invited the faculty to engage with us, and we worked to engage with the entire community about it. Then, after the faculty meeting, we received a direct email that said, “While I understand the rationale for this and think it is important, it might be perceived as a bit exclusionary because there are some folks whose spiritual practices, namely Jewish, cannot

participate because it is on a Friday.” My colleagues and I agreed that a response needed to be, “We appreciate your concern, and if you’re inspired to do something differently that speaks to your experience we would support that as well.” I believed this individual should not leave it on us to create a space for an identity that they identify, without them stepping out and communicating previously that this need existed. The experience falls along a pattern wherein Black people who are willing and courageous enough to talk about race, as soon as they do so they are told, “Well, everybody should be included in that space! You should do that for everybody!” When no one else had previously stepped out to create their own representative spaces.

I sat on a faculty search committee when a counselor educator applied for a position whom, depending on your professional circles, is pretty well known with respect of addressing issues of multiculturalism, social justice, and advocacy in her scholarship. She was described as divisive. I do not know her personally just by way of her scholarship, but I had to ask the committee, “Why is she divisive? Is she divisive because she’s speaking to issues of race, and how race may influence experience of counselors?” In these moments, I hear coded language that seeks to cover or make more palatable the possibility of something being said that is *racist*! Whether racist in nature, or institutionally racist. My hunch is that she made some members of our faculty uncomfortable with her comfort/courage in making race and the effects of racism central in her scholarship. She possessed a confidence in pointing out implicit and explicit bias, institutional or systemic racism, and other forms of oppression that exists in our professional communities. I reminded the committee that we needed to judge the candidates on the merit presented in their application materials versus what we personally knew or felt of her. It was risky and I was nervous and hesitant – I want to be seen as a contributing member to my learning

community – but I am continuing to be reminded that everybody is not going to like what I have to say, and that should not dictate whether I address issues.

For example, when I sat on a review and retention committee there was a young man of color who was dismissed from the program for a number of reasons, both personal and reasons of professionalism. He was fine academically, the evidence suggested that he knew his content, but personal matters were getting in the way of him being successful, he was coming to class late and turning his assignments in late. Sometime after his dismissal, he submits an appeal to come back. As the review and retention committee we were all in agreement that he had made a strong enough case, that he was addressing the issues that the committee said he needed to address. When we brought the matter back to the full faculty, there was an overwhelming, "*No. He's not ready.*" This young man had addressed the personal issues that were identified in his remediation plan. Plus, there was nobody else in this program who was doing the community work that he was doing. So, I said to the faculty, "I know that we all recognize that for many people who come from oppressed groups, or have identities from oppressed groups, it is equally important for them to do well in their coursework and have a strong tie to their community. So, if we're collectively going to say that he's not fit to be back here, to finish his handful of credits worth of work. When we have evidence that he's doing what we said he needed to do: then I think we need to ask some questions of ourselves."

Saying something was risky. I was the new guy and this might have been *the* first time where I had to state my case to a larger group and try to persuade them. I am not so naïve to think that coded language like divisive cannot be applied to me, depending on what issue I raise. But in this particular case I felt particularly tied to it because it was another man of color who had worked hard to straighten out the things in his life that were preventing him from being

successful. I know that the time is coming that I will sit on the admissions committee for master's students, and when I think about the diversity of our program, our master's program? It is *all* white women! I don't know how aware other people are of that.

Recently, I was teaching this intro class and I remember giving some instruction or having a conversation in the class when a young white female student said something to me that I interpreted as absolutely snide. I said to myself, "You wouldn't have parted your lips to say that if I were a white faculty member." She would not have said that to a white faculty member. She would not have said that to John or Jane. But I know I need to be mindful of promotion and tenure, even within the department, because it moves out to the Dean and the rest of the university. I am still subject to and influenced by my student teacher evaluations, so if the students come to a conversation on race or culture in the environment my colleagues and I created, and I say something controversial and there are students in my classes, that may have a bearing.

Even though my student evaluations are largely positive, I've seen feedback that communicates that I integrate too much sociopolitical content into my courses, and that this is not appropriate. Not that I do it "too" much, but that I do it and, from students' perspectives, that is not appropriate. But a pretty skilled counselor is going to find out that if a client enters counseling about their job, they're not solely there about their job. They are there about their job, their personal relationships with their partner, and that there's always two or three levels that go beyond what they articulate as a presenting issue. Nobody functions in one way with one identity ever in life, *ever*.

Thankfully, I have a strong family support system in my wife, my children, particularly my daughter. My daughter asked me last year as a middle-schooler, "Dad, can you get me an 'I

can't breathe!' shirt?" I said to her, "Listen, if you wear this shirt, just know that you're going to get questions, and some of those questions aren't going to be nice. So, you better be ready, you need to be ready to field the questions." And I have my faith. Jesus was in the street. Jesus resisted. So, if I say that I'm a follower of Christ, and at the end of the day I say that I'm a Christian man, but I'm not willing to resist social norms and injustices in ways that I interpret Christ to have done, then I should not say that.

I believe that for many of us in counselor education, particularly faculty of color, really any faculty of color, there is enough research that tells us that we typically have to go outside of our programs and our departments to find mentorship and support. Because we are all over the country trying to make sense of this experience. Being the only Black man on the faculty and wanting to do a good job in respect to teaching and research, but not being so naive that I can rest on my laurels even if I have a good year. I cannot be comfortable with that. I got a really ringing endorsement from my chair that's going to go on to the dean, but I am just aware of my presence and kind of the influence I am having, and how other people might perceive it.

To me resistance as a counselor educator is being courageous enough to do the things that people like Frantz Fanon and Clemmont Vontress said we need to do. Being willing and brave enough to confront messages, images, and other forms of represented pathology that negatively depict marginalized people, particularly Black people, being able to call that out. Being honest enough to really question how we've come to understand, accept, embrace and develop routines that may be evidence of a colonized mind and colonized traditions. Resistance for me as a counselor educator means being willing to challenge those things consistently, not when doing so is most comfortable, not when doing so is safe. Being critical enough to say, "That ain't right!" or "That's coded language."

Resistance and really being able to make sense of it is about being sensitive and aware of the biases that exist. Bias is like residue, it is all over the place and you have to be able to say, "You know what, I see that, and it's not cool. I see that and let's correct it." Acts of resistance might take on different forms, but they are always going to be met with some opposition because that is the nature of resistance and critical questioning.

## JADE

I am a southerner by blood. I grew up in the air force. I was born in Europe, spent first three years there, moved to the southeast, spent a couple years there, then moved to the West Coast, spent a couple years there, moved to the South, couple years there, back to Europe for three years, and then finally to the southeast again where my dad retired. After I graduated college, I still did not know what I wanted to be when I grew up. At a hotel management company, they called me their HR director. It seemed like HR was about using people and making as much money as possible, and doing the least for your employees as possible. That is a really cynical view, but at the time I thought, *'This really is not fitting for me.'* I saw myself as someone who wanted to help others and better people, instead of trying to make money off them or trying to take advantage of them. So, we came to a mutual parting of the ways at one point.

I answered a blind ad to an administrative assistant position in a non-profit mental health clinic. One day, I found myself at the front desk talking to somebody for literally for 45 minutes, and one of the counselors came up behind me and said, "You know you can get paid for doing that." I said, "OK, tell me more about that." I attended a counselor education program at my local college, and through my training it was confirmed that this was exactly what I was supposed to be doing. Then one day I was walking by my adviser's office and she said, "Hey Jade, you want to be on a presentation?" It was presentation for a regional ACES conference. I was bowled over by the whole experience. She sat me down in the lobby at one point and said, "So what do you wanna do?"

I said, "Well, I'm going to be a counselor, what do you mean?"

And she said, "Well have you ever thought about doctoral studies?"

I just about fainted.

After I graduated I spent a year working at the same place where I had my internship, a school based mental health counseling program. I enjoyed it, but I missed being in the higher education environment. I missed the world of academia, and that was confirmation for me that, *'OK it's time. I've gotten good clinical experience, I can get more in a doctoral program, it's time.'* The doctoral program I attended was a well-established and long-accredited program in the country, but the dean of the school of education did not support the program, so it was incredibly restricting for the faculty, and, consequently, us. We had more administrative responsibilities than typical doctoral students do. My cohort was very tight, we are still tight. Whenever we go to conferences we make a point to meet up and have time together.

-

Coming out took me a long time. I did not really know myself or understand myself until I was in my late twenties. I had a boyfriend for many years and we eventually got engaged, we broke up twice and then finally for real. I was not very self-reflective about my sexuality or who I was. I tried to date for a little while, but it just was not very interesting to me. It never occurred to me that I might be gay because it was not in my world at the time. Then I accidentally fell in love with a woman. When I realized that I fell in love with a woman, it completely blew my mind. It turned everything I thought I knew upside down. My head literally exploded, and I felt like there were fireworks going off. And I am very thankful that I was in the Episcopal church at the time because it was around the time that Gene Robinson got elected as the first openly gay bishop in the Episcopal church. To see the struggle and the fighting that that caused in the church was actually good for me. The church that I was in was extremely supportive, and the priest would preach sermons that were just on fire and passionate.



Now, telling her was the most terrifying thing I have done in my whole life. Worse than writing my dissertation and defending it. Worse than anything. But I knew that I had to tell her, I needed to get it out. She was gracious, very gracious, ultimately letting me down easy. It was hard for a while, and, honestly, it did change us for about a year after that. I was heartbroken and I needed to get over that before we could really be that close again.

Speaking out has been even slower for me because I am fearful. I do not incorporate fear into my personality, but fear has been a theme in my life. Then I met this friend, a colleague of mine when I lived in the South. She and I were both hired at the same time at the same institution. We were hired because of our strong support for this university's progressive stance on sexual and gender diversity rights and against the counselor referring based on personal religious beliefs. Angela is an amazing social justice activist. She came from the Mid-West and was born at the wrong time. She should have been a flower child in the 60s. She would have been on the front line of every protest line, putting flowers in the gun barrels. Now she uses social media, and infuses social justice conversations in every course she teaches. I learned a hell of a lot from her. In some ways, she changed me because, at the time, I was finally out and called myself a social justice activist – or advocate – but I was not doing a hell of a lot. She probably does not know what an impact she had on me in that respect. She lit that fire, the fire of courage in me, and I started to do things like go to a town hall meeting with some of the state legislature who were doing a listening tour of the state and stand up there and speak passionately about the need to understand and fund school counselors.

That was when I realized that I could use my voice. That my voice was important and it was powerful, and that was a major discovery for me. At this point in my life I am here at this university that I dearly love, but it has got some problems. One of those major problems is

bigotry. Institutional discrimination and microaggressions based in the traditional structure are commonplace here. So, I bring them up when it is appropriate in class and talk to students, say “So what are we going to do about this? We claim we are counselors who are advocates, so let’s advocate.” I tend to be a person who feels first and thinks afterwards. So, whenever I sense an injustice I feel angry and I feel the need to do something productive with that anger that is part of my motivation. The other part is just a general sense of this being how I enact what I believe to be a Christian. To speak out against injustice and make things better for all of us and not just some of us.

I try to be very collaborative with my students. I want them to open up and be who they are, and I do that by modeling that myself. I remember in my first position in counselor education, I was sharing an office with another adjunct faculty member a gay man who was very out, and he talked about coming out to his class. I remember thinking at the time, *‘Well that seems really personal.’* But now I cannot imagine not doing that. I certainly do not hide it and will share examples in class that obviously situate me as a gay person. I have got rainbows everywhere, so it is kind of obvious. I have not had any student respond negatively, and I have had several students respond positively because I think that I am the only LGBTQ faculty member that they have contact with. One student said that she sees it as a beacon of safety because it is obvious that I am here and that I am open about my identity.

I have a really collegial relationship with colleagues, a good relationship, particularly with the faculty in my program. I would say I definitely relate more to the females in my department than the male members, the male members are older and there is a generational difference. The dean is very supportive of me because I was hired to run the program that he started, so I think he keeps a special place for me. I feel very connected.

I will also email students to check-in, particularly female students, and keep an eye out for female doc students. I have so recently entered the world that they are about to enter and the memories are fresh. I think of the possible pitfalls and things that they might be prone to experience that I can help to deal with or think about before they get there. I check in on what is coming up for them, what kinds of support do they need, and what do I see coming around the bend for them that they might not see. Interestingly, I had this independent study that was focused on grief with a student, but we ended up talking about how grief intersects with LGBTQ identities because that was emerging for her. I would self-disclose about things that happened to me, and she would disclose about things that happen for her. I broach my identity so that it opens the door in case they want to use that connection.

Related to my identity, I do not know that I have ever experienced a direct oppressive statement or experience, but I suppose that is what makes them microaggressions. Little things that cause me to ask, "Was that just them being weird? Was that because I am a woman? What is this about?" For example, there was a big vote recently about an institutional change, and some faculty members in the department, older white males, were going around and talking to folks they considered to be power players, trying to exert some pressure on them to vote their side of whatever this issue was.

There are a lot of backward things about my current institution and that is one of them.

These faculty members were going around and making subtle threats, and out of the program faculty, five people were contacted and had meetings with them. I did not get contacted. While I am really glad that I did not get contacted, I also thought, "Oh. OK so they don't see me as a power player. Interesting. Wonder what that's about." Maybe that is my junior faculty status, but I do notice and hear stories from others about female faculty members being told to be quiet

more often, that we are too vocal, and that we need to listen more. Institutionally, this university has a problem with diversity and inclusion.

Even though the climate amongst students and faculty in general is OK, we fight battles within ourselves. Little skirmishes every day. When I got here, I was amazed to find that I did not see rainbows all over the place, and that there were no faculty who were hanging safe zone signs outside their doors. The ones that were seemed to be from the 80s. At my previous institution, I was used to just being out and open, rainbows everywhere, and there was a pretty substantial LGBTQ faculty community. Not here. So, I feel a little self-conscious about that, and no one says a single word. It feels like invisibility, almost like when I hang my rainbows outside my door, or when I advertise ALGBTIC, or a queer support group, it blasts out into the silence, because there is *so much* deafening silence.

A while back in a faculty meeting it was suggested that we needed to do some more team building. The idea was a result of feedback we got on a program review saying, "We don't really understand your department, and you don't seem to play well together." Our department is made up of loosely related programs, the counselor education program is the most functional and collegial of them all. At the faculty meeting, I raised my hand and said, "Well why don't we have a departmental safe zone training? That would be fantastic and we can have some updated stickers hanging in the hallway. We can show our students that we care about them and also we can show our faculty that we are supportive of each other's diversity."

Lip service. "Oh, yeah! Ok, yeah, let's do that!"

Later a doodle poll went around and there were **three** times on there, and all three of the times were times that were during classes or inconvenient. I could not even go to the times that were made available. They picked one time, and three people showed up. The session was

canceled and rescheduled for another time they picked, and not one person showed up. We never had a Safe Zone training. And we never talked about professional development opportunities again. I felt they were saying, "Well we tried your idea and it didn't work, so, bye bye." It did not feel good.

So, because of the lack of diversity and inclusion, the students on our campus have stood up. They have demonstrated and they have done all kinds of things. Meanwhile, vandalism has increased at the LGBT Services Center. It is also escalating and bothers me a lot, and, in response, I try to be louder and open amongst the faculty because there is no one else. I feel like my identity as an LGBTQ person gets erased around here because it is not seen. It is not acknowledged. Even saying something at that faculty meeting was scary. I remember feeling my heart was pounding. I really do not speak very often in those meetings because it is pointless. But in that moment, I thought, *'A) I have something to contribute and b) I needed to contribute and we needed to hear this.'* So, I said it, and I was happy to have said it, and happy in the moment at the reception it received, but very disappointed later. I am the only one that I know of who actively walks around saying, "Hi I'm a gay person. Nice to meet you."

Discriminating against somebody is harder when they are someone you know and like, rather than a faceless identity. At the same time, it is frustrating to be the flag bearer with no one behind me. I have decided to pick my battles with them, rather than just to beat the drum. Beating the drum all the time, people will get used to the noise and they do not listen to it anymore. Beating the drum makes more of an impact if you beat it when it is really important to. There is also the "tenure anvil" that contributes to my struggle with speaking up. As long as I am not tenured, it makes it more difficult. I have disengaged from the departmental meetings. I am

there, but I do not participate in much, there is no need and there is not a whole lot of listening that goes on.

I do not like resisting by myself.

Instead, I try to do things with others. I know that I am serving as a model for students, so whatever I do I try to do publicly, and if I can drag some of them along with me then awesome. If not that is fine, I am still modeling. For example, I took my counseling class to the LGBT Services Center when they had their Coming Out Week party. The students heard the Associate Director of Campus Diversity speak and they got to know some of the LGBT mentors. Some of the students came up to me afterward and said, *"We didn't even notice this was here!"*

Recently, I was invited to speak at a dialogue where they were showing a part of a documentary about Ferguson and trying to open a discussion with the university about the Black Lives Matter movement. At first, my knee jerk reaction was to say no because, what do I know about that? But they had asked me because of my stance on social justice and because I have been loud about it, so I thought to myself, *'Well I would be probably doing more harm by declining the invitation than by going and acknowledging that I'm coming to this from my perspective as a white person, but here's what I see, and here's what we can do about it.'* For me, the personal aspect of feeling oppressed and resisting or not resisting hits close to home. It is a trigger of mine. What led me to be a counselor was feeling sensitive to injustice, but I have rarely thought about my own response to injustice.

I give myself a little more credit than I did before. I feel proud of my growth. I know I still have more to do and there is always going to be something, some form of oppression to resist. I intend to keep growing, but I do feel, looking back, that I really did do some things that matter. As opposed to the picture that I had of myself before, which was a person who was too

fearful to speak up and do anything. Being increasingly more vocal is a way that I want to challenge myself. I want to choose a different way of resisting than being quiet in faculty meetings. Continually challenging my students, but also my friends and my family because they tend to say, “Oh yeah, that really sucks.” And they post about it on Facebook.

And that is hashtag activism.

I want to tell them to put their money where their mouth is. We are counselor educators, we espouse social justice, but I am not seeing a lot of social justice. So, I would like to challenge us all to do that. I recall having a conversation with another counselor educator here. I went to his office when our state was in conflict over some anti-LGBT legislation, and said to him, “Can you believe all this is going on?” And he responded, “I’m not so sure I’m against this bill.” It blew my mind. I had made some big assumption that we were all on the same page, but we were not. Most of the time, I feel like I can be who I am and nobody is going to say something – but in other ways, I do not know that the rubber meets the road.

Resistance to me means standing up against injustice. It can be active. Or it can be passive. Refusing to do something or staying silent intentionally. Resistance can take many forms, just as oppression takes many forms. Resistance means advocacy, it means helping the voiceless or the unheard to be heard. Joining with – not doing for – those who are oppressed, which includes people with mental health issues. To advocate for what they need and become empowered. Resistance means doing the hard thing. Opposing oppression from within the very systems that perpetuates it. Resistance also means impressing upon students not just the responsibility, but the *necessity* of advocating for themselves and for clients.

## CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

While the profiles presented above can speak for themselves, interpretation of in-depth phenomenological interviews is an appropriate multipart process (Seidman, 2012). First, the researcher develops participant memoranda that capture the connections between participant experiences and the existing literature (see Appendix D). These memoranda help to situate the profiles in historical context with existing themes and results from the literature on structural and systemic oppression in academia. The memoranda also help connect the profiles in relationship to one another, and to generate a conversation that is focused on addressing the research questions. Second, the researcher reflects on their own experience by conducting a minute and written version of the in-depth interviews with themselves (Seidman, 2012): the self-interview.

Below, I share the data responsive to the research questions that guided this investigation. I do so through the critical race feminist lens that formed the foundation of the critical in-depth phenomenological interviews, emphasizing empowerment and resistance (Denzin, 2015; Rodriguez & Boahene, 2012). The profiles inform the research questions and the collective literature by providing three anthologies of resistance: the inheritance, the strategies, and the shared struggle. These three collections from the connected profiles are shared here and connected to their respective research question, demonstrating the powerful effect of connective strategies. As Seidman (2012) points out, remembering that there is a limit and temporality to the profiles is important in interpreting them. They are a momentary snapshot (Pasque & Salazar Pérez, 2015) of a life that, as Seidman states, will go on. So, here I discuss what emerged from a critical race feminist interpretation, but emphasize that other interpretations and other lessons can emerge from others' critical readings of the profiles, and that this is the whole point of the phenomenological profile (Seidman, 2012). Finally, I present the self-interview and conclusions.



### Inheriting Resistance

The first part of Seidman's (2012) in-depth phenomenological interview procedure focuses on the life-history of the phenomenon in question. Consequently, the first interview centered around participants' journeys to counselor education and enacting resistance. This addressed the second research question of this inquiry: How did minoritized counselor educators come to be involved in resistance? Participants shared their many trajectories toward resistance, and each of them discussed how resistance has evolved in the context of their lives. These trajectories included family, friends, and the wisdom of generations before their own; and all of them connected their resistance to an emerging awareness of existing issues. This mirrors previous findings that minoritized faculty may rely on their familial and friendship ties for support and wisdom (Lerma et al., 2015).

Lutz et al. (2013) also theorized that minoritized faculty entered academia with expectation of inclusion, but quickly became disillusioned by the reality of academia and developed sophisticated strategies for navigating oppression and marginalization. For Eartha, this included reliance on her previous experience attaining tenure, and navigating spaces that did or did not reflect their social identities. As she explained, "I left tenure coming here. I still have people who think I was absolutely crazy, but I thought, '*You did it in one place, you can do it in another place*'" (p. 72). Eartha's prior experience was central to who she is and how she enacts resistance. She discussed her expertise and competency, and how it has prepared her for her role. She also discussed how her mother has played a role in her willingness to speak out, and that she relies on her mother for support:

Being raised...a woman in the South, the culture tries to teach us to  
be seen but not heard. We are expected to look pretty, but not have

an opinion about anything. One of the things I can definitely say about my mom is that she did not go for that. She taught us that if this is how we feel, then we need to be comfortable in voicing our opinion. (p. 75)

Similarly, Hyacinth discussed the role of her parents in shaping her ability to speak up and speak out. She especially discussed her father's experiences in the business world, and the wisdom that her parents provided about navigating the world:

You are different from people, and people might treat you differently. That does not mean you are not as smart. That does not mean you do not deserve to be there, just like everyone else does. If you feel uncomfortable with anything, you can talk to me, you can talk to someone at school. And you can let your voice be heard (p. 64)

These messages shaped a lifelong commitment to letting her voice be heard when she felt treated unfairly. The message was also strengthened by other minoritized counselor educators in the field, mentors, who have given her similar messages:

Now, the messages are not just from my parents anymore, they are from folks who have been in this for a whole lot longer than me. My mentor is a Black man, and even hearing things from him and other folks say, "You need to be heard, don't wait. Get it done. Say something when you feel something is wrong." (p. 65-66)

Wisdom from past generations of minoritized counselor educators have built confidence for Hyacinth speaking out. She discussed feeling more supported and having colleagues and friends

within and outside the discipline that she can turn to for consultation. Jade and West reflected a similar influence on their willingness and ability to speak out, voices from colleagues and past generations that empowered them.

Like Eartha, West referenced his past experience as an emerging Black man in America. He discussed seminal experiences in during his undergraduate years, as well as involvement in resistance efforts throughout his early adulthood. These seemed to strengthen his ability to speak up at his current institution. West also expressed wisdom he received from past generations of minoritized educators outside of counselor education, individuals who expressed to him the challenges experienced by minoritized faculty in higher educations:

I knew other colleagues who were working in student affairs or who wanted to pursue the professoriate...Hearing them voice concerns about mixed messaged regarding what tenure would require, and the challenges of being one of few people of color if any, and trying to prioritize how they would spend their time engaged in different forms of service, versus really trying to develop their scholarships and research pipeline based on what they understood to be the most efficient pathway toward tenure. Now that I'm in the academy working toward the professoriate, I can really appreciate much more some of those challenges that those colleagues were talking about in that point in time. (p. 101-102)

West reflected many of these same issues at his current institution, and expressed an ability to spot them that emerged from the wisdom of those who had dealt with them in the past. West's

experience especially highlights the enduring issues in the academy, and the need for institutional attention and support (Louis et al., 2016).

Jade discussed that her resistance was not inherited from family or past generations of faculty with minoritized social identities, but from a friend who modeled resistance and her traditions as a Christian:

Angela is an amazing social justice activist...In some ways, she changed me because, at the time, I was finally out and called myself a social justice activist – or advocate – but I was not doing a hell of a lot. She probably does not know what an impact she had on me in that respect. She lit that fire, the fire of courage in me...That was when I realized that I could use my voice. That my voice was important and it was powerful, and that was a major discovery for me...The other part is just a general sense of this being how I enact what I believe to be a Christian. To speak out against injustice and make things better for all of us and not just some of us. (p. 111-112)

Jade explained that resistance was less fear-inducing for her when she was not enacting it alone. The lack of allies was especially difficult for Jade given the importance of representing students and faculty with sexual and gender diversity. Reflecting on the courage of her friend, the transformations in her church surrounding sexual and gender diversity equality, her responsibility as a Christian, and her privilege as someone who is white became motivators for her continued development as a someone who enacts resistance.

Religion and spirituality as a motivator for resistance was also reflected by West and Deacon. Deacon expressed that the epitome of being a Christian is, “to advocate for those that do

not have a voice, and for those of use that power to support those that are less than in any way that we can” (p. 95). For West, the connection went a step further:

Jesus was in the street. Jesus resisted. So if I say that I am a follower of Christ, and at the end of the day I say that I am a Christian man, but I am not willing to resist social norms and injustices in ways that I interpret Christ to have done, then I should not say that. (p. 107)

For these participant, resistance was an inextricable part of their identities and the teachings of their faith. Their beliefs provided them resolve and courage to speak out against injustice both within and outside of the academy.

### **Passing on Resistance**

While some participants described their journey to resistance through by the influence of those who have come before them, Hope and Deacon describe their journey to resistance as responsibility that comes with their professionalism and social privilege. Hope who reflected existing literature by initially considering resistance as similar to self-advocacy (Beale et al., 2013), discussed how speaking out is “the nature of counseling and counselor education...less about advocacy for a particular individual and more about advocacy for underrepresented populations in general...Speaking out is more a part of my own professional code of ethics” (p. 83). Hope discussed the important of providing a role model for counselors-in-training, and demonstrating how confrontations in advocacy can beneficially facilitated. Later in our interviews, Hope began to reconsider advocacy as resistance, again reflecting how resistance involves an awareness of structures of oppression and a direct challenging of them by naming

them and shining a light upon them (Freire, 2007), as oppose to more superficial calls for policy change.

Deacon also shared that he came into resistance through his passion for minoritized populations and the necessity to teach the issues to his students. Deacon acknowledged that his access to the academy and his PhD necessitate his action: “I know I have privilege, as someone with a PhD, and I have to use that privilege. I have to leverage that privilege to benefit those that do not have that privilege” (p. 94). The journey to resistance stemmed from his own personal passion for populations that did not often have a voice, his responsibility to counselors-in-training learning to work with these population, and his role as a counselor educator:

I have always had a passion for underrepresented populations and advocating for them, especially African American males in higher education that attend predominantly white institution...advocating for members of the LGBT community, queer persons of color, and persons impacted by HIV/AIDS. As a counselor educator, I can equip my students in being more effective in working with those populations...ensuring diversity in our counseling programs, and making sure that other persons of color that are in our profession are getting the proper mentoring and guidance that they might not get from white professors. (p. 94)

Lutz and colleagues (2013) theorized that minoritized faculty, in their study faculty of color, entered academia with an expectation of inclusion, then became disillusioned by the reality of the institution and developed strategies for navigating oppression and marginalization. The researchers called this balancing survival and resistance. Throughout the profiles I saw some

examples of this, but also examples of minoritized counselor educators coming to academia without the naiveté that the researchers described. West, Hyacinth, and Eartha had prior experiences that had prepared them for the structures of oppression they might encounter, which then influences their approaches to resistance. Jade, Hope, and Deacon expressed surprise at the lack of support and the lack of consideration that they felt. Some minoritized counselor educators, and faculty more broadly, may enter academia better prepared for what they will encounter. Equipped with strategies not only of survival and coping, but also resistance and success (Jones et al., 2015).

When discussing the role of past mentors, friends, and family, each participant expressed the hope that their profile would be beneficial for other minoritized faculty entering academia, that they find community and mentorship in the profiles. Deacon, for example, expressed, “These are things that others need to know. I did not hear anything about this when I was a doctoral student. Nobody told me about this kind of stuff when I was a doctoral student” (p. 97). Eartha hoped others would gain from her contributions and her profile what she was able to attain, an understanding that, “Oppression is real and I’m not crazy...that there’s community out there that understands what I’m going through and who is there to tell me what to do.”

### **Strategies of Resistance**

The first research question asked: What experiences have minoritized counselor educators had with resistance? This question focused on capturing the phenomenon of resistance in detail (Seidman, 2012), making it possible to differentiate strategies of resistance that connected across the profiles. Participants featured three apparent strategies of resistance that were unique to this investigation, and two that have been previously reflected in the literature. Participants shared experiences where they resisted erasure, unequal expectations, cultural

taxation, biased recruitment and retention, and microaggressions. A fuller discussion of the structures oppression experienced by participants is provided in Appendix D. Here, I emphasize resistance and empowerment, experiences when the participants spoke out and felt strength and confidence in doing so. The six strategies of resistance discussed here are: sustained service, self-love, mentoring as resistance, risk-taking, being unapologetic, and coloring/queering the lens.

### **Sustained Service**

The literature on minoritized faculty experiences has demonstrated that service, or specifically overburdening or culturally taxing service, can contribute to the disadvantaging and overexposure of minoritized faculty (Joseph & Hirshfield, 2013; Turner et al., 2008). In fact, dedication and commitment to service is expected, at the same time as it is undervalued on the track to tenure (Chesler, 2013; Gasman et al., 2015), leading to an impossible quagmire for many minoritized faculty. Paradoxically, service has also been found to function as a strategy of resistance (Turner et al., 2008), even providing an restorative outlet for minoritized faculty experiencing higher levels of stress that is due to subtle discrimination (Eagan Jr & Garvey, 2015). Turner and colleagues (2008) explain that service can function in opposition to the restrictive and unequal expectations of the institution by providing a platform from which to resist. Through the critical race feminist theoretical lens, service can be understood as a non-traditional act, a commitment that is not a part of the culture shaped by white male dominance. To practice service is to step outside the social control that dictates scholarly productivity and departmental/institutional contributions. Deacon captured this institutional expectation well when he expressed:

My service is not encouraged. They want to see more service to the department and to the program. I am involved and on the planning



committees for different disciplinary events and conferences, and they just want to see what I can do for the program and the department. (p. 96)

West also expressed this expectation of reduced service and more scholarly productive, and he expressed the ways in which he challenges them. West found irreplaceable value in his service, and was not willing to reject service when it strengthened his teaching:

I do service in my local community, I am active in my local chapter of my fraternity, and I was told, “Maybe you should give that up.” Why the hell would I do that when it influences my teaching? If I am not in a school [as a school counselor], then these young men that I see between sixth and twelfth grade that are predominantly Black are going to influence how I teach in the classroom when I am talking about the experiences of Black boys in schools. (p. 102)

For both West and Deacon, service was an essential aspect of who they are, and they were not willing to compromise them at the cost of their benefits to their expertise and contributions to the community. As West pointed out, service and the commitment to service falls outside of the “inherited white-supremacist idea” (p. 102) that faculty separate their personal lives from their work. For both participants, service was an inextricable part of what makes them successful and efficient counselor educators.

### **Self-Love**

Lutz and colleagues (2013) posited that after a minoritized faculty member moves through the stage of disillusionment with the institution, they develop sophisticated strategies for surviving the road to tenure. One of these strategies, they found, is living one’s own values and

self-love. Self-appreciation and self-love fall outside the traditional ideal worker norm (Kachchaf et al., 2015), who sacrifices the personal for the professional, commits to long hours, and is constantly available and visible. This neoliberal capitalist social norm of the worker expects subservience and subjugation to the organization culture and mission. To live one's own values and to self-love run in opposition to that. Self-love is an acknowledgement that one is satisfied, welcoming, and compassionate with themselves. That one has their limits and should treat themselves with kindness.

In reflecting on her experiences, Hope expressed a self-love that characterized a deep sense of appreciation for her limitations and the necessity to protect her own wellbeing:

Still, I am proud of myself for going through that process and returning with the strong presence. I showed that I also own this department. Not that I am filling a role that you want me to do, but that this is mine. This is my unit. This is my organization, and those are my students. And it is my job to correct them if there is an issue. I still feel how powerfully some of those experiences affected me. In my work, those kinds of experiences made me feel powerful as a person, and also powerless because many of the things are beyond my control. I cannot do much to change them. I cannot change others, the only thing I can do is change myself, or change how I view the world. How I act or behave. (p. 90-91)

Hope expressed how the racial and environmental microaggressions that she has experienced have taken a strong interpersonal toll, but that they have also shaped a strong appreciation of her

ability and her agency. Similarly, Jade's resistance awoke a deeper appreciation for herself, one that she distinctly described as not being there before:

I give myself a little more credit than I did before. I feel proud of my growth. I know I still have more to do and there is always going to be something, some form of oppression to resist. I intend to keep growing, but I do feel, looking back, that I really did do some things that matter. As opposed to the picture that I had of myself before, which was a person who was too fearful to speak up and do anything. (p. 116-117)

Freire (2007) described resistance as an act of love. A love for society, and a compassionate desire for its transformation. CRFT then helps us understand self-love as an act of radical wellbeing, an appreciation for one's self and wellness that is also couched in the ongoing desire for self-improvement and social transformation. For Deacon, resistance itself was an act of self-love and a passion for the uplifting of others, "Resistance to me is staying true to myself and saying fuck you to everybody else. Making sure that persons of color, whether they are clients or counselor educators, are getting their just due" (p. 98). Eartha's self-love emerged throughout the interviews through her self-confidence and in her confidence about her experience, but in her reflections on her resistance she disclosed a deeper appreciation of herself:

In those instances, where I have chosen to confront, I have walked away from that feeling much better about myself. I feel that I have walked away with that other person having more respect for me. That they recognize I am here to do a job. And that I do a damn good job. (p. 81)

Self-love as resistance is a less direct, but equally as powerful strategy. The recognition that enduring social change requires both rage (Rodriguez & Boahene, 2012) and an honest admiration of one's self. A looking back and seeing that while the struggle continues, as Jade said, minoritized faculty *can* do some things that matter.

### **Mentoring as Resistance**

Similar to service more generally, mentorship has been categorized as a service activity that can produce distinct taxes on minoritized faculty's time and identity. Faculty of color, for example are regularly recommended as mentors for incoming faculty and students of color (Dancy & Jean-Marie, 2014). Women faculty also feel pressured to perform mentorship and emotional-work with struggling students (Joseph & Hirshfield, 2013). In these ways, mentorship can function as a depleting force in the lives of minoritized faculty. While mentorship and service are areas that minoritized faculty may find worth committing to, that must be balanced with them being undervalued in academia (Gasman et al., 2015).

On the other hand, critical in-depth phenomenological interviewing (CIPI) uncovered that mentoring can also function as a strategy of resistance. Research has consistently demonstrated that receiving mentoring is positively related to minoritized faculty success (Lutz et al., 2013; Turner et al., 2008), while the lack of mentoring can lead to feelings of isolation, non-belonging, and early departure (Joseph & Hirshfield, 2013; Kelly & McCann, 2014). Participants discussed giving mentoring as a third dimension of this system, but one that functioned as a challenge to the status quo. Three participants discussed mentoring as resistance through their unique connections with their mentees, especially those they share a social identity with.

Deacon expressed that mentoring is an act of championing those that come behind him. Mentoring was not only for the academic success of the student, but for their long-term blossoming of an individual:

Being a mentor and being very deliberate about seeking out those that are coming behind me...Being that person for them, that go-to person and not hiding the different intersections of me. Not being afraid to embrace my Blackness, my gayness - and putting myself out there. Because a lot of them do identify as Black gay men and need to see that there's someone out there that supports them. (p. 94-95)

Deacon demonstrates, in his mentoring, a boldness and confidence in who he is and his journey as a Black gay man in counselor education. Jade expressed a similar use of her identity in mentoring as she encouraged the growth and development of rising students. Jade discussed that mentoring was a way to not only support students, but illuminate structural barriers:

I will also email students to check-in, particularly female students, and keep an eye out for female doc students. I have so recently entered the world that they are about to enter and the memories are fresh. I think of the possible pitfalls and things that they might be prone to experience that I can help to deal with or think about before they get there. I check in on what is coming up for them, what kinds of support do they need, and what do I see coming around the bend for them that they might not see. (p. 113)

Through their mentoring, participants seemed to pass on the resistance they themselves had inherited. Mentoring functioned as an avenue to continuously change the institution by preparing future professionals more savvy in navigating structures of oppression and marginalization. Hyacinth shared that the conversations she has with her mentees now carry the messages that her own mentors gave to her, messages that helped in her journey as an educator:

The mentoring piece will always be important to me. Because I know that's what helped me. Mentoring is how students of color get through and graduate. The conversations that I have talking to a master's student who wants to get her doctorate, and the advice I'm giving her and when I have said to her, "This is what you will encounter, and this is what you'll need to do." (p. 71)

CIPi's grounding in critical race feminist theory helped to unveil how mentoring functions not only as a potential burden, but as a strategy for agency, empowerment, and resistance. Through CRFT, mentoring is recognized as an inherently subversive act, inaccessible to the organizational culture or status quo ideologies that shape academia. Chesler (2013) warns that minoritized faculty who are committed to mentoring can be labeled as deviants, not in following the dominant normative system. Through mentoring, the minoritized faculty can pass on knowledge and strategies to future generations of faculty who can continue change-making in the institution.

### **Taking Risks**

CIPi also revealed taking risks as a strategy for resistance. Unlike mentoring, which had partial foundations in existing literature, taking risks appears to be a unique strategy emerging from this investigation. Participants discussed experiences where alternative strategies felt futile and options seemed to run out, and they decided to take a risk in confronting oppression directly.

Hope described the pressures and taxation of academia as being enough to deal with, and her experience of risking resistance:

Academia itself is a lot, pre-tenure itself is a lot...With all of those pressures plus the external things, plus dealing with the visa, dealing with being a mother, dealing with extra administrative work that I never dealt with in the past, it is a lot of things added to the plate. So, I find that I have to take risks. I needed to speak it. Not only for myself, but in the future. (p. 91)

Hope seemed to imply that without taking the risk of resistance, she might be overwhelmed, so risking doing something instead of nothing was the better choice. For other participants, taking risks involved a recognition that without risk the costs of being in academia may get higher.

In his work on a review and retention committee, West found himself risking resistance against collective messages the prejudged and stereotyped a student:

Saying something was risky. I was the new guy and this might have been *the* first time where I had to state my case to a larger group and try to persuade them. I am not so naïve to think that coded language like divisive cannot be applied to me, depending on what issue I raise. But in this particular case I felt particularly tied to it because it was another man of color who had worked hard to straighten out the things in his life that were preventing him from being successful. (p. 105-106)

For West, the faculty in his department were neglecting the contributions this individual made to his community, and were ignoring the apparent lack of diversity in the student

body. West risked resistance as a refusal to go along with a false meritocracy that would reward a certain performance of ‘graduate student.’ Similarly, Hyacinth risked resistance in direct opposition of a message that dictated what areas of scholarship were valuable and which were not.

Hyacinth discussed a continuous false equivalency between her social identity as a Black Caribbean woman, and the type of scholarship she should be focusing on. Griffin et al. (2013) found that while minoritized faculty face an expectation to research areas that connect with their social identities, they also faced disproportional skepticism and questioning of their scholarly products. Gasman et al. (2015) go as far as asserting that research on diversity-related issues is widely undervalued, despite expectations that it be done. In Hyacinth’s experiences, skepticism about her work has led to moments where she risks resistance to avoid future differential treatment:

This was not the first time I had seen them talk to someone this way – I could not be the one who let it go. I thought it was unfair to me and to other people who had gone through the same thing – younger women and people of color that they would speak to differently than each other or older white faculty...These individuals were also tenured, and one of them probably would have been on my Promotion and Tenure committee, but I felt there was just a bigger issue at the moment. There was risk to saying something, but the same disrespect would continue happening if we do not say anything. (p. 67-68)



Likewise, Eartha risks resistance to better her long-term experience. Continuous challenges to expertise and competency by students can be an especially difficult hindrance to minoritized faculty satisfaction and success (Joseph & Hirshfield, 2013; Kelly & McCann, 2014). Eartha sees the continuous challenges from her students as directly related to the lenient admission policies of her department. Therefore, she risks resistance as a way to reduce the likelihood of future challenges:

But what I noticed is that when we admit students who don't meet the criteria, then that makes my job much more difficult. And these are generally the students who complain about my classes and that I'm too hard, or that my standards are too high. So, for that reason, I have become much more comfortable in speaking up. Both the support I receive from the other faculty members in my program, and that my job is made much more difficult if I do not speak up. (p. 75)

Sometimes, risking resistance emerged out of desperation and weariness. Deacon expressed that, when confronted by his department chair in a way that invalidated his experience as a gay Black man in academia, he took a risk:

I told him that when we have met I have left our meetings discouraged. That he always talks about things I have done wrong, but never of how I have grown or what I have done well with. My heart was racing, but it just came out. I had to get it off my chest, and I am glad I said it to him. (p. 98)

Deacon does not know what repercussions exist for the risk he took in his authenticity, but he expressed a total lack of trust in his department. Deacon feels tokenized by his faculty and undervalued, and this has resulted in his considering departure from his current institution.

Taking risks destabilizes social norms that are structured around power and status quo hierarchies. As Hyacinth described, her risk-taking caught her colleagues by surprise, as the senior, tenured, highly-regarded colleagues did not seem to expect her to respond. CRFT keeps central that issues of racism and sexism, in their myriad forms, are still prevalent and powerful across the social fabrics of society (Rodriguez & Boahene, 2012). In academia, white male dominance shaped historical traditions that gagged younger faculty along gendered and racialized hierarchies. CRFT helps capture that when minoritized faculty take risks in resistance, they destabilize powerful normative traditions about performance and behavior in the academe.

### **Being Unapologetic**

Jones and colleagues (2015) assert that critical race theory does not specifically address what they labeled *Irrational Reactions to African American Gatherings*. I disagree. The researchers found that participants reported their white colleagues become concerned or uncomfortable when large numbers of Black individuals gathered in one place. Critical race theory, and CRFT, address this through their emphasis on racism as a central issue in today's society, and the importance of historical competency. Historically, in the United States, racist ideologies have dehumanized or villainized people of color, ascribing racialized and problematized attributes to skin color and phenotype. People of color coming together were labeled a public menace or bound to be *up to no good*. White colleagues' discomfort at large numbers of people of color coming together is the modern-day residue of these racist ideologies.

In this investigation being unapologetic emerged as a strategy of resistance for two participants. While not as salient as the other strategies across the profiles, it is still worth a brief mention. It is also important to note that being unapologetic does not mean not apologizing for bad behavior, but not apologizing for being who one is. Eartha, for example, confronted potential erasure of her own and her students' social identities in a student's use of the n-word. For Eartha, not addressing the student's behavior was impossible:

I had to make sure she understood how damaging, how ugly, nasty this word is. If she is going to bring this word up, then she needs to talk about the word's history. She just went right through the rest of the presentation. At the very end of class, I stood up and could see the look on some of the students' faces. I said to the class there are some things that are so vile that we don't even say them, and the n-word is one of them. (p. 78)

Eartha described the student's behavior as a clear neglect of history, and she confronted it as such. West, on the other hand, confronted unequal expectations of him without apology. West confronted departmental expectations that he become more involved in service to the institution, while he maintains high productivity:

I might have people critique how much service I provide, because I am not signing up for committees, but I say, "Y'all want me to write!? Well, let me write. You want me to pursue grants? Then don't ask me to serve on no committees." (p. 102)

These participants' contributions are discussed in relation to Jones et al. (2015) because carry some similarities to their findings. Participants all discussed surprise in others when they

were wholly themselves. Hope discussed a desire to break “Asian stereotypes” (p. 89) by having more of her own voice. Deacon expressed a sense of being an outsider because he was fully himself. Being unapologetic emerged from the participants experiences in being fully authentic, and environmental indications that this was out of the ordinary. In a CRFT lens, the authentic expression of minoritized faculty is met with discomfort because of status quo social norms that shape institutional and departmental cultures. Participants’ being unapologetically themselves destabilized those cultures and introduced a degree of otherness to the dominant normative narratives that dictate faculty departmental exchanges and behaviors.

### **Coloring/Queering the Lens**

The final strategy of resistance that emerged from the profiles as a result of the CIPIs was coloring/queering the lens. Like mentoring as resistance and taking risks, coloring/queering the lens appears to be a unique strategy apparent as a result of the CIPIs. Gasman et al. (2015) describes ahistoricism as the negligent ignorance of history and historical events, and colorblindness as an ideology that claims universalism and race-neutrality while inadvertently privileging majority identities due to unfamiliarity with the ways that historically-rooted systems of power and privilege exist today. Together, these two status quo ideologies maintain white male able-bodied dominance across social contexts. For example, Aragón, Dovidio, and Graham (2016) found that faculty with colorblind ideologies were less likely to adopt inclusive teaching practices than faculty with multicultural ideologies.

Lutz and colleagues (2013) theorized that faculty of color in predominantly white institutions would develop sophisticated strategies for navigating oppressive institutional climates. One of these strategies, the researchers found, was decoding racism. The participants in this investigation seemed to partially reflect this finding. Participants readily decoded hidden

messages as a way to make sense of everyday experiences with students and colleagues.

However, in instances of resistance, participants went further to introduce new information and questioning as a way to subvert oppressive narratives and affect more inclusive practices.

Effectively, participants used their expertise and critically consciousness to provide an alternative hue to the lens of the individual they were confronting by inviting them to empathize with those most affected by oppressive structural and systemic practices. Coloring/queering the lens differs from taking risks in that the strategy invites collaboration as a form of subversion, rather than risking a direct confrontation with the oppressor.

As an example, West confronted a faculty search committee regarding an applicant to his program. West perceived there to be coded language in the search committee's feedback regarding the applicant. The applicant, a woman of color, was described as divisive, a commonly prescribed stereotype of people of color who present – as discussed above – unapologetically. West decided to challenge this coded language, and remind the committee that merit needed to be defined by the applicant's scholarship:

I had to ask the committee, "Why is she divisive? Is she divisive because she's speaking to issues of race, and how race may influence experience of counselors?" ...My hunch is that she made some members of our faculty uncomfortable with her comfort/courage in making race and the effects of racism central in her scholarship. She possessed a confidence in pointing out implicit and explicit bias, institutional or systemic racism, and other forms of oppression that exists in our professional communities. I reminded the committee that we needed to judge the candidates on

the merit presented in their application materials versus what we personally knew or felt of her. (p. 104)

West is confronting the same discomfort that he senses in his white colleagues when *he* is unapologetic himself. By introducing the possibility of coded language, West destabilized the possibility of biased recruitment moving forward by coloring the search committees lens to issues of racialized stereotypes. Similarly, Deacon utilized this strategy to queer the lens of a faculty's opinion on one of his students.

Deacon's social identities as gay Black man and his commitment to service and leadership are also challenged by his faculty. Deacon continuously deals with colleagues' discomforts around his confidence. His social identities also facilitate powerful connections with his students, and he found himself queering the faculty's lens regarding their views on one particular student:

At a faculty meeting, we spoke about him and some of the faculty commented on his personality, and I said, "Well, that's cultural and he's not going to discuss that with y'all." I had to explain that performance persona that he has. I said, "You know what? That comes from being a man of color in academia that's all white, and in the field of counseling, that is mostly white. Like being a Black man in America." (p. 95-96)

Deacon spoke in resistance to narratives about this student that were ignorant of the experiences of gay Black men. Here the expectation was not that Deacon would speak up, but his decision to challenge what he saw as heteronormative narrative surrounding his student.

Jade also utilized this strategy in her work advocating for sexual and gender diversity on her campus. The literature reflects the uses of critical pedagogy as a powerful tool for student development and social change (Rodriguez et al., 2012). Jade practices critical pedagogy with her students regularly, but here she seemed to utilize the coloring/queering the lens strategy specifically to affect the mindset of her colleagues. Jade reminds her colleagues of the importance of mutual support, and uses her own social identities to build visibility:

At the faculty meeting, I raised my hand and said, “Well why don't we have a departmental safe zone training?...We can show our students that we care about them and also we can show our faculty that we are supportive of each other’s diversity.” ...I try to be louder and open amongst the faculty because there is no one else. I feel like my identity as an LGBTQ person gets erased around here because it is not seen. It is not acknowledged...I am the only one that I know of who actively walks around saying, “Hi I'm a gay person. Nice to meet you.” (p. 114-115)

Jade believes that making her identity as a gay woman more visible will break the silence surrounding sexual and gender diversity at her institution. She explained that discrimination is rising on her campus against those with sexual and gender diversity, and she feels responsible for doing something about it. Heterosexism and cissexism, or discrimination and subordination of those with sexual and gender diversity, arise out of patriarchal climates that are plagued with traditional notions of masculinity. By making herself more visible and queering the lenses of her colleagues, Jade disrupts the growing othering and erasure around her.

In her struggle against incompetency in her department surrounding her international status, Hope also relied upon the coloring/queering the lens strategy. Discrimination and prejudice toward international faculty is rooted in racism and ethnocentrism. CRFT helps recognize that the incompetency Hope feels in her department is evidence of a structure that does not benefit her nor centralize her needs as an international faculty because she is not part of the normalized professor identity. To begin resisting this feeling of erasure and isolation, Hope broaches the discussion on her international status:

On one hand, when I have broached the subject of my international status, I have wanted them to know that I have the right information...I felt vulnerable, and that was also motivation to do something to change it. Afterward, there was a sense of relief because I showed the facts in a professional manner. And I think that part of that relief comes from thinking, *'Well now I've done all the things that I can control, and the rest of the things I can't.'* (p. 86-87)

Hope disclosed a great deal of hardship surrounding her international status, and repeated conflicts with her institution. She also discussed how her identity as a mother is erased in similar ways as her identity as an international faculty. Hope must not only work to color the lens of her colleagues, but also give voice to her identity and unique challenges as a mother.

Coloring/queering the lens is a strategy that seems to have emerged uniquely in this investigation. Participants each discussed the value and benefits of introducing information and questions that helped other faculty and students to consider alternative perspectives or experiences. The effects of white supremacy and patriarchy are evident in academia for many



minoritized faculty. CRFT helps to comprehend how a strategy like coloring/queering the lens functions to spark the emergence of critical consciousness. An awareness of stories that communicate a different experience of academia. By challenging ahistoricism and colorblindness, coloring/queering the lens illuminates the realities faced by minoritized faculty to those previously unaware of them. CIPI has contributed three strategies of resistance unique to this inquiry (Mentoring as Resistance, Taking Risks, Coloring/Queering the Lens) and phenomenological profiles that capture the experience of these strategies and the meaning-making surrounding them.

### **Resistance as Shared Struggle**

The final interview focused on participants' meaning-making surrounding the phenomenon, giving a future-oriented context to the phenomenological profile (Seidman, 2012). Therefore, the third research question asked: What does enacting resistance mean in the lives of minoritized counselor educators? Discussing *all* of the meanings that resistance holds in the lives of the participants is beyond the scope of this dissertation. That being said, participants maintained an intimate interest and hopefulness for each other throughout the interview process. Participants expressed their hopes that their profiles of resistance and their contributions would be helpful to other participants. Therefore, resistance as a shared struggle became the powerful thread connecting each of the profiles. A desire to share something useful for others in the struggle of equity in academia. This final section discusses each participant's reflections on resistance and connects them to the theoretical grounding of this investigation.

Hope shared that resistance in her life does not always mean results. For her, resistance became more focused on the day to day efforts, instead of the end goal. Despite a belief that her

efforts might not make a difference, Hope was invested in a collective struggle to improve the organizational culture of academia for minoritized faculty:

Resistance needs a system. It needs systematic change. Not only people with similar experiences, or people like me taking action and being resistant, but also for people who are different from me. Those who are making policies and those who have power...And although changes are not going to happen in one day, we should keep the hope. (p. 91-92)

Resistance for Hope meant hoping for social change, while working and speaking out in order to make it happen. Similarly, Eartha's sense of resistance was focused on creating change, both for herself and for her student:

Resistance to me means that there is a failure to change even in the face of truth. Even when that truth has been displayed and acknowledged over and over, individuals still fail to make change as a result. I am the object or the person to whom the resistance is focused. I present myself in the classroom and students resist who I am and what I stand for. I am also the change agent – staying there with them, to let them know I am not going anywhere. (p. 81)

Eartha discussed that while students may challenge her, she maintains confidence in herself and in her ability. Eartha had always known she wanted to be a teacher, and in resistance that did not change. She invests herself in her students' growth and learning. The same as Eartha sees herself as a change-agent, West places responsibility upon himself for continuing to

endeavor in change-making. West discussed resistance as a willingness to do the hard work that creates social change:

Being willing and brave enough to confront messages, images, and other forms of represented pathology that negatively depict marginalized people, particularly Black people, being able to call that out. Being honest enough to really question how we've come to understand, accept, embrace and develop routines that may be evidence of a colonized mind and colonized traditions. Resistance for me as a counselor educator means being willing to challenge those things consistently, not when doing so is most comfortable, not when doing so is safe. (p. 107)

hooks (1990) discussed resistance as located not in words, but in the actions that individuals take to counter the status quo. hooks described resistance as a space that is shared by advocates, activists, and allies that come together to speak truth to power, remember the past, and honor voices from the margins of society. For Hyacinth, resistance is not about her, but about those voices that she represents and is a result of:

Resistance means the bigger picture. That resistance is not just about me...I always think about how important it is for me to be some sort of example. When I graduated with my doctorate, one of my cousins called me right after the ceremony, she was crying, and she said, "You did it for all of us. Like that was for all of us. When you walked the stage, we were all walking the stage with you." (p. 70)

Resistance is only valuable if it honors those who come before and benefits those who come after. Hyacinth sees resistance as her responsibility to those who look up to her. Resistance, in this way, is not about her, but about creating a better system for those who are entering the discipline. Like her mentors before her, Hyacinth is providing wisdom to the future generation.

As West's resistance means that he does the hard work and continuously improves himself, Jade's resistance also means joining one's self with the cause of those disadvantaged in society. Jade's resistance means that she has committed to improving the lives of those who are oppressed by speaking out against social injustice:

Resistance to me means standing up against injustice. It can be active. Or it can be passive. Refusing to do something or staying silent intentionally. Resistance can take many forms, just as oppression takes many forms. Resistance means advocacy, it means helping the voiceless or the unheard to be heard. Joining with – not doing for – those who are oppressed...Resistance means doing the hard thing. Opposing oppression from within the very systems that perpetuates it. (p. 117)

Jade describes resistance in her life as the opposition of oppression even from within that very system. She also reflects Hinchey's (2010) resistance as disengagement. Jade discussed her decision to disengage from her faculty as an act of opposition, while still engaging her research and teaching in critical ways (Lutz et al., 2013).

An awareness of the structural and systemic issues was important to all the participants. Resistance necessitated the ability to see injustice and structural practices that functioned to

marginalize. Deacon expressed vivid imagery of his resistance as an act of breaking the structural workings of oppression:

Resistance to me is rage against the machine. Being able to place a monkey wrench in those gears of oppression and holding that monkey wrench there so those gears stop and malfunction, so they never run again. Malfunction to the point that they are beyond repair.

(p. 98)

Deacon's imagery captures the collective nature of resistance as occurring against systemic and structural inequities in the academy and not one individual. The difficulty in working to destabilize a widely pervasive system. At the same time, participant expressions of meaning-making gave voice to the importance of continued efforts, resistance for more than just the individual, and systemic perspectives for creating lasting change.

CRFT appreciates that social change is a systemic endeavor. Issues like racism and sexism do not affect every individual in the same way. In academia, creating lasting change is a long-term effort. Brought together, the participant's reflections on meaning-making illustrate that resistance is a day-to-day exercise. Participant profiles connected in their collective wisdom that resistance involved various moving parts that include students, faculty, administration, patience, determination, and the occasional mechanic sabotage. CRFT elevates the individual threads of meaning-making as equally valuable to the whole. Minoritized counselor educators find wisdom in *each* of the participants' sense of meaning, and not in any one individual theme.

### **The Self-Interview**

The final step in Seidman's (2012) process for interpreting data is to conduct the self-interview. The research is given the opportunity to reflect on their own parallel process in

conducting the three-part in-depth phenomenological interviews. Honoring the contributions and commitment of participants by applying the procedure to themselves. Following the critical qualitative reorientation of the CIPIs conducted, I present my own minute account of the in-depth experience of conducting this research through a CRFT lens.

I came to this research when a mentor sat me down and told me, “Your career as a dark-skinned Latino counselor educator won’t be quite the same as your white colleagues.” I grew up constantly witnessing my mom struggle with racial microaggressions and accent discrimination in her workplace, and my father subjected to racism and outright invalidation attributed to his dark skin and work in construction. I experienced bullying throughout my childhood for the color of my skin and my non-traditional masculinity. I began speaking up in my high school, standing up to those that bullied other students of color or even teachers. But it was in Hawai’i that I learned about racial injustice and colonialization. The message my mentor gave, I had gotten in my own life before. For example, a professor in my master’s program who attributed my bad writing – born out of procrastination and laziness – with my inability to conform to the expectations of “American institutions.” This professor knew nothing about me, but my name. If they had, they would’ve found that I am Puerto Rican. I am an ‘American’. And I speak fluent English.

Conducting this research brought up a lot for me. The experience was rewarding, powerful, surprising, and informative. Most of all, it was as demanding as it was empowering. Participants shared dimensions of their lives that they had not shared with anyone else. They shared the burdens set upon them by institutional cultures that do not welcome the intersectionality of their social identities. I learned about hidden motherhoods, secreted mental health concerns, wrenching confrontations, and powerful concealed heartbreaks. Participants

shared experiences with me that could not make it into this dissertation. Experiences so vivid and discriminatory that I had to sit down. Then, sweat and cry about leaving them out of the final profile. As Cannella and colleagues (2015) point out, the endeavor to elevate the voices of resistance is central to the CQI, but not more important than protecting the livelihood of those individuals. Together, the participants and I could not find a way to conceal their identities in these experiences. They were *so* rich, they were too rich. They were identifiable.

This is what this research has meant to me. Realizing that capturing the *real* experiences of minoritized faculty would certainly change the narrative, but would also place them at risk. Instead, we (the participants and I) present profiles that capture the essences of experience, but alter and obscure. This research has taught me that I certainly am not alone. That six voices exist in the discipline that actively and willfully resist the reality of institutional oppression. That the participants see the issues and use strategies based in personal experience and professional expertise to counter them. To me, this research has provided six affirming and empowering voices to a space of silence. Voices that reassure new and retiring minoritized faculty, and their majority identity allies, that they are not alone in resistance.

That they are not alone in talking back.

That they are not alone in making trouble.

### **Conclusions**

Who we are as educators is inextricably linked to how we do what we do. For minoritized faculty in academia, the process of identity formation is burdened by organizational cultures and structural practices that work to direct in which direction those identities form. Minoritized faculty navigate oppression and marginalization that is historically rooted in the institution of higher education, and perpetuated by an organization ahistoricism, colorblindness, and status quo

ideologies structured around white male dominance (Cannella & Perez, 2012; Chesler et al., 2013; Gasman et al., 2015; Griffin et al., 2013; Monzó & SooHoo, 2014). This oppression and marginalization manifests in structural and systemic practices of exclusion that include: subtle discrimination and microaggressions; cultural taxation, tokenism, and erasure; disproportional challenges to competency and expertise; bias in recruitment, promotion, and tenure; and unequal treatment and expectations.

Lutz and colleagues (2013) found that Black faculty encountering these structural and system practices balanced survival and resistance on the road to tenure. The research theorized that minoritized faculty entered academia with an expectation of inclusion, but were quickly disillusioned with the institutional reality, leading to the development of sophisticated strategies for navigating the institutional terrain. These strategies included decoding racism, requiring respect, assertive communication; as well as, strategies for engagement and disengagement, and “reducing harm and shaping success” (p. 139). Through CIPI, I found that Lutz and colleagues’ grounded theory was reified in some ways, while refined and clarified in others.

This investigation resulted in five strategies of resistance apparent in maintaining connections between participant profiles. While the six participants navigated different organizational cultures in various geographic regions, they encountered strikingly similar oppressive and marginalizing structures. To destabilize them, participants used strategies of resistance that included: sustaining service involvement despite organizational pressure; embodying self-love and self-appreciation despite a neoliberal capitalist ideal worker norm that demands commitment to the institutional success and not the self; mentoring as resistance that prepares future *tempered radicals* (Beale et al., 2013) – more savvy individuals who can continue to agitate the institution from within, while maintaining the scholarly value; taking risks



in confronting bias and oppression more openly to affect long-term change; and providing a reframe in thinking for the oppressor by coloring or queering their positional lens. While the first two strategies of resistance have been noted in previous literature (see Lutz et al., 2013; Turner et al., 2008), the latter three appear a unique result of this CIPI.

### **Implications for Counselor Education**

Improving the experience of minoritized faculty in academia is a systemic issue. Therefore, it requires systemic solutions. Institutional and administrative recognition of the oppression and marginalization experienced by many minoritized faculty is an essential first step toward providing systemic policy changes (Louis et al., 2016; Turner et al., 2008). Participant Hope reflected this in her assertion that the administration needed to recognize the difficulties faced by international faculty and faculty of color. Unlike other disciplines, Counselor Education is widely and directly influenced by both the Council of Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) and the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES). CACREP and ACES could break ground by publicly acknowledging the need and responsibility of counselor education programs to address inclusivity and diversity on the faculty level. While not all programs are CACREP accredited, or in line with ACES, institutional support would set an example with far-reaching implications.

The findings of this inquiry, as well as other studies in counselor education (e.g. Alexander-Albritton & Hill, 2015; Haskins et al., 2016; Lerma et al., 2015) have significant implications for Counselor Education when measured against the Coloring/Queering the Lens strategy of resistance. Haskins and colleagues (2016) found that minoritized counselor educators may introduce their own social identities to facilitate learning and critical consciousness in their students. Counselor education programs can take an additional step by introducing existing

literature of minoritized faculty into their counselor education doctoral programs. This would help reframe the lens of doctoral students and future faculty. Not only considering their research, teaching, and service, but also that there exists a need for advocacy and activism the faculty level. For rising minoritized counselor educators, this would also break the illusion of inclusivity that continues to exist as they enter academia (Lutz et al., 2013). Participant Eartha hopes that research like this and other studies will make it into her doctoral classroom, to help guide a more critically conscious and inclusive worldview in her students.

Beyond institutional acknowledgement and curriculum reforms, Counselor Education can work to support minoritized counselor educators by addressing structural issues more directly. For example, Turner et al. (2008) recommends that departments and institutions create official and systematic mentorship programs that generate more administrative pressure to support minoritized and incoming faculty. Hoffman and Mitchell (2016) suggest that institutions have the capacity to make diversity and inclusion by addressing the discourse they use in responding to critical incidents (Fraser & Hunt, 2011), and ensuring that critique is met with professional development opportunities that create systemic change rather than defensiveness. Counselor Education programs can duplicate this by creating internal and interdisciplinary mentorship programs that systematically connect minoritized counselor educators to beneficial mentorship.

Official and systematic mentorship programs remove the risk of overburdening senior minoritized faculty by making mentorship a collective process and transparent expectation in the whole department. In addition, official and systematic mentorship programs address Harper's (2009) *confession of inadequacy*, wherein majority identity faculty avoid mentoring by confessing that they simply do not know how to mentor minoritized faculty. Instead, the mentorship program makes explicit the expectation that majority identity faculty learn by

engaging professional development opportunities that enhance their critical consciousness and competency surrounding diversity issues. Official and systematic mentorship programs spare already overburdened senior minoritized faculty from being funneled new faculty that share their social identity (an example of cultural taxation); they also avoid unhealthy and incompetent mentorship by developing competent allyship among majority identity faculty.

Finally, Counselor Education programs on both the master's and doctoral level could benefit from introducing critical race feminist theory into counselor training. As a contemporary theory of human and social understanding, CRFT intersects traditional notions of the individual with systemic conceptualizations that account for historical, sociocultural, and political forces. Beale and colleagues (2013) found that more than multiculturalism, *critical* multiculturalism was essential for generating direct and sustained institutional change. Critical multiculturalism is concerned with issues of social justice and power, and demands empowerment and the redistribution of resources to those minoritized and disadvantaged in society. CRFT guided this inquiry toward revealing the in-depth experiences of resistance among minoritized counselor educators in academia, an investigation that had not been carried out prior. In counseling and counselor education, CRFT sheds new light on our views of colleagues, students, and clients.

This critically conscious approach to counselor education can generate what Harper (2012) cites as equity-mindedness. An attention to creating meaningful and collaborative relationships with those most likely to be affected by social discrimination and systems of power. In counselor education, this would mean joining with minoritized counselor educators. As Participant Jade pointed out, joining with—not doing for. Equity-mindedness would mean that faculty, both minoritized and majority identity, seek out both students and faculty that are most likely to be affected by oppression and marginalization, engaging them in supportive

relationships that assist them in navigating organizational culture, finding resources, and pursuing professional and personal interest toward academic and disciplinary success. In this inquiry, each participant demonstrated a degree of equity-mindedness in their use of mentoring as resistance.

### **Suggestions for Future Research**

Further research is needed to better understand the Mentoring as Resistance, Taking Risks, and Coloring/Queering the Lens as strategies of resistance. In particular, future research may focus specifically on these strategies and their impact on organizational cultures and structural and systemic change. This would generate greater transferability, providing conclusions that are more easily applied cross-contextually (Mason, 2002). A discourse analysis may also provide unique insights into the holistic experience of minoritized faculty. Throughout the interviews, most of the participants reflected an intuitive use of language to discuss their experiences, navigating a linguistic terrain that avoided accusing individuals without addressing the systemic issues. How minoritized faculty discuss oppression in academia may inform the ways that the institutional culture shapes their perception and experience. As Dirks (2016) found in a policy discourse analysis at four Big Ten campuses, organizational discourses were able to shape institutional perceptions of transgender individuals toward victimization, disabled and disordered, or resourceful and change-agentic. Institutional discourse shape how not only minoritized populations are perceived in academia, but also how their efforts at change-making are perceived (Hoffman & Mitchell, 2016).

In addition, future research can focus on the role and efficacy of diversity and climate committees. Diversity and climate committees have a growing presence across college and university campuses as one significant way of addressing diversity and inclusivity issues. Every

participant mentioned being involved in diversity or climate related service and committees. However, research into the role, efficacy, and successful strategies of diversity and climate committees is scarce. Future research can explore the strategies that these committees use to enhance the experiences of minoritized faculty and improve organizational cultures. Connecting and supporting strategies of resistance among the faculty themselves.

Institutional and policy analyses may also help to illuminate the mechanisms that maintain the continued challenges experienced by minoritized faculty and students despite a considerable body of literature. Research into administrative perceptions, beliefs, and awareness surrounding minoritized faculty experiences may also help to clarify any potential biases or institutional constraints that prevent further policy and organizational change. Interdisciplinary research may also help to address this important area from multiple analytical perspectives. Louis et al. (2016) point out that participants in their study recommend administrative recognition of oppression and microaggressions in academia as a way to bring to foster organizational change. Research with institutional leadership may reveal if administrators have an understanding of the literature and experiences surrounding minoritized faculty, making this recognition possible.

The findings of this CIPI are representative of existing literature, and grounded in an empirically supported theoretical lens. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that this inquiry has some significant limitations. First, this CIPI focuses on six minoritized counselor educators. While the small sample size is appropriate to the method, it may limit the transferability of findings across disciplinary context. Still, participant profiles function as a snapshot into the lives of six minoritized counselor educators actively resisting oppression in academia. The benefits of the inquiry are in the potential applicability of the profile to the lives of other minoritized faculty.

Still, future research could expand the scope of the inquiry to include minoritized faculty outside of counselor education, and connects those profiles to the profiles provided here.

While the lack of focus on one minoritized social identity may be seen as a limitation, here this is seen as a strength through the CRFT lens. Instead of presenting profiles that are delineated along any social identity lines, an overlapping assemblage is presented that depicts resistance to similar structures of oppression from perspectives that might not otherwise interact. Nevertheless, there exists limitation in the need for greater representation across social identities. As discussed in Chapter Three, the inquiry did not include representation of Latino, Indigenous/Native, Asian American counselor educators, nor did it include faculty with visible disability or gender diversity. Eagan Jr and Garvey (2015) point out that there is miniscule research into the experiences of faculty with sexual and gender diversity, so much so that the effects of sexuality- and gender-based discrimination is scarcely understood. Nishida (2016) demonstrates how changing institutional terrains, influenced by neoliberalism and the privileging of hyperproductivity, also engender exclusionary climates for individuals with disability and mental health concerns. So, more research is needed to inform more inclusive policies and institutional support in the lives of these minoritized faculty.

## References

- Alexander-Albritton, C., & Hill, N. R. (2015). Familial and institutional factors: Job satisfaction for female counselor educators. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 54(2), 109–121. doi.org/10.1002/ceas.12008
- Allen, A. (2016). Feminist Perspectives on Power. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2016). Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University. Retrieved from <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2016/entries/feminist-power/>
- American Council on Education (2016). *American College President Study*. Retrieved from <http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/American-College-President-Study.aspx>
- American Counseling Association (2017). *Our Mission*. Retrieved from <https://www.counseling.org/about-us/about-aca/our-mission>.
- Anzaldúa, G. (1990). How to tame a wild tongue. In R. Ferguson, M. Gever, T. Minh-ha, & C. West (Eds.), *Out there: Marginalization and contemporary cultures*. New York, NY: MIT Press.
- Anzaldúa, G. (2007). *Borderlands/la frontera: The new mestiza* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Aunt Lute Books.
- Aragón, O. R., Dovidio, J. F., & Graham, M. J. (2016). Colorblind and multicultural ideologies are associated with faculty adoption of inclusive teaching practices. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*. doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000026
- Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (2017). *ACES Information*. Retrieved from <http://www.acesonline.net/aces-information>.

- Baker, C. A., & Moore, III, J. L. (2015). Experiences of underrepresented doctoral students in counselor education. *Journal for Multicultural Education*, 9(2), 68–84.  
doi.org/10.1108/JME-11-2014-0036
- Barrio Minton, C. A., Wachter Morris, C. A., & Yaates, L. D. (2014). Pedagogy in counselor education: A 10-year content analysis of journals. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 53(3), 162–177. doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2014.00055.x
- Beale, R., Chesler, M. A., & Ramus, E. (2013). Faculty members as change-agents? In M. A. Chesler, A. A. Young, & R. L. Beale (Eds.), *Faculty identities and the challenge of diversity: Reflections on teaching in higher education*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Becker, H. (1998). *Tricks of the trade: How to think about your research while you're doing it*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Bloom, L. R., & Sawin, P. (2009). Ethical responsibility in feminist research: challenging ourselves to do activist research with women in poverty. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 22(3), 333–351. doi.org/10.1080/09518390902835413
- Calley, N. G., & Hawley, L. D. (2008). The professional identity of counselor educators. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 27(1), 3–16. doi.org/10.1080/07325220802221454
- Cannella, G. S., & Perez, M. S. (2012). Emboldened patriarchy in higher education feminist readings of capitalism, violence, and power. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 12(4), 279–286. doi: 10.1177/1532708612446421
- Cannella, G. S., Pérez, M. S., & Pasque, P. A. (2015). *Critical qualitative inquiry: Foundations and futures*. New York, NY: Left Coast Press.



- Cartwright, B. Y., Washington, R. D., & McConnell, L. R. (2009). Examining racial microaggressions in rehabilitation counselor education. *Rehabilitation Education; Carbondale*, 23(3/4), 171–181. doi: 10.1891/088970109805029996
- Chang, C. Y., Crethar, H. C., & Ratts, M. J. (2010). Social justice: A national imperative for counselor education and supervision. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 50(2), 82–87. doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6978.2010.tb00110.x
- Chesler, M. A. (2013). The state of research with faculty identities in higher education classrooms and institutional contexts. In M. A. Chesler, A. A. Young, & R. L. Beale (Eds.), *Faculty identities and the challenge of diversity: reflections on teaching in higher education*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Chesler, M. A., Young, A. A., & Beale, R. L. (2013). *Faculty identities and the challenge of diversity: reflections on teaching in higher education*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Chesler, M. A., & Young Jr, A. A. (2007). Faculty members' social identities and classroom authority. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 2007(111), 11–19. doi.org/10.1002/tl.281
- Christopher Brown II, M., & Elon Dancy II, T. (2009). Predominantly white institutions. In K. Lomotey (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of African American Education*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.
- Churgay, C. A., Smith, M. A., Woodard, L., & Wallace, L. S. (2014). A survey of family medicine department chairs about faculty with disabilities: A CERA study. *Family Medicine*, 47(10), 776–781.
- Constantine, M. G., Smith, L., Redington, R. M., & Owens, D. (2008). Racial microaggressions against black counseling and counseling psychology faculty: A central challenge in the

- multicultural counseling movement. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 86(3), 348–355. doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6678.2008.tb00519.x
- Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Programs (2015). *2016 CACREP Standards*. Retrieved from <http://www.cacrep.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/2016-CACREP-Standards.pdf>.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013a). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013b). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.
- Dancy, T. E., & Jean-Marie, G. (2014). Faculty of color in higher education: Exploring the intersections of identity, impostorship, and internalized racism. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 22(4), 354–372. doi.org/10.1080/13611267.2014.945736
- Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2012). *Critical race theory: An introduction*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Denzin, N. K. (2015). What is critical qualitative inquiry? In G. S. Cannella, M. S. Pérez, & P. A. Pasque (Eds.), *Critical Qualitative Inquiry: Foundations and Futures*. New York, NY: Left Coast Press.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York, NY: Kappa Delta Pi.
- Dirks, D. A. (2016). Transgender people at four Big Ten campuses: A policy discourse analysis. *The Review of Higher Education*, 39(3), 371–393. doi: 10.1353/rhe.2016.0020
- Dollarhide, C. T., Gibson, D. M., & Moss, J. M. (2013). Professional identity development of counselor education doctoral students. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 52(2), 137–150. doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2013.00034.x

- Eagan Jr, M. K., & Garvey, J. C. (2015). Stressing out: Connecting race, gender, and stress with faculty productivity. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 86(6), 923–954. doi: 10.1080/00221546.2015.11777389
- Felski, R. (2011). Critique and the hermeneutics of suspicion. *M/C Journal*, 15(1). Retrieved from <http://journal.media-culture.org.au/index.php/mcjournal/article/view/431>
- Felski, R. (2015). *The limits of critique*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977* (1st American ed). New York, NY: Pantheon Books.
- Fraser, G. J., & Hunt, D. E. (2011). Faculty diversity and search committee training: Learning from a critical incident. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 4(3), 185–198. doi: 10.1037/a0022248
- Freeman, M., deMarrais, K., Preissle, J., Roulston, K., & St. Pierre, E. (2007). Standards of evidence in qualitative research: An incitement to discourse. *Educational Researcher*, 36(1), 25–32. doi: 10.3102/0013189X062980
- Freire, P. (2007). *Pedagogy of the oppressed: 30th anniversary edition*. New York, NY: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Gardner, S. K., & Veliz, D. (2014). Evincing the ratchet: A thematic analysis of the promotion and tenure guidelines at a striving university. *The Review of Higher Education*, 38(1), 105–132. doi: 10.1353/rhe.2014.0045
- Gasman, M., Abiola, U., & Travers, C. (2015). Diversity and senior leadership at elite institutions of higher education. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 8(1), 1–14. doi: 10.1037/a0038872

- Gasman, M., Kim, J., & Nguyen, T.-H. (2011). Effectively recruiting faculty of color at highly selective institutions: A school of education case study. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 4(4), 212–222. doi: 10.1037/a0025130
- Gibson, D. M., Dollarhide, C. T., Leach, D., & Moss, J. M. (2015). Professional identity development of tenured and tenure-track counselor educators. *Journal of Counselor Leadership and Advocacy*, 2(2), 113–130. doi: 10.1080/2326716X.2015.1042095
- Giroux, H. (2014). *Neoliberalism's War on Higher Education*. Chicago, IL: Haymarket Books.
- Griffin, K. A., Bennett, J. C., & Harris, J. (2013). Marginalizing merit?: Gender differences in black faculty D/discourses on tenure, advancement, and professional success. *The Review of Higher Education*, 36(4), 489–512. doi: 10.1353/rhe.2013.0040
- Hall, S., & Hulse-Killacky, D. (2010). Perceptions of doctoral level teaching preparation in counselor education. *Journal of Counselor Preparation and Supervision*, 1(2). doi: 10.7729/12.0108
- Harper, S. R. (2009). Race-conscious student engagement practices and the equitable distribution of enriching educational experiences. *Liberal Education; Washington*, 95(4), 38–45.
- Harper, S. R. (2012). Race without racism: How higher education researchers minimize racist institutional norms. *The Review of Higher Education*, 36(1), 9–29. doi: 10.1353/rhe.2012.0047
- Haskins, N. H., & Singh, A. (2015). Critical race theory and counselor education pedagogy: Creating equitable training. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 54(4), 288–301. doi: 10.1002/ceas.12027
- Haskins, N. H., Ziomek-Daigle, J., Sewell, C., Crumb, L., Appling, B., & Trepal, H. (2016). The intersectionality of African American mothers in counselor education: A

- phenomenological examination. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 55(1), 60–75.  
doi: 10.1002/ceas.12033
- Hinchey, P. (2010). Rethinking agendas: Social reproduction and resistance. *Counterpoints*, 24, 93–110.
- Hinojosa, T. J., & Carney, J. V. (2016). Mexican american women pursuing counselor education doctorates: A narrative inquiry. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 55(3), 198–215.  
doi: 10.1002/ceas.12045
- Hoffman, G. D., & Mitchell, T. D. (2016). Making diversity “everyone’s business”: A discourse analysis of institutional responses to student activism for equity and inclusion. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 9(3), 277–289. doi: 10.1037/dhe0000037
- hooks, bell. (1990a). Marginality as site of resistance. In R. Ferguson, M. Gever, T. Minh-ha, & C. West (Eds.), *Out there: Marginalization and contemporary cultures*. New York, NY: MIT Press.
- hooks, bell. (1990b). Talking back. In R. Ferguson, M. Gever, T. Minh-ha, & C. West (Eds.), *Out there: Marginalization and contemporary cultures*. New York, NY: MIT Press.
- hooks, bell. (2003). *Teaching Community: A Pedagogy of Hope*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hunt, B., & Gilmore, G. W. (2011). Learning to teach: Teaching internships in counselor education and supervision. *The Professional Counselor: Research and Practice*, 1(2), 143–151. doi: 10.15241/bhh.1.2.143
- Jones, B., Hwang, E., & Bustamante, R. M. (2015). African American female professors’ strategies for successful attainment of tenure and promotion at predominately White institutions: It can happen. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 10(2), 133–151.  
doi: 10.1177/1746197915583934

- Joseph, T., & Hirshfield, L. (2013). Race, gender, and identity taxation in the academy. In M. A. Chesler, A. A. Young, & R. L. Beale (Eds.), *Faculty identities and the challenge of diversity: reflections on teaching in higher education*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Kachchaf, R., Ko, L., Hodari, A., & Ong, M. (2015). Career–life balance for women of color: Experiences in science and engineering academia. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 8(3), 175–191. doi: 10.1037/a0039068
- Kelly, B. T., & Fetridge, J. S. (2012). The role of students in the experience of women faculty on the tenure track. *NASPA Journal About Women in Higher Education*, 5(1). doi: 10.1515/njawhe-2012-1095
- Kelly, B. T., & McCann, K. I. (2014). Women faculty of color: stories behind the statistics. *The Urban Review*, 46(4), 681–702. doi: 10.1007/s11256-014-0275-8
- Langdridge, D. (2008). Phenomenology and critical social psychology: Directions and debates in theory and research. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 2(3), 1126–1142. doi: 10.1111/j.1751-9004.2008.00114.x
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Lee-Thomas, G. (2008). Faculty self-examination of racial identity development and student learning. *Journal of Excellence in College Teaching*, 19(2&3), 7–29.
- Lerma, E., Zamarripa, M. X., Oliver, M., & Cavazos Vela, J. (2015). Making our way through: voices of Hispanic counselor educators. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 54(3), 162–175. doi: 10.1002/ceas.12011

- Lester, J. (2008). Performing gender in the workplace: Gender socialization, power, and identity among women faculty members. *Community College Review*, 35(4), 277–305. doi: 10.1177/0091552108314756
- Levin, J. S., & Aliyeva, A. (2015). Embedded neoliberalism within faculty behaviors. *The Review of Higher Education*, 38(4), 537–563. doi: 10.1353/rhe.2015.0030
- Lombardi, A. R., Murray, C., & Gerdes, H. (2011). College faculty and inclusive instruction: Self-reported attitudes and actions pertaining to Universal Design. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 4(4), 250–261. doi: 10.1037/a0024961
- Lorde, A. (1990). Age, race, class, and sex. In R. Ferguson, M. Gever, T. Minh-ha, & C. West (Eds.), *Out there: Marginalization and contemporary cultures*. New York, NY: MIT Press.
- Louis, D. A., Rawls, G. J., Jackson-Smith, D., Chambers, G. A., Phillips, L. L., & Louis, S. L. (2016). Listening to our voices: Experiences of Black faculty at predominantly white research universities with microaggression. *Journal of Black Studies*, 47(5), 454–474. doi: 10.1177/0021934716632983.
- Lutz, K. F., Hassouneh, D., Akeroyd, J., & Beckett, A. K. (2013). Balancing survival and resistance: Experiences of faculty of color in predominantly Euro American schools of nursing. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 6(2), 127–146. doi: 10.1037/a0032364
- Madrid, A. (2004). Missing people and others: Joining together to expand the circle. In M. L. Andersen & P. H. Collins (Eds.), *Race, Class, and Gender: An Anthology*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.

Malott, K. (2010). Multicultural counselor training in a single course: Review of research.

*Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 38(1), 51–63. doi:

10.1002/j.2161-1912.2010.tb00113.x

Malott, K. M., Hall, K. H., Sheely-Moore, S., Krell, M. M., & Cardaciotto, L. (2014). Evidence-based teaching in higher education: Application to counselor education. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 53, 294–305. doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6978.2014.00064.x

*Education & Supervision*, 53, 294–305. doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6978.2014.00064.x

Malott, K., Paone, T. R., Maddux, C., & Rothman, T. (2010). Multicultural counselor training:

Assessment of single-course objectives and pedagogical strategies. *Journal of Counselor*

*Preparation and Supervision*, 1(2), 16–27. doi: 10.7729/12.0109

Marbley, A. F., Wong, A., Santos-Hatchett, S. L., Pratt, C., & Jaddo, L. (2011). Women faculty of color: Voices, gender, and the expression of our multiple identities within academia.

*Advancing Women in Leadership*, 31, 166.

Mason, J. (2002). *Qualitative researching*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.

Maxwell, J. (2012). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.

Maxwell, J., & Miller, B. (2008). Categorizing and connecting strategies in qualitative data analysis. In P. Leavy & S. Hesse-Biber (Eds.), *Handbook of emergent methods*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

McRuer, R. (2003). As good as it gets: Queer theory and critical disability. *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies*, 9(1), 79–105.

McIntosh, P. (2004). White privilege and male privilege: A personal account of coming to see correspondences through work in Women's Studies. In M. L. Andersen & P. H. Collins



- (Eds.), *Race, Class, and Gender: An Anthology*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- McKenzie, M. (2014). *Black girl dangerous: On race, queerness, class and gender*. Black Girl Dangerous Press.
- Meyer, E. J., & Lesiuk, V. (2010). Subverting the ivory tower: Teaching and learning through critical dialogues. *Cultural Studies <=> Critical Methodologies*, 10(5), 394–396. doi: 10.1177/1532708610374813
- Milsom, A., & Moran, K. (2015). From school counselor to counselor educator: A phenomenological study. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 54(3), 203–220. doi: 10.1002/ceas.12014
- Monzó, L. D., & SooHoo, S. (2014). Translating the academy: Learning the racialized languages of academia. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 7(3), 147–165. doi: 10.1037/a0037400
- Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.
- National Center for Educational Statistics (2013). *The Condition of Education 2013*. Retrieved from <https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2013/2013037.pdf>.
- Nishida, A. (2016). Neoliberal academia and a critique from disability studies. In *Occupying disability: Critical approaches to community, justice, and decolonizing disability* (pp. 145–157). Dordrecht, NL: Springer.
- Odegard, M. A., & Vereen, L. G. (2010). A grounded theory of counselor educators integrating social justice into their pedagogy. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 50(2), 130–149. doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6978.2010.tb00114.x

- Orr, J. J., Hall, S. F., & Hulse-Killacky, D. (2008). A model for collaborative teaching teams in counselor education. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 47(3), 146–163. doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6978.2008.tb00046.x
- Pasque, P. A., & Salazar Pérez, M. (2015). Centering critical inquiry: Methodologies that facilitate critical qualitative research. In G. S. Cannella, M. S. Pérez, & P. A. Pasque (Eds.), *Critical Qualitative Inquiry: Foundations and Futures*. New York, NY: Left Coast Press.
- Prosser, M., & Trigwell, K. (2006). Confirmatory factor analysis of the Approaches to Teaching Inventory. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76(2), 405–419. doi: 10.1348/000709905X43571
- Ratts, M. J., Singh, A. A., Nassar-McMillan, S., Butler, S. K., McCullough, J. R., & Hipolito-Delgado, C. (2015). Multicultural and social justice counseling competencies. *AMCD: Alexandria, VA*. Retrieved from <http://www.counseling.org/docs/default-source/competencies/multicultural-and-social-justice-counseling-competencies>.
- Ratts, M. J., & Wood, C. (2011). The fierce urgency of now: Diffusion of innovation as a mechanism to integrate social justice in counselor education. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 50(3), 207–223. doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6978.2011.tb00120.x
- Ricoeur, P. (1973). The task of hermeneutics. *Philosophy Today*, 17(2), 112–128.
- Ricoeur, P., & Savage, D. (1970). *Freud and philosophy: An essay on interpretation*. New Have, CT: Yale University Press.
- Rodriguez, D., & Boahene, A. (2012). The politics of rage empowering women of color in the academy. *Cultural Studies↔ Critical Methodologies*, 12(5), 450–458. doi: 10.1177/1532708612453003

- Rodriguez, D., Boahene, A., Gonzales-Howell, N., & Anesi, J. (2012). Practicing liberatory pedagogy: Women of color in college classrooms. *Cultural Studies <=> Critical Methodologies*, 12(2), 96–108. doi: 10.1177/1532708611435211
- Saar, M. (2010). Power and critique. *Journal of Power*, 3(1), 7–20. doi: 10.1080/17540291003630320
- Sallee, M., & Hart, J. (2015). Cultural navigators: International faculty fathers in the U.S. research university. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 8(3), 192–211. doi: 10.1037/a0039042
- Savin-Baden, M., & Major, C. H. (2012). *Qualitative research: The essential guide to theory and practice*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Seidman, I. (2012). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences, fourth edition* (4 edition). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Seward, D. X. (2014). Multicultural course pedagogy: Experiences of master's-level students of color. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 53(1), 62–79. doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6978.2014.00049.x
- Shulman, L. S. (2004a). *Teaching as community property: Essays on higher education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Shulman, L. S. (2004b). *The wisdom of practice: essays on teaching, learning, and learning to teach*. (S. M. Wilson, Ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Spivak, G. C. (1990). Explanation and culture: marginalia. In R. Ferguson, M. Gever, T. Minh-ha, & C. West (Eds.), *Out there: Marginalization and contemporary cultures*. New York, NY: MIT Press.

- Stanley, C. A. (2006). Coloring the academic landscape: Faculty of color breaking the silence in predominantly white colleges and universities. *American Educational Research Journal; Washington*, 43(4), 701–736.
- Stockdill, B. C. (2012). Queering the ivory tower: Tales of a troublemaking homosexual. In *Transforming the Ivory Tower: Challenging Racism, Sexism, and Homophobia in the Academy* (pp. 145–182). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai‘i Press.
- Sue, D. W. (2010). *Microaggressions in everyday life: Race, gender, and sexual orientation*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Tennant, M., McMullen, C., & Kaczynski, D. (2010). *Teaching, learning and research in higher education: A critical approach*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- The Chronicle of Higher Education. (2013). *Race, ethnicity, and gender of full-time faculty at more than 4,300 institutions*. Retrieved from <http://www.chronicle.com.ezaccess.libraries.psu.edu/interactives/fac-diversity>.
- Toporek, R. L., Lewis, J. A., & Crethar, H. C. (2009). Promoting systemic change through the ACA advocacy competencies. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 87(3), 260–268. doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6678.2009.tb00105.x
- Trigwell, K. (2011). Relations between teachers’ emotions in teaching and their approaches to teaching in higher education. *Instructional Science*, 40(3), 607–621. doi: 10.1007/s11251-011-9192-3
- Trigwell, K. (2013). Evidence of the impact of scholarship of teaching and learning purposes. *Teaching and Learning Inquiry: The ISSOTL Journal*, 1(1), 95–105. doi: 10.20343/teachlearningqu.1.1.95

- Turner, C. S. V., & Myers, S. L. (2000). *Faculty of Color in Academe: Bittersweet Success*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Turner, C. S. V., González, J. C., & Wong (Lau), K. (2011). Faculty women of color: The critical nexus of race and gender. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 4(4), 199–211. doi: 10.1037/a0024630
- Turner, C. S. V., González, J. C., & Wood, J. L. (2008). Faculty of color in academe: What 20 years of literature tells us. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 1(3), 139–168. doi: 10.1037/a0012837
- Vaccaro, A. (2012). Campus microclimates for lgbt faculty, staff, and students: An exploration of the intersections of social identity and campus roles. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 49(4). doi: 10.1515/jsarp-2012-6473
- Velmans, M. (2007). Heterophenomenology versus critical phenomenology. *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences*, 6(1–2), 221–230. doi: 10.1007/s11097-006-9033-z
- Welton, D., & Silverman, H. J. (1987). *Critical and dialectical phenomenology*. New York, NY: SUNY Press.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- West, C. (1990). The new cultural politics of difference. In R. Ferguson, M. Gever, T. Minh-ha, & C. West (Eds.), *Out there: marginalization and contemporary cultures*. New York, NY: MIT Press.
- West, J. D., Bubbenzer, D., Cox, J. A., & McGlothlin, J. M. (2013). *Teaching in Counselor Education: Engaging Students in Learning*. Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

Wittig, M. (1990). The straight mind. In R. Ferguson, M. Gever, T. Minh-ha, & C. West (Eds.),  
*Out there: Marginalization and contemporary cultures*. New York, NY: MIT Press.

## Appendix A: Exemption Determination

**Date:** August 18, 2016

**From:** Courtney Whetzel, IRB Analyst

**To:** Javier Casado Perez

Type of Submission:	Initial Study
Title of Study:	Living Resistance in Academia: A Critical Inquiry with Minoritized Counselor Educators
Principal Investigator:	Javier Casado Perez
Study ID:	STUDY00005550
Submission ID:	STUDY00005550
Funding:	Not Applicable
Documents Approved:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Living Resistance in Academia (17 August 2016), Category: IRB Protocol</li> <li>• Living Resistance in Academia - interview questions (17 August 2016), Category: Data Collection Instrument</li> </ul>

The Office for Research Protections determined that the proposed activity, as described in the above-referenced submission, does not require formal IRB review because the research met the criteria for exempt research according to the policies of this institution and the provisions of applicable federal regulations.

Continuing Progress Reports are **not** required for exempt research. Record of this research determined to be exempt will be maintained for five years from the date of this notification. If your research will continue beyond five years, please contact the Office for Research Protections closer to the determination end date.

Changes to exempt research only need to be submitted to the Office for Research Protections in limited circumstances described in the below-referenced Investigator Manual. If changes are being considered and there are questions about whether IRB review is needed, please contact the Office for Research Protections.

Penn State researchers are required to follow the requirements listed in the Investigator Manual ([HRP-103](#)), which can be found by navigating to the IRB Library within CATS IRB (<http://irb.psu.edu>).

This correspondence should be maintained with your records.

## Appendix B: Informed Consent for Research

The Pennsylvania State University

**Title of Project:** Living Resistance in Academia: A Critical Inquiry with Pre-Tenure Minoritized Counselor Educators

**Principal Investigator:** Javier F. Casado Pérez, MS NCC PhD Candidate

**Telephone Number:** 732 573 5262

**Advisor:** Richard Hazler, PhD PCC NC

**Advisor Telephone Number:** 814 863 2415

You are being invited to voluntarily participate in a research inquiry. The summary below explains information about this research.

- The purpose of this inquiry is to generate greater understanding surrounding the experiences of minoritized counselor educators (MCEs) in academia. Specifically, the principle investigator (PI) aims to explore acts of resistance, wherein MCEs confront unequal treatment, discrimination, or bias in their classrooms, programs, departments, or academic community. This inquiry will contribute to a national dialogue on faculty diversity, as well as increase disciplinary knowledge on the experiences of minoritized counselor educators.
- With your consent, the PI will contact you via telephone to conduct a brief screening conversation. This screening will include a brief information-gathering discussion of your involvement with diversity issues and social justice, as well as your identification with diversity. If you are eligible to continue in the inquiry, the PI will ask you to participate in **three 60-90 minute** in-depth interviews focused on your life history, specific experiences in confronting oppression, and meaning-making as an minoritized counselor educator. The PI will construct a detailed profile once your interviews are completed, a process that will be regularly open to you. Your endorsement of the finalized profile will be requested by the PI.
- Efforts will be made to limit the use and sharing of your personal and research information to those people who have relevant need for access. Some of these records may contain information that personally identifies you, and reasonable efforts will be made to keep that information private.
  - A list that matches your name and location of work with your code number will be kept in a locked file or password protected file in the PI's personal office.
  - Your research records will be labeled with your code number and pseudonyms, and will be kept in the PI's personal office.

In the event of publications or presentations resulting from this inquiry, no identifiable information will be used or shared. The inquiry team will do our best to keep your participation in this research inquiry confidential to the extent permitted by law. However, absolute confidentiality cannot be guaranteed.

If you have questions or concerns, you should contact Javier F. Casado Pérez at 732 573 5262. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research subject or concerns regarding your privacy, you may contact the Office for Research Protections at 814-865-1775.

Your participation is voluntary and you may decide to stop at any time. You do not have to answer any questions that you do not want to answer.

Tell the researcher your decision regarding whether or not to participate in the research.



## **Appendix C: Interview Protocols**

The Pennsylvania State University STUDY00005550

Living Resistance: A Critical Inquiry with Pre-Tenure Minoritized Counselor Educators

### ***Protocol for Interview I: The Life History***

***research question:*** *How did counselor educators come to be involved in resistance?*

The purpose of this interview is to generate knowledge about participants' past life experiences with discrimination, prejudice, and marginalization. As well as, the connections between these experiences and the participants experience becoming a counselor educator. Examples of questions asked in this interview are:

1. Please, describe your position at this university (attending to teaching, research, service).
2. Can you tell me about yourself?
  - a. social identity, family background, place of origin
3. In the 90 minutes that we have, I wonder if you can describe to me the life experiences that led to you becoming:
  - a. A counselor.
  - b. A counselor educator.
  - c. A counselor educator who enacts resistance in academia.
    - i. Experiences can vary from early life to recent education, but should encapsulate both.
4. What has thinking back over your life been like for you today?

### ***Protocol for Interview II: Experiences in Detail***

***research question 2:*** *What experiences have counselor educators had of resistance?*

The purpose of this interview is to generate knowledge about participants' more recent experiences with discrimination, prejudice, and marginalization. The interview aims to construct detailed accounts of minoritized counselor educators confronting or resisting these otherwise oppressive experiences. Examples of questions asked in this interview are:

1. How would you describe (students/faculty/administration)'s interactions with your identity as a (minoritized social identities)?
2. Can you identify moments where you have felt, or seen others, slighted, judged, or treated unfairly based on your, or their, identity as a (minoritized social identity) whether in your classroom, department, or institution and confronted this?
  - a. Would you feel comfortable reconstructing that experience in-detail?
    - i. Identifying as many as three experiences and reconstructing them, with special attention to capturing experiences with students, faculty, and institutional bodies.
3. What has today's interview about these experiences been like for you?

### ***Protocol for Interview III: The Reflection on Meaning***

***research question 3:*** *What does taking resistive action mean in the lives of counselor educators?*

This purpose of this interview is to bring together the previous two interviews into a discussion on the meaning-making process of the participant. This interview aims to generate knowledge about how experiences of resistance create meaning for participants navigating the academic world.

Examples of questions asked in this interview are:

1. How have these past interviews made sense to you?
2. What does resistance mean to you as a:
  - a. Person?
  - b. Counselor?
  - c. Counselor Educator?
3. Given what you've shared about your life before becoming a counselor educator, the first interview, and your experiences as a (minoritized social identity) counselor educator confronting oppression, the second interview, how do you understand your own acts of resistance in your life?
4. Given what you've just shared, how do you see your acts or resistance affecting your directions in the future?

## Appendix D: Participant Memoranda

### Hyacinth

Interviews with Hyacinth focused a lot on her relationships. She talked about her feeling more welcomed by disciplines outside of counselor educations because of the research that she does – and how she saw this as possibly connected to her being a Black Caribbean woman. Turner et al. (2011) discussed that faculty of color often face the expectation of doing scholarly work that is representative of their own social identities. In other words, faculty of color are expected to do research on diversity issues or issues in communities of color, while these are simultaneously undervalued on the road to promotion and tenure (Gasman et al., 2015). Hyacinth discussed how she often wants to have the autonomy to focus on her own work and reach out to students that *she* wants to reach out to, but faces repeated expectations from her department of becoming involved in diversity-related committees, issues, or mentoring with students of color. Jones et al. (2015) discuss this as overexposure or hypervisibility to diversity issues. These unequal expectations, and the tokenization therein, come from expecting high productivity while funneling all diversity related issues and students of color to one or two individuals (Cartwright et al., 2009; Joseph & Hirshfield, 2013). Giving word to her acts of resistance was a very powerful experience for Hyacinth. She talked about the natural fit that she felt in discussing herself as a change-agent, especially the ways connected with her life history.

### Eartha

The interview process with Eartha was distinctly powerful given their focus on outright and repeated challenges to her expertise and competency by her students. She discussed how her years of experience seemed to be ignored and that her leadership was not trusted by her students. On an almost all white campus, Eartha shared that she does not feel she has mentorship, and

must look outside her department. She also disclosed that she did not trust her students would be accepting of her mental health diagnosis – instead, they would hold it against her. Kelly and McCann (2014) discussed this as challenges to social acceptance, and how continued questioning and doubt in their departmental culture and poor mentoring led some women faculty of color to depart before achieving tenure. Similarly, Eartha disclosed, during the length of the interviews, that she was considering departing from her current institution. This was a poignant revelation, and one that Eartha explained was directly related to the questioning, doubt, and lack of acceptance she received from her students. Discussing her acts of resistance, I noted that Eartha balanced her personality with her acts. That her sense of being an extreme introvert and confrontation-avoidance sometimes prevented her from speaking up. Louis et al. (2016) discussed this as picking one's battles, and Eartha seemed to balance the feeling of futility with a commitment to foster change.

## **Hope**

When I contacted Hope for the interviews, she disclosed that she would have plenty to discuss regarding experiences of oppression in academia. Yet, her interviews focused primarily on her own acts of agency, self-advocacy, and empowerment. Her main challenges surrounding institutional invalidation regarding her international status and her identification with motherhood. Sallee and Hart (2015) provide an excellent literature review on international faculty working in the United States, and points out the lack of social support and high degree of isolation that international faculty experience and attribute to their race and international status. For Hope, this was made worse by institutional incompetency and dismissal surrounding her international status, even after having hired an international faculty, and a lack of interest in her experience as a new mother. This included the outright disregard for her just having given birth

when a colleague contacted about her class. These environmental microaggressions communicated to Hope that she is an outsider in her own work place, and produce repeated reminders that she does not belong (Joseph & Hirshfield, 2013). Haskins and colleagues (2016) found that, among African American mothers, there was a sense that they needed to “make their own way” (p. 66) through, and they sought social support from those they trusted and developed an internalized sense of success. Hope reflected this in her by finding someone she trusted within her program and seeking support for her motherhood from other women outside her department. She also expressed a strong commitment to agency, autonomy, and ownership of her role and her department—making her own way through despite professional stressors.

### **Deacon**

The interview process with Deacon was poignant and vivid. Deacon did not shy away from fully disclosing his experiences in his department, and his interviews focused on his lack of support and an organizational culture that was not welcoming of him or students of color. Deacon especially emphasized a lack of trust in his departmental colleagues and a need to be a support figure and role model to the rising students of color. Constantine and colleagues (2008) found that, among Black counseling and counseling psychology faculty, there was a feeling of erasure and inadequate mentoring. Louis et al. (2016) also found that faculty felt futility in the effort to counter experiences of invalidation or assumptions. Deacon expressed that his faculty ignored issues that affected students of color, and unique experiences felt by students with sexual diversity. Deacon also experienced a lack of support and inadequate mentoring, and even though he identified some faculty as supportive, a general unwillingness to truly trust the individuals he worked with. When discussing his acts of resistance, Deacon talked about resisting for his students, for those that come after him, and in the spirit of his religious beliefs. This was similar

to West and Jade, who also cited their religious beliefs as a reason they resist. Deacon talked about his students bringing him joy, and that this was the reason he had not departed his institution yet.

### **West**

Conversations with West were focused on institutional barriers and the importance for him to be authentic to who he sees himself to be. West expressed dissatisfaction with the, at times, contradictory expectations of his department and his experience with systemic bias and microaggressions in practices like admissions and recruitment. While, West also experienced challenges with students, his attention was on the institutional and systemic problems. Reflecting existing literature, he challenged the persistent stereotypical and biased thinking in his department's interactions with students and applicants of color (Beale et al., 2013), and shared powerfully about structural attempts to dictate in the directions his energies go. Griffin, Bennett, and Harris (2013) discuss the racialized and gendered meritocracies that exist in academia, and their attribution of value and merit to practices that align with a white male dominant norms. For West, this seemed to be coupled with an erasure of who he is as a Black man, and what helped him make it through as an academic. He placed value in mentorship and service, but experienced the ways that these are devalued by the institution (Gasman et al., 2015). West enacts resistance in his daily life, and finds great strength in his history, family, religion, and mentors. West was an acutely critical individual, and he could see, what he called, the "residue" of bias across institutional practices.

### **Jade**

Like West and Deacon, Jade found strength in her religion. As a gay white woman, she was highly aware of the intersectionality of her privilege and her minoritization. Her greatest

struggle, and what seemed to be the focus of our interviews, was in the environmental erasure of her gender and sexual diversity at her institution. For Jade, this seemed to matter most because of the message it was sending to students and other educators. Jade is an advocate and an activist for sexual and gender diversity, and while this has brought her some success with students and the surrounding academia community, her department does not seem to be as responsive.

Vaccaro (2012) emphasized the importance of faculty and students in shaping campus climates around sexual and gender diversity, but found that institutional support and policy needed to go further to make it a central issue throughout the institution. Jade discussed being inspired by the students around campus, but feeling a need to pick her battles with her own department. She expressed a determination to do more and to be a more active change-maker given the privilege and access to power that she had. This was reminiscent of Stockdill's (2012) call for those with the privilege to enter academia to “make trouble” (p. 148).

## VITA

### Javier F. Casado Pérez MS NCC

#### education

---

- (2017) **Ph.D. in Counselor Education and Supervision – The Pennsylvania State University**  
2016 **Graduate Student Online Teaching Certificate** – Penn State World Campus  
2015 **Graduate School Teaching Certificate** – Schreyer Institute for Teaching Excellence

#### research involvement

---

- 2013 – 2017 **Graduate Researcher.** Project TEAM™ research and development team.

#### teaching experience

---

- |      |  |      |                                  |
|------|--|------|----------------------------------|
| 2017 | <b>Rehabilitation and Human Services Internship.</b> | 2016 | <b>The Helping Relationship</b>  |
| 2017 | <b>Introduction to RHS.</b>                          | 2015 | <b>Grief and Loss Counseling</b> |
| 2016 | <b>Case Mgmt. and Communications Skills.</b>         | 2015 | <b>Group Work in RHS</b>         |
| 2016 | <b>Medical Aspects of Disabilities.</b>              |      |                                  |

#### counseling & professional experience

---

- 2016 – 2017 **Graduate Instructor.** Rehabilitation and Human Services, University Park, PA.  
2015 – 2017 **Advanced Doctoral Student Supervisor.** The CEDAR Clinic, University Park, PA.  
2014 – 2016 **Intern Counselor.** The CEDAR Clinic, University Park, PA.  
2014 **Practicum Career Counselor.** Bank of America Career Services Center.

#### peer-reviewed publications and book chapters

---

- Casado Pérez, J. F.,** Carney, J., & Hazler, R. J. (2017). Student leadership TEAMS: A leadership empowerment intervention for school (re)connectedness. *Journal of Counselor Leadership and Advocacy*. doi: 10.1080/2326716X.2017.1288590
- Casado Pérez, J.F.** (2015). Dumpster Diving: Utilizing member concerns to disengage the autopilot. In *Group Work Experts Share Their Favorite Activities for Supervision*. Association for Specialists in Group Work.
- Casado Pérez, J.F.** (2015). Painting Your Group: Artistic representation of the group experience. In *Group Work Experts Share Their Favorite Activities for Supervision*. ASGW.

#### selected refereed professional presentations

---

- Casado Pérez, J.F. & DeLessio Parson, A.** (2016). *Interdisciplinary diversity training: Diffusing multicultural competence and advocacy*. NARACES 2016 Regional Conference, Syracuse, NY.
- Casado Pérez, J. F.** (2015, October). *Smart teaching: Integrating research-based learning principles into counselor education*. ACES 2015 National Conference, Philadelphia, PA.
- Casado Pérez, J. F.** (2015, April). *Leadership Empowerment: A conceptual model for reengagement of marginalized youth*. 5<sup>th</sup> Annual CSI Pennsylvania Statewide Conference, State College, PA.

#### selected service involvement

---

- 2017 **Affiliate Member.** President's Commission on Racial/Ethnic Diversity, Penn State.
- 2015 – 2017 **Reviewer.** *Journal of the Pennsylvania Counseling Association*.
- 2015 – 2017 **Member.** Diversity and Climate Enhancement Committee for the College of Education.
- 2015 – 2016 **Graduate Student Representative.** Diversity and Climate Enhancement Committee, the Department of Educational Psychology, Counseling, and Special Ed.
- 2014 – 2017 **Doctoral Student Mentor.** Counselor Education and Supervision Program.
- 2014 – 2017 **Judge.** Penn State's Graduate Student Exhibition (every spring).
- 2014 – 2015 **Co-Chair.** Professional Development Committee organizing the 5<sup>th</sup> Annual CSI Pennsylvania Statewide Conference.

#### awards

---

- 2016 – 2017 **Burdett Larson Graduate Fellowship.** College of Education (fall-spring)
- 2013 – 2017 **Bunton-Waller Assistantship.** Office of Multicultural Programs (fall-spring)
- 2014 **CSI Statewide Networking Grant.** Lead author for CSI Chapter Grant totaling \$300.
- 2011 – 2013 **Leadership Award.** Monmouth University