

**ENACTMENTS OF WHITENESS IN PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICE:
REPRODUCING AND TRANSFORMING WHITE HEGEMONY IN THE
UNIVERSITY CLASSROOM**

by

Jessica M. Charbeneau

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
(Sociology)
in The University of Michigan
2009

Doctoral Committee:

Emeritus Professor Mark Chesler, Chair
Emeritus Professor Patricia Y. Gurin
Associate Professor Karin A. Martin
Associate Professor Alford A. Young, Jr.

The classroom, with all its limitations, remains a location of possibility. In that field of possibility we have the opportunity to labor for freedom, to demand of ourselves and our comrades, an openness of mind and heart that allows us to face reality even as we collectively imagine ways to move beyond boundaries, to transgress. This is education as the practice of freedom.

- bell hooks, *Teaching to Transgress* (1994, p. 207)

© Jessica M. Charbeneau
2009

In memory of my dad, Glenn Boyd Matthews (1933 - 2001), who taught me to meet
people where they are and do the best with what you have.

And to my mom, Eloisa Almendárez Matthews, who taught me that growth and
possibility are part of life.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I recently heard the following lyrics to the song *Come with Me* by folk singer Joe Jencks (2007):

*It's an illusion we carry with us
As we wade on through the waters of our lives
That we must be strong and hold our own here
But a helping hand will save us by and by*

*I know alone that I will falter
But with a good friend near me I will carry on*

If I had not been certain of these sentiments before, the experience of researching and writing this dissertation has certainly taught me that alone I will falter but with encouraging faculty, colleagues, friends and family near me I will (and did!) carry on.

My advisor, colleague and friend, Mark Chesler, whom I met eight years ago as a prospective student visiting the department and who remained a touchstone throughout my graduate career, was instrumental in the completion of this project. Thank you for opening doors, supporting my progress and helping me develop a sense of personal and professional confidence I will carry with me always.

Each of my committee members made significant contributions to my work here and at different points during my time at Michigan. Pat Gurin is a role model whom I admire and who has taught me about scholarship, social justice and the power of compassionate, loving activism. Karin Martin inspired me as a qualitative researcher, writer, and academic, and supported my efforts by modeling a balance of parenthood and

professorship. Al Young asked me probing questions and offered theoretical insights throughout my graduate years, with tremendous impact on this project specifically and on my overall thinking regarding race, identity and research.

Other people also had a hand in getting me from there to here. The Faculty Diversity research team provided a space for conversation and feedback on different aspects of this project. I learned so much from this community of researchers, including the value of collaboration and trust in the development of ideas. During the research phase of this project I had a delightful time working with two Sociology Undergraduate Research Opportunity (SURO) students, Allison Kimmel and Elizabeth O'Toole. My experiences with them were welcomed reminders of the pragmatic impact I hope this project has on pedagogical practice. My own teaching ability and insight into pedagogical practice was strengthened through my involvement at Project Community with Joe Galura where I was introduced to peer-facilitation and teaching others how to teach, The Center for Intergroup Relations with Charles Behling, Kelly Maxwell and Monita Thompson – your strength and wisdom influence me in more ways than you know, and the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching (CRLT) with Mary Wright as a Graduate Student Mentor (GSM) and through participation in workshops and other learning opportunities. All of these teaching experiences shaped my interest in researching pedagogy and advocating for transforming practices. My time working at the National Center for Institutional Diversity (NCID) with Pat Gurin, Phillip J. Bowman, Angela Locks, Ana Ormsby and Nancy Abinojar also helped me combine my interest in teaching with the potential for change in institutional structures that shape our lives. They also gave me the gift of great friendship and camaraderie.

The following people came together to create an invincible network of social support without which this project would not have been possible. If it had not been for their caring, generous and loving connections I would have let it go a long time ago: The staff at the University of Michigan Health System Child Care Center, especially Miles Gale, Darius Cobb and Carrie Corga for their loving care of Henry; Julica Hermann, Elaine Weiner, Louise Dobish, Sara Goodkind, Susan Lee-Rife and Kim Greenwell for keeping me sane throughout it all – and still; Kristie Ford, Michelle Kelso and Angela Locks for going through it together and holding me up at times along the way; Marge Greene, Jennifer Jones, Lisa Collazo, Rachael Bercey, Christy Thomas, and Dr. Alinda Cox for keeping my body, mind and spirit in good shape; Mary Grace Carter, Kim Greenwell and Kim Huisman for their limitless, openhearted support and encouragement; Jenny Johnson, Meredith Klatt, Laura Van Slyke, Kerry Ryan, Eoin Ryan, Juno Ryan, Julie McLean, Mike McLean, Betsy Chung, Donald Chung, Shelley Guerra, and Shannon Ratcliff for all the difference; friends at St. Francis School, especially Sarah Walker and Maddie Kadas for their appreciation of the heft of completing this project while tending to a kindergartner; Loyce Matthews - my Moo, the Tias - Lydia Briseño and Sara Almendarez, and David Daily who carried and loved me all the way; and, of course, Ryan - my one, and Henry - my bright light, who kept me grounded in love and reminded me that together we are the bigger picture.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
ABSTRACT	viii
CHAPTER	
I. WHITENESS IN THE UNIVERSITY CLASSROOM	1
Whiteness in Higher Education	8
Conveying Whiteness through Pedagogical Practice	17
II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND METHODOLOGY	23
Enactments of Whiteness in Pedagogical Practice	24
The Sample	39
Data Collection	41
Data Coding and Analyses	43
Methodological Limitations	47
III. REPRODUCING ENACTMENTS OF WHITENESS IN PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICE	54
Reflecting Limited Racial Awareness	56
Reflecting White supremacy	69
IV. TRANSFORMING ENACTMENTS OF WHITENESS IN PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICE	78
Expressing Racial Awareness	81
Challenging White Dominance	89
V. THE STRUGGLES OF TRANSLATING TRANSFORMING PEDAGOGY INTO PRACTICE	99
Connecting pedagogical intentions with pedagogical practice: “...I have to really work on myself not to do that.”	102
Uncertainty in the classroom: “...I was unprepared for that moment”	109

Struggles negotiating disciplinary norms: “So, that's a culture I'm working against.”	119
Struggles managing institutional assumptions of gender: “Outsiders just should be kept out.”	124
VI. CONCLUSION: CONTRIBUTIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH	133
Sociology of Race and Critical White Studies	134
Anti-racism Educational Practices in Higher Education	137
Implications for Further Research	145
APPENDIX	149
REFERENCES	154

ABSTRACT

I conduct a conceptual and empirical inquiry into some of the ways enactments of Whiteness in the pedagogical practices of white faculty who have been recognized as successful teachers serve to reproduce or transform White hegemony in the university classroom. My effort is both descriptive and pragmatic: I illustrate racialized pedagogies by reviewing prior writings on this topic, create a categorization system of racially reproducing and transforming pedagogical practices, and apply this system to interviews with 18 white faculty talking about their racial identities and pedagogical practices. I use this analysis of the 291 enactments of Whiteness in the pedagogical practices of this group of white faculty to suggest that: reproducing enactments reinforce and transforming enactments challenge White hegemony, both reproducing and transforming enactments of Whiteness are present in pedagogical practice, and that together these enactments act as forces of agency that support and alter the White hegemonic influences in this institutional space of Higher Education. I offer some insight into the intersections of gender and discipline with Whiteness, especially in the struggles of translating transforming pedagogy into practice. This dissertation contributes to 1) the sociology of race and critical White studies by identifying ways Whiteness is constructed through reproducing and transforming enactments of Whiteness that, respectively, reinforce norms of Whiteness and, through a rearticulation of Whiteness, challenge their hegemonic influence. This dynamic offers insight into the long standing sociological

inquiry into the interplay between structure and agency by identifying mechanisms that demonstrate how agency both supports and alters larger social structures, and how structures constrain this movement. The struggles translating transforming pedagogy into practice described by the white faculty in this study provide an opportunity to examine these points of movement where agency starts to push against structure. This research also contributes to 2) the field of higher education by identifying transforming pedagogical practices that can inform and facilitate the incorporation of anti-racism pedagogy by individual white faculty or through larger faculty development efforts at this level of educational attainment.

CHAPTER I

WHITENESS IN THE UNIVERSITY CLASSROOM

Whiteness is a major organizing principle in contemporary U.S. society. It includes not only a micro-level personal racial identity but a social location and pattern of interactions in the context of macro-level political-economic structures, and cultural representations and norms (Omi & Winant, 1994). Like race itself, Whiteness is a social construction and a lived reality, a subjective experience and a set of objective power structures and relationships that protects a racial hierarchy that privileges whites and promotes the hegemony of Whiteness. Whiteness, White dominance, or White hegemony, refer to a set of social forces beyond the individual and beyond a conscious belief in White supremacy. That is not to say that the ideology of White supremacy does not play a foundational role in the establishment and maintenance of racial inequality (Gossett, 1965; Lewis, 2002; Roediger, 2005), but White supremacy and racial prejudice seldom are taught explicitly. As Bonilla-Silva (2006) argues, covert socialization into White dominance occurs rather universally while overt expressions of supremacy have become discursively more subtle and nuanced. Just because white people do not express or hold prejudicial attitudes, does not mean they are not affected by and reflect their White and privileged racial standing in their behaviors (Doane, 2003; Lewis, 2002). These normative behaviors of White privilege and assumptions rooted in White hegemony are acted on by individuals and are integrated into the policies and practices of

social institutions (Feagin, 2000; Feagin & Feagin, 1986; Omi & Winant, 1994).

Together, they form the binding for the structure of Whiteness and resulting racial hierarchy. I argue that identifying specific enactments of Whiteness (behaviors that signify what it means to be white in our society) is vital to exposing and challenging the hegemony of Whiteness. These enactments serve as mechanisms by which the structure of White dominance is reproduced or transformed. In this sense, the construction of Whiteness occurs in the movement between and around these processes.

Higher education is an institutional space where the macro structures and micro interactions of race (and other power structures) come together, and without interruption contribute to the reproduction of these structures in larger society (Bourdieu & Passeron, 2000/1977).¹ Throughout, and especially in its higher reaches, higher education is a White and male dominated system (Chesler, Lewis & Crowfoot, 2005). The reproduction of Whiteness and White (and male and upper-middle-class) dominance is part of the ‘hidden curriculum’ of higher education (Bourdieu & Passeron, 2000/1977). It is manifested in faculty expectations of students, curricular choices, reading lists, classroom seating patterns, ways of relating with different groups of students, curriculum requirements, graduation standards, the spatial structure of campuses and classrooms, and residence hall arrangements. These and other formal and informal policies and practices of the institution help to reproduce White hegemonic social practices within the walls of the institution (see Kincheloe, Steinberg, Rodriguez & Chennauet, 1998; Margolis &

¹ In the preface of the 1990 edition of *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*, 2nd ed., Bourdieu makes a point of addressing the reification of education as the sole force behind the “reproduction” of power structures. He asserts that education (or the school system) “*contributes* to reproducing the structure of the distribution of cultural capital and, through it, the social structure itself (and this, only to the extent to which this relational structure itself, as a system of positional differences and distances, depends upon this distribution) to the ahistorical view that society reproduces itself mechanically, identical to itself, without transformation or deformation, and by excluding all individual mobility” (pp. vii-viii). This is how I use the concept here.

Romero, 1998). Individual faculty members' pedagogy also is shaped by and thus reflects the practices of the larger educational institution. As such, institutions of higher education are also spaces where White privilege is conferred to white students and, thus, all students are taught the norms, practices and expectations that comprise the structure of White hegemony and resulting racial inequality (Zamudio & Rios, 2006). It follows that they are also spaces where students of color, and all students, learn what constitutes being non-white within this structure. To varying degrees, white students try to avoid this classification.

Individuals display varied understandings of racial issues and awareness of their own racial identity. Faculty act in a variety of ways, with or without intention, which serve to either or both reinforce or challenge normative assumptions of White hegemony. White professors may know intellectually that they are white and that racism and other forms of social inequality exist, yet often do not have the experiential knowledge or desire to see and address such issues when they are present in the classroom. The reproduction of White hegemony occurs when such issues are overlooked or denied, or treated as sidebars or "extra" issues to be incorporated if time or circumstances allow. Some white faculty are aware of, desire to and know how to challenge the prevalence of White hegemony in higher education and seek to transform it through their pedagogical practice (see Mayberry, 1996; TuSmith & Reddy, 2002). While there is a literature on white students' attitudes about students of color and students' of color experiences in predominantly white classrooms and universities (see Bonilla-Silva & Forman, 2000; Chesler, Peet & Sevig, 2003), the benefit of diversity for all students during their college years and as citizens of a diverse democracy (Bernstein & Cock, 1997; Cantor 2003;

Checkoway, 2002; Gaurasci & Cornwell, 1997; Gay, 1997; Giroux, 1997; Gurin, 2003; Gurin, Dey, Hurtado & Gurin, 2004; Parker, 2002, 1997; Schneider, 2001), and in some cases those of faculty of color (see Turner & Myers, 2000; Vargas 2002), there has been significantly less focus on Whiteness and the actions of white faculty in higher education (see Katz, 1991; Maher & Tetreault, 2003; Mayberry, 1996; Messner, 2000; Weinstein & O’Bear, 1992) and a particular scarceness of literature looking at how Whiteness intersects with faculty members’ pedagogical practices. The analysis that follows is an effort to advance this piece of the conversation.

This dissertation project and theoretical framework contributes to 1) the sociology of race and critical White studies by identifying ways Whiteness is constructed through reproducing and transforming enactments of Whiteness that, respectively, reinforce norms of Whiteness and, through a rearticulation of Whiteness, challenge their hegemonic influence. This dynamic offers insight into the long standing sociological inquiry into the interplay between structure and agency by identifying mechanisms that demonstrate how agency both supports and alters larger social structures, and how structures constrain this movement. The struggles translating transforming pedagogy into practice described by the white faculty in this study provide an opportunity to examine these points of movement where agency starts to push against structure. This research also contributes to 2) the field of Higher Education by identifying transforming pedagogical practices that can inform and facilitate the incorporation of anti-racism pedagogy by individual faculty or through larger faculty development efforts at this level of educational attainment.

To this end, I present a theoretical framework grounded in literature and interview data that identify what everyday enactments of Whiteness look like when they take place in a pedagogical context. I apply this framework in a qualitative examination of interviews on teaching in diverse classrooms with 18 white faculty from a large Midwestern research university who have been formally and informally recognized for their teaching success fostering intellectual development on a culturally diverse campus. Through this analysis, I identified 291 enactments of Whiteness and 70 expressions of struggles implementing transforming enactments in pedagogical practice. I use these data to suggest that White dominance is reproduced through enactments of Whiteness that reflect limited racial awareness and White supremacy. Transforming enactments of Whiteness are also present among this faculty group. In these latter practices, Whiteness is rearticulated as enactments that challenge White hegemony through pedagogical practices that express racial awareness and challenge White supremacy. Engagement in reproducing or transforming pedagogical practices is not mutually exclusive: both types of enactments of Whiteness are evident in the majority of the faculty's descriptions of their pedagogical practices. Enactments of Whiteness are also influenced by other identity and group memberships. Interwoven in my analysis is an investigation of how the intersections of gender, discipline and Whiteness shape how white men and women in the natural sciences, humanities and social sciences engage Whiteness in their pedagogical practices.

This group of faculty is an ideal group with which to start this analytic project because as individuals with a Euro-American cultural background, they are a group that has most clearly been influenced by and conferred the norms of Whiteness that in turn

grant privileges within the racial hierarchy of our society. In other words, they have been taught to be white, and to take for granted the privileges this social identity guarantees. This is not to say that this group of white faculty act on their White privilege because they are essentialized white beings. In fact, the findings of this study indicate that many also challenge White hegemony and struggle to transform White dominance. They act on White privilege because they were born into and benefit from a society where racial identity is constructed in such a way that physical characteristics carry implications of social standing; Whiteness grants a position of advantage and being of color grants a position of disadvantage.

Along with other group memberships (gender, ethnicity, class, sexuality), aspects of social location mitigate and complicate this dichotomy to be sure. A particularly significant factor among this group of faculty is the elite status they hold as tenure track faculty (some tenured full professors) at a prestigious Extensive Research (R-1) university institution. Additionally, each was either awarded for successful teaching in diverse classrooms or was recognized by their peers as effective teachers in this setting. Their attention to diversity suggests a certain level (or implication) of progressive social and or political perspective with heightened awareness of racial dynamics. The reproducing enactments of Whiteness found among this group give insight into the persistence of White hegemony even among a highly educated, recognized and relatively progressive group. The transforming enactments of Whiteness evident in their interviews sheds light on how white faculty recognized for successful teaching in diverse environments are using pedagogy to challenge White hegemony. While the specificity of this group limits generalizability, it also provides an opportunity to explore our

theoretical understanding of processes that reinforce White hegemony, ways Whiteness is being rearticulated to challenge this structure, and how educators can interrupt White hegemony and challenge the ideology of White supremacy.

In the next chapter, I present literature on the intersection of Whiteness and pedagogy and a theoretical framework I developed by drawing on this literature and through thematic readings of the data. I use this framework to organize the enactments of Whiteness I identify in the pedagogical practices the white faculty in this study describe. The methodology I used in this effort is also outlined. The following three chapters offer interpretive analyses of the data as reproducing enactments of Whiteness in pedagogical practice, transforming enactments of Whiteness in pedagogical practice, and the struggles of translating transforming pedagogy into practice, respectively. Although I discuss the intersection of gender and discipline where particularly salient in the findings, I do not attempt a comparative analysis between enactments of Whiteness across gender or discipline. The small sample size limits this analysis. Once cross-sectioned across identity groupings based on gender and 3 disciplines, the groups become too small for in-depth analysis, but remain large enough to provide a window into the relevance and necessary insight garnered from this intersectional analysis. In Chapter 6 I present a discussion of the theoretical implications of these data for the way Whiteness is defined and practiced by white faculty and suggest ways these definitions and practices can broaden our understanding of how Whiteness can be renegotiated to challenge its hegemonic influence. I conclude this final chapter with strategies for practicing transforming pedagogy, offer some thoughts on how this analysis can inform faculty development, and point to implications for further research. Now, I turn to literature on

Whiteness, Higher Education and pedagogy to establish a foundation for the analysis and discussions to come.

Whiteness in Higher Education

Critical race theory (CRT) (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001) provides a framework for understanding the structural underpinnings of race by critically examining how race is used to organize society. Critical White Studies are an offshoot of this body of thought. The focus here is also on understanding the racial structure, but more on “...what it means to be White, how Whiteness became established legally, how certain groups moved in and out of the category of Whiteness, the phenomenon of White power and White supremacy, and the automatic privileges that come with membership in the dominant race” (Delgado & Stefancic 2001, p. 74). White studies have evolved to include a range of dimensions within this focus. Doane (2003) and others (Bonilla-Silva, 2006; Dovidio & Gaertner, 1986; McConaghy, 1986; Schuman, Steeh, Bobo & Krysan, 1997; Kinder & Sears, 1981) argue that while Whiteness has lost some of its opaqueness through this examination, new efforts to conceal Whiteness have emerged (e.g., “identity vacuum” experienced by Whites, color-blind ideology, new forms of racism). Roediger (2006) asserts that the focus of critical studies of Whiteness has shifted from political and moral investigations toward historical inquiry into the production and reproduction of Whiteness. I use these data to expand this focus by examining contemporary practices of production that are clearly rooted in traditional, and thus historical, norms.

In a review CRT in education, Dixson and Rousseau (2005) found that the struggle to end racism is present in education only in the form of recommendation

without implementation of specific actions. Transforming pedagogical practice is one way educators can engage in anti-racist work. Understanding the connections between Whiteness, race, and the racial hierarchy in society has become imperative to efforts of decentering Whiteness and recognizing it as identity as well as a power structure in society (Doane, 2003). A CRT approach to pedagogy is one way to challenge the epistemologies of race that support a structure of White dominance (Chaisson, 2004, Yosso, 2005). The history and construction of Whiteness in the U.S., including the relational aspect of Whiteness to Blackness, the interactional realities of Whiteness in everyday life, the elusiveness and multiplicity of Whiteness and how Whiteness shapes access to resources such as educational attainment, are all starting points for a critical examination of Whiteness. Drawing on aspects of these approaches, I focus on the social construction of Whiteness in the United States as a system of hegemony that perpetuates itself, in part, through interactional enactments of Whiteness that are part of the policies and practices of social institutions.

The construction of race and the resulting racial structure is an iterative process. Race is defined through intersecting structural processes, which serve to reinforce and normalize the notion of race, validate the racial structure, and fortify the structural processes that result.² As a result, it becomes difficult to determine where race began. Essentialists (see Hernstein & Murray, 1994) answer this query by asserting that race is an intrinsic characteristic to which society has adapted: on this basis social positions and

² For example, education was outlawed during slavery. As a result normative values around being educated (or being civilized) were placed out of reach for slaves. Today, there is still a gap between whites and blacks in terms of education – in test scores and attainment. The social structures that created these race based differences (slavery, segregation, suburbanization, school funding) are often not considered by whites, but the corresponding consequences are noticed and become justifications for these structures and other comparable social policies.

inequalities are viewed as a natural result of racial difference. However, social constructionists contend that race is socially defined (Cornell, 1996; Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Fine, 1997; Frankenberg, 1993; Hall, 1996; Martin, 1991; Montejano, 1987; Omi & Winant, 1994). From this perspective, social positions and inequalities are a result of social processes that have used racial distinctions as justification for differential treatment. Where practices of domination/subordination and the resulting hierarchies are viewed by the former position as part of the natural order, the latter argues that such practices are generated through reactions to socially based circumstances. The essentialist approach takes a linear view that originates with biological distinctions. Constructionists consider the way society continually shapes and defines difference. I approach race from a constructionist position, and as such, I am met with the challenge of establishing a starting point for discussing race. Every place of entry is an interruption of the larger schematic. Thus, discussing race becomes a dynamic endeavor, one that is itself iterative, circular, and relational.

The exclusion or inclusion of groups from or into White citizenship through practices of domination is the clearest example of the relational construction of race in the United States. While some argue that Whiteness predates the establishment of race-based slavery in colonial America (Degler, 1972; Gossett, 1965; Jordan, 1968;), others contend that Whiteness was defined through the social practices and legal changes that positioned Black as slave and White as non-slave (Morgan, 1975; Thompson, 1975; Williams, 1966). Some proponents of the latter position also argue that the very foundation of the racial structure lies in the construction of Whiteness: in defining non-White, White was also defined (Lewis, 2002). Not only was color and country of origin

linked to ethnicity and race, but it also became a symbol of supposed civility, genetic superiority, and justified privilege for Whites (Gossett, 1965). In the United States, Whiteness was constructed through the delineation of savage from civilized, slave from non-slave, and non-Anglo Saxon from Anglo Saxon. And inherent in this separation was the larger project of domination. Dominance was fortified not through mere numbers alone, but rather through a strengthened sense of a superior White racial identity (Roediger, 2005). With the establishment of White and non-White came perpetual bondage through the establishment of a racial hierarchy in the United States.

This hierarchy is maintained through the continuation of dominance through the laws and social practices established by Whites *primarily* for their own benefit even if participation by individual whites in these practices is unconscious and the differential outcomes that result are unintended. As Lewis (2002) argues, “race would not exist without racism – the racialization of Whites is inherently about domination and exclusion because the category’s very existence is dependent on the continuation of the oppressive racialized social system” (p. 1). The notion that Whites are superior to non-Whites, and the social and legal practices enacted to support this claim serve to constantly reinforce a racial structure based on White supremacy. This structure takes the form of a racial hierarchy where Whites are advantaged and non-Whites are disadvantaged *because of their racial classification* (Bonilla-Silva, 2006). Through a system of domination, Whites are positioned apart from and above Blacks and other people of color. This project of domination is dependent on the process of racial formation and is maintained through larger social forces such as the economic, employment, legal, and educational structures, as well as through individual acts (Omi & Winant, 1994).

Fine (1997) encourages a relational examination of race relations, one that examines the system of race dynamics and supports the argument that White privilege is accumulated through an institutional web of advantage for Whites. In this theoretical approach, she makes four assertions. First, she argues that institutions such as the economy and the educational system not only maintain Whiteness, but create it *in the next generation* as well. Second, in these structures, Whiteness is “co produced” with non-White racial/ethnic groups in that the relational dynamic where Whiteness equals advantage and Blackness equals deficit creates disparity between groups based on racial classification. Whiteness does not exist without the other (i.e., Blackness or non-White racial identity) just as advantage cannot exist without disadvantage. Third, relational positions of Whiteness and Blackness require that they be studied as a system, rather than on their own. To fully represent this shift in analysis, Fine calls for a more complex re-positioning of Whiteness as a dependent variable³ rather than as an independent variable which is the common research approach. Instead of seeing race (i.e., Whiteness or Blackness) as an essential aspect of one’s identity that affects other factors (i.e. income, education), Fine argues that race is created by societal factors such as institutional structures and practices and policies (e.g., housing segregation and ability tracking in education⁴) based in Whiteness that serve to create and maintain racial identity and

³ Fine (1997) does not use the term dependent variable but implies such in her description of how social scientist study race and how this should change: “If we—that is, psychologist and educators—persist in our analyses “as if” races/ethnicities were distinct, separable, and independent rather than produced, coupled, and ranked, then we will continue to “discover” that white kids (or adults) “have it” (whatever it is) and students/workers of color don’t” (p. 64).

⁴ Housing segregation is an example, as is ability tracking in education. Social locations become associated with different racial identities. Those identities are defined by the characteristics of these locations. In this way, racial identity absorbs the characteristics that surround it. People of color live in housing projects, which are designed, deliberately or not, in a way that promote crime through overcrowding and built in economically strained urban centers. These racial identities become deviant through this association with crime and the related negative characteristics. Students of color are stereotyped as less intelligent than

corresponding inequalities: instead of race as a determinant of shifts in dependent variables such as levels of educational attainment, the construction of race is dependent on levels of educational attainment. From this view, how much education one attains impacts how one is raced (e.g., limited educational attainment implies minority racial status and high levels of attainment can result in the authenticity of racial identity being questioned) rather than one's race predicting one's educational attainment (e.g., minority status implies limited access, interest, or ability to attain high levels of education). As such, institutions support the perpetuation of racial inequality and the racial markers that result. This is not a strictly linear relationship the terms independent and dependent imply. Both racial identity and social institutions are interconnected in shaping one's social locations and sense of self. Fine asserts this relational dynamic in her fourth point. Institutional structures create an individual and group sense of race, individual racial identities and collective racial tensions. Yet, once institutionalized, the *interplay* between the institution, the individual, and the collective is lost, leaving the status quo unquestioned. Institutionalized racism naturalizes White superiority and the need for others to conform to associated norms. The institutionalized raced and gendered messages embedded within the professionalization process integral to gaining acceptance in these spaces go unrecognized and the identities and related collective tensions lose salience in light of the entrenched policies and practices, *which were created on the basis of racial difference to begin with*⁵.

white students and are therefore presumed to belong in low or middle level classes in school. Normative assumptions associated with these classes within the academic hierarchy are then attributed to the students enrolled in them regardless of their actual ability. See (Feagin & Feagin, 1986; Feagin, 2000) for a more extensive discussion on forms of institutional discrimination.

⁵ For example, Thompson (1975) argues that the labor structure of a plantation social system creates a situation in which race is constructed, is used, in order to control and ensure the existence of a labor force through slavery. Because the advantaged class became reliant on the need for a low cost, continual source

Fine (1997) contends that while access to social institutions is broadening for people of color, the institutions themselves perpetuate Whiteness as normative. While racism against people of color appears to be abated through policies aimed at increasing access, racism for Whites, or the perpetuation of White privilege, is ever present. Whites see themselves as individually non-oppressive but too often fail to recognize the structures of inequality resulting from their collective privilege. She argues that we have not examined how the very institutions where we are fighting for equal access and opportunity for people of color create and maintain Whiteness as privilege camouflaged as merit (i.e., raises, promotion, employment status, respect). Who is in the building might have changed but the value of their skin has not. In fact, despite intentions in Higher Education to create a more inclusive campus, Iverson (2007) and others (Morfin, Perez, Parker, Marvin, & Arrona, 2006) argue that these policies can secure patterns of exclusion and inequality. The system of Whiteness remains.

Even at institutions of color White dominance can be a factor. Foster (2001) suggests that the influence of Whiteness that comes with white faculty teaching at HBCU institutions threatens the ability of these institutions to successful meet their mission of

of labor to protect their profits, they created a myth of racial hierarchy to support the enslavement of one group by another. In other words, the economic security secured through a system of slavery led to the creation of a social structure (i.e., racial hierarchy supported by the hegemony of Whiteness) that delineated people as Black slaves and White owners. Applying Fine's (1997) argument, one could argue that the racial hierarchy created under slavery remains a part of our social structure, in the legacy of racial inequality as well as in the way Whiteness is created and reinforced through institutional and social practices. The hegemony of Whiteness supports continued racialization as a way to maintain privilege. White privilege is justified and reproduced through a sense of entitlement established through opposition to and denigration of other racial groups. The myth of White superiority continues through the institutional racial inequality embedded in the social structures of society, such as the educational and employment systems. The results are conditions of disadvantage (i.e., poverty, cultural deviance, consequences of discrimination) that are interpreted by Whites as validation for the belief in the superiority of Whites and inferiority of non-Whites.

educating and empowering African Americans. One reason may be that while institutions make claims to support diversity, they do not typically see or look for ways the institution's policies, practice or culture reinforces the exclusion and inequality that result from a system of White hegemony (Stanley, 2006). This project is an effort to address Fine's call to focus on institutions as spaces where White hegemony is constructed and maintained through a relational system of differential advantage and disadvantage between racial groups. By identifying ways Whiteness is reproduced and transformed through pedagogical practices, we can achieve greater transparency around how the construction of Whiteness is reinforced and how it can be rearticulated in ways that challenge instead of maintain its hegemonic influence.

Drawing on Hall's (1996) analysis of new ethnicities, Giroux (1997) argues for a rearticulation of Whiteness that acknowledges the interconnections between Whiteness and other social forces, including dynamics of power and multiplicity of identities in an effort to show white students (and other individuals and institutions) a path towards transformation. The focus on diversity and multiculturalism in academia, activism, and public discourse has been primarily on individuals' social group memberships (i.e., race, ethnicity, gender, social class, sexuality, able bodied). The experience of having membership in more than one social identity groups, of being poor and a person of color is recognized, but often in an additive approach in terms of being a double or triple minority. Recently more has been written about the intersection of these memberships (Andersen & Hill-Collins, 2004; Frankenberg, 1993; Hill-Collins, 1990; hooks, 1981, 1989; Jordon, 2001; Moraga, 2001).

The multiple identities within groups are relevant to lived experiences. There is not a monolithic Black, Asian American, Latino, or Native American experience nor is there a monolithic White experience. Most of us hold a combination of agent and target group memberships, thus experiencing advantage in some ways and disadvantage in others (i.e., someone who is upper-class and Latina, lower-class and white, gay and white)⁶. Doing so also helps us question the normative assumptions of Whiteness. Under this new framework we are able to experience our different memberships as fluid, and the multiplicity and intersectionality of identities is affirmed (Harris & Sims, 2002; Perry, 2002). Even when difference in experience is acknowledged it may be solely attributed to non-racial identity memberships, such as social class or sexuality. Yet, through analysis that incorporates multiplicity, it also becomes clear that not all middle class individuals or all gay men have the same experience⁷. The same is true of white faculty members.

It is important to draw out the stark and nuanced distinctions within and between groups as well as how institutional structures shape these differences (Fine, 1997). By recognizing the multiplicity of White identity, Whiteness becomes more salient as a racial identity within our racial structure that co-exists with other structures of domination and difference (e.g. gender, discipline). Bringing forth the impact of other group identities on lived experience serves to destabilize the dominance of Whiteness. Certainly the privilege remains, but its nuances are exposed. Commonality of experience

⁶ Target groups are those identity groups that are disadvantaged in society because of their place within power structures. Agent identity groups are those groups that are advantaged because of their place within the power structure.

⁷ In other words, what is the experience of being a poor woman of color versus a middle-class white man? How does the interplay between race and gender impact the experience of being poor, middle-class or, for that matter, heterosexual, lesbian, bisexual, gay, trans, or queer? How is having a physical disability different from having a mental disability and how does either differ from holding neither? Does this change if the person is Christian or Muslim?

can no longer be used as generating common goals and practices. The identification and articulation of variations within a powerful group whether political, religious or otherwise, can threaten its dominance⁸. In this way, recognition of the variations of Whiteness can threaten White supremacy. The danger of this analysis, of course, is to overshadow the constant within every variation of Whiteness; White privilege. Whiteness carries privilege, regardless of existing within a combination of target, or subordinate, identities⁹. The salience of Whiteness remains. However, drawing attention to the range of social locations in which Whites reside makes it easier to recognize that all Whites do not have the same experience, and thus the White experience cannot be the normal experience in society. This informs my analysis of how gender and disciplinary positions impact how Whiteness is experienced and navigated. By drawing attention to how these norms influence the enactments of Whiteness by white faculty who hold different gendered positions in different disciplinary fields I can draw attention to the ways Whiteness intersects with these positions and further question the normative assumptions of Whiteness.

Conveying Whiteness through Pedagogical Practice

Pedagogical practice is a useful focus for examining how Whiteness is reproduced because it is where the formal and informal norms of society come together in a place of learning; students are taught culturally relevant content and culturally established norms

⁸ Target groups seek out solidarity in order to gain greater power through their collective voice and presence. For this reason, recognition of the multiplicity of identities within target groups can also be seen as a threat to group power.

⁹ Similarly, a non-White racial identity carries with it societal disadvantage regardless of the agent, or dominant, identities with which it is combined. An upper-class Black man may have the power of the dollar on his side, but his racial identity will still deny him racial privilege. He may be able to pay the country club dues, but the doors may still remain locked.

of interaction. The practices of white faculty in this study provide a particularly revealing examination because their White privilege affords them heightened legitimacy as gatekeepers of education/knowledge in a predominantly White institution that carries great influence on access to cultural capital (Bourdieu & Passeron, 2000/1977). Pedagogical practice is also the principal way white professors enact and confer Whiteness as they work and relate in the classroom. It includes the way faculty engage in interactions with students - how they relate with white students and students of color as they select and present classroom material, conduct student assessments, utilize particular teaching approaches or tactics, make and act on assumptions about student learning styles and achievement, and formally and informally engage with students. In this way the educational institution, in the person of the faculty, makes explicit the distinction between who is privileged due to race and who is not, who is granted access (to education, employment, opportunity, equality) and who is threatened (by unemployment, inequality, violence), who is deemed worthy and unworthy, who has or can be expected to have talent and merit and who does not. Faculty, especially white faculty, learn their pedagogical craft in ways that consciously or (most often) unconsciously serve this racial priority.

Often faculty adhere to a call for cultural tolerance. This is a common approach to diversity in education but often perpetuates the invisibility of Whiteness by focusing on people of color 'fitting in' with 'White ways' and white people being 'understanding of others'. An underlying assumption here is if people of color learn to assimilate to White norms, they will succeed. Difference is often acknowledged or celebrated, but seldom understood in terms of various groups' histories or experiences of oppression and

privilege. Rarely is Whiteness itself named and examined. Individual (or groups of) white students, their parents, school faculties and administrators, and the dominant social structure in society may occasionally be named as perpetrators of discrimination, prejudice, and racism. But what often goes unnamed is the institutional oppression and unearned White privilege embedded in higher education (e.g., in student admissions, hiring and retention of faculty of color, dominant norms and styles of teaching, differential experiences of white faculty and faculty of color, or of white students and students of color, etc.), which reflect the overarching hegemony of Whiteness (Chesler et al., 2005; Feagin & Feagin, 1986; Johnson, 2006; Maher & Tetreault, 2003; Wise, 2005).

The issue of power is largely avoided in these examinations and the context of how and why this inequality happens is not addressed. The individual *who happens to be white* may be blamed for individual expressions of prejudice or acts of discrimination, but the larger social force of Whiteness, within which they (and we) live, is relieved of responsibility through omission. It follows that the questioning gaze of white people often falls on those individuals and groups *already* faced with disadvantage. Responsibility is placed on people of color for the conditions that have been thrust upon them by a racial structure in which Whiteness dominates; and the ramifications for white people's own racial identity go unrecognized and uninterrogated. Spaces of learning in higher education are not exempt from this pattern. Wise (2005) argues that white people need to refocus attention onto their own Whiteness instead of fixing people of color. Spaces of higher education are places where transforming practices can be modeled and society can be changed. According to Giroux (1997),

As white youth struggle to find a cultural and political space from which to speak and act as transformative citizens, educators should think about what it means pedagogically and politically, in order to help students redefine whiteness as part of a democratic cultural politics (p. 313).

Some white faculty, and more than some faculty of color, have elected to incorporate pedagogical practices that challenge the reproduction of White dominance (see Bell, Washington, Weinstein, & Griffin, 1997; Mayberry, 1996; TuSmith & Reddy, 2002).

When white professors use transforming pedagogy, they are modeling an alternative to the normative practices of Whiteness that reproduce racial inequality.

Yet, disclosing, deconstructing, and challenging Whiteness can create discomfort for instructors as well as students, as it is likely to be a new experience for both.

Whiteness as the unnamed norm lies within the professor and within the student, and is embedded into the very classroom where the professor and student encounter one another. Students come from a White-dominated society and enter into another realm of the domain of Whiteness when they enter into a college classroom¹⁰ (TuSmith and Reddy, 2002). This manifestation of the pervasiveness of Whiteness may go unrecognized by some White faculty, even those who assume that their pedagogical philosophy in and of itself creates an inclusive classroom. What is often lacking here is the recognition that the inherent authority of Whiteness in the racial structure of society and higher education influences the power dynamics within university settings, including the classroom, and in the structure and culture of the institution (Reddy, 2002). Indeed,

¹⁰ HBCUs and HLUs offer some students of color a way to distance from the hegemony of Whiteness even if dominant society labels these institutions as inferior. This labeling of HBCUs and HLUs as inferior is itself an example of a double enactment of whiteness because of the label itself and because other schools are not labeled HWCUs and only recognized as PWIs (predominantly white institutions) within particular liberal academic circles.

the prevalence of Whiteness is in the course material and in relations between students, but it is also between professor and student and in the environment itself (Reddy, 2002).

Reddy (2002) asserts the need for faculty to dismantle the White privilege they are granted as White instructors. However, she acknowledges the difficulty of distinguishing between authority based in White privilege and instructor authority based in a faculty member's role within the structure of an academic course. Is the power White professors employ in the classroom based in the privilege held as a white person, or the authority held as an instructor¹¹? Since higher education, after all, is an institution created within a structure of White supremacy, it takes effort to disentangle the two (Chesler & Young, 2007), especially when the instructor's authority is impacted by other social identities, such as race or gender (Reddy, 2002). A white, female professor is not likely to be viewed or treated with the same level of authority in the classroom as a white, male professor (Reddy, 2002). That said, white faculty are granted a level of authority that is not usually experienced by faculty of color, despite their shared professional position.

When the (often hidden) rules of Whiteness are under direct attack, they typically are met with institutional and individual resistance that prevents significant change. Boudreau and Eggleston (2002) recount the challenges to the introduction of an antiracist and diversity-related pedagogy into a freshman seminar course at a small, predominantly White college. Their attempt to make this curriculum change was resisted via appeals to the maintenance of traditional forms of curricular practice and pedagogy (as well as by covert challenge). Feagin and Feagin (1986) label this dynamic of resistance "indirect institutional discrimination", whereby institutional practices which result in or maintain

¹¹ Freire (2002) argues that the traditional authority professors assume is illegitimate in that it is created through the structure of domination (white supremacy) on which traditional ideologies of education are based.

inequality are created or sustained even though this may not have been their original or manifest intent. The system of White dominance is reproduced, in part, because it is embedded in society's power relations and culture and is kept elusive by structures and practices that support White privilege in institutions as well as in micro level interactions that take place every day, including in college classrooms.

However, Whiteness can be and is being reshaped by efforts inside and out of the classroom to transform this established, historically entrenched system by recognizing and challenging its hegemony. There is growing recognition of and dialogue around the need for transforming pedagogy and how to implement it in the college classroom (see Mayberry, 1996; TuSmith & Reddy, 2002). These efforts are not made without struggle (McKinney, 2002; TuSmith & Reddy, 2002). White faculty who confront White hegemony in their pedagogical practices do so within a structure of institutional norms which reflect, and thus support, White hegemony (McKinney, 2002; TuSmith & Reddy, 2002). The struggles the white faculty in this study discuss confirm that changing patterns of White hegemony in pedagogical practice does not come easily. It involves personal racial awareness and a willingness to go through the paces of learning how to break normative patterns. Learning about these struggles gives us a better understanding of how faculty development efforts can support both white faculty and faculty of color in their process of learning and practicing transforming pedagogy. In the next chapter I present the theoretical framework I created and the methodology I used to explore some of the ways Whiteness is enacted in the pedagogical practices of this particular group of white faculty.

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND METHODOLOGY

The focus of this study is the dynamic interplay between structure and behavior – the macro and micro dialectic between the structural force of Whiteness and the personal and interactional manifestations of this structure. As Lewis (2002) argues, this attention to structure is essential to the study of Whiteness *because Whiteness and its enactment in particular ideas, attitudes and behaviors depends on the structure of domination*. For this reason, attention to both the structure and particular acts of domination becomes essential to understanding the category of Whiteness, and specific to this study, how Whiteness is manifested in the pedagogical practices of white faculty.

I see Whiteness as a structural force that impacts the pedagogical practice of white faculty. From this perspective, the pedagogical practices of white faculty have the potential to support the racial hierarchy by reinforcing White hegemony and to rearticulate Whiteness in a way that challenges this structure of dominance. It is necessary to look at Whiteness within higher education in order to further develop a critical consciousness of what it means to be white in our society, and not because a focus on Whiteness or the experiences of white faculty is more valuable than a focus on Blackness or the experiences of faculty of color. It is important to continue the documentation of inequality; however, there also needs to be more research that furthers our understanding of the policies and practices that are the structural underpinning of

dominant group behavior in order to make visible patterns of White hegemony and resulting racial inequality. Greater clarity and recognition of these patterns can intensify efforts to disrupt this structural force.

In order to better understand this dynamic, I applied the theoretical framework of enactments of Whiteness generated from the data and the literature outlined below in qualitative analyses of the pedagogical practices white faculty described in face-to-face semi-structured interviews. As such, the unit of analysis in this study is enactments of Whiteness rather than white individuals. I used coding procedures associated with grounded methodology (Glaser & Strauss, 1969) that also included iterative data analyses in which I moved between the literature, broad thematic categories and the more specific nuances that comprise these general groupings (Emerson, Fretz & Shaw, 1995). I describe the data sample, data collection and data analyses in detail later in the chapter.

Enactments of Whiteness in Pedagogical Practice

My review of the literature on Whiteness and how this construct organizes higher education and pedagogical practice, along with thematic readings of the interviews led me to create the category system reflected in Figure 1. This framework is illustrated in terms of general, or every day, enactments of Whiteness (column 1) and in terms of how these same enactments are manifest in white faculty members' classroom pedagogical strategies (column 2). I categorize these enactments as either reproducing or transforming depending on whether they serve to reinforce or potentially challenge White hegemony. The emergence of these groupings was gradual throughout the project. Initially I wondered what everyday enactments of Whiteness looked like in pedagogical practice

and how enactments of Whiteness in this context served to perpetuate White hegemony. I generated the reproducing enactment categories from my knowledge of Whiteness literature at the beginning of the project. As I examined the interviews, I began to recognize that Whiteness was also enacted in ways that challenge White hegemony instead of only reproduce it. I then labeled these as transforming enactments, established categories as they emerged and mirrored these categories with the reproducing framework. I describe the categories of reproducing and transforming enactments of Whiteness here and elaborate on each area further in Chapters 3 and 4 where I apply the enactments of Whiteness framework in an empirical analysis of the pedagogical practices white faculty report using in the classroom. The boundaries between categories within the larger groupings of reproducing and transforming enactments are not absolute or indisputable. Examples of one type could well be interpreted as associated with another. I have drawn the boundaries here in an effort to clarify their meaning rather than restrict their application to the data.

Reproducing Enactments of Whiteness in Pedagogical Practice

I identify two broad themes that capture some of the ways enactments of Whiteness sustain and reproduce the structure of White hegemony: enactments that 1) reflect limited racial awareness and 2) reflect White supremacy.

Limited Racial Awareness

Drawing on the literature and data, I discuss the following three enactments of Whiteness that reflect limited racial awareness: 1) ignorance and obliviousness, 2) denial of difference and dominance, and 3) voluntary attention to difference and dominance.

(1) Ignorance and obliviousness: In general, Whiteness is reproduced through ignorance and obliviousness when white people claim ignorance or are unaware of difference. Whether intentional or not, whites' obliviousness to race-based issues and inequities, including their own privilege (Bonilla-Silva & Forman, 2000; Crenshaw, 1997; Headley, 2004; McIntosh, 1989), and declarations of ignorance or unawareness of racial-ethnic structures and norms (Forman & Lewis, 2006; McIntosh, 1989), serve to minimize racism and maintain dominance. According to Flagg (1993), "The most striking characteristic of whites' consciousness of Whiteness is that most of the time we don't have any....to be white is not to think about it" (p. 957).

In pedagogical practice, this form of Whiteness is reproduced when white faculty remain ignorant or resistant to recognizing their White privilege, racial inequality, racial difference within education, and the value of diversity in the classroom (Chesler et al., 2005; Margolis & Romero, 1998). In commenting on the invisibility of Whiteness, Lippin (2006) suggests that while teaching courses in ethnicity "my whiteness was so 'subject' to me, that I couldn't see it...There is greater danger that lies in unacknowledged and unexamined points of view. What we do not bring to consciousness has even greater power to influence us. Without recognition we remain in unwitting collusion with our own unconscious, unexamined perspectives" (pp. 110-111).

(2) Denial of difference and dominance: When white people deny or minimize racial difference and inequality they are reproducing Whiteness by assuming its normative presence in society. The power of Whiteness is sustained further when racial prejudice or discrimination is defined as the inappropriate actions of a few white people and the operations of a system of oppression and dominance is denied or minimized

(Bobo, Kleugel & Smith, 1997; Bonilla-Silva, 2001; Crenshaw, 1997; Terry, 1981). Such reasoning is most evident in the adoption by white people of a color-blind attitude about race (Bonilla-Silva, 2001). Thus, the status quo of White dominance and privilege is interpreted as a 'natural' phenomenon and not as a consequence of the operation of racial power and influence. In fact, Mills' (1997) argues that this constitutes an epistemology of ignorance whereby whites' remain ignorant of the 'racial contract' and thereby innocent of involvement in any racially discriminatory acts or policies.

The acceptance of normative epistemological assumptions in academia reinforces and supports the application of a color-blind ideology to pedagogical practice. White faculty extend this assumption through pedagogical practices that deny or minimize the race-based power differentials between professor and students, and between students of different identities. In the face of such an approach by white faculty, the pressure to assert the realities of life of students' of color is placed squarely on their own shoulders. The weight of presenting this argument is likely to silence many students. Moreover, when students do raise such issues they may promote defensiveness or denial on the part of the white faculty member: as articulated by O'Brien (2006), "...when I became the class' next example of the unintentional discriminator, I felt my whole identity as a white antiracist called into question. My internal reaction was the typical white stance of defensiveness" (pp. 84-5).

(3) *Voluntary attention to difference and domination:* A somewhat unique variant of denial is evident in the tendency for White people to see their own racial identity and others' racial oppression when it is convenient for them and act on it when it is safe for them to do so, but close their eyes and turn their backs when it is challenging or

threatening to them (Yancey, 2004). Their racial awareness is optional and voluntary in a society that does not mark them or their cultural practices as unique and thus they do not consider themselves and their practices as unique (Waters, 1990). As a result white people may claim the primacy of identities linked to gender, religion, socioeconomic class, ethnicity or national origin when their White privilege and power is 'outed' or threatened and they feel defensive: then their ethnicity may be constructed as a story of parallel oppression and struggle, as "immigrant tales" (Gallagher, 1995). The result is avoidance or denial of membership in the privileged or oppressive social category of Whiteness. Such voluntary racial awareness is also reflected in Johnson's (2006) discussion of the 'privilege paradox': here white people may recognize on an intellectual level that white people have certain objective privileges, but fail to internalize this understanding at a subjective level of awareness of such privilege in their own lives.

White faculty also exhibit this paradox and privilege of choice it affords them and other white people by deciding when and when not to engage in racial issues (Wagner, 2005). In pedagogical practice, white faculty recognize, value and address race and racial issues on their terms and according to their timing. This may be particularly common in disciplines where a focus on race is considered secondary or unrelated. An example is the process by which issues of women of color were not considered in Women Studies and feminist course material (or the movement generally) until women of color gave voice to this negation (Hill-Collins, 1990; Lorde, 1984) and white women could no longer sidestep the issue (Frankenberg, 1993; Srivastava, 2005).

Reflecting White Supremacy

Whiteness is also reproduced through actions that reflect White supremacy. I identify two categories that capture the way some of these actions are discussed in the literature and were evident in the data: 1) acts of omission that maintain White hegemony by applying White norms to everyone, and 2) acts of commission that disempower others through demonstrations of White privilege and oppression.

(1) Acts of omission: Similar to the denial of difference and dominance discussed above, are acts of omission that maintain White hegemony by applying White norms to everyone. But, where the former denies difference, this enactment takes the assumption of White norms to a different level by assuming that White norms are universally viewed as the standard by which lived experiences are judged. When white people apply their own perceptions and preferred practices to all people and situations, asserting or accepting their perspective as *the* social reality or source of common sense, and draw connections with others based only on their experiences, knowledge, and worldview, the apparent normalness of these rules and guidelines is reinforced (Bush, 2004; Doane, 2003; Headley, 2004; Tatum, 1997). People who are different, or who act in ways not included in White assumptions and understandings, are absent or invisible, exoticized and diminished as well as poorly understood.

This can be seen in the pedagogical practice of white faculty when they assume their own way of learning, their educational experiences and expectations, and their personal references are shared by all (Chesler et al. 2005). Students of color can be excluded when white professors use examples that are not familiar to them or do not represent them. Johnsrud & Sadao (1998) argue that this elite form of White racism is often reflected in

white faculty members' "adherence to dominant norms, values, and ideologies that made no room for different cultures and/or world views" (quoted in Allen, Epps, Guillory, Suh & Stassen, 2002, p. 16). Similarly, Hunter (2002) suggests that "The unspoken knowledge systems of whites and men dominate and regulate the content of race and ethnicity courses. The knowledge bases are unspoken because they are often taken for granted assumptions that remain unquestioned by the instructor and/or the students" (pp. 256-7).

(2) *Acts of commission*: Disempowering others through explicit demonstrations of White privilege and oppression is an overt way to reproduce White supremacy. Traditional acts of commission, or active and overt expression of White supremacy, often look like 'old-fashioned' racism, which in most educated circles has disappeared or gone underground. More common currently, white people may support fair play rhetorically or with regard to abstract policy issues but carry the remnants of implicit prejudice in their everyday actions (Bonilla-Silva, 2006; Schuman et al., 1997).

This can be done in the classroom or in interactions with students when white faculty employ pedagogical practices that, intentionally or not, secure and sustain the power of Whiteness. In terms of acts of commission, white professors may manifest Whiteness by consciously ignoring students of color, not calling on them or cutting them off, ignoring racist undertones or overt incidents, and/or dismissing their concerns regarding a particular content issue or the course in general. For example, Scheurich & Young argue that (2002) "...if a college professor makes a racial slur during a class lecture, this is seen as overt racism...a public, conscious and intended act" (p. 223). But they also draw attention to the operation of covert racism, wherein "...a professor may consciously

choose not to mentor a Mexican American doctoral student...because of racial biases” (ibid). In the latter case the bias is not readily apparent and may be disguised by provision of an ‘acceptable’ reason for the behavior, such as a concern about English language proficiency or different areas of interest. The very invisibility and impenetrability of such bias may be even more damaging to the student since it is more difficult to challenge this subtle form of racism, especially given the racial and status power differentials between the professor and student.

Transforming Enactments of Whiteness in Pedagogical Practice

I identify two broad themes evident in the data and literature that capture some of the ways enactments of Whiteness interrupt and challenge the structure of White hegemony: enactments that 1) express racial awareness and 2) challenge White Supremacy.

Expressing Racial Awareness

Drawing on the data and literature, I discuss the following three enactments of Whiteness that indicate expressions of racial awareness: 1) disclosing personal Whiteness, 2) acknowledging and attending to plurality, and 3) revealing patterns of White hegemony.

(1) Disclosing personal Whiteness: White people challenge the hegemony of Whiteness when they acknowledge the presence of Whiteness and articulate the impact Whiteness has on social interactions and structures, including their own racial privilege (Johnson, 2006; Kendall, 2006; McIntosh, 1989). White people’s conscientious attention to their racial identity and privilege can lead to the expression of their White group membership in public, both as white individuals and as members of the White

group. Such awareness may take the form of acknowledging prejudice and dynamics of racial inequality or deliberately using the term 'white' in self-descriptions and in references to others (as contrasted with only using racial identifiers when describing others as in 'my Black friend' or 'my Mexican housekeeper').

When white faculty express this awareness in their pedagogical practice, they announce and discuss their own racial identity and those of white students in the classroom, and how this identity affects classroom dynamics. For instance, Maxwell (2004) deliberately and straightforwardly acknowledges her Whiteness and shares this information with her classes: "I generally do this by telling my story – my story of coming out as white" (p. 163). This can lead to the second enactment under this category.

(2) *Understanding and attending to plurality*: White hegemony is also challenged when white people reject assumptions of universality by demonstrating an understanding of plurality and by recognizing that there is a racial hierarchy in our society that positions whites above other racial and ethnic groups. Addressing the existence of others' realities and plural traditions or cultural styles must also mean paying attention to Whiteness: Flagg (1993) reports her efforts at "...labeling herself and her community's existing standards as White whenever possible" (pp. 991-992). The possibility of accepting other standards and norms is enhanced when aspects of normative culture and standards can be identified as 'White', or based in Whiteness, rather than being seen as natural or the ways things are and should be.

Deconstructing Whiteness through pedagogical practice challenges the universalization of Whiteness (Ortiz & Rhodes, 2000). Further, by recognizing and

including other voices in the curriculum, in instructional tactics and in classroom interactions, white faculty challenge the normative practices of Whiteness (Anderson & Adams, 1992; Auster & MacRone, 1994; Kolb, 1984; Montgomery & Groat, 1998; Morey & Kitano, 1997).

(3) Revealing patterns of White hegemony: Patterns of White hegemony are revealed and its influence diminished when white people recognize the dominance of this narrative in our society and how it promotes inequality within a system of White privilege. Both public disclosures of Whiteness and acknowledgement of plurality can reveal the overarching nature of White hegemony and privilege within which all racial interactions and systems take place. As Proudman and his colleagues argue, such privilege/oppression may not be the fault of a specific white individual but that does not mean they are not responsible for it (Proudman, Welp & Morris, 2006). The benefits that come with White privilege bestow this responsibility. When white people gain advantage at the expense of people of color, they are responsible for changing this inequity. Some authors also suggest that white activists seeking to reveal the hegemonic system of White racial dominance take the strategic step of also elaborating the costs to themselves and the society of such dominance (e.g., psychologically in the form of guilt and fear, socially in the form of homogenous friendship circles, economically in the form of person power loss, etc.), and thus the self-interest white people have in reducing racial discrimination and dominance (Feagin & Vera, 1995; Goodman, 2001; Kendall, 2006; Kivel, 1996).

White faculty do this in pedagogical practice by explaining patterns of White dominance and hegemony as they arise in course materials, classroom dynamics, and the university itself. In this context, Mathieson (2004) emphasizes the struggle involved in

living a ‘double life’ as a white anti-racist educator, “of being white and benefiting from privilege on the one hand, and opposing the ideology of Whiteness in education, on the other” (p. 238). Openness about this dynamic tension, and a consistent effort to learn more about it, is in itself a potentially liberating experience for white faculty and for students of all races/ethnicities.

Challenging White Supremacy

White hegemony is interrupted through actions that challenge White supremacy. I identify two categories that capture the way some of these actions are discussed in the literature and was evident in the data: 1) creating alliances with members of other racial-ethnic groups, and 2) acting to alter structures and cultures that promote White dominance.

(1) Creating alliances with members of other racial-ethnic groups: Creating alliances with people of color that transcend the normative racial structure and its embedded assumptions that “white is right” is one way to challenge White supremacy. There is a considerable history of such interracial alliances or coalitions in the legacy of social change efforts in the United States (Alcoff, 2006) and Crowfoot and Chesler (1996) have described some of the particular roles white men can play in such efforts. This can be done by white faculty when they make ally behavior a part of their personal and pedagogical practice in order to transcend patterns of White dominance present in the classroom, and creating the opportunities for students to develop these behaviors themselves.

Effective and lasting alliances between whites and persons of color, or between white faculty members and students must be reciprocal, involve common agendas,

understanding of each party's self-interest, mutual caring and concern, and significant sharing of status and power. In a discussion on ally behavior, Kendall (2006) states:

Authentic cross-race relationships are risky and challenging; they require paying close attention to nuances of behavior that we might otherwise take for granted. It means, for the white person, being invested in providing support to the target group person, particularly countering comments made by unthinking white people (pg. 145).

This is quite unlikely in the classroom without major challenge to dominant pattern of higher education that promotes a monopoly of classroom power and wisdom in the hands of the largely white, male faculty. However, there are efforts to change the policies, practices and cultures that maintain these structures of power and exclusion.

(2) Acting to alter structures and cultures that promote White dominance: Actions aimed at altering structures and cultural norms by innovating new policies and practices that directly or indirectly perpetuate the social racial hierarchy and resulting inequalities can make a difference. Efforts to challenge the ideology and manifestation of White supremacy in societal or organizational systems of White dominance may vary considerably, depending on the nature of the situations, the actors involved, and their personal values, skills, resources, and willingness to take risks in dealing realistically with White resistance to significant change efforts¹².

For white faculty, this translates into efforts that create opportunities for students to reconsider existing structures and cultures through exposure to various ways of knowing and being. It also means acting personally to alter traditional norms and practices in the classroom, institution and/or community. Faculty members committed to

¹² Indeed, both C. Thompson (Thompson, Shaefer & Brod, 2003) and B. Thompson (2001) have published instructive multiple case studies of the activities and struggles reported by white activists working for racial change.

challenging White dominance and hegemony in higher education often conceive of themselves as anti-racist advocates, as promoters of social justice in the classroom and the larger university. Their actions may take a variety of forms: revising the subject matter of their courses or of departmental policies and programs; altering classroom tactics or practices (pedagogies) – my particular emphasis in this project; and working for change in the structure and culture of university operations. For example, Sonn (2008) asserts curriculum initiatives to raise awareness around racialized oppression and exclusion in an effort to change how psychology is practiced and researched.

Together, the categories described above comprise the theoretical framework of enactments of Whiteness I apply in my analysis of the pedagogical practices described by white faculty. Now I will turn to the methods I used in this process.

Figure 1. Reproducing and Transforming Enactments of Whiteness

Reproducing Enactments of Whiteness

In general

In pedagogical practice

Reflecting limited racial awareness	
<p><u>1. Ignorance and obliviousness:</u> Claiming ignorance or being unaware of difference</p>	<p>Remaining ignorant or resistant to recognizing their White privilege, racial inequality, and racial difference within education, and the value of diversity in the classroom</p>
<p><u>2. Denial of difference and dominance:</u> Denying or minimizing racial difference and inequality</p>	<p>Denying or minimizing the race-based power differentials between professor and students, and between students of different identities; Adhering to a color-blind view of difference</p>
<p><u>3. Voluntary attention to difference and dominance:</u> Turning on and off awareness of difference, racial oppression, and inequality</p>	<p>Recognizing, valuing and addressing race and racial issues only on their terms and timing</p>
Reflecting White supremacy	
<p><u>1. Acts of omission that maintain White hegemony by excluding people who do not comply with White norms:</u> Assuming White norms are universally viewed as the standard by which lived experiences are judged</p>	<p>Assuming their own way of learning, their educational experiences and expectations, and their personal references are shared by all; Assuming that safety, security, and services are experienced similarly among all students in the classroom</p>
<p><u>2. Acts of commission that disempower others through demonstrations of white privilege and oppression:</u> Disempowering others through implicit and explicit demonstrations of privilege and oppression</p>	<p>Employing pedagogical practices that secure and sustain the power of Whiteness in the classroom</p>

Transforming Enactments of Whiteness

In general

In pedagogical practice

Expressing racial awareness	
<p><u>1. Disclosing personal Whiteness:</u> Acknowledging the presence of Whiteness and articulating the impact Whiteness does have on social interactions and structures</p>	<p>Announcing and discussing their own racial identity and those of white students in the classroom, and how that affects classroom dynamics</p>
<p><u>2. Acknowledging and attending to plurality:</u> Understanding plurality and recognizing that there is a racial hierarchy in our society that positions Whites above other racial/ethnic groups</p>	<p>Recognizing and including other voices in the curriculum, in instructional tactics, and in classroom interactions</p>
<p><u>3. Revealing patterns of White hegemony:</u> Recognizing that the dominant narrative in our society is based on the perspective of the White racial group and acknowledging their social location within this system of White privilege</p>	<p>Explaining patterns of White dominance and hegemony as they arise in course materials, classroom dynamics, and the university itself</p>
Challenging White supremacy (power and privilege)	
<p><u>1. Creating alliances with members of other racial-ethnic groups:</u> Acting to bring individuals and groups of varied racial/ethnic identities together to form relationships that transcend the normative racial structure</p>	<p>Making ally behavior a part of one's personal and pedagogical practice in order to transcend patterns of White dominance present in the classroom, and creating opportunities for students to develop these behaviors themselves</p>
<p><u>2. Acting to alter structures/cultures that promote White dominance:</u> Innovating to challenge patterns of White supremacy by trying to transform structures, practices and cultural norms that directly or indirectly perpetuate the social racial hierarchy and resulting inequalities/injustices</p>	<p>Providing opportunities for students to challenge/question/reconsider existing structures/cultures through exposure to various ways of knowing and being. Acting personally to alter traditional norms and practices in the classroom, the institution and/or the community</p>

The Sample

The data for this study come from the Faculty Diversity Research Project which I have been a member of for several years. The project was granted IRB approval in 1999. Since then principal investigators, Mark Chesler and Al Young, have led the research team through the interview phase and are facilitating the analysis phases of the project. We used a semi-structured protocol to interview sixty-six faculty on the campus of a large Midwest Extensive Research (R-1) university about their experience teaching in a diverse educational environment. During the span of time the interviews took place, the university underwent exceptional public and private tensions around its Affirmative Action admissions policy and associated court cases. Diversity and teaching are both seen as “hot” topics on campus and a certain level of trust in the integrity of the study was important. The reputation of Chesler and Young as progressive faculty helped legitimize this project and facilitated the recruitment process. The main criterion for selection in the study was a reputation for successful teaching. Faculty were either officially awarded for their teaching and ability to foster intellectual development on a culturally diverse campus by the university or recognized informally as good teachers in diverse spaces by their colleagues. In this latter case, interviewees were asked at the end of the interview the following question: “Do you know of colleagues who are especially attentive, creative or effective in dealing with issues of race and racism in classes? Who are they? What do they do? What makes them effective?” The research team identified additional faculty through snowball sampling based on interviewee recommendations. They were all tenured or tenure track faculty. These factors, along with the liberal reputation of the institution where they teach, come together to create a group of

relatively progressive faculty with a particular status and assumed skill in the classroom. While limiting the generalizability to other faculty groups, these characteristics offer a particularly valuable opportunity to examine successful pedagogical practices. No attempt was made to gather a representative sample (for survey data relevant to choices faculty make about their teaching practices see Lindholm & Astin, 2008; Lindholm, Szelenyi, Hurtado & Korn, 2005; Astin, Antonio, Cress & Astin, 1997), but to solicit the most advanced thinking and experience on these issues from what is, in many ways, a particularly sophisticated group. However, purposive sampling was used to maintain a balanced racial-ethnic and gender sample throughout the recruitment process. Due to the limited racial-ethnic diversity among faculty, this became more challenging as the study progressed. Each interviewee signed a consent form before the interview started. Here, I include the eighteen interviews conducted with white faculty. There were 9 women in the sample. Two of these women were in the humanities, 3 in the natural sciences, and 4 in the social sciences. Of the 9 men in the study, 3 were in the humanities, 3 in the natural sciences, and 3 in the social sciences.

Table 1: Demographics, Gender and Discipline

DISCIPLINE	GENDER		TOTAL
	Female	Male	
Humanities	4	3	7
Natural Sciences	2	3	5
Social Sciences	3	3	6
TOTAL	9	9	18

Data Collection

The interview protocol (see Appendix) focuses on issues of teaching in diverse classrooms. It addresses the following broad areas: teaching philosophy, racial identification and significance, perspectives on racial-ethnic dynamics in the classroom and on campus, and faculty relations with colleagues. Interviews were recorded digitally or on tape and transcribed by a transcriber outside the research team. Interviews were also “cleaned” by members of the research team in order to fill in confusing portions of the transcripts and to disguise and/or delete information that would put interviewee anonymity at risk. All names used here are pseudonyms. Each interview lasted about one to one and a half hours; although a few were longer or took place over two meetings. Interviewers were almost always of another social group identity than the interviewee, usually in terms of race and/or ethnicity. This inclusion of cross-racial pairing was used in an effort to capture implicit information about how the interviewer interacted with someone of a different racial group. This would provide an additional source of information about how the faculty might interact with students of a race other than their own. It is important to keep in mind that for the interviews analyzed in this study this means the interviewer was most likely a person of color¹³. An explicit attempt to capture the effect of this mismatch of identity is incorporated into the interview protocol. The last question in the protocol asks, “Do you think this interview would have been different, would your answers have been different if I had been more like you in terms of race, gender discipline, etc.? If yes, how?”

¹³ Of the eighteen interviews with white faculty, fifteen were cross-matched and due to logistical issues, three were not.

I participated in the interviewing process over a period of two years. Each member of the research team was encouraged to conduct interviews during their involvement in the project if this coincided within the timeframe in which interviews were collected. There were some differences between interviewer and interviewee that were built into the research design. First, I and others were graduate students and by involving graduate students, there was a power differential in status inherent in some of the interviewing relationships¹⁴. Secondly, cross-matching the racial-ethnic or gender social identity of the interviewer and interviewee added another power differential in the interview process. In the larger project, the interviewer sometimes was white and the faculty member was a member of a target racial-ethnic group. In the case of the interviews examined in this study, the interviewer usually was a member of a target racial-ethnic group and the faculty member was white. I was conscious of the status differential between faculty and myself as a graduate student; however, it was complicated by my own sense of status as an older graduate student and new mother. The feeling of deference to the faculty being interviewed may have been heightened had I been younger with different life experience. Disciplinary differences also impacted some interview interactions. For example, I was questioned about qualitative methods and their level of objectivity by a natural science professor after we completed the interview. I suspected his doubts about the legitimacy of the methodology early on in the process and I doubt I convinced him otherwise.

Along with other research team members, I did experience some internal and external moments of tension or confusion linked to my own identity during the interview

¹⁴ There also were at times differences in academic status between the principal investigators and the faculty they interviewed.

process. Being both white and Mexican-American positioned me as an insider/outsider at various points in the interview. Visibly, most people read my light skin complexion as an indicator of white identity, and I was more often assigned interviews with faculty of color for this reason. Yet, when I revealed my racial-ethnic identity in the context of the final questions on the protocol, “Do you think this interview would have been different, would your answers have been different if I had been more like you in terms of race, gender, discipline, etc? If yes, how?” there were two occasions where interviewees were asked, “Well what race are you?” Both reacted congenially when I told them of my mixed racial background. There was a sense of connection expressed. For example, one professor said she would have shared the same information but probably in a more straightforward manner. She also asked how I experienced my background growing up and shared a bit about her own children’s experiences being of a multi-racial-ethnic heritage. Interestingly, she had made an assumption that I was European-American based on my last name, which a former professor of hers shared. In an interview with a white faculty member, the response to this last question was “Well, you are like me.” In this case, the interviewee assumed a shared white identity because of my appearance. When I explained my background she did not elaborate on how this racial difference would have impacted her answers but focused on the disciplinary differences between us indicating that my questions would have been different if I were in her field.

Data Coding and Analyses

As a member of the research team, I had the opportunity to familiarize myself with the data over time. This allowed for a continued focus on what the interviewees said

in the interviews, for their voices to rise above preconceived notions (mine and those of other research team members) of what they would (or should) or would not communicate regarding their interactions and understandings about teaching in diverse educational environments. This exposure in a collaborative setting served as a space to question and discuss my own and others' thoughts about how faculty responded to the interview protocol, and to challenge, confirm, and complicate these thoughts as we read or heard about each completed interview. This exposure to the data helped me explore my research interests. As my focus on Whiteness and pedagogy developed, I began to pay more attention to the interviews with white faculty and on those protocol areas focused on race and pedagogy. I come to this project with a general question in mind: In what ways is Whiteness enacted in white faculty's pedagogical practice¹⁵? I base my analysis on self-reports by the eighteen white faculty about race and their pedagogical practices in their responses to the following interview topics: racial awareness, conflictual interactions in the classroom, teaching philosophy, reflections on white students and students of color, general descriptions of events occurring in the classroom, emotions mentioned in relation to racial interactions in the classroom, dissonance in expressions of racial interactions, presence of ally behaviors or attitudes, and overall discussion of undergraduate students. Some of these areas of discussion proved more salient than others.

I coded the data through an iterative process in which I constantly moved between the data, my interpretations of the data, and the relevant literature. This took the form of literature reviews, informal thematic readings of the interviews, discussions of the data

¹⁵ Teaching interactions may take place, formally or informally, in or outside of the classroom. For instance, teaching may take place in office hours, via email exchanges, or in context unrelated to teaching per se (e.g., running into students at the grocery store or serving on committees together).

with members of the research team, generation of the theoretical framework of enactments of Whiteness generally and in pedagogical practices outlined at the beginning of this chapter, and thematic categorization of codes. I relied heavily on interpretive memoing¹⁶ as an analytic tool and used NVIVO, a computer based qualitative software program, to code and organize the data. This process led to an analytic approach by which I first developed the framework for the general reproducing enactments of Whiteness. I then applied this piece of the framework to the data moving from thematic coding towards more focused categorization of the data. In the process, I recognized that some of the white faculty were also challenging Whiteness through their pedagogical practice. Taking this lead from the data, I then expanded the overall framework to include categories of transforming enactments of Whiteness generally and in pedagogical practice. Relatively late in the coding process I noticed and became interested in the struggles some of the white faculty described trying to implement what I coded as transforming practices. I decided to bring this aspect of the data into my analyses as a way to understand more about the process of challenging White hegemony through pedagogy.

In total, I identify 291 enactments (108 reproducing and 183 transforming), and 70 expressions of the struggles this group of faculty describe as part of their attempts to translate transforming pedagogy into practice. While the sample of white faculty is small, the enactments of pedagogical practice and expressions of struggles evident in their interviews make for a robust set of data. Any white faculty member could (and did) report many different behaviors and one interview could contain behaviors categorized as

¹⁶ The coding processes are heavily influenced by the work of Emerson et al. (1995) and Glaser & Strauss (1967).

reproducing along with behaviors categorized as transforming; thus here I categorize and comment on particular (and often situational) thoughts and behaviors, not on persons. It should be clear, moreover, that the work presented here reflects faculty members' own perceptions and interpretations (not those of their students and colleagues) as received, organized and interpreted by myself. At the same time, other aspects of the individuals' identity were compelling and important to informing the enactments and struggles they described. To this end, I include some analyses of the interplay between gender and discipline with Whiteness, particularly where this is salient in the analysis of struggles white faculty described as part of their attempts to practice transforming pedagogy.

This process did not take place in isolation. The collaboration and longevity of the research project facilitated discussion with colleagues about the interviews, the issues generated in the interviews, and the coding and analytic processes of each member of the research team. As a group, and as individuals, we are in a constant process of stepping into and away from the data. Our understanding of what is "in the data" evolves as we revisit the interviews themselves and as we discuss our analyses with one another. I participated in this process throughout my analytic process. Having others who are familiar with the research with which to discuss my thoughts around the data helped me think through my interpretive analysis by providing a space to discuss my thoughts, interpretations, and questions along the way. I also worked with two Sociology Undergraduate Research Opportunity (SURO) students. The teaching and research interactions with these students supported my investigation of the relevant literature and provided me an opportunity to reflect on the interviews from their perspectives as undergraduates. One of the challenges of writing about Whiteness is recognizing my own

use of the normative discourse as I am trying to deconstruct it. There is an obscurity to the pervasiveness of Whiteness, in my own writing and in the interviews, that makes it difficult to name.

Sharing my writings and research in these collaborative spaces sharpened my ability to recognize the influence of Whiteness. Throughout, I tried to stay close to the data in an effort to represent as accurately as possible the experiences, feelings, interpretations, and understandings described by the interviewees. However, I acknowledge that what I offer here is my interpretation and analysis, neither of which are free of but perhaps benefit from my own bi-racial identity as Latina with white skin privilege and pedagogical knowledge and perspective. My years of teaching before and during graduate school afforded me many opportunities to negotiate, reflect on, and wrestle with the intersections of my own racial/ethnic, gender, and professional and social statuses with my own teaching. The insight I gained from these experiences influenced my sympathy for, and at times heightened my impatience with, the missteps and struggles the white faculty described.

Methodological Limitations

There are some notable limitations to the design of this study. The sample size of eighteen faculty is small and select. The white faculty included here were recognized, formally or informally, for their success teaching on a diverse campus and in diverse classrooms. As such, there is some assumption that this success is associated with pedagogical beliefs, practices, and social awareness that are linked to a relatively progressive group of faculty. These are the “good” teachers, so to speak. Variations of “good” (in categories captured here and in other terms) were undoubtedly revealed

through the analysis process; however these variations within this group are just that – within a pool of progressive faculty. The enactments and struggles found with this group would likely not be found with other faculty who have not been similarly identified for successful teaching in diverse classrooms, who might be unsuccessful or merely acceptable teachers in diverse classroom.

The limited intersectional analysis of gender, discipline and Whiteness restricts what can be learned about this group of faculty or the way these aspects of identity and social location come together in enactments of Whiteness in pedagogical practice. We do know that generally, more enactments of Whiteness in pedagogical practice were found in the interviews with white women faculty than with white men faculty (56%, 44% respectively). Roughly the same number of reproducing (41%) and transforming (59%) More transforming (59%) than reproducing (41%) enactments were found among this group of white women faculty. The spread between the number of reproducing and transforming enactments was wider among white men faculty with 32% reproducing and 68% transforming. This may be because women are generally more willing to engage in the interview process, offering more information about their practices. This openness may also explain the 24% difference in the number of reproducing enactments among white women faculty compared to white men faculty. White women faculty might be more willing to share their mistakes or uncertainty around their teaching practices than are white men faculty. Alternatively, white women faculty may feel it necessary to express their complicity with the normative assumptions of the institution in an effort to demonstrate their membership to the dominant group regardless of the extent to which they have internalized these norms. This may be particularly true among white women

natural science faculty. The relatively fewer number of reproducing enactments among white men faculty might indicate their ability to keep the influence of White hegemony out of their teaching practices. However, while white women faculty negotiate acceptance through compliance with dominant norms, the white men faculty in the study may be demonstrating their ability to censor themselves in the interviews when it comes to behaviors that may not be met with approval or threaten their authority.

With respect to disciplinary differences, the number of enactments found in the interviews with each group of white faculty was similar with an average of 17.33 enactments per natural science faculty, 14.8 per humanities faculty and 16.14 per faculty in the social sciences¹⁷. However, there were differences between these groups in terms of how many enactments of each type were found. Natural science faculty had the highest mean for reproducing enactments with 13 compared to 3 for humanities faculty and 2.14 for social science faculty. Most of the transforming enactments were found among the social science faculty with a mean of 14 followed by the humanities faculty with a mean of 11.8 and natural science faculty with a mean of 4.33. The disciplinary norms of the natural sciences offer a likely explanation for this given that theirs is a field where notions of empiricism and objectivity guide their examination of the natural world and take priority over social, experiential, and interactional issues and ways of knowing. As a result, issues of race and interracial interaction are considered outside the scope of their subjects and classrooms. Not recognizing race leads to the invisibility and resulting reinforcement of Whiteness.

¹⁷ I use mean numbers for this analysis given the different number of faculty in each disciplinary group (natural science = 6; humanities = 5; social science = 7).

Comparatively, the norms of both the humanities and social sciences encourage engagement with aspects of the social world and, as such with race and related issues. It is likely that these groups of faculty have considered these issues with more depth analytically and are more experienced bringing them into the classroom in ways that more often transform rather than reproduce White hegemony. It is also possible that the similar empirical research practices and the shared focus on society and human behavior in the fields of social science provides this group of faculty a common language and tools for discussing race within a context of power structures and resulting inequalities. It follows that this foundation comes through in pedagogical practice more easily than for faculty in the fields that make up the humanities where the human condition is also examined but through a greater variety of analytic and critical perspectives and specificity. This relatively expansive approach is less likely to provide humanities faculty a shared language or conceptual understanding about race that would then translate into pedagogical practice. These disciplinary norms described also influence and are reflected in how the different faculty groups teach and how common it is to talk about teaching methods. Typically, natural science faculty teach along more traditional lines whereas social science and humanities faculty engage in a more diverse range of instructional approaches including lecture as well as active and experiential methods. As a result, social science and humanities faculty are able to offer more expressive and reflexive descriptions than are faculty in the natural sciences.

The presence of disciplinary and gender differences discussed here are apparent in the data I present in the following three chapters on reproducing enactments of Whiteness in pedagogical practice, transforming enactments of Whiteness in pedagogical practice,

and more specifically in analysis of the struggles this group of white faculty describe as they try to translate transforming pedagogy into practice, respectively. However, while I speculate on these differences throughout the analysis, the design and scope of this project does not afford much more than that. I hope what is offered generates questions for further research around gender and disciplinary differences in the ways Whiteness is enacted in the college classroom. What I present in the following chapters provides more insight into the commonality of ways these groups engage in pedagogical practices that enact Whiteness than in these distinctions.

Yet, given the void in the literature with respect to studies on Whiteness and pedagogy, I believe that it is important to explore these interviews and present how this examination contributes to our understanding in this area. As argued in the preceding chapter, this group of faculty is a substantial place to start this investigation into Whiteness and pedagogy. The faculty in this study are likely to have developed a more sophisticated sense of race in the classroom, including their own position as a white faculty member, than would another group who had not been similarly recognized. It is likely that the faculty in this study teach differently, have had different experiences, and perhaps, have more to say. As such, they offer insight into Whiteness and pedagogy from a group closer to the topic. These data can also be used to enhance studies that focus on a more general faculty population in a variety of groupings and categorizations (e.g., faculty tagged as “bad” teachers) are important populations to include in the larger project of Whiteness and pedagogy, as both will inform our understanding.

Other limitations of the study include issues of validity, credibility, and reliability. Interviewing relies on the willingness of the interviewee to relay information honestly

(Weiss, 1994). In this study the interviewers were identified and selected for their success. I hope that they took this as a sign that what they had to say was important, that their experiences did not need to be altered for the sake of the interview. However, it is very difficult to corroborate the facts or eliminate any self-consciousness of the interviewee that might lead to misrepresentations (Weiss, 1994). It is also possible that the act of responding to the interview protocol generated new insights on the issues asked about that might vary from the way the faculty thought about the interaction in the moment. In some interviews, recollections and reflections evolved or changed over the course of the interview and it seemed at times like the interviewees were contradicting themselves. Interviewees also reevaluated their own accounts at different parts of the interview. Yet, their responses provide information about their own perceptions, truths, and insights about their connections to race in pedagogical practice. Discourse is a significant process in the reproduction of Whiteness and the interview process itself is a meaning-making endeavor. As such, their own analysis and self-reflection became part of the data.

I sought out opportunities for triangulation in an effort to address the issues of validity and enhance the reliability of my interpretations. For part of the project, three people coded the data, the two SURO students, and me. My interpretations of the data are formed through my own exposure to the data as well as discussions with these students and the Faculty Diversity Research group. Both of these strategies provided opportunity to double or triple check my interpretations. In order to enhance the credibility of the study, I tried to make my analytic and interpretive process transparent, make clear my application of these interpretations to a broader understanding of

Whiteness and pedagogy rather than to faculty in general, and sought out literature, readers and advisors to assist me in staying true to the interviews and the analytic process.

CHAPTER III

REPRODUCING ENACTMENTS OF WHITENESS IN PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICE

I use the theoretical framework of enactments of Whiteness outlined in the previous chapter to suggest that norms and behaviors which reproduce White hegemony generally in society can also be found in pedagogical practice. I use the data generated from the interviews with this group of white faculty to demonstrate this assertion. As I discussed in Chapter 1, institutions of Higher Education are spaces that reflect and maintain White hegemony. The influence of this structure is apparent in the normative epistemological assumptions from which academia operates. Scheurich and Young (2002) see this influence as a form of racism:

Epistemological racism means that our current range of research epistemologies—positivism to postmodernism—arises from the social history and culture of the dominant race, that these epistemologies logically reflect and reinforce that social history and that racial group (while excluding the epistemologies of other races/cultures), and that this dynamic has negative results for people of color in general and scholars of color in particular (p. 231).

For the most part, academics, white and of color, are trained not to second guess this normative approach. Acceptance of these norms can make some white faculty averse to hearing or encouraging students to voice experiences of racism that do not conform to traditional representations generated through normative academic practices. Auletta and Jones (1994) argue that the silencing of these students reinforces feelings of exclusion and the absence of their voices and experiences in classroom discussions reinforces the

idea that the White experience, including how race should be represented in a college classroom, is the common and acceptable experience. When white professors comply with these norms, they reinforce limited racial awareness and can, intentionally or not, promote practices that reflect White supremacy.

In this chapter I present an analysis of what general reproducing enactments of Whiteness (Figure 1, Column 1) look like in pedagogical practice (Figure 1, Column 2). As with everyday interactions, Whiteness is reproduced in pedagogical practice through enactments that reflect 1) limited racial awareness in the forms of ignorance and obliviousness, denial of racial difference and domination, and through voluntary attention to difference and domination; and reflect 2) White supremacy through acts of omission that maintain White hegemony by excluding people who do not comply with White norms, and acts of commission that disempower others through demonstrations of White privilege and oppression.

Of the 291 enactments of Whiteness in pedagogical practice I identified in the interviews, I categorized 108 (37%) as reproducing. A slight majority (56%) of the reproducing enactments of Whiteness reflect White supremacy. This is not a major difference but may indicate that the practice of White hegemony were more apparent in the interview process while the silences by which limited racial awareness can be demonstrated were not captured as easily. Almost a quarter more reproducing enactments were found among white women faculty than among white men (62% and 38%, respectively). As I previously speculated, this difference might be linked to the investment white women faculty have in demonstrating their complicity with dominant norms and white men faculty's practiced ability to censor themselves in an effort to avoid

self incrimination. Disciplinary differences also emerged. I identified an average of 4 times the number of reproducing enactments per white professors in the natural sciences (13) than white faculty in the humanities (3) or social sciences (2.14). These differences are likely linked to disciplinary distinctions that encourage to more or less degree how aware and articulate their faculty are with respect to racial issues and pedagogy generally. These numbers are reflected in the analysis that follows. Most of these enactments were found among white women natural science faculty. Among the faculty we hear from in the following analysis, Susan's descriptions offer a particularly insightful window into what reproducing enactments of Whiteness look like in pedagogical practice.

Reflecting Limited Racial Awareness

Ignorance and obliviousness: "It really doesn't come up."

In general, Whiteness is reproduced when white people claim ignorance or are unaware of difference. In pedagogical practice, this form of Whiteness is reproduced when white faculty remain ignorant or resistant to recognizing their own and their white students' White privilege, racial inequality, racial difference within education, and the value of diversity in the classroom. Limited racial awareness can take the form of ignorance of and obliviousness to aspects of a social context that are outside the white individual's personal or group understanding or experience. This limited perspective about the way things are in the world leads to dismissal of claims of difference or of discriminatory treatment from members of other racial/ethnic groups and is compounded by the tendency for some white people to behave as if there are no distinct racial/ethnic cultures that have significant meaning or value, but only a single American (i.e., U.S.

white, mostly male, mostly Christian, heterosexual and upper middle-class) culture. Thus Whiteness is the norm, so much so that most white people do not think of themselves in racial terms, reserving racial identity as something that only people of color have. White race might be named, the structure of Whiteness is kept elusive.

Being oblivious or inattentive to racial issues is one way white faculty enact Whiteness and is reflected in the following examples from Susan and John, both in the natural sciences.

I: Do you find your race to be important?

R: I have no idea. I don't think so.

I: You don't think so?

R: Um-um. (Susan, Natural Sciences)

I: Do you get a sense in the classroom of what students feel about diversity or is that again so far removed from what you do?

R: It (diversity) really doesn't come up. I have some feeling that students by and large feel pretty positive about it, but I don't think that comes from my classroom experiences, I think it comes from other experiences I've had. If there is negative feeling, any significant negative feeling on campus about it, I've not picked it up. I wouldn't be surprised if there were some...but if there is some it's held very close to the chest so to speak and I've not seen it spill over into any public discourse. I don't know if there are any fraternity's or sororities that are Lilly white and want to keep it that way. By tradition most sororities are going to be racially of one make up or another, although a few break the barriers, most do not. But I don't think that necessarily means that there's a conscious wanting to keep the club pure, whatever it is. But there may be, I just don't know. (John, Natural Sciences)

In the first quote, Susan clearly indicates her lack of awareness of the impact her racial identity may have on herself and, thus implicitly on others. In the second quote, John expresses the possibility that there are negative racial feelings on campus at large, while at the same time dismisses the likelihood, relying on the belief that he would have picked up on them if they were present. In particular, this faculty member suggests that the fact that such negative reactions have not been made public, at least to him,

demonstrates their relatively unimportant social relevance. The failure to know about, seek out, consider and integrate others' perspectives is both an example of privilege and one way white faculty members' ignorance and obliviousness serves to maintain hegemony. This is particularly clear with John's lack of awareness regarding the history of race (class and religious) exclusion and segregation at the root of the Greek fraternal system.

Another way this enactment of Whiteness reflects limited racial awareness is by not attending seriously to how their Whiteness affects the faculty's own epistemic frameworks, attitudes and teaching practices. The following exchange with James, a professor in the humanities, suggests that consideration of this influence may be viewed insignificant in light of the press to present scholarly material.

I: Other than their withdrawal from portions of the class, are there any kinds of issues, circumstances that are problematic around students of color in the classroom?

R: Well, some have writing skill issues. The most common right now, it seems to me, are students from Asia who, you know, English is not their first language, and they have just problems with sentence structure and commas and stuff like that. And someone has to spend a huge amount of effort sort of going over their grammar before you can even get to the writing material. And it's hard to know how to approach them because some of them are extremely knowledgeable and should be getting an "A" in terms of content. Um, and some African American students have writing problems, you know, they need to be in special tutorials, so they can get their grammar and so on, down. So that's one thing. I assume in the case of African American students, it's more of a class...a class thing, what school they went to, where the Asian Americans could be from very wealthy classes but, uh, it's just very difficult to learn to write in another language. So the language skill...the writing skill issue is big in English classes.

I: Do you get a sense of what students' expectations are of each other in your classes? Whether in terms of behavior, performance, involvement, what have you?

R: Well, I definitely notice in the evaluations they often comment on the other students. And one of their complaints is that in my classes there's usually a

division between those who participate and those who are passive. And I suppose on a negative side, the students who become passive accuse the participants of being "apple polishers" and saying what the professor wants them to say, and the students who participate accuse the others of being lazy and not having done the reading. And I think there is a problem in classes of students not having completed the reading and not being able to participate on that basis. Because you're assigned a lot of pages, you know, you can't spend a whole semester on one work and you want them to read major portions of several works. So there is often that split in the class, on that basis, not a race...not a race basis.

I: Is there still any work you try to do, have you thought about how to confront that?

R: Yeah. That's what I talk to a faculty colleague about all the time because he doesn't have that problem, he gets every person. There is a kind of a split among teachers. This one guy is a wonderful lecturer, and his main thing has always been the student. Whereas, I'm certainly interested in students, but my main thing has always been the material. And he teaches courses on sports, but he teaches tough subjects like AIDS, and he teaches the survey courses. You know lecturers that kind of fill in for whatever is...whatever they need. But I know that he is much more fixated on the student in the class, whereas I'm kind of split between the student and the material. I really want them to understand this material. I really want them to learn an approach to the field, to know what a psychological approach is, a sociological approach is, an historical approach is, and that's...means, for me, a lot of effort has to go into explaining ideas. And, I guess, in those moments when you're explaining ideas, the students do become kind of a blur. (James, Humanities)

He acknowledges that his focus on the course material overshadows any attention directed at student differences, including ones related to race/ethnicity. While he describes and links variation in skill sets to racial differences, he does not seem aware of the potential link between differences in ability and differences in participation, and that both are linked to race. In fact, he claims there is not a racial split. It is telling that he avoids this analysis by shifting his focus to his valuing the material over the students. By appreciating only a limited range of intellectual characteristics, indicated by student ability or course content, James minimizes the presence of racial difference and

dominance inside the college classroom. Thus failing to see differences, he precludes or sidesteps any responsibility to attend to these forces.

Obliviousness to racial differences in the classroom also can occur in regard to the power differential between professor and student and/or between students of different identities. Susan, once again, concisely expresses her view of the classroom.

I: How do you deal with conflict between racial groups in the classroom?

R: There isn't any in my classroom. (Susan, Natural Sciences)

When faculty members fail to recognize the ways in which their own and their white students' power dominates classroom dynamics, they are likely to miss both obvious and subtle patterns of racism (i.e., microaggressions). The result may be focusing responsibility on the obviously racialized group member (the student of color), to prove, defend, or let go of their knowledge and experiences of racial inequality. This is not merely an individual instance of stubbornness or egotism: it is the natural result of life in a White-dominated society and professional socialization and practice in a White-dominated academy.

Denial of racial difference and domination: "...it doesn't matter what color they are ..."

As powerful as ignorance and obliviousness is the stated denial of group-based differences or advantages/disadvantages. When white people deny or minimize racial difference and inequality they are reproducing Whiteness by assuming its normative presence in society. White faculty extend this assumption through pedagogical practices that deny or minimize the race-based power differentials between professor and students, and between students of different identities. Often this is conveyed through adherence to

a color-blind view of difference. Or, should difference be acknowledged, they may discount the impact, relevance or true meaning of such difference. Bobo (1999; Bobo et al. 1997) describes how such a stance leads white people to emphasize their individuality rather than their group identity and to prioritize their own experiences with ‘reverse racism’ or the victimization of whites. Feagin and Vera (1995) refer to this stance as the adoption of a ‘sincere fiction’, which enables one to divorce oneself from acknowledging embeddedness in the privileges of a racialized society and the accrual of advantages thereby. This perspective explains one’s own and others’ station as the result only of individual talent and effort, rather than as influenced heavily by the workings of a race conscious society and its history. The myths of fairness and meritocracy are thereby upheld. The notion that race (or gender) doesn’t matter and that group differences don’t exist or are irrelevant are consistent with a color-blind view of how to deal with race in the classroom.

Assuming a color-blind view may seem to be the most humane and egalitarian approach to interacting with students, but: (1) it is not realistic, since all who are sighted do in fact see color and most interpret color within the societal framework of racial hierarchy; (2) such color-blindness negates the history and contemporary impact of racial discrimination and oppression on everyone; (3) it devalues, by making invisible or irrelevant, the unique culture, cultural styles and politico-economic experiences of students of color (Bonilla-Silva, 2006; Frankenberg, 1993); and (4) it thus masks the power differential between students of different racial/ethnic backgrounds and between faculty members and students. Frankenberg (1993) sees color blindness not only as ‘color evasion’ but as ‘power evasion’.

In the face of such an approach, when students do raise such issues they may trigger defensiveness or denial on the part of the white faculty member. Many faculty have too much at stake as classroom experts to place themselves in a learning posture on racial matters, especially not as learning from students. And at a structural level the academy often keeps White privilege in place by ignoring or casting non-dominant groups' uniqueness outside the realm of intellectual and practical (i.e., instructional) relevance. In this way denial of racial difference and White dominance differs from obliviousness in that the faculty member recognizes differences but elects to minimize or otherwise not deal with them, as illustrated in the following comments by Phil, a humanities professor, and Bridget, a natural science professor.

I: OK. What about the actual composition of the classroom being racially diverse or culturally diverse? How do you deal with those issues? Or are they issues at all for you to deal with?

R: You probably need to particularize the question more. I'd say I don't deal with it, I just, I have the classroom and we work together.

I: Right, so it's not something that you say, OK, I have a multi-cultural, or racially diverse classroom, I'm going to change my teaching style accordingly.

R: No. (Phil, Humanities)

I: Do you think you can teach effectively without paying attention to issues of diversity in class?

R: I can in my field. I think as long as everyone in the classroom feels they can talk to me and ask me questions, then it doesn't matter what color they are or what gender.

I: Now I'm going to ask a few questions about your students: where are white students on issues of racial diversity? Is that expressed in any way in your class? For instance, can you give an example.

R: They do have to work in groups and usually teams will, some will be diverse sometimes.

I: Are they self selected?

R: Yes. It's usually mixed in terms of gender, it's usually mixed.

I: Do you know where they are in terms of race?

R: I think it's hard to generalize. I'm sure some people are not as far along as others, but it would not be really expressed, except on papers or exams. It's hard

to ask the faculty what they think, where they think the students are, unless it's a class on racial diversity or whatever. In a natural science setting, it shouldn't really come up except when some problems come up, because it's not relevant to the class. But otherwise, it's going to be very hard to ask about this and we don't want to put all the white students in the same group too, because they're not.

I: If you saw that all of the students of color were together and all the white students were together, or you tried to create the teams and make them diverse and there was a negative display, have you seen that?

R: I did end up with this African American guy and a woman, they both ended up on the same team, she was in his area too, so she didn't really know anybody.

I: Same question about students of color: do you get any indications from where they are on these issues of diversity.

R: One example I can think of is that one of the African American students, she had problems and this Hispanic guy helped her out, and that other student started doing much better, and I just felt, I think that he's a very generous guy, he's a very nice guy, and he was just being nice, he wanted people to do their best. And it was kind of cool to see. But I don't think we can generalize African American students, we have so few of them in this field that it's hard to say. (Bridget, Natural Sciences)

Neither Phil nor Bridget deny the presence of racial issues, but rather deny the importance or necessity of addressing them. Their position affords them the privilege to dismiss or minimize the significance of diversity and how it impacts the dynamics of the course or the students' experiences. This is particularly revealing in Bridget's use of dismissive language when talking about the difficulties faced by students of color and in her apparent lack of racial nuances implicit in the interactions she describes.

Denial and minimization may also take the form of supplanting the importance of racial difference with emphasis on other differences or issues – such as social class, religion or intelligence. These differences do matter, but when a professor says racial diversity does not, she or he is saying that such differences among students, especially departures from the cultural norm, are irrelevant or inappropriate and that the issues students of color bring to the table are not relevant. This posture itself reinforces

Whiteness. For instance, when asked how she first learned to consider how to deal with racial diversity in the classroom, Pamela and Susan, both natural science professors, offered the following.

How did I first learn to consider it? You know, I probably went to like some (teaching center) seminar, and they said, "Here's some differences." And I probably, what I remember thinking is, okay, are any of these relevant for anything I do? And I don't know if they are. But I think more than...I try to determine if some...I mean, everybody comes from some context, right? I mean, certainly I do. I still think maybe for me personally I think socioeconomic background is as much of a influence on where people are in attitudes as anything else. (Pamela, Natural Sciences)

I: Is there anything that you think white students do, that consciously or unconsciously expresses their racial privilege in the classroom? Or their advantage?

R: Basically, I don't know. They...they ask questions more. They ask for favors more.

I: Well; do you deal with that at all? Do you challenge their sense of privilege?

R: No. I try to develop the same sense in the minority students. (Susan, Natural Sciences)

In the first example, Pamela is unconvinced of the full significance of racial difference by asserting a shared experience of coming from "some context" yet ultimately names socioeconomic background as having as much influence as "anything else". Given that the question was specifically regarding racial diversity, "anything else" can be read as race. Dismissing race or actively trying to minimize it by comparing its impact with other social identity group membership (and social class is often used in this way) is a way white faculty can resist the need to address racial inequality and diversity in their classes. When a professor says diversity does not matter, she or he is saying that differences among students, especially departures from the cultural norm, are irrelevant or inappropriate and the issues they bring to the table are not relevant. This posture itself reinforces Whiteness. In the second, Susan assumes that privilege can be given to

students of color rather than recognizing the constraining forces of White hegemony. Dismissing or minimizing the importance of race and racial privilege, its possession or lack thereof, leads to a failure to address racial inequality and diversity in the classroom.

Voluntary attention to difference and dominance: "I have never addressed that."

Paying voluntary attention to difference and dominance by turning on and off awareness of difference, racial oppression and inequality is another way to reproduce Whiteness. White faculty who enact Whiteness in this way recognize, value and address race and racial issues only on their terms, when and how they choose. This somewhat unique variant of denial is evident in the tendency for white people to understand and act on their own racial identity and others' racial oppression when it is convenient or safe for them to do so, but to close their eyes and turn their backs when it is untimely, challenging or threatening to them (Yancey, 2004). Thus, their racial awareness is occasional and voluntary (Waters, 1990). They report situations where they voluntarily (and unilaterally) decided whether, when, where and how the class would engage their own or students' positions within the racial hierarchy. This is evident in this exchange with David, a social science professor.

I: How public are you in your teaching about your own racial membership?

R: I'm public, I'm very public to the extent that I think it has any relevance to what's going on.[Sometimes] I identify myself as a white, male, straight, married, old, whatever, right away. In another class I generally identify myself as a senior, powerful, tenured professor, first, because that's most important, and then as time goes on I generally report some gender stuff. (David, Social Sciences)

David illustrates his prerogative to determine in what context his own or others' racial identity is important. Students of color do not have the same ability nor do they have the

privilege of turning on and off the way white students and faculty engage with them. The choice this faculty demonstrates to move in and out of dealing with his own racial identity is an example of White privilege as well as faculty privilege.

Difference and dominance are here treated as malleable realities that can be shaped and made use of when convenient. Whites may claim the primacy of identities and opportunities/resources linked to gender, religion, socioeconomic class, ethnicity or national origin when their racial privilege and power is 'outed' or threatened and they feel defensive. Then even their own ethnicity may be constructed as a story of parallel oppression and struggle, as "immigrant tales" (Gallagher, 1995). The result often is avoidance of membership in the privileged or oppressive social category of Whiteness.

Susan provides this example:

I: So how public are you with your racial/ethnic memberships and identities?

R: Well I think of myself as a scientist rather than anything ethnic. So I talk about, I'm a scientist and this is what we do and...I try to teach that to everybody, because it's very important that undergraduates learn what it means to be a scientist or something, an eth-not ethnics, ethics, um, questions they have to be taught ethics. What is...what is scientific ethics. I mean, if you don't talk, a real scientist, and here's what I do, and here's why what you're doing is wrong. I do say sometimes during classes, "Gee, I've got a slow European brain", because some people think it's very important to be quick and not be right. By giving a fault to myself I try to attempt to make people comfortable with the way they think. (Susan, Natural Sciences)

Susan uses her ethnic identity as a proxy for her race. She appears comfortable implying publicly that her intelligence is affected by her ethnic identity (it even is stated in partial jest, to show the ridiculousness of such a claim), but her example implies students should feel the same comfort about the links between their identities and their intelligence or intellectual style. Her racial privilege (European is White for this faculty member) remains secure and this privilege may mean she has little to lose in the suggestion. This is

unlikely to be the case for students of color, especially African-American students, who live with a legacy of historic claims of their racial/ethnic inferiority being linked to brain size. Now they are faced with managing that historic stereotype internally and with their interactions with White students and the White faculty member in class.

Such voluntary racial awareness is also evident when progressively minded white people cast themselves as a ‘good white person’, one who can transcend the structure of racial oppression in their own attitudes and behaviors, or suggest that other aspects of their personal backgrounds and outlooks help them stand out as different from more ordinary white faculty members.

I: What have you found useful in helping to improve your ability to deal with diversity?

R: I grew up in an Eastern urban area... (and) saying I work in an inner city and with people who are Black or Latino gives me a lot more credibility than someone who just sort of sits and reads... So that if I want to like call on a kid who’s say African-American or Latino and say, “You know, what’s going on. You know?” I mean not to call on them to tell me what it’s like to be Black, but to connect to them. I think they know who I am. So it’s not like I’m this foreign person. And I think students feel comfortable raising that stuff that they might not feel comfortable (raising) in other classes. (Neil, Social Sciences)

Neil, from the social sciences, argues that his background and involvements give him credibility and show students that he is not ‘this foreign person’. He sees himself and wants to be seen as a good white person, not like some other white faculty. Indeed, if institutionalized racism and privilege are hegemonic, it is important to resist, “The temptation to present the persona of an exceptional ‘alright white person’” (Back, 2004, p. 5). The assumption that one’s individual history or actions can override the structural impact of white identity and dominance in interracial dynamics is questionable at best, and a further example of White privilege. People of color, and certainly students of color

who experience power differentials based on both their racial and student statuses, cannot voluntarily or safely make these assumptions.

White faculty may also enact voluntary attention when they conduct an exercise, lecture or discussion that includes issues of race and inequality, but then resist or avoid discussion of the racial dynamics of the class itself. This stance may also be related to the pressure to be 'the expert', and thus not to venture into areas where one is less experienced, knowledgeable, or confident. Even when racial difference and White dominance are acknowledged as such by white faculty, the privilege of choosing whether or not and when to engage these issues in the classroom remains. This can be seen in this extensive exchange with Paul.

I: Do you ever experience issues of inter-racial ignorance or awkwardness or separation in the classroom context?

R: Students have segregated themselves by race in your classroom. I have never addressed that. It doesn't happen 100% of the time.

I: Do you think it matters at all in the classroom dynamics

R: I believe it matters. I also believe it matters if they don't. So there are two situations there. It is really tempting to put value judgments on the two different alternatives, and my rational mind tells me don't do that. That every situation and every circumstance is different. People behave the way they do for reasons, and getting people to understand why they behave the way they do is much more important to me than trying to impose some other kind of external thing on top of that. So having seen both and seeing no particular trend in it, these things, things self-assemble in different ways for different reasons. So I, my rational mind is not willing to put a value judgment on the differences. My emotional mind is. But I'm pretty highly influenced by the culture of higher education.

I: How do you reconcile with that, the emotional -

R: You know, I close my eyes and teach. Over the long term, it gets easier to try and understand why some of this is happening rather than worrying about why something isn't happening. So given any situation, if the venues come up to try to understand what's going on and why it's gone this way, well, that's interesting. Why hasn't it gone another way? Well, that's interesting. Maybe under these circumstances this is the way this is going to go. So I understand that the discomfort is enough of me not to spend my time putting it off on them. So it's

my discomfort, it's my problem. And my way through it is through understanding what I see. Not by trying to raise it in my opinion as yet another tension.

I: Do you think that there are any particular issues going on with students of color in the classroom?

R: I have to believe there is. I mean, I'm on this campus, I have to believe there is. It is not something that I, except for whatever kind of opportunities I've had, have actively and constantly engaged in the course of the administration of my course. It's much more likely for me to have that conversation with people after they've left my course, or if they're here to talk about campus and stuff. The, unless a person is really, really interested to come in and talk about the non-chemistry of the course, my students are really busy people, and they're thinking about partitioning their time and it doesn't matter who they are. If they're going to come to see me at a time we made the appointment, it's much more likely we actually end up talking about the course. So, I mean, in terms of the overall situation on campus, as it might exist in class, I'm probably had more of those conversations with people who weren't in my class. People who after they'd been in my class, or stuff like that. (Paul, Natural Sciences)

Paul assumes a highly intellectual and cognitively logical stance which translates into a passive approach to the problematic racial dynamics he acknowledges are happening or believes are present. He chooses not to engage in these dynamics by labeling them as infrequent and thus not significant and by deliberately looking the other way. The choice of whether to take note of, acknowledge or act upon issues of racial difference or dominance sends a message to students about what is and is not valued in a predominantly-White college classroom.

Reflecting White supremacy

Acts of omission that maintain White hegemony by excluding people who do not comply with White norms: "You don't have to get angry about it."

When White norms are applied to everyone Whiteness is further mystified and omitted from inquiry, since it becomes the invisible forest in which only individual trees

can be seen. This stance is distinguished from ignorance/obliviousness and denial of difference/domination in that it recognizes or admits difference but valorizes and prioritizes the values and practices embedded in Whiteness. White faculty may assume that all students should behave and learn in normative ways that are embedded in their own and in white students' experiences and approaches. They assume their own way of learning, their educational experiences and expectations, and their personal references are shared by all. Morey & Kitano (1997) identify this as a monocultural approach to classroom content and process, one that defines curricular content and examples, methods of evaluation, and pedagogical methods likely to be drawn from and centered on the dominant White experience. This enactment by Pamela demonstrates the operation of the myth of normalcy and universality in the suggestion that special knowledge or skill beyond those utilized in a non-diverse class is not necessary in dealing with students with different backgrounds.

I: What kind of knowledge, skills and temperament do you think a faculty member needs in order to do a good job in a racially diverse classroom.

R: In a racially diverse classroom? You think they need different skills (than) for a non-racially diverse classroom? I don't know. I think they need...I think they need to be able to listen and maybe observe a little bit more than they do in a.....I guess in a non-racially diverse...I mean, in a non-diverse classroom, racial, gender, whatever, you're not going to have the differences, right? (Pamela, Natural Sciences)

It may also be that some white faculty also take their accustomed ways of teaching and relating with students for granted, and assume that comfort, safety and learning opportunities are experienced similarly by all students. One example of how this

behavior can take shape is by applying White dominant norms to classroom discussions that include racial conflict. This exchange with Tom, a social science professor, is one example.

I: How do you deal with conflict between racial groups in the classroom?

R: Well in all kinds of ways. I mean, it's clearly not just one thing. You know what I mean? Um, and I'm glad it's not just all oppression. Some of them (students of color) don't do anything, because they're just getting through, you know. Some of them raise the issues rather repeatedly and annoyingly because it's about emotion, and so they don't quite know how to raise it in a way that the people can hear it, you know. When that happens, I'll, actually it hasn't happened in my classroom for quite some time, I think probably because I raise it first. But...but, but...but when a student.

I: What's the "it" in that sentence?

R: Someone bringing up their own color or issues of racism or prejudice in an angry repetitive, annoying fashion. Instead they should bring it up in a more thoughtful way...you know, it's okay to bring it up. You don't have to get angry about it.

I: Partly because you've legitimated it coming up and...

R: I think so, yeah. (Tom, Social Sciences)

In the above example, Tom appears comfortable with the presence of racial conflict in the classroom as long as these conversations stay within parameters that are comfortable or acceptable to him. Directing or reframing an emotional or angry dialogue that is constructed “in a way that the [white] people can hear it” may or may not be intentional, but it results in an exertion of White dominance to keep the white faculty and students safe by demanding that students of color comply with White norms. Kendall’s (2006) “experience is that when white people ask for safety they don’t...want to be yelled at by people of color” (p. 153). This discomfort leads to problematizing the manner in which the students of color communicate instead of the white students’ and professors’ different manner or dislike for this way of expressing thoughts and feelings. White faculty may not recognize potential differences in how students from varying racial (and socio-economic class and gender) backgrounds experience the classroom or what is at risk for them in

these classrooms and these restricted conversations, and thus may not take any action to ensure that all students have what they need to feel safe and take advantage of educational opportunities and resources.

Some white faculty may also assume that access to educational resources is shared equally among all students and that differences in students' success navigating institutions of higher learning are a result of individual and not structurally shaped cultural practices, or that the differences are cultural (i.e., essential) and not the result of institutionalized racial power structures. Faculty who are unaware of the fears, concerns or barriers experienced by students of color (or of white students engaging in learning with students of color), may do little to acknowledge and address the challenges they face. For example when asked what she had learned about teaching in a diverse classroom, Susan described how she reacts to students of color being late to class.

Minority students, Black students, will often in recitations, often they'll come in late. And you have to be patient and understand that that's their way, I think, of expressing 'I'm in control of the situation. I'm going to come late to this class and it's going to be fine. I don't have to be in this class'. They'll make appointments with you for help and then not keep them. And again, I always think that that's because they really feel like they have to be in control and feel so lost. And so I just take off points. And there aren't a lot of minority students in science classes, and I think it's just a whole...I mean, I can imagine myself walking into the classroom full of people different from me, and...I wouldn't want to call attention to myself by being late. I could imagine wanting to be more in control by showing that I could do what I wanted in the class. (Susan, Natural Sciences)

She interprets students of color as trying to protect themselves or assert power or control in their relationships with her and the class by meeting course expectations on their own terms, by coming late to class or not coming to appointments at all with her. Her response to these underlying power/control issues – her role in the dynamic – is to assert her own power and control by penalizing the students for their behavior. She

demonstrates empathy for the students of color but judges their behavior according to her own standard of how she would respond and wants them to respond, and implies that if they behaved more in line with how she would in the same situation they would be better off.

Acts of commission that disempower others through demonstrations of White privilege and oppression: "But, that's true in any difficult student. Right?"

Often referred to as 'modern', 'aversive', or 'symbolic' racism (Dovidio & Gaertner, 1986; Kinder & Sears, 1981; McConaghy, 1986), white people can enact Whiteness through acts of commission by actively or passively making life more difficult for others. Because they have both power and a secured position within the racial hierarchy, they can choose to ignore the voices challenging their position or requesting or demanding equal rights and entitlement. This can be done in the classroom or in interactions with students when white faculty employ pedagogical practices that secure and sustain the power of Whiteness. Even when acting with the best of intentions White faculty sometimes operate in ways that make life more difficult for students of color.

I try to do little things...But I think more than anything, it just makes me try to see where the student is coming from as an individual rather than just jump right in with my own take on what I think they're actually saying. And I'm also not afraid to say, "Okay, so if you think this is...do you think this is an example of discrimination? Do we want to deal with this? Do you want me to work with your GSI? Or do you want me to work with you or what?" And I...I don't see a point of skirting around that, you know. If there's an issue. And if there's not, then they have to be able to say, "No, I don't think that's the problem, I think it's this."
(Pamela, Natural Sciences)

In this example Pamela appears to wish to address fairly an issue of a student reporting an incident of discrimination. But in effect she places a great deal of pressure on the student without providing the student any support. The line of questioning indicates that “they have to be able to say” what is and is not the issue. The student must educate the faculty member in depth, must prove the nature of the incident. The faculty member does not acknowledge the power differential at stake in this interaction, nor the student’s vulnerability in making, and perhaps losing, her case. Covert or implicit oppression also is often the result of assumptions based in the White privilege of blaming others for their situation. This is captured in the passive posture Susan reports taking in a racially/ethnically difficult situation, as follows:

I: Now what do you think are the knowledge, skills and temperament that a faculty member needs to possess in order to be able to do a good job teaching in a diverse classroom?

R: Infinite patience. You have to be able to understand what people feel about what they're doing, you know. That's hard in a racially diverse classroom because we learn to read body signs. That's something that really is pretty accurate. Um, so you have to learn to read body signs to get an accurate understanding.

I: Can you give me an example of that? How are they different? And what have you learned?

R: Oh, well, um, I...the young woman who...Muslim young woman. People would say things in class about Saddam and Pakistan and things before class. And then she just kind of stood there, or stopped there, and she wouldn't turn around, and she looked troubled, but she could speak. So perhaps it's just her and this type of thing of being a Muslim in this atmosphere.

I: Certainly the experience of feeling uncomfortable was because of her identity and the conversation that...

R: Oh, I'm sure it was. But I don't know from her reaction. (Susan, Natural Sciences)

Susan sees white students’ problematic behavior and recognizes the Muslim woman’s distress, but does not intervene in the situation. Despite her acknowledgement of the need to read body language in an effort to understand racial dynamics, she does not act on this knowledge, perhaps because the student behaved differently than Susan would have in a

similar situation. Moreover, she places the primary explanation for the student's response (or lack thereof) on the young woman and her identity instead of on the identities of and treatment she received from the other students. The following excerpt from the interview with Ann, a social science professor, presents another example of how white faculty may problematize the way students of color behave:

I: Are there things that you can or can't get away with, or do or do easier because of your race, your gender, or your status?

R: Status. Yeah. I like being a faculty member. It's pretty cool. So, I do. The other thing that I have is having spent a lot of time in Africa is status. It works. That's when I say that I can tease these African students. It's partly that I know what can make them laugh. And, so I play a bit in the tangle of how to handle those relationships, establishing my legitimacy as someone who knows Africa through that banter with the African students, where I know they will be friendly. I know they have no -- they [African students] don't have, excuse the term, hang-ups. It sounds like a very diminishing term, but anyway, they tend not to be full of anger. What you do deal with in African American students often is anger. But, that's true in any difficult student. Right? They're angry with you and there's like all these projections. You're their mother, their father, their something. You're like this bad person. You know, and you've got to just deal. (Ann, Social Sciences)

The implication here is that students of color (especially African Americans contrasted with Africans) are "difficult students" because of *their* issues, whether it is disengagement from the course or feelings of hostility. The students of color, rather than the course or classroom approach, or the societal context of racism and White supremacy, is the source of the problem. Ann's focus in these examples is not on the cause of these behaviors but rather on the inconvenience of dealing with them.

Regardless of intent, these examples of reproducing enactments of Whiteness in pedagogical practice illustrate the way white faculty can reinforce the White power structure. Limited racial awareness is part of this process. Ignorance of and obliviousness to racial concerns can be justified by the assumption some white faculty make that their

interpretation of events or situations can be relied upon *without* the need to seek out the opinions and perspectives of people of color who are also involved. White people can move through society unaware of what people of color think or experience without repercussions. This is not the case for people of color whose survival and success depend upon their ability to perceive the perspectives of whites and act accordingly (DuBois, 1994/1903). Denial of or the voluntary attention to difference and domination serve to maintain racial inequality and dismiss the differential impact this hierarchy has on the lives of white people and people of color. The larger structure of White hegemony is reproduced in a pedagogical context when White supremacy is enacted in the teaching methods. Acts of omission that maintain White hegemony by excluding people who do not comply with White norms and acts of commission that disempower others through demonstrations of White privilege and oppression reinforce White dominance and students of color are faced with the burden of attending to their educational goals and responsibilities while negotiating the oppressive environment that results.

Failing to recognize and act on the reality that some ways of knowing, learning, and behaving are culturally embedded means that one's customary materials and approach may not engage all students successfully. Thus, certain groups of students will be disadvantaged by a singular approach and learning will become disproportionate. Where white students may identify the classroom experience as familiar and comfortable, students of color may experience the classroom as unfamiliar and unsettling. Or, students of color may recognize the classroom atmosphere as similar to all their other classrooms, especially if they grew up in a predominately white neighborhood, in its exclusion of them. In essence, they are entering or living in an alienating culture. They may have to

employ coping mechanisms they have learned earlier, such as speaking a certain way. Others may have to spend time figuring out what the barriers to their learning are in the class and then develop strategies for managing the obstacles. White faculty who employ reproducing enactments in their pedagogical practice may not recognize these difficulties or the underlying racial dynamics. Despite the many examples from Susan, she maintained that race was not a recurring issue in the classroom.

I: So you've mentioned that race does not come up in your classrooms at all.

R: Not as much...no. (Susan, Natural Sciences)

It may be that the disciplinary norms she adheres to demand that race not be an issue in a science classroom. It may also be that as a women scientist she feels an added need to comply with these norms herself lest her own minority position be questioned. Both of these factors are elements of White hegemonic control. Regardless, chances are the students, of color and white, would likely differ in their assessment of what goes on in her classrooms. In the next chapter, I turn to the ways some white faculty are expanding their racial consciousness and breaking their collusion with White hegemony by engaging in transformative pedagogical practice.

CHAPTER IV

**TRANSFORMING ENACTMENTS OF WHITENESS
IN PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICE**

Some scholars (Johnson, 2006; Kendall, 2006; Kivel, 1996; Thompson, 2001) have attended to the ways in which it is possible and important for white people to transcend the various forms of racial unawareness and oppressive behaviors that maintain White hegemony. Wagner and others (2005; Adams, Bell & Griffin, 1997; Collett & Serrano, 1992; Schoem, Frankel, Zuniga & Lewis, 1995; TuSmith and Reddy, 2002; Scheurich & Young, 2002) argue that pedagogical practices can be reworked to promote transformational change in this respect. This can be done by creating an inclusive classroom by transforming normative academic practices (Collett & Serrano, 1992). This includes who is in the classroom, what material is presented, and how it is delivered. O'Brien (2004) calls for not only a change in curriculum content, but for a shift in the process of how the curriculum takes shape. For example, she challenges faculty to challenge the lack of emotion in the dominant epistemological approaches by "exploring how incorporating the emotional response of *anger* in class discussions of racial oppression disrupts the normative hierarchies of White dominance in classroom space" (p. 68). This is in contrast to what we heard in the previous chapter from Tom, a social science professor, who was trying to silence anger rather than explore its epistemological value.

However, efforts to transform pedagogical practice are clearly evident among the group of white faculty in this study. In this chapter, I apply the theoretical framework of enactments of Whiteness outlined in Chapter 2 (Figure 1, Column 1) and use the data generated from the interviews with this group of white faculty to demonstrate the presence of transforming enactments of Whiteness in pedagogical practices. These enactments 1) express racial awareness by disclosing personal white identity, acknowledging and attending to racial plurality and revealing patterns of White hegemony and one's location in a system of White privilege; and challenge White supremacy by 2) creating alliances with people of color on diversity issues, and acting to alter structures and cultures that support normative patterns of Whiteness embedded in our racial hierarchy. Of the 291 enactments, I identified 183 (63%) as transforming. I described some of the differences with respect to the number and kind of enactments present among this group of faculty in Chapter 2. However, there are some numbers that have particular relevance here. Given the selection criteria applied to this group, it may not be surprising that most of the enactments I identified in the interviews were transforming enactments. I found roughly the same number of transforming enactments among white women and white men faculty, 52% and 48% respectively. More transforming enactments were found on average among the practices of social science faculty with a mean of 14 compared to humanities professors with a mean of 11.8 and natural science professors with a mean of 4.33. Whereas the group most represented among the reproducing enactments was white women natural science professors, I found most of the transforming enactments among the interviews with white women social science professors. The relative broader range of teaching methods commonly found in

the social sciences and humanities compared to the natural sciences might provide more opportunities to explore transforming pedagogy. Where natural science faculty utilize normative practices such as lectures, social science and humanities professors are more likely to incorporate active and experiential learning strategies. These strategies are not in and of themselves transforming, but they do provide more avenues to incorporate these types of enactments. This spread of representation is evident in the analysis that follows with most of the examples coming from the interviews with the white women and men social science and humanities faculty.

An interesting difference arose in terms of the kind of enactments evident in the groupings of reproducing and transforming. While the number of reproducing enactments was fairly evenly divided between those that reflect limited racial awareness and reinforce White supremacy, this was not the case within the group of transforming enactments. In this group, almost two-thirds of the enactments were classified as expressing racial awareness and just over a quarter as challenging White supremacy. The data from this group of white faculty suggest that it may be more likely for white faculty to act in ways to transform Whiteness through enactments that express racial awareness than through enactments that challenge White supremacy. This difference can inform faculty development efforts geared at transforming pedagogy by delineating what enactments white faculty may find more accessible (expressions of racial awareness) and those that are perhaps more daunting (challenging White supremacy). It may be easier and safer for white faculty to learn how to incorporate expressions of racial awareness into their teaching repertoire versus how to recognize and dismantle the influence of White supremacy evident in their practices.

Expressing Racial Awareness

Disclosing personal white identity: "I gave the presentation on my identity..."

This enactment of Whiteness is transformative, or challenges the hegemony of Whiteness, when white people acknowledge the presence of Whiteness and articulate the impact of Whiteness on social interactions and structures. When white faculty reflect this awareness in their pedagogical practice, they announce and discuss their own racial identity and that of white students in the classroom, and how this identity affects classroom dynamics. The relatively rare nature of such self-disclosures by white faculty generally, and the openness, and perhaps vulnerability, implied thereby, can lead to temporary student defensiveness and caution (and not coincidentally, both caution and/or distrust and greater comfort and/or participation from students of color). However, in the long run greater openness, trust, and willingness to take such communicative and behavioral risks can result in benefits for all students. O'Brien (2004) points to the importance of racial self-disclosure and frames its occurrence in the context of a mutual learning experience in the classroom. This disrupts the hierarchical nature of normative faculty student relations which is particularly salient when the faculty member is white. Jennifer, a social science professor, and Marc, from the natural sciences, report below how they publicly shared their racial identity in the classroom in the context of their own participation in exercises designed to help students explore such issues.

I: How public are you in class about your racial group membership and identity?

R: Tremendously in these classes so my role often in these classes are to talk about white privilege and to draw examples from like take a day of my life, like the Macintosh piece, but to take a day of my own life and just detail how many of my privileges that day came from me being white.

I: Do you think it has an impact on what happens in class?

R: My being white?

I: Yes, and how you kind of play your identity or use your identity.

R: Well I'm sure just being white has an impact it makes in conventional classes where maybe it is 90% white kids where they just think this is how the world ought to be and then when I play with it and urge them - this was true in one of my courses recently, it was maybe 50%, 60% white. I gave the presentation on my own identity and have them do the "who am I" (exercise), and then I asked the white kids how many of them put down white. Practically none of them did and so then if I use my identity (as a White person) they have to stop being comfortable. Because most of them are just not going to have thought of themselves as white. So this is a good teaching moment. (Jennifer, Social Sciences)

I: How do you think about your racial identity, how does it play out, how do you draw attention to it?

R: We've taken at some times the self-identity matrix. And I do it myself and we break it down and have a couple of two-on-one discussions. I always pretend I am one of the gang and students are asking me questions and whether I think of myself as (white and) heterosexual, those sorts of things. (Marc, Natural Sciences).

Exercises such as the ones Jennifer and Marc describe help students explore privilege and Whiteness in the context of a range of social group memberships, including race, gender, socioeconomic class, and sexual orientation. They offer students an opportunity to explore these issues themselves and faculty participation models the necessity of doing so regardless of your academic standing, position or race. Naming and investigating Whiteness becomes an academic exercise with personal relevance.

Part of white faculty members' awareness and disclosure of personal Whiteness is an acknowledgment that students of color will not and cannot afford to take such openness for granted. In a response to a question about how public she was about her own racial identity in class, Mary, a social science professor, noted:

I feel like my race is read. You know, they read my race. My commitments around anti-racism I'm very open and direct about. I'm very conscious that students of color are judging, evaluating, interpreting how safe they are with me, what I'm going to do if white students say, as they do, painful and hurtful things. So I know that I am being read, I should be read, and I want to be read. I'm putting things out so that I will be read. (Mary, Social Sciences)

The risk of opening up about one's race and related social realities is not the same for all students or for all faculty. Mary's comment suggests her understanding that, "...[w]e who are white walk into a conversation carrying all of the people of our race with us, whether we want to or know that we're doing it" (Kendall, 2006, p. 129). Students of color need to test the waters to determine how safe it is to engage in a dialogue on race or any other topic with white faculty and students. This is true for white students as well. Acting on this need enables some white faculty to build the trust required to create a safe academic space for all students.

Acknowledging and attending to racial plurality: "So I think about it (diversity) ahead of time."

In practice, attending to diversity does not mean giving up aspects of one's culture or behavioral norms, but it does mean understanding and acknowledging that other cultures and values are legitimate. Understanding and recognizing that the racial hierarchy in society positions whites above other racial and ethnic groups are implicit elements here. White faculty challenge the normative practices of Whiteness when they incorporate multiple voices into the curriculum, instructional tactics and classroom interactions. A number of authors have discussed the need for course planning to incorporate plural views. Their perspectives include broadening the subject matter of

their courses, or at least introducing multiple voices into their curricula and reading lists (Bell, et al., 1997; Garcia & Smith, 1996; Morey & Kitano 1997; Schoem et al., 1993). In addition, Law, Phillips and Turney (2004) urge institutions and their faculty to, “...include considerations about delivery as well as course content and resources...The process of learning should be inclusive and take into account the needs of all learners...” (p. 100). This means generating a variety of course activities, approaches and examinations that permit students with different individually- or culturally-based learning styles to find their own best way of working/learning (Anderson & Adams, 1992; Auster & MacRone, 1994; Kolb, 1984; Montgomery & Groat, 1998; Morey & Kitano, 1997).

Several white faculty members discussed a variety of course activities, approaches and examinations they used that permitted students of varied backgrounds and learning styles to find their own best way of working/learning. They reported including multiple voices in different ways, diversifying course material, actively seeking the inclusion of different perspectives from students in the class, and attending to and drawing students’ attention to the interactive social arrangements of the classroom – such as the way people of different racial and ethnic groups sat together or communicated and related with one another. David, from the social sciences, offers the following:

I: How do you deal with issues of racial diversity in the classroom?

R: OK. Well, I think about it from the outset. I think from the get-go. I think about it ahead of time, and I think about the structuring the curriculum, and I think about watching out for classroom seating patterns, and I think about watching out for who I talk with, and a whole bunch of things like that ahead of time. And so I prepare to organize the class in ways that challenge overtly or covertly the normal ways that we do race and gender, and other things in a university classroom. So that I will sometimes ask students early on, first day, second day of class, to meet in groups of people who don't look like them. That's all I have to say, and everybody knows what we're talking about. Or I will, if I see students of different races generally starting to pick certain kinds of seating

patterns in the classroom, I will raise that as an issue. I'll say, look at what's going on here, what do you think that's about? As I said earlier, I try to use what's going on in the classroom...challenging them can be overt in terms of, hey, look what's happening here. Or it can be covert, like pick someone to talk to who's different than you. I'm trying to get out ahead of it to challenge the normal patterns that carry race or gender into the classroom. I'll do that in curriculum materials, as well. I'll try and make sure that in the qualitative research class that we have materials written by people of color, and women as well as men, and about race and gender issues involved in the class. (David, Social Sciences)

He points out that preparation, awareness and a willingness to draw attention to and even orchestrate student interactions if need be are all methods for attending to the inclusion of multiple voices in the classroom. The following quote is another example of addressing plurality through course assignments and reaching out to students. Paul, a natural sciences professor, explains his effort to do this.

What I've tried to build in my courses is a menu of opportunities and to try to educate the students in class about the nature of different options. There are twenty different ways to get here. You can take one-on-one tutoring approaches. You can come to class and use groups that are informally structured through the course pack. You can go to the science learning center and do this. You can be part of a living-learning community. You can be part of the honors community. You can read advice that's here and come and meet with me about these things. You can write out stuff that I look at. And how do I make the decision about which of these things is good for me and bad for me? Well my answer is, "Let's talk about your ability to understand what these differences are and how you might enter into this." (Paul, Natural Sciences)

The variety of learning opportunities outlined above demonstrates a wide spectrum of ways students can and do learn. Paul's openness to them signals a shift away from dominant epistemological assumptions that often shut out students of color. By going beyond the dominant and traditional instructional set of practices and tools Marge, from the humanities, is also making space for, and as a result affirming, alternative (and potentially culturally-preferred) ways of learning.

If I have students of color I assume they are concerned about (a range of) examples...I'm imagining that they're more interested, more comfortable then. As I would be if they only show men's work, I mean if they show only men's work I'm really ticked off. So I assume certain politicization and that they're watching and that they're sometimes appreciative if there's a little bit more. (Marge, Humanities).

Here, Marge considers her own reactions and potential loss of interest in a course that did not include course content generated by scholars of identity group memberships similar to her own, or concerning issues with particular relevance to her. She accepts the notion that students place value on curriculum inclusiveness. As a result all students may develop greater openness and understanding of their own and others' experiences and perspectives, and the social forces that create or support such patterns.

Revealing White hegemony and one's location in a system of White privilege:

"And that includes looking at privilege and oppression..."

Recognizing that the dominant narrative in our society is based on the perspective of the white racial group, and publicly acknowledging a social location within this system of White privilege is a transforming enactment of Whiteness. White faculty do this in pedagogical practice by explaining patterns of White dominance and hegemony as they arise in course materials, classroom dynamics, and the university itself. Thus, rather than limiting discussion to the individual nature of white identity, this approach helps identify the historical and/or societal context in which Whiteness becomes an instrument of racial dominance. As an example, Marchesani and Adams (1992) note the importance of

drawing attention to the way in which the society and the university itself “reflects the cultural norms and traditions established by its predominantly Western White male originators” (p. 12).

Identifying, much less revealing, one’s location in a system of White hegemony may sound unlikely in everyday interactions. However, as McIntosh (1989) argues, it is possible and essential to challenging the normative practices under White hegemony. This is not to say that it is necessarily a comfortable or easy process. Indeed, white faculty members’ efforts to disclose their own location in systems of White privilege and dominance, and their corollary efforts to engage in their own racial learning, are likely to make them feel vulnerable and some white students uncomfortable. White ignorance, defensiveness and denial are then likely to be played out in the classroom by both faculty and students. However, greater understanding and appreciation for the influential role societal structures can play are often found on the other side of these initial reactions.

The following examples illustrate how some white faculty structure classroom exercises or reflect on classroom dynamics in ways that draw students’ attention to patterns of White dominance. Showing statistics or creating opportunities for self-examination are ways to incorporate an examination of racial structure and resulting privilege and oppression. Jennifer and Tom, both from the social sciences, link such structures to students’ own lives, in terms of their own professional roles and responsibilities. Learning to recognize patterns of White hegemony in these courses can help students recognize them once in the professional realm.

I: Can you think of any specific strategies; especially if white students don’t have the same level of awareness?

R: One thing that works....I ask that one of their assignments was that they had to go in mixed groups and they could not just have their little [White and Jewish]

group from day one. So I randomized them and gave them numbers and they had to go in (mixed) groups. Each group could take on something, they could take a dining hall, they could go to a bar, they could take on student meeting places, they could go somewhere and spend enough time there that they were social observers of who's doing what with whom., for how long. And then come back and try and analyze what is this setting and why is it here at this school. So you can push them to be social observers and to try to make sense out of racial patterns. (Jennifer, Social Sciences)

I: How do you raise them in the syllabus?

R: My syllabi tend to be about 14, 15 pages long. And in there I'll talk about oppression and privilege and then I'll...I'll have assignments that really ask you to examine it for yourself... One of the things I do in my classes for students who are going to be service providers is I have them do a self-reflection to recognize how they're a tool in that service provision. And that includes looking at privilege and oppression and prejudice and discrimination, not only the experience that they're going to give to other people but what that's about. (Tom, Social Sciences)

In this next example, Neil, a social science professor, points to his own privileged position as a white faculty member and the respectful treatment this social location affords him. In the second quote, he describes one way he tries to draw attention to patterns of White hegemony outside of the classroom.

I've also used the example of that when I'm walking down the street people don't think I am a junkie or something. Whereas, some of my colleagues (of color), if they're wearing the wrong clothes,...people sometimes think that they don't belong here. I mean there's been things in school where people have questioned faculty members (of color) about what they are doing here, you know. I never have to worry about that. (Neil, Social Sciences)

I show data on the percentage of people in different categories of jobs and income, percentage who are white and Black and I always make it clear that less than 2% of the professionals are African American and people in (this) school they're only like 5%. And so, "Why should it be different? Why should we have more Black professionals?" (Neil, Social Sciences)

All of the above quotes demonstrate ways to acknowledge White racial patterns. While Gallagher (2003) reports that many of the white students he interviewed "...were 'tired hearing about' the role whites have played in American racial history. Interviewees were also tired of the discomfort they experience when discussing these issues with non-whites seated next to them in the classroom" (p. 303). Yet, by challenging students to examine their own classroom behavior, faculty help students to gain an understanding that they are not only observers but participants in these patterns.

Challenging White Dominance

Creating alliances with 'others' on diversity matters/issues: "That's part of what I see as my responsibility as a white person and as a teacher..."

White people can challenge White hegemony by coming together with 'others' as allies in an effort to work together for racial change and equality, instead of replicating the normative power differentials of cross-identity relationships. This is done by white faculty when they make ally behavior a part of their personal and pedagogical practice in an effort to disrupt patterns of White dominance in the classroom, and through creating opportunities for students to develop these behaviors themselves. Activists (Johnson, 2006; Kendall, 2006; Kivel, 1996; Proudman et al., 2005) describe behavioral patterns available to a white ally or coalition partner: advocate, associate, enabler, partner, friend, mentor, co-worker for change. Some of the faculty went out of their way to create new kinds of connections or alliances between themselves and students of color. In some instances that meant paying special attention to or challenging the ways white students acted out patterns of dominance (perhaps in order to ease the burden on students of color

to engage in such challenges), and as the second quote below indicates, in other cases attending to the needs and problems students' of color often encounter in a White dominated educational and social environment.

I: Where are white students generally on issues of racial diversity?

R: Hopeful, ignorant and awkward. I think white students, particularly at this university, hope to have good relationships with students of color. They hope to learn about the society in which they're living in. I think they're dreadfully ignorant, both at an informational level, and at a level of understanding the relativity of their own identities and other people's identities. And I think as a result of that, they are very awkward in knowing how to initiate and knowing how to connect, and knowing how to talk with other kinds of folks.

I: How do you deal with that, what do you do about that sometimes racial problematic behavior in the class?

R: I generally try and challenge it before the students of color have to challenge it. That's part of what I see as my responsibility as a white person, and as the teacher. Not to let the burden be on the students of color. I'm not always fast enough to do that. And so I will ask a white student what it is that they're saying, or why are they behaving in a certain way, or what's going on? It doesn't help to say that's a racist behavior. Unless somehow we've laid the ground work for saying that racism means that you operate in certain ways whether you intend to or not, so if we effectively discuss the term enough so it doesn't send people into shock, we can use it. But, so I'll ask what's going on, or I'll set up some exercise that will put the dynamics out there in the open where we can work with them.(David, Social Sciences)

One of the situations that comes up in classrooms, if you look at research or read a book that involves people of an African American heritage, or whatever...often the white students will discuss it while the people who are most directly represented probably are feeling resentful and feeling the naiveté of the others as they try to discuss the book.... Generally what I'll do there is I'll try to say things that I feel are representational or in the ball park of what the silent students of color would say as a way of encouraging them to feel represented and to bring their voices in. I also watch closely for them to indicate that they're ready to speak, and if they are silenced by the White appropriation of their issue in the classroom, not that whites shouldn't talk about it but not in a way that appropriates the issue in the classroom, I will get with that student afterwards. I will call or talk to them before the next session, or whatever, to make sure that

they know I know it's going on and encourage them to not feel damaged or isolated by it, or encourage them to speak the next time. (Phil, Humanities)

I: Have you ever been accused of being soft or bending over backwards for minority students or for White students?

R:Oh. Sure. But I don't have a problem with that. I had an amazing, bright honors student one year who was on the hockey team. I busted my butt to help him get some extra, some different discussions, so that he could stay on the hockey team. He ended up with a full ride through med school. So I have no problem with trying to help someone get through something. My student I have now, when she was an undergrad she was a single mother. We worked hard to make sure we could help with taking care of this darling little kid who's now a fourteen year-old. (Pamela, Natural Sciences)

These quotes from David, Phil and Pamela from the social sciences, humanities and natural sciences respectively, illustrate how white faculty's attunement to the needs and styles of both white students and students of color might translate into alliances.

Development of these practices and relationships challenges White dominance by acknowledging the validity and significance of power and entitlement in interracial relationships and opportunities for learning. Being an ally on diversity issues by challenging white students' racially inappropriate behavior so that students' of color do not always have to, checking in after a potentially damaging racial exchange in class, and encouraging all students to have a voice in class can undermine the dominant norms that keep some students of color (and some white students) on the margins of academic life.

Some alliance work can be quite complex or confusing in these interracial contexts: questions of the limits of relationships or help arise, as do risks in being misunderstood. Marge and Sarah, both social science professors, offer the following:

I: Okay. How about being touch or bending over backwards for white students?
R: I don't know. I don't think so. I might bend over backwards in some weird way for a student of color, maybe making assumptions about things they've faced or whatever, even though they've never talked to me about it. I know that wouldn't be a very good idea, but I can't say it never happened. (Marge, Social Sciences)

There was an older African American woman in this class who was writing some of the most exquisite papers, really wonderful papers. And I said to her, when I handed one of them back, had she thought about going out for graduate work, because this was good work. Well she reacted in a very sort of paranoid way, and I quickly thought, 'well, what's going on here'? And then I thought, 'She thinks that I am being patronizing and just think this is good work for a Black person.' So I said, 'Really I do think these are some of the best papers I've ever gotten. You are asking questions the way a graduate student does.' I really worked hard at trying to reframe whatever she had originally heard to what I meant. And at that point she kind of relaxed and kind of blossomed. And in fact she stayed quite close to me. I hear from her periodically and she tells me what she's doing. (Sarah, Social Sciences)

Alliance building between white faculty and students or colleagues of color requires a willingness to acknowledge that past and current experiences of racism will inform these relationships, and as Marge's comments suggest, faculty interactions with students.

Instead of taking offense that the student in the second example received her comment with suspicion, Sarah reflected on how the comment may have come across from the student's perspective. She then reframed her words and was willing to engage on the student's own ground.

There are times when being an ally on issues of antiracism or social justice in the classroom requires allying with white students who take meaningful risks in confronting difficult racial dynamics. Good alliances often work to the benefit of all parties involved. Jennifer described how this alliance building can work through student interactions in a class where open communication about these issues is nurtured.

I: What kind of knowledge skills and temperament do you think a faculty member needs to possess in order to do a good job teaching interracially diverse classroom? Specific knowledge skills.

R: I think that maybe the most important knowledge is about conflict. I don't think you can do it well if you don't know anything about conflict. I think you need to know a lot about intergroup the history of intergroup relations so that you know what it means not just as a stereotype but you know what it means when some Asian -American student is being differential or silent. You have to know something about silence and how the concentration camp experience was not talked about in families otherwise you are going to stereotype that Asian-American women are quiet and passive. You have to have some sense about this; you do need to have some explicit content knowledge. Temperament I think you have to embrace conflict and not be scared of it; not be scared of emotion. Once in a class a few years back there was a African-American student who had grown up in one of those very wealthy Connecticut towns the name of which I have forgotten. Maybe there were four African-American students in his high school. A very high achieving kid and there was a white woman from a rural area who...was having this very hard time whenever she was characterized as 'you people'. One day she just burst into tears and she said she just couldn't take it anymore; she could not take being called you people. She's not just you people, she's not just white, etc. etc. He (very high achieving African American student) came over to her and held her hand and said, 'I don't like to be called you people either. The phrase is not used to me directly but there isn't a moment in my life that I walk across this campus that I am not aware that I am being perceived as you people so it isn't very good on either side of this.' He was being incredibly nurturing...And if he hadn't nurtured her I would have found some way to help the whole class deal with the powerful thing she was saying and feeling, which they all say they felt too from their different perspectives. You just can't do this if you're scared. (Jennifer, Social Sciences)

In this situation, Jennifer did two things that illustrate her desire to build alliances with students as they engage in race based issues. First, she did not try to take over control when the African American student addressed the white student. She was willing to step aside in recognition of his closeness to the issue. Secondly, she was clear that if he had not engaged with her as he did, that she would have done so by addressing the issue with the class. A piece of what was at risk here was a white student's self-awareness around

race and White privilege. Supporting this growth is part of alliance building. Instead of shutting white students out or silencing them, white faculty can help them develop ally behavior by practicing it with them.

Acting to alter structures/cultures that support White dominance: “In essence the discrepancy disappeared.”

Along with ally relationships, white people can also take steps to change the very structures that uphold the hegemony of Whiteness. This can be done by altering structures and cultural norms by creating new policies and practices that transform the practices and cultural norms that directly or indirectly perpetuate the social racial hierarchy and resulting inequalities. For white faculty, this translates into efforts to alter structures and cultures of academia by exposing students to various ways of knowing and being, providing opportunities to reconsider existing structures and cultures, and acting personally to alter traditional norms and practices in the classroom, institution and/or community.

Some faculty members who saw patterns of White dominance in their own teaching or in classroom dynamics elected to alter the ways in which the prevailing culture and pedagogical traditions or customs of the university system privileged Whiteness. Others altered their ways of instructing and interacting with students and their approaches to student learning. John, a natural science professor, and Ann from the social sciences, made just such changes in their respective courses.

My exams were multiple choice and based on problem solving. We took this program and we'll ask a question from one of my exams and give them several answers. If they choose the wrong answer, which often from my questions meant drawing the wrong conclusion from a situation, you don't tell them, 'No dummy,

you're wrong,' but here's something about why they were wrong. Give them some kind of feedback about the nature of the mistake they had made and try the situation again. So we set up some software like that with the added element that we randomized the order that the questions and answers were presented so people could go through these exercises several times and not just memorize the pattern of the questions. The first two years that I had this software my exam means shot up for the class as a whole. When I announced this thing I never said this is obviously for minority students. Although some people have done stuff like that, it's like shooting yourself in the foot. I said, 'There's this facility here and it's for helping you study for exams, go take a look at this software and see if you find it useful.' This was a self-contained facility and they sat down and ran the software. In essence the discrepancy disappeared between the minority students and the rest of the class at the same time that everybody's performance increased. To me that was the most profound lesson of the whole thing. (John, Natural Sciences)

I can give a straight lecture where I don't ask for any participation. For me, diversity really comes into play when you're encouraging active learning and participation. I certainly have times when I need to rush [through] the material. The material ends up being about race but I think that's different than it being about diversity. For me, I think that [what] is really important is the mode of authority, it's the style of authority, it's the style of the [classroom] structure. Diversity is about drawing out multiple voices in the classroom and getting people, allowing them to speak. And you can teach race and give a whole course on race and never hear a single voice. (Ann, Social Sciences)

In both examples above, John and Ann acted to alter the normative pedagogical practices embedded in the White hegemony of the institution and were not serving overall student learning. Each white faculty took steps to make learning more accessible to students of color, and in turn white students as well. In order to create learning opportunities to address the race-based performance inequalities, the John changed the normative assumption that all students have equal resources to study aids and services outside of what is expected to be provided by the instructor. In the second example, Ann argues for an interactive approach because she feels that traditional methods do not successfully facilitate student learning. She recognized a need for and implemented a pedagogical

practice that consciously incorporated multiple voices instead of merely that of the white professor and that did not let her concern with the material turn students into “kind of a blur” as illustrated in an earlier example of reproducing pedagogy from James, a humanities professor. In this case, the normative practice of (white) professor as expert was diminished in order to encourage a more inclusive dialogue around issues of race.

For some white professors, challenging traditional patterns of White dominance in the classroom involved anticipating or surfacing the conflicts that underlie so much of polite and non-explorative racial interactions. These exchanges from interviews with Jennifer and Phil provided this example.

I: OK. How do you deal with conflict between racial groups or just racial conflict in the classroom? Can you think of any specific examples?

R: I had everybody in the class split (in half) and each half takes on the role of being a member of a group that wasn't their group and then gave them a controversial topic. What happened is that the people who were no longer playing themselves, but were playing a member of some other group said some outrageous things that hadn't been said in class before. Then we stopped it and the other half of the class was to be an analyst. The first thing I did was to say, 'What I want you to do is to tell me if things were being said here that we haven't heard before?' And then they did get it and they saw that there were sentiments that either the person assumed the white person they were now playing would say (and vice versa)...And it was the closest we came to people shouting at each other. And I just kept saying, 'Alright this sure brought out a lot of anger didn't it? OK, why do we have so much anger at about this point?' (Jennifer, Social Sciences)

I didn't used to be able to do this but when I get tension (in the class) I don't intervene real quick. I let people play out what they need to do. And then we have something real in front of us, because those are real expressions of what's in people's minds. Whereas if I'm always controlling or tempering or keeping a quiet classroom it's not as real as a classroom as it might be. So I prefer to look at it (the conflict or tension), because then you learn. Whereas if I'm lecturing you don't learn. (Phil, Humanities)

In the first example above, Jennifer deliberately designed an activity that surfaced such conflict and permitted racial phenomena to be discussed and analyzed openly. In the second example, Phil discusses the discipline and courage it takes to work with conflict in educationally productive ways. Conflict was not avoided or suppressed in either example, but was used as a pedagogical tool with which to explore, discuss and analyze thoughts, beliefs and assumptions around race. Doing so pushes white students and students of color to engage both their intellect and their emotions surrounding racial dialogue. In the process, they rupture the normative assumptions that support structures of belief and practice that support White supremacy.

The quotes in this chapter demonstrate some ways in which white faculty can challenge the normative assumptions of Whiteness through transformative pedagogical practices that express racial awareness and challenge White supremacy. These practices come together to create an intellectual environment where Whiteness is acknowledged and investigated as a matter of course. Disclosing personal Whiteness, acknowledging and attending to plurality, and revealing patterns of White hegemony represent ways to bring about an awareness of race that many white college students never achieve. However, the emphasis on revealing structures of White privilege, and one's own enmeshment in them, have led to warnings against white faculty seeing and presenting themselves as exceptions to these patterns, as representatives of the 'good white person' (Back, 2004; O'Brien, 2004). Indeed, if institutionalized racism and privilege are hegemonic, it is important to resist this temptation and to actively interrogate one's own Whiteness as well as that of the white students and the institution. Just because white faculty may engage in transformative actions does not mean they are any less involved in

perpetuating and benefiting from White privilege and systems of White supremacy, or that they are any less vulnerable to unintentionally displaying acts reflecting implicit racism.

By challenging White supremacy by creating alliances with racial-ethnic group members and acting to alter structures and cultures that support White dominance, White faculty are able to create some fissures in the hegemonic influence of Whiteness. However, the danger remains that a white faculty's efforts to support students of color and challenge white students' critical consciousness around Whiteness end up mirroring patterns whereby progressive White people (in this case faculty members) reach out to support, take care of, or advocate on behalf of persons (students) of color. Most undoubtedly these are useful actions. But true alliances between Whites and persons of color, or between faculty members and students, are reciprocal. They involve common agendas, mutual caring and concern, and equalization or at least some sharing of status and power. This is quite unlikely in the classroom without major challenge to the dominant ways in which academia follows a pattern of education that promotes a hierarchy of power and wisdom in the hands of the (mostly white) faculty. And at that point we are talking about overt or covert efforts to alter the structure and culture of White (and male and upper-middle-class) higher education. Openness about this dynamic tension is in itself a potentially liberating experience for white faculty and for students of all races/ethnicities. In the next chapter, I explore this tension in an analysis of the expressions of struggle some white faculty in this study described as part of their efforts to translate transforming pedagogy into practice.

CHAPTER V

**THE STRUGGLES OF TRANSLATING TRANSFORMING PEDAGOGY
INTO PRACTICE**

As the quotes in the previous chapter illustrate, Whiteness is being reshaped by some white faculty members inside the classroom through efforts to recognize and confront the normative pedagogical practices that stem from an entrenched system of hegemony. These efforts are not made without struggle (McKinney, 2002; TuSmith & Reddy, 2002). Despite being formally and informally recognized for their success in teaching in diverse classrooms, the white faculty members in this study still came up against difficult, tense, challenging pedagogical situations and are often uncertain, confused and frustrated in their attempts to address the issue at hand. The struggles surfaced in the spaces between the analytic dichotomy of reproducing and transforming pedagogies, in the effort to implement a less reproductive and/or more transformative approach. As such, they illustrate the fluidity and complexity of these negotiations, and highlight the unevenness with which white faculty enact Whiteness.

Patterns are hard to change. In one teaching situation, a transformative approach can be easily implemented while in the next, the entrenched familiarity of reproducing practices may seem most accessible. The struggles these white faculty talked about indicate that, as with learning other skills, translating ideas about transforming pedagogy into actual practices is an iterative process between learning how to perform the skill,

implementing the skill, and reflecting on what worked and what needs to change next time. Intention to implement transforming pedagogy does not necessarily translate into practice. Sometimes, and even with prior conceptualization and planning, the realization of needing or wanting to teach in a different way came in the moment, or when reflecting on an interaction or pedagogical practice that did not go as planned. Another factor to consider is the larger academic context of translating transforming pedagogy into practice. White faculty who confront White hegemony in their pedagogical practices do so within a structure of institutional norms which reflect, and thus support, this power structure (Boudreau & Eggleston, 2002; McKinney, 2002; Reddy, 2002). Whether in the classroom or in other instructional exchanges with students, these spaces of teaching are located within a larger context of disciplinary and gender norms that are part of this structure. When white faculty members try to adopt transforming pedagogy or translate it into practice, they depart from these norms and often conflict, tension and unease result (TuSmith & Reddy, 2002).

In this chapter, I present the following elements of the struggle to practice transforming pedagogy: connecting pedagogical intentions with pedagogical practice, uncertainty in the classroom, negotiating disciplinary norms, and managing institutional assumptions of gender. Of the 70 expressions of struggle translating transforming pedagogy into practice I identify in the interviews, most come from white women faculty (63%) compared with white men faculty (37%). The average expressions of struggle among faculty in the social sciences was 4.71 compared with 5.6 for humanities faculty and 1.5 for natural science faculty. White women social science faculty expressed struggles more often than white men in this group. The divide among humanities faculty

was more evenly split. This may mean that women faculty tried transforming more often than men in this group or that they reported more struggles in trying to transform than men in this group. Both white women faculty in the social sciences and humanities were particularly expressive in descriptions of their struggles compared to white women faculty in the natural sciences. In particular, white women humanities faculty talked extensively about their struggles implementing transforming pedagogy. Men in the humanities were slightly more expressive of struggles than men in both the social sciences and natural sciences. The relatively high number of transforming pedagogical practices among the social science and humanities faculty groups overall may have set the stage for them to recognize and discuss struggles more than their natural science colleagues. These differences may also be linked to the disciplinary distinctions between these groups with white women and men humanities faculty more engaged in a meaning making process while white women and men social science faculty drew more on a conceptual understanding and language supported by their discipline in their efforts to explain and understand their struggles. The relative silence among the natural science faculty could be linked to the relatively few opportunities they perceived to attempt transforming pedagogies within the set of teaching practices or content more typical in their fields. It also could be a reflection of their relatively limited awareness for the need of this pedagogical approach, how to implement these practices or an unwillingness to engage in these practices.

These numbers are reflected in the analysis that follows. We hear primarily from white faculty in the humanities and social sciences. In particular, Marge, a humanities professor, and Ann from the social sciences, talked extensively about their struggles

implementing transforming pedagogy generally and with several examples that illustrate uncertainty doing so in the classroom.

Connecting pedagogical intentions with pedagogical practice: "...I have to really work on myself not to do that."

Struggles arose as white faculty recognized the need for transforming pedagogy and as they attempted to integrate this approach into their teaching practice. One area of struggle white faculty faced was figuring out how to proactively recognize and address the racial component of the course content or structure rather than addressing race only when it surfaced in relation to isolated topics or was judged as relevant to students of color in the room. In response to a question about the knowledge, skills, or types of temperament a faculty member needs to do a good job teaching in a racially diverse classroom, Elizabeth and Marge, both in the humanities, talked about both a willingness to talk about race and the difficulty of doing so.

Well I think number one is the faculty needs to talk about race and ethnicity, they need to talk about it openly. I think a lot of instructors don't do that because their course may not be on that. Like in one of my classes, how can I do this and never talk about race? I did, I managed to do that for semester after semester. I never talked about race. For me that class was about class and unfairness, but we talked about topics without mentioning race. It was incredible. First of all realizing that you are doing that, and secondly having the courage to do it and then getting comfortable with the kinds of things that can come up. (Elizabeth, Humanities)

I: What kinds of knowledge, skills and temperament do you think a faculty member needs to possess in order to be able to do a good job teaching in a racially diverse classroom?

R: So, I think one of the first things you have to have is some self-consciousness about your own position. And, I know all the time that I lack and fall into traps or pits. I mean, it's very easy to bring race up as soon as somebody presents stories of their black family or something, and have race be absolutely absent from conversations until then. Or, to always look at the black student to make sure

how things are registering, you know, if race comes up about something. And, I have to really work on myself not to do that. But, the only thing I can recommend is self-consciousness and concern. (Marge, Humanities)

Each quote describes the faculty's belief that it is necessary, albeit difficult, for white faculty to recognize race as an organizing structure of society that shapes identity and racial dynamics and, to proactively address its presence in the course material and classroom. Both indicated their need to stay aware of the absence of recognition and, as Elizabeth pointed out, have the courage to do things differently. Elizabeth's use of the word "courage" speaks to the trepidation white faculty can feel when they change their pedagogical approach. Marge recommended self-consciousness and concern as tools to increase awareness. Yet she also recognized the need for vigilance to maintain this intentionality, to "really work" on herself not to fall into the "traps or pits" of losing sight of what she sees as her responsibility as the professor in the class to bring up race.

When David, a social science professor, was asked if he thought about race in the context of his teaching, he connected race with power and spoke of his attempts to negotiate the two in his pedagogical practice.

I think, well, essentially I think, I first think about power constantly. And since, for two reasons, I think. First of all because the most important thing that's going on in the classroom is the power of difference between students and faculty. Because of the authority structure in the system and the issue of expertise and age and all that stuff. And secondly since so much of what is race or class or gender in this society is power, then for both those reasons, the common variable is power, and you can see how this starts to connect, both with my personal interests, I think dilemmas around power and authority, and with how I sometimes get real confused about control around issues. So I'm constantly working myself in the classroom. So [being white] matters because it's a piece of power. (David, Social Sciences)

In this example, the focus is on how race and power are part of the traditionally hierarchical structure of the classroom which positions professor above student and is

compounded by the larger racial hierarchy that positions white above non-white. Like Marge, he pointed to the vigilant self-awareness he assumes in his efforts to keep from reinforcing the larger structural impact of race and power inside the classroom. As Elizabeth's previous quote about courage suggests, fear can be generated from intentions to address race from a transforming approach. Neil, in the social sciences, described his fear of making a misstep in his efforts to present course material in a more racially conscious manner.

So I try to make all those points, and I try to get into the fact that it's not biological. At least so far we don't think its biological there are these big differences in the stuff like social importance and all that we talk about...why might Black students be subjected to different stresses thing. Whites, you know, they talk about jobs or where people live and housing, racism and all that stuff. So I really try to bring it really out front...I have this voice in the back of my head somewhere that says, people like me get in trouble for saying something that somebody objects to because I'm willing to talk about it. And I know people on campus who've been, you know, attacked because of something that they said, but they're really out there trying to talk about it. So it's kind of a...you know, you've got to worry about whether you're politically correct or you say the right thing. There was an occasion a couple years ago where this guy who I really like was trying to show something about regression. He fed in all the variables, certain variables, certain people. So he was showing the differences between Whites and Blacks IQs. And then his whole point was if you add in whether it was a one-parent family or a two-parent family...one was income, one was the education of the parent that the race thing goes away. But the students sort of didn't want to hear that, and they just went around saying, "This guy's saying Blacks are inferior," and the guy got in all kinds of hot water. And I...it was clear that he didn't...But if he hadn't...if he'd just used...[lack of home] he would have had no problems. So, you know, I mean, I think hopefully that's not going to happen. But I'm sure it could, you know. You could say one thing and it would really antagonize people. But I'm hoping that, you know, people would look at sort of my career as, you know, with respect. (Neil, Social Sciences)

The "voice in the back of my head" did not stop Neil from practicing transforming pedagogy, but it is a pressure he contends with. To be sure, the example he described of the negative reaction to another professor's attempt is not an isolated event. Learning a new skill or approach often means making mistakes. Implementing a new way of

teaching, especially one that is counter to normative pedagogical practice and involves such a sensitive topic as race, is likely to come with a number of mistakes resulting in hurt feelings all around. Neil worried about this but found comfort in the fact that his career would reflect his intentions and be met with respect if he were to ever find himself in a situation similar to the one he describes. Yet, despite the best of intentions, racism, discrimination or expressions of prejudice can result. White faculty may not execute their intentions as well as they would like to, or they may be tentative in their approach for fear of charges of racism or favoring students of color at the expense of white students. If the use of transforming pedagogy to challenge White hegemony is used without skillful implementation, everyone can pay a price, students of color as well as white students and white professors.

In their attempts to pay attention to race, some white faculty found themselves relying on students of color to educate them or other students. This perpetuates a monolithic view of racial experience that falsely assumes that all members of a particular racial group share the same experiences. This view is reinforced and the role of White dominance in the racial dynamic is ignored when only students of color are asked to tell their story instead of facilitating a discussion with all students about how their own racial location fits into the larger racial structure. As argued in other chapters, the result is preservation of the racial hierarchy by making only students of color exposed and vulnerable. The following quotes from Jack, in the humanities, and Sarah, a social science professor, demonstrate the struggle some white faculty faced in their effort to increase racial awareness without making students of color into token spokespeople representing their communities.

You know, if I've learned anything from all the mistakes I've made as a teacher, it's that any one theory of who they are in that diverse landscape is going to capture some things and not capture other things. You know, that...that the good insight of people coming from different places can lead to the bad practice of having a student of color being made to speak for the whole community. (Jack, Humanities)

I: OK. We've been speaking about some of the ways white students' behavior may be problematic at times. Are there things of students of color do that are problematic on racial issues?

R: I don't know. Nothing explicit comes to mind. I think there are lots of things they do that are helpful. And some of it, I mean they're not helpful in just refusing to engage around some of those issues. And I mean, I do think some of them are quite worn out, having to deal with those issues over and over and over again, and feeling quite burdened by it. And I respect that a lot. So I work very hard at trying not to, especially if you have a group that's outnumbered by the whites in the class by somehow not making it be their job to educate. And that's not always easy to do. (Sarah, Social Sciences)

In Jack's reflection, we see again how intentions to practice transforming pedagogy can lead to reinforcement of the hegemonic practice of holding people of color, in this case students, responsible for teaching white people about race. Sarah spoke to the resistance students of color have to being used in this way and the tension she feels about their reaction. She voiced her understanding and respect for why they are reticent, but she also finds it challenging because it puts the responsibility and hard work of addressing racial issues on her.

It is also challenging for white faculty to be cognizant of the way White hegemony shapes epistemological norms, be open to other ways of knowing and learning, and implement an inclusive pedagogical approach. Assessment of students' work is an area where white faculty invested in transforming pedagogical practice struggle with applying normative evaluation standards to work by students of color. When asked if white students and students of color generally have the same skills, talents and learning styles, Sarah expressed concern that her assignments might disadvantage some students:

R: So, yeah, I'd say there is some [difference], and I worry that sometimes the kinds of assignments I give make it harder for people who are having to translate, who aren't used to kind of ambiguity and dealing with multiple level things at the same time. That I actually disadvantage them by what I value in terms of assignments.

I: What types of students are not used to dealing with those types of issues?

R: Well, I mean, sometimes it has to do with I think what kind of undergraduate education they had. Or what kind of sort of exposure they've had to things. And I don't know that there's a huge racial difference. I'd say it's probably appropriately more common among African American students. On the other hand, we've had a couple of Native American students, who had just challenged everybody on the faculty to figure out how on earth to grade the kinds of products they turned in. They would be exquisite but not explicitly telling you what the point was they were making. They were actually Native American cultural productions. And they were quite wonderful in a whole lot of ways, but they don't fit your ordinary grading criteria. But I think most people have dealt with them by trying to figure out how to adapt the grading criteria. Or how to teach them how to function because they're going to have to write case reports and they're going to have to write case notes, and in some ways they're going to sort of have to learn how to participate in some means of communication that isn't intrinsically their own. But how do you help them learn to do that without de-valuing what they bring to it is a struggle...I've sat down with somebody and said, you know, I know this may not be comfortable, but can you try and explain this to me? I mean, assume I'm a dumb reader here and I'm not getting the point from what you're trying to say. But that's a struggle. And how do you kind of value where they're coming from, without stereotyping, without making the assumption that may be in fact stigmatizing but adapting what you do in a way that allow people to play to their strengths. (Sarah, Social Sciences)

In this quote, the work by Native American students challenged the normative grading criteria faculty applied to their work. Department faculty recognized that the grading criteria did not adequately measure the quality of the students' work and some have tried to adapt their criteria. Sarah recounted the uncertainty this recognition has caused around issues of evaluation and instruction. She recognized that the academic skills some students of color come to college with may be incongruent with the skills of white students and with the values and expectations embedded in the assignments she gives to

both groups. She described the struggle she faced addressing this disconnect between cultural norms and White normative practices stating that these students' work does not fit "your ordinary [read as white] grading criteria". Of particular note are the struggles around, on the one hand, racially conscious interaction with the Native American students, and on the other, the reality of preparing them to enter a profession that maintains normative standards of evaluation. In this situation, normative White practices disadvantage students of color while benefitting white students.

In the next quote, John, a Natural Science professor, talked about an interaction with a student that made him reflect on his epistemological assumptions.

I just wonder sometimes whether it's that you're not communicating with that other 20%, that it's something about the language you used or how you phrased things or your common experiences. I don't know how you can train people in this area, I'm not even sure I've done a good job of defining what this area is. But I think that I don't automatically make this assumption anymore and I warn my GSI's about it especially, when a student comes in and is from another cultural background, be careful not to make assumptions in your communication about what things mean or be on the lookout for potential miscommunication. I have a feeling there's some real differences about the way people from the mid-eastern countries for example view some things in their cultural and social structure and it may very well influence our communication and ability to communicate about scientific issues. I don't know if anybody's attempted to study that phenomenon and document it or if there is any literature on it, but I have begun to pick it up in the last few years as my classes have gotten more diverse. There seem to be these little vacuums of understanding where you can't - you know how the student is doing in the rest of the class and the student is bright enough, but there are certain things you just can't communicate (John, Natural Sciences).

In these examples from Sarah and John, the inadequacy of normative pedagogical practices, evaluation standards and explanation of course material, were exposed through interactions with students of color or their work. While both professors expressed a willingness to take a transforming approach to evaluations and differences in the ways of knowing, they were not proactive in these efforts. Students of color were the educators

here. John explained his recognition that normative explanations may not resonate with a diverse group of students but questions his ability to do things differently. Interestingly, he wondered if there is any research to guide him. This could be because he has not sought out this information, but it also indicates that research on pedagogy, and specifically the way Whiteness shapes epistemology and pedagogy, is not a highly visible part of faculty development. Implicit in the White normative structure of academia is an assumption of the instructional authority of (white) professors coupled with a devaluing of teaching. Both shape the intentions white faculty have about what should happen in the classroom and the pedagogical practices they in turn employ. As such, these institutional norms are in and of themselves obstacles to transformative pedagogy.

Uncertainty in the classroom: "...I was unprepared for that moment"

The struggle to practice transforming pedagogy is most visible in white women faculty reflections on their attempts to address race and managing the difficult classroom interactions that result. At times, these struggles come out of a disconnect between what the white faculty think they have been able to achieve in terms of effectively bringing race into the course content and attending to racial dynamics, and unexpected feedback that leads them to question their interpretation. Marge's willingness to be so honest about her vulnerabilities provides important insight into the lived experiences of trying to implement transforming pedagogy in a university classroom. In this quote, she recounted a situation when she felt this uncertainty.

I had one student who, um, she presented a story about her little niece or nephew, a little child, and kept it very family, but not about interpretations about of race or culture issues, but just the presence of the child and his appearance and all entered race into the situation, I guess, but nothing was said much about it. It was just her

family, and all. But, in a piece she presented in another venue, outside of class, - about her feelings about race and how angry she was. I thought, "Wow, none of that has come out in my class." And, I don't know if that means that I did a good job or a bad job. I mean, her presentation was about her family and about her nephew and it wasn't focused on race. But, she has focused on race, and she was much more outspoken and sharp about what she had to say than I thought, or that I had any reason to know. So, there might be something about my classroom that was keeping her from expressing that, or that meant she didn't want to or need to. I really wouldn't know which to say. (Marge, Humanities)

Sometimes despite their best efforts, white faculty either do not know how to reach students of color or their attempts are met with some form of resistance. In this case, Marge was surprised by the fact that a student of color did not bring up race in her coursework even though she did focus on race in another venue outside of the class setting. She wondered whether it was something about her classroom or the student that kept race, and her anger about racial issues, out of her work. Marge's question about doing a good or bad job reflects the tension between meeting the pedagogical goals of the student completing an assignment satisfactorily and creating a classroom space where students feel like race is and can be part of the discussion.

Failure to manage this tension and achieve the latter can result in separation or withdrawal on the part of the students of color. Ann, a social science professor, shared the following two examples of students disengaging from class:

I: How do you deal with interracial ignorance, awkwardness or separation? Students who withdraw, who you can tell are withdrawing or disengaging from the discussion.

R: Yeah. I think that's actually one of the things that I find, the last time I taught this course, I thought it was an incredible success, because I was having so much fun and I was having 50% of the students actively participating. But, you know, what? There were like another 50% who were feeling very alienated, and a lot of those student were Hispanic. Their skills were low and they were feeling very shy about speaking, English wasn't their first language. I had put such a premium on speaking orally. They like always sat together. It took me a long time to figure it out. I, you know, there is something about just moving to that active classroom that once you have big numbers, it's not so easy to do it and be sure

that you're not, you know. And, there was probably an issue that black kids, African American, African and Caribbean, felt they owned that classroom. They were totally into that material. So, I think those -- and, they all had literacy problems. They all weren't quite there with their writing, and they probably were really shy to speak. (Ann, Social Sciences)

Yeah. You know, I also had, I had this really bright black woman student who I really wanted to enroll in discussion and she, she, you know, she would never give in to my wish that she speak. That was, you know, there was some complicated dynamic there about -- the way I interpreted it was she just, she liked the class and she came to the class, but she didn't trust how -- she just maybe thought I was being a little bit too cool, you know, a little bit too cool for my, a little bit, she just wasn't sure of the act. She was just holding off a little bit there. It was really, for me, very disappointing, but it was this presence in my classroom. She's watching me. So, you know, I think with me being like, okay, I'm going to get down there, talk to my students, I can make this happen, you know, there are students who are skeptical. And, a really bright student isn't just going to say, "Oh, great." She just checked me out the whole time, watched the whole dynamic. I mean, who knows? She did great work. She got an A, but she just like wasn't going to fall into this game of playing her.... Huh-uh. (Ann, Social Sciences)

In the first example, she realized that her initial perception of inclusive participation was not accurate. She was not able to engage half the class and had not heard their silence as a message of alienation. The possible explanations she considers for why one group of students of color was disengaged and another group was not illustrates the complexity of racial dynamics in a racially diverse classroom. Ann's willingness to reflect on what went wrong in this situation may help her identify how she can reach all, or at least more, students in the future. In the second example, she talked about her struggle to connect with a black woman in her class and the distrust with which the student responded to her attempts to draw her in. She expressed her disappointment in what she sees as a failed effort but understands some students of color will be wary of sharing their experiences in class and skeptical of any attempts made by a white professor to connect with them. In both of these examples, Ann speculated about the reasons behind the points of struggle.

While the possible explanations she generated indicate a transforming approach that considers the multifaceted issues of teaching in diverse classrooms, she still grappled with how to manage these complex interactions.

Professors' expectations for a course can also shape interactions with students. In the following example, Jack described the uncertainty he felt in interactions with students where he is enforcing normative classroom standards.

I: Has there ever been a moment where students or color, or White students, for whatever reason, regarded you as being racially unfair, or a racial problem in your conduct?

R: I think...I mean, there've been moments I would say of individual relationships where I've pushed students of color on late work or a grade, or on demeanor in class, or on not showing up in class, that they've experienced as unfair with a racial frame to it. They might have said it was racist, I'm not sure. I didn't come back to me in that form. And there've been time in those episodes where I've asked myself that. Am I not...either am I not dealing with the student the way I would deal with a White student, the procedural unfairness, or am I not paying attention to what's the specific thing that's going on in the student's life and background, so I'm not being an effective teacher. And I'm sure that there are moments when that was true, you know, that you just, you know, you make those mistakes. I think in general on the content of my teaching, I can't think of, there haven't been any [big conflicts]. You know, and I think as I look back over my teaching, I'm probably, I've probably been more effective in the content than in always knowing, in the dynamics with a student, how to reach them. That would be where I would criticize my teacher. (Jack, Humanities)

He wrestles with what it means to be an effective teacher, to hold all students to the same standards historically applied to white students or to consider these standards within a context of how race impacts the lives of students of color and their ability to meet these expectations. He acknowledged the racial frame around these interactions but still struggles with the tension and uncertainty he experiences as he negotiates the application of these standards and his racial awareness of the larger issues that are likely involved. The quality of the education the students of color bring with them to college, whether

they have to work to meet the economic demands of being in college, or responsibilities they still have to their families back home, are some examples of issues that can impact class performance.

Confusion about how to address race and attend to racial dynamics can translate into uncertainty in how to bring racial awareness to interactions between students.

Elizabeth described her struggle with how to best address growing conflict between white students and students of color.

I would say in this one class and also in an executive board that I'm a member of that is very diverse and deals with issues of social justice, we went through the same kinds of issues. What brought it to the floor was an executive board member of color, African American woman, talked to me about her feeling that there was this glass wall that was separating the people of color from the whites. In that group it's mainly African American, not 100% but mainly African American and white. That this feeling was shared by the African American members that there was this glass wall and the whites were totally oblivious. I had no idea they were feeling that and none of the other whites that I talked to had any idea they were feeling that. So I believe - I see it too in the journals, I see the students of color sounding off about the white students and I hear them talking after class with each other and the white students are not aware. In the class it's because I guess - well okay, they're not totally unaware because there will be an issue and people get heated about it. But what they didn't realize was I think the white students thought that the students of color were heated about the issues themselves. They didn't think that they were mad at them and they were, they were really mad at them. When that came out in that fishbowl discussion, the white students were - their mouths opened, they turned red, they were just visibly like how is that possible? I had a number of white students both tell me and write in their journals that they were about to give up on the whole thing. They were shocked and I had known because I had been hearing and I had sometimes tried to - I had wrestled with myself. What I did not want to do was talk to the white students as white students and talk to the students of color as students of color. I felt that that was unfair and dishonest and I have a lot of colleagues who would disagree with that, they would say "it's absolutely necessary, you have to do it." (Elizabeth, Humanities)

Because of, or perhaps despite, her own experience being approached by the board member of color about the racial exclusion the board members of color were experiencing, Elizabeth wanted the students of color in her class to communicate their

anger about the white students' behavior themselves. She struggled with whether or not she should address the issue with each group separately but decided it should come from within the group. It is unclear how she saw her role in the group. While she did create a space for dialogue between the student groups, she did not appear to guide either group in how to effectively, if heatedly, to connect around the issue. The interaction left white students shocked and ready to disengage instead of with greater awareness and a more sophisticated understanding of why the students of color were angry with and offended by their behavior in the class.

Without a comprehensive awareness of the way Whiteness shapes racial dynamics, white faculty can find it difficult to address and anticipate racial conflict, and as a result, struggle in their interactions with both white students and students of color. Marge shared the confusion and sense of failure she felt in how she addressed a white student's expression of privilege in her work.

I: So, how do you deal with that resistance or that impatience? What do you do? Just push through? Address it? Ignore it?

R: Sometimes I confront them and say, I mean, you might notice more if your own identification was not of such a privileged group, but normally, I'm more gentle, and maybe not as effective as a result, but just thinking that the work going up and the students telling about their own stories will somehow be edifying. I don't know. I don't always feel that I do a good job, and I don't tend to be particularly confrontational about it. But, one student who was a student in my class this semester, did a project about her brother, and her brother had been a Peace Corps worker in a Latin American country, and she had photographs of the projects he'd worked on, and students [were] connecting the photographs and adding a narration. And, she added in a narration that had the villagers being extremely grateful to her brother, and he was, um, they were so lucky to have had him there, and he was so glad to get home. And, it was so - it positioned him as this great white savior and the U.S. as the only place, and that place [the Latin American country] as some place to go and do your social service and come home and escape to your comfortableness, and I was just appalled. And, I said something about this seems really insensitive. You never say that he learned something from being there and from them, and that they taught him about their lives and things like that. And then, she was very taken aback and was very proud

of her project and she had learned a lot just in the mechanics of putting it together and she was very proud of her brother. So, another student sort of rescued the situation by saying, "Well, I wouldn't want her to change her project, but she could maybe add something", and he was a Chinese man, and he saw the dilemma and he saw that she was hurt, and he found a gentler way. Anyway, I was just kind of appalled, and I came out a little too strongly, I think, in terms of her needs, anyway, and no one else in the class was as distressed about it as I was. I felt like I had failed. I mean, what were all these readings about. (Marge, Humanities)

In the above quote, she questioned whether a gentle or harsh, indirect or direct, approach is most effective when addressing the impact of white racial identity in the classroom.

Her comments imply that a gentle approach is not as effective but recounted a situation when she named the elements of White supremacy she saw in a white student's work and thinks she may have gone too far, or was not effective. An added component to this situation which the white faculty member does not acknowledge is the collusion implied by the "rescue" of the white student by the student of color whose actions she saw as gentler and more effective. Instead of recognizing the fact that for reasons of self-protection people of color act in ways that uphold White hegemony and defend white people's actions, she understood this to be a sign that she had indeed been too harsh and straightforward in her disclosure of Whiteness. The fact that none of the other students (most of whom were probably white) were upset by the project, despite the reading she had assigned to heighten their understanding of issues of race and dominance, compounded her uncertainty and feelings of failure.

Sometimes it is more appealing to keep things comfortable than to risk escalating racial discord. In the following quote, Marge described the unease she felt when faced with a moment of racial conflict in her class that came out of a discussion about the Holocaust and the legacy of racism towards African Americans.

Very awkward. I mean, like I needed to be some kind of peace-keeper, and that I had my own allegiances or something like that, that I was unprepared for that moment, that I thought their feelings were somehow, um, the students who were angry were the students of color and they were very strident, and it was very hard for me to, to, um, to make the class comfortable, which probably wasn't a very good idea anyway. It probably was important to not be comfortable. But, I was uncomfortable and didn't really know what to do, and I thought the students were very alarmed and abashed and maybe not very educated by the experience, the ones who had brought the photographs up there. They were just like, you know, "Oh, those are awful people or something like that." I don't think that it had a lot of useful meaning. It was just a very tense time and not a good time. (Marge, Humanities)

Marge also talked specifically about not knowing how to effectively manage racial conflict between student groups in a way that would further their educational goals. In this example, she talked about the tension she felt between addressing racially problematic behavior and concerns about censorship.

I guess I've been thinking mostly about undergraduate education here, but I had a graduate student who did some work and she used, um, video stills captured from Little Rascals films, and somehow she described her own childhood as very deprived and unhappy and she identified tremendously with the Little Rascals. Have you ever seen them? These naughty little children. They're awful. I thought they were just awful, so I had to imagine what was attractive to her about them, and they have, um, I hope I'm getting it right. They have a black child with little pigtails, um, as one central character. And, she said she particularly identified with that child. And, so she made an image that had herself looking through maybe it was a fence or something, at this child from the Little Rascals film. Maybe it would be a better story if I could remember the name of the child. Um, we had two graduate students who were African American in our program, and they hated that image. They wanted her to take it out because they felt - they saw it as the black child looking through the fence at the white child, wishing to be white. They completely misunderstood what she meant to say, but I felt that she needed to pay attention to how miss-understandable it could be and encouraged her to add text. And, she preferred to just let people misunderstand. And, I was asked would I make her take it down because it was offensive, and I was much more interested in trying to create some kind of context for it in which it would, you know, these multiple readings of what it meant, her own and others. And, I don't know - it was due to come down kind of before it became too big an issue. But, it wasn't one that thought I'd found a good solution to and of course, any solution kind of was a censorship of her, but then it probably wasn't very successful in terms of what she meant it to do or say either. And so, it should have been instructive, but it was more just horrible. (Marge, Humanities)

In this situation, she wrestled with meeting the needs expressed by students of color, negotiating issues of censorship, and the disciplinary focus on content rather than context in presentations and communicating how content alone can lead to painful interpretations. In the end she felt she had not been able to successfully address any of these pieces of the conflict. A senior professor in the humanities, James suggested that sometimes you can come up with what you think is a solution only to find out it is not.

Well, it's always...it's always easiest for me to teach about periods that I lived through. While, of course, I didn't live through some of the times I teach but I'm working on and done so much research and so I feel like I lived through it and so I think that, uh, when we get into fields that I know best I have an advantage because, um, I...I mean, I just...I know the material and the background material I can present it, um, and sort of, I think, a non-threatening way. Um, I don't know, I mean, I think it's...it's just always hard. I don't know that there's...I'm hesitant to say there's something that...that always works. Just when I think somebody's...something's a sure thing, there's a strategy, it blows up in my face. (James, Humanities)

One aspect of practicing transforming pedagogy is being comfortable with this uncertainty and confident in using this pedagogical approach to address difficult and unexpected situations. Chances are, white faculty have not been taught in transforming ways themselves nor have they had much pedagogical training to draw from. In addition, they may have limited spaces to work through issues of race including their own white identity. In these ways, they are unprepared to attempt the transformation of Whiteness in their classes. Yet, as they step out and try, they are met with feelings of uncertainty. This is likely an unfamiliar feeling for white faculty, especially white senior faculty, awarded for their success teaching in diverse classrooms. A sense of certainty is typically taken for granted among this group. Some white faculty found paths through fear and discomfort with racial conflict and came to see these dynamics as a place of authentic learning.

However, such acceptance does not come without trepidation. As this quote from Phil, a humanities professor, suggests white faculty may have to assume a new vision of their role in the classroom and become comfortable with new norms of interaction.

I: Can you remember a time in class when a racial event occurred, and it created strong emotional feelings for you, nervousness, disconcertedness, anxiety, fear or anger?

R: Things that have erupted more, where somebody has simply, there are probably two kinds. One is where someone has simply spoken up and said very, very strongly what you just said is racist. And that person is outspoken, great command of language and is very angry. And what I learned to do was to not intervene. While it's happening. People are looking at me, and they're saying, why doesn't the professor stop it. And I can see that in their faces, and I think, and I'm respecting the person who's angry. And so I let that person finish, and then generally my first instinct is to trust the class, to deal with it. However they're going to deal with it. If it's, and then I can't remember specifics of that particular instance, except there's a point at which I'll express my opinion, I'll try to sum up what's just been said, try to enable both sides, if it comes to a matter of sides, to hear each other. But at the moment it's happening, it's very tense, because I can feel the tension rising, I can feel the fear that people have, I can feel the anger of this person, which can be abusive. I know there's going to have to be some damage control afterwards. But to stop it early on and to say don't talk that way in my classroom, or say, he's right, you know, or anything, you don't have to say any more, is to not respect the person who needs to speak. If such a person goes on for a long time, then I would try to find a way to ease in, thank him. Is this what I hear you're saying? Something to sort of sum it up and get it slowed down if it goes on for a long time. Your opposite case, of course, is the one where you're in a discussion and you know that the language you're hearing from other students itself is racist. Innocently maybe. It's just out of people not knowing, or coming out of their background, and you can feel other students getting ready to move in on them. Or just feeling very uncomfortable, feeling silenced. And again you can feel very, very high tension in the room. You can get just a simple remark from somebody, you can almost feel, and sometimes you hear it. People go, aaaaahhh, because of what's been said. And again, those I wait to see what happens. And really try to work with the person who made those comments. If they're keeping a journal with them, or if you can catch them after class, I can say what you just got back, something you stumbled into, let's talk about it. Let's work on it. And he hears legitimate voices back, or she does. And then again, we can begin to do damage control. So when I get tension, and I didn't used to be able to do this, but when I get tension, I don't intervene real quick, I let people play out what they need to do. And then we have something real in front of us, because those are real expressions of what's in people's minds. Where if I'm always

controlling or tempering or keeping a quiet classroom, it's not as real a classroom as it might be. So I prefer to look at it, because then you learn. Whereas if I'm lecturing, you don't learn. (Phil, Humanities)

Phil made space for student voices. In doing so, he also opened up space for conflict and tension. However, he saw this discord as an opportunity for students to reconsider normative structures and cultures. Students were exposed to different ways of knowing and being by other students instead of by him as the authority figure in the room. This did not mean that he abandoned his role as professor; rather he tried to navigate this role in a way that supports an authentic learning environment. The dominant norms around the role of professor and the way information is conveyed to students are transformed. Yet, Phil described more than just pedagogical shifts. He also revealed the emotional price of transforming pedagogy. In this case, over time, he has learned to sit with the tension in an effort to respect the students' voice and make space for the real but difficult issues at hand.

Struggles negotiating disciplinary norms: "So, that's a culture I'm working against."

As the last quote above indicates, there are assumptions embedded in academic norms and practices that stem from the structure of White hegemony. These norms and how they impact pedagogy vary among the natural sciences, humanities and social sciences. The following quotes illustrate some of the struggles the white faculty in this study described as they negotiated disciplinary norms with transforming practices. Disciplinary differences in research and epistemological perspectives, the extent to which race is perceived to be part of the subject matter, and the racial/ethnic knowledge of the students in a particular course are some factors that influence these struggles. A

particularly clear example of the tension between epistemological norms and transforming pedagogy can be seen in Paul's extensive response to a question about teaching in the natural sciences.

I consider what I do to be multi-cultural education. Up and down the line. I have described the culture of the natural sciences, I have, sometimes I think I have more prejudice against me representing the culture of natural sciences in terms of how it impacts the belief systems of my students than they have towards any racial issue today. So the question that I have literally posed on more than one occasion was why is multi-culturalism so stereotypically associated with social culture rather than academic culture. Why is it not inclusive? It's meant to be provocative. Why is it not inclusive of academic culture? And I understand all the good reasons, believe me. Believe me; I understand all the good reasons. And yet I turn around and say, live in my shoes, because I'm living the life of a scientist in a society with certain ideas about us. [Research results show] real progress is made with respect to their thinking about the subject matter. But boy, cross outside that boundary and there was not even a hint of a change that you were actually impacting their personal belief systems as it might apply to other situations that they immediately removed from the agenda of your syllabus. And for me, the complexity of dealing with that problem on every single day makes looking at some of the more stereotypical social aspects of multi-cultural instruction pay up. Almost. I don't mean that literally. But in terms of the notion of the culture of science and really what ought to be the impact of me from the students in this science classroom, I can't even, I mean, it's very frustrating to think actually, those research results that you really can't press on that very much. In terms of the kinds of things that I hear in terms of curriculum development, where race and gender issues through authorship and creation of text and all that kind of stuff, come from, impacts me in my area of science nearly zero. Text books now do a much better job of attending to historical development and the use of names and the creation of sensitivity towards the appropriate issues. And I think there are really honestly good things that you can do in terms of the way curriculum is structured, the way classrooms are managed, the way you interact with students, and so on, that are good for diversity in general. But that does nothing to target any population except doing a morally better job at the job that you're doing. Be inclusive for real, and administer and show the kind of sensitivity across the entire population that you're dealing with, and provide the interventions that's necessary if you see the imbalance taking place within the population. So, I mean I would say I actively do all of those things. I mean, you have to be very aware of what everything tells you in terms of structuring that kind of work. But it's not addressing the issue of the scientific content and subject matter of the course, which really, really does sit fundamentally in a colorless, raceless, I mean, I think some would explode to hear me say that. But there is a representation here in terms of approach to science that I'm talking about. And my

approach to science is drawn from a tradition and experience and so forth that does represent a way of looking at the world. And it characterizes the nature of the classroom. (Paul, Natural Sciences)

Paul retained his hold on to the cultural influences of the natural sciences while at the same time attending to strategies aimed at supporting multicultural and transforming pedagogy. A perhaps unintended result is his resistance to considering how these disciplinary assumptions uphold White hegemony by privileging empirically generated knowledge over other forms of knowing and revering, without question, a view of science generated almost entirely by white men, or how these different perspectives can inform the other. In fact, he is frustrated by the limited influence he has over students' adoption of a scientific perspective. Despite his efforts to validate multicultural efforts, he risked the disciplinary equivalent to claims of reverse racism or white victimization.

Pamela, also in the natural sciences, shared the trepidation she felt when she decided to bring race into a discussion of DNA.

But so I did talk about the [television special tracing African American ancestry through DNA] in my class. And I thought about it a lot. I thought about whether there was some way I could be offending anyone. And I ran it by my [graduate] student. I said, "This is what I want to talk about," because it's a really...it was really fun. It was really interesting that, you know, they could do these traces and they could figure out a little bit about ancestors and how many.....great-great-grandparents had been White presumably....or not. Or Indian in the case of some of the family stories. And.....I said, you know, I just...I just want to...this is what I want to say, is there anything in here that I'm missing that I...you know. Because I don't want to.....inadvertently offend anyone, but I just thought it was a wonderful PBS special. So...so I did use that this year, and that's....the first time I've really overtly said, "Look there are some differences and people do come from different places." Because that doesn't normally really belong in my class. (Pamela, Natural Sciences)

In spite of her own excitement about the information presented in the television special, she was also concerned about how to do this respectfully. She explained her lack of experience and tools for introducing race which, in her mind, is not a normal or

legitimate topic in her science classroom. She was also afraid of offending someone, and perhaps, of being called out in an environment where she usually confided in the material she presents. Both Paul and Pamela tried to incorporate transforming pedagogy but see clear boundaries between their scientific fields and this pedagogical approach, both in terms of actively bringing in race related content and in how to manage reactions to the material. Science is a field where the content is often assumed to be raceless. By pointing out that variation in DNA is linked to differences in racial identity, Pamela pushed the boundaries of what she considers acceptable scientific material and incorporating social understandings of racial differences and unequal treatment, and perhaps opening the door to conversations not deemed acceptable for a science classroom.

There are also epistemological and technical assumptions, issues and practices in the humanities that help maintain White hegemony. Marge described her attempt to challenge these assumptions.

Yeah, I mean, it gets quickly into not what I do about it, but how the whole framework of problems in humanities and personal expression and things like that. I mean, well, I encourage people to use the issues that concern them, and to consider their own location, their own cultural, economic location as a starting point. And we have to talk about the relevance of that, because they often reject that as, you know, they don't think about that audience, but that immediately speaks to them as some commercial concern. They're not supposed to think that it's tainting to the work to think about who's going to look at it. It was very Euro-centric, and it was a really a white male movement that became kind of the model. Expression was everything, and, um, non-figurative and non-informative. The kinds of conversations I remember from my own education were about presentation and not content. I mean, that's the level of the kinds of conversation about what worked and so the expectation that the field will be about that, about some kind of increased ability to delegate, to attract the muses that will help them be inspired, that will be a conversation with themselves, that will get their ideas onto paper, or onto whatever form, medium that they're using, that's what they, you know, most of the classes prepare them to look for. And, um, so, that's a culture I'm working against. And, so I've used - as things came along - there's a

book on multiculturalism and I use that at times. Much of the literature has very strong, um, language, makes a demand on specialized language, critical cultural discourse. It's pretty demanding and it's not even something I'm even all together on top of, and Marxism and so on as a starting point. I mean, I've done a great deal more reading than they have, but often, the first complaint I'll have is this reading is way too hard, and it doesn't make any sense and why should we bother with it. So, um, uh, but now I have a lot of colleagues to call on who are interested in using this work as an intellectual - as a side of intellectual thoughtfulness and so on, so we'll see what happens. (Marge, Humanities)

Here the disciplinary norm is to privilege content over how content is perceived. Marge challenged these disciplinary norms by exposing students to literature about diversity and hegemonic structures which can then inform their work and encourage students to consider not only their execution of the work but the impact their presentations can have on their audiences. In doing so, she pushed against her disciplinary boundaries.

The epistemological assumptions in the social sciences bring their own challenges. While disciplinary norms establish more space to bring in voices that are different than those that represent a dominant white male perspective (as is true in some areas of the Humanities), this also presents a struggle for white faculty who are trying to challenge students of color to expand their sometimes very well developed understanding of racial issues and dynamics. Jennifer described her struggle to challenge students of color in this way.

I: Um, uh they really are. Do students of color and white students generally have the same skills, talent, and learning styles?

R: Well I think students of color in general if they've had a group experience, I mean some of them have not, are way ahead on their analytic capacities for understanding social science. That has to get harnessed and used but they start with the basic sociological understanding of the world.

I: How do you deal with that gap, that difference?

R: Well I think it is hard because it can just promote the arrogance on the part of students of color that they know so much more. They after all have to go so much deeper and so it is hard because you don't want to just depend on their expertise and then not move them anywhere. It's hard. (Jennifer, Social Sciences)

Many students of color come into a social science classroom with lived experiences or expertise that have prepared them for the course content. The struggle for white professors (or professors of color) is to acknowledge the intellectual insight these students can offer but challenge them to develop it further by teaching the theoretical and analytic tools within the field. This can be a tricky pedagogical negotiation for white faculty. They risk dismissing the knowledge and understanding students of color bring to the course content, taking a passive approach to the intellectual development of the students in order to avoid a situation where their own expertise could be questioned because of their white identity, and facing the resentment of students of color who feel unduly pushed or challenged and who might question the white faculty's tactics or their right to use them. In this case, Jennifer struggled in an effort to enhance the educational experience of the students of color by drawing in, as opposed to pushing against, disciplinary boundaries while being careful not to alienate the students of color in the process.

Struggles managing institutional assumptions of gender: “Outsiders just should be kept out.”

Intertwined with practices of transforming pedagogy and navigating disciplinary norms are expectations based in assumptions of gender. The institutional norms of academia reflect the hierarchical system of gender as well as race. Women and men faculty navigate these norms from different social locations as they struggle with implementing ideas and practices based in transforming pedagogy. While both are members of the academy, White men faculty are positioned within these norms and white

women faculty are positioned at the margins or outside of them. Both can either adhere to normative practices or challenge them through transforming pedagogy, but it is important to understand that either approach is shaped by these subject positions.

Both white men and women faculty are constrained by traditional white male norms, in general and in attempts to practice transforming pedagogy. However, white men faculty maintain their privileged positions by keeping normative practices and assumptions in place. For example, authority is an entitlement of being a white male professor that can be used, at the professor's discretion, to either maintain pedagogical norms or mitigate the challenges of implementing transforming practices. When white women faculty challenge pedagogical norms, they do so without the security this authority affords and which white men professors often take for granted: as such women are further constrained in their efforts. This disparity is illustrated in the following quotes from Ann and Neil, both in the social sciences.

I: Now, are there things that other people can do or get away with that you can't because of those same things?

R: Yeah. Yeah, I think men have it way too easy in the classroom. They don't have a clue how much harder it is to have authority and to get respect and to just not have to deal with a lot of bullshit from students who want to, you know -- I mean, I take a real risk, because I do break down authority relations and so then I have to deal with, the people who want to exploit that and abuse that and are more likely to do that because I'm a woman. (Ann, Social Sciences)

I: Do you encounter resistance in the classroom from these students, to the race information?

R: No.

I: You don't.

R: No, they...I mean, I'm the authority figure, you know. I mean, they may not agree with me, but they never say they don't agree with me. And they write what they think I'm looking for on the test, so... ...it's hard to know what they think. (Neil, Social Sciences)

Ann talked about the difficulty she had implementing transforming pedagogy and maintaining her authority in the classroom because students responded to her identity as a woman with less respect. This attitude is compounded as she implemented a transforming approach that breaks down traditional and hierarchical authority relations characterized by clear roles of professor and student, and thus questions norms of Whiteness and gender. Historically, and thus traditionally, the position of professor in this hierarchy has been a white man. Therefore she encountered resistance and struggled to either retreat from transforming pedagogy or deal with the challenge. In the second quote, Neil cited his role as the authority figure as the reason he does not face resistance from students around issues of race. He also accepted that this power dynamic shapes the way they respond on exams. The conformity to this traditional relationship between professor and student reinforces patterns of White hegemony, both in terms of the complicit relationship between learner and teacher as well as in what is learned. While Ann recognized that she takes a risk in her pedagogical approach, she identifies gender as the compounding factor, not that she is disrupting White hegemonic practices. Neil accepted that he is granted authority but does not position it in terms of his race or gender, nor did he question the impact it has on student learning. In fact, he stated that students “never say they don’t agree with me”. His position as a white male authority figure brings with it the challenge of teaching course content without really knowing where students are in their understanding. For white women faculty, authority is not an entitlement; rather it is achieved through the accumulation of years, status, experience, and often compliance with traditional norms.

Mary, a social science professor, described how gender constraints are not as restrictive now that she has aged and advanced professionally.

I: Do you think there are things that you can't get away with?

R: Well, it depends on with whom. There are definitely things I can't get away with because I'm a woman, um, or that I don't get away with, that is, that people don't accord me a certain kind of credibility or respect, um, because I'm a woman, or because I'm a feminist, and that is on my sleeve too.

I: But, you don't feel like your authority gets undermined very much in the classroom.

R: No. Not anymore. I mean, you know, there is the gender thing, but it is, um, it is weakened by age and, you know, official status, being a full professor. So, they, you know, probably I feel more confident than I did, but also, they just accord some kind of automatic assumption that you know what you're doing that they don't accord a young woman, for sure. (Mary, Social Sciences)

The pressure to conform to accepted notions of credibility and dominant norms can be strong, and can involve attempts to co-opt diversity efforts while targeting women faculty. In this example, Marge's effort to hire another white woman faculty to replace her while she went on sabbatical was considered narrow by the predominately male department.

We found that I had to invite - when I went away on sabbatical or something - a guy, because if I hired another woman, it would be like three too many, and it would impact people's sense that I was fair and that I was broad. I mean, we're always being accused of being narrow because, in fact, I'm probably one of the people among the more concerned about diversity of the school, but I'm narrow because I'm focused on that or I'm focused on disabilities or I'm focused on women, and that's narrow. (Marge, Humanities)

Claiming that concern about diverse representation is narrow reflects the invisibility of Whiteness and assumptions of maleness that underlie academic norms. White faculty can and do challenge these norms but it is important to recognize that the struggles associated with implementing transforming pedagogy have their roots in the disciplinary and departmental practices these faculty must also negotiate. In some cases, particularly in

the natural sciences, white women faculty adapt to these norms until they feel secure enough to move beyond them. Susan, a natural science professor, shared how she has been able to negotiate these boundaries.

R: Well, there's a lot of us and only a few women, and we almost never see each other, and there are even fewer minorities, whom I work with. And that's all there is in my department. I think, you know, we're...we're just separated. The department has been ghetto-ized in the sense that we are housed by some groups. And some groups, you know, they...you know, they went to try and we've only one outsider in this hard-wired thing that we're carrying with us from the Stone Age. Outsiders just should be kept out. And that's in this...that's what's in this department.

I: So what are you in that organization?

R: I'm down here. I'm in no group because of...I came a long time ago and there were no women. I was the one of the first tenured woman in science, at the university. And I learned to survive by myself.

I: That must be a very powerful experience for you.

R: Well, you know, it's just...being able to survive by oneself might be a good survival mechanism, but it's not a good work mechanism. Now that I've survived, I'm trying to force myself to become more outgoing. (Susan, Natural Sciences)

She recognized that the department has been segregated with non-males and non-white males being grouped together within the departmental space. Instead of claiming membership in one of these groups, she conformed to the dominant norm of the lone academic and independent researcher. She seems clear about the risk to do otherwise. Here again, her movement and esteem within the department were not entitlements she was granted because of her position as a faculty member, but rather were dependent on her ability to adapt and survive in a male culture, presumably through tenure and until she had achieved seniority.

Both white men and women faculty find ways of challenging these norms but issues of authority influence their efforts. When white men faculty do challenge racially unaware practices, they do so at the risk of reinforcing dominant norms of race and

gender and their dominant position as white men. Tom, a social science professor, acknowledged his position of privilege and described how it affords him the space to question accepted practices.

I: Are there things that you can do in the classroom because of who you are, that you can get away with, that other people can't?

R: Fabulous things, absolutely. Oh, my God! [laughs] I can make errors, I can make mistakes, I can have a bad day, I can be disorganized -- which I'm not typically. I'm pretty anal about that. Um, I can use terms incorrectly, which most people of color can't use. You know, I can switch between black and African American without any cost, and they can't. They have to stick with one term, or they'll be nailed -- not only by the majority, but by the minority students. I can, um, criticize people. One of the models of teaching that, that's always, always drove me crazy and until four or five years ago...I asked around but no one knew what to do about it. So I figured it out on my own. But one of the models that drove me crazy, was okay, we're going to have our...our Diversity Day and that's it. So, here, we're going to have ten readings on, you know, here's what Hispanic people say and here's what African Americans say and here's what people from Cuba say. And then we're never going to touch it ever again, and that always just drove me nuts, because it was just such a bullshit kind of thing to do. It was like you don't mean it, you're just...you know, you're just saying it, right? So, so I can criticize that, whereas if a person of color criticizes that, they're shooting their own, you know. And, and so they get nailed not only, they get nailed by all sides is what it feels like to me. And I hear it. And when I hear it I try to address it with the students, you know, but, yeah, I can get away with anything... (Tom, Social Sciences)

Tom did not need to hold back his criticisms or maintain normative teaching practices in order to secure his authority or legitimacy. It is, in fact, the authority and legitimacy built into his privileged position as a white male professor that gives him the freedom to act as he chooses. He also used his position to address the negative comments students (and others, perhaps) make about faculty of color. It is likely that similar comments are made with respect to the choices white women faculty make, although he did address gender in his response. Regardless, his comments suggest that his actions are received differently

because of his identity. Even as Tom used his privilege to advance the ideas and practices of transforming pedagogy, he may have also reinforced the power of his position.

Where some white men faculty pushed up against disciplinary norms, some also seemed more accepting than white women faculty of boundaries of authority, working within them instead of questioning them. This is reflected in an earlier quote from Paul who talked about how “[his] approach to science is drawn from a tradition and experience and so forth that does represent a way of looking at the world. And it characterizes the nature of the classroom.” This is in contrast to an earlier quote from Marge who identified and challenged the white, male hegemonic structure of her discipline which she refers to as “very Euro-centric” originating as a “white male movement that became kind of the model”. This is the cultural perspective she finds herself “working against” by exposing herself to different viewpoints. She resists the normative approach by educating herself and by trying to bring what she has learned into the classroom. She explained:

We use a story made by a woman whose own background is African American and Native American, and she gave up her daughter, um, when her daughter was four because she married a white guy, um, who was a filmmaker and they went to do things that were very creative, that were very exciting to her and that was her life. And, so she gave her daughter up for adoption when she was four. And then, she's very confrontational about all the issues that she addresses in herself and her life and her work. And then, the daughter looks for her as an adult, and when they get together, the mother makes a film about them getting together and I just think the film is just wrenching and tragic, and it's very hard for me to like this mother who gave up her daughter and all. The students are completely impatient with it, black and white students, and everyone, you know, all the students are. I think I'm older and I've been a mother, and things that really affect me in the film. The adopting mother is black, I mean, it doesn't get us into white versus black issues so much as in black and how she's represented her own family and culture and her self realization as a woman who is black and [in a profession where there are not many black women]. And, we've read bell hooks and things

like that. So, we have sources that bring the conversation, but it's those things that have led me to the way to do it. I have no education in how to deal with diversity in the classroom. (Marge, Humanities)

In this case, Marge tried to address racial issues in a course where they are traditionally kept invisible. However, without guidance for how to do this successfully, including a fuller understanding of the interracial dynamics at play in the film and in the student responses (or her own, for that matter), she could only go so far and seemed dissatisfied. She presented the material, but it is less clear as to whether or not she went further by also addressing the role of Whiteness, interracial marriage, women's liberation, or the challenges of being a black woman in that profession. She did not help the students gain a greater awareness of these issues from her own position as a mother by unpacking the impatience they expressed. Because there are no institutionalized practices for this type of transforming pedagogy within her discipline, she created her own path.

It can be difficult to identify and challenge dominant white male norms from a place of racial privilege even while holding a position that is negatively impacted by them. The following quote from Mary provides a window into one example of this struggle in the social sciences.

During the stormiest period of our department trying to figure out how to become diverse, um, this was common, a common sort of thing that would happen in meetings, um, is that graduate students of color would tell white faculty that the department was racist. So what did we do? We did lots of wrong things. We got defensive and said, "No, we're not." And didn't get it that what they meant was racist, not prejudiced, not - you know. So we couldn't hear it because we were so hurt. Um, so we got over it. I mean, it took a lot of work, I mean, a lot of time, a lot of talk and pain, but I think we figured out, um, gradually, we were racist - that is the program was a racist space, and we needed to do something about it. We did a lot of things to try to change that. We had a lot of conversations about it which we needed to learn how to hear what was being said, or what was meant, rather than what was being heard. And so we had to take a lot of proactive steps, and some of those were things I initiated that had to do with changing the way the program worked. Um, you know, things like what the curriculum looked like,

what the, um, faculty looked like, recruiting faculty of color, uh, what the staff looked like, um, what kinds of activities were going on supporting a, um, caucus or constituency group that was specifically exclusionary which was very hard for the white faculty to tolerate - a group being racially based and exclusionary, but we did it, learning to do all those things. (Mary, Social Sciences)

Being confronted with the racist impact of White dominate norms can be a volatile and emotional experience with lots at risk for all involved, especially for the students of color who brought the issues to the table. However, unlike the previous example where Marge addressed these issues alone in her classroom, Mary's shift away from normative departmental practices to working with colleagues to establish new norms that support transforming pedagogy are likely to go much further than any one faculty can alone.

The process of shifting into and maintaining a transforming pedagogical practice does not come without its challenges. Once white faculty members recognize that normative pedagogical practices perpetuate and reproduce White hegemony, many of them understand the need and wish to do things differently. However, making this actual transition in their own practices entails personal and professional growth that include learning how to put intentions of transforming pedagogy into practice, managing classroom interactions with and among students, and navigating institutional disciplinary and gender norms. One of the striking aspects of the struggles these white faculty talk about is how infrequently they mention seeking help through faculty development structures. In the concluding chapter, I discuss some strategies white faculty can use as they work to implement transformative pedagogies.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION: CONTRIBUTIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

In this project I present a theoretical framework that delineates some of the ways Whiteness is enacted in reproducing and transforming ways in larger society and demonstrate the presence of these same enactments of Whiteness in the pedagogical practices of this select group of white faculty. These data reveal these practices as a dynamic space of reinforcement and rupture of the hegemonic influence of Whiteness and in doing so offer two primary contributions to sociology and higher education, respectively.

As stated in Chapter 1, the theoretical framework and analyses contributes to the sociology of race and critical White studies by identifying ways Whiteness is constructed through reproducing and transforming enactments of Whiteness that, respectively, reinforce norms of Whiteness and, through a rearticulation of Whiteness, challenge their hegemonic influence. Together with the struggles this group of white faculty discussed in their efforts to translate transforming pedagogy into practice, these enactments offer insight into the long standing sociological inquiry into the interplay between structure and agency by identifying mechanisms that demonstrate how agency both supports and alters larger social structures, and how structures constrain this movement. Additionally, this research contributes to the field of higher education by identifying transforming pedagogical practices that can inform and facilitate the incorporation of anti-racism

pedagogy by individual faculty or through broader faculty development efforts. I elaborate on these contributions in this chapter and discuss directions for further research in this area which can address some of the limitations of this study and open up new avenues of inquiry and understanding.

Sociology of Race and Critical White Studies

I use the data to go beyond individual attitudes and intentions linked to racial identity and address the everyday enactments of Whiteness in the pedagogies practiced by white faculty operating within a racialized social context. This focus draws attention to the processes that maintain White hegemony and help us understand how to interrupt the forces of dominance that are at the root of the racism, inequality and disadvantage created through this organizing structure (Fine, 1997; Leonardo, 2004; Omi & Winant, 1994). Hence, a focus on behaviors among this group of white faculty is not an attempt to reinforce the centeredness of Whiteness but to examine some ways this dominant structure is supported and challenged. The structure of White hegemony is supported by reproducing enactments of Whiteness in pedagogical practices that support normative patterns of Whiteness and the conferral of White privilege. Transforming enactments of Whiteness interrupt this regenerating process and can push against and reshape the structure of Whiteness. We see that reproducing and transforming pedagogical practices co-exist. Their mutual presence challenges a monolithic view of Whiteness; not all white faculty enact Whiteness in their pedagogical practices in the same way. The data and analyses illustrate these variations and provides some indication as to how gender and discipline intersect with these practices. Through these transforming enactments of

practice, white faculty put into question the taken for granted assumptions of this racial structure and expose all students, and model for white students, a different way of being or acting white. Whiteness is rearticulated to challenge its hegemonic influence in these instances.

My emphasis on transforming pedagogical practices begs the question of whether social structures can change through individual behavioral efforts or if real change comes only from a restructuring of the social systems and organizations that surround individual efforts. This analysis indicates that there are individual faculty members who are currently attempting to teach in ways that transform normative pedagogical practices. But the examples of transforming pedagogy presented here must be considered within the organizational context of institutional racism and the constraining factors of higher education in Primarily White Institutions - reward structures, disciplinary norms, and other informal norms and practices (Chesler et al., 2005; Gair & Mullins, 2001) – that keep these transformative practices on the margins or as optional elements of faculty development. Sweet's (1998) research confirms the constraint institutional norms place on faculty's implementation of radical pedagogies that serve to counter dominant educational practices that are detrimental to non-dominant racial and ethnic groups. Indeed, the overarching Eurocentric perspective of what a university class should look like, combined with the professional dependence on external approval, encourages faculty to comply with these norms and in the process reinforce them (Auletta & Jones, 1994). Even when institutions of Higher Education embrace diversity action plans or initiative, they may not look reflectively at the policies and practices that maintain the structures of White hegemony (Iverson, 2007; Stanley, 2006).

Congruence between faculty beliefs about diversity and perceptions of the institutional value of diversity is an important factor that facilitates faculty incorporation of diversity efforts in the classroom (Mayhew & Grunwald 2006). When faculty and the institution are at odds, Sweet (1998) argues that engaging in the struggle to balance a non-dominant radical pedagogical philosophy with institutional demands, and implicitly accepting the tensions involved, may be the most effective approach to implementing these practices. The data in this study demonstrate how both reproducing and transforming enactments of Whiteness co-exist among this group of select white faculty as well as within most of the individual faculty's teaching repertoire. The push and pull of compliance and resistance within the larger structure illustrates the dynamic interdependent connection between the agency of faculty and the structure of the institution.

Identifying pedagogical practices as acts of agency within the larger structure of Whiteness reflected in institutions of higher education may help us delineate the ways individuals negotiate and shape these spaces. White faculty in this study acted to reproduce and transform the structure of Whiteness through the pedagogical choices they made. While these choices were likely made with different levels of intentionality, they speak to ways agency reproduces structure and pushes against it. In this way, the data support Bourdieu's (Calhoun, 1995) recognition of agency existing within structure and Sewell's (1992) extension of this recognition to emphasize both the reproducing and transforming effects of agency on structure.

Anti-racism Educational Practices in Higher Education

Perhaps the most pragmatic contribution garnered from this project is the identification of reproducing and transforming enactments of Whiteness in pedagogical practices and how recognition of these practices can inform faculty development efforts. Faculty, through their teaching practices, are the primary conveyors of education in colleges and universities. They are also affected by and confer Whiteness through their pedagogical practices. As such, these practices become mechanism for maintaining or challenging racial inequality. However, assumptions of normativity and the invisibility of Whiteness that underlie White hegemony promotes the assumption that white faculty are unbiased conveyors of knowledge, unaffected or influenced by social identity or the larger structure of race, and that methods of instruction are similarly objective tools in the learning process. Indeed faculty themselves may not be aware that their teaching methods reproduce White hegemony. As Maher and Tetreault (2003) point out:

A necessary part of perceiving how the assumption of Whiteness shapes the construction of classroom knowledge is understanding its centrality to the academy's practices of classroom practices of intellectual domination, namely, the imposition of certain ways of constructing the world through the lenses of traditional disciplines. Such domination is often couched in the language of detachment and universality, wherein the class, race, and gender positions of the "knower" is ignored or presumed irrelevant (p. 72).

It is important for white faculty to examine their current pedagogical practices that serve to uphold the dominance of Whiteness and to then transform these practices. This requires not only an examination of one's own teaching practices, but of the structure of White hegemony in society and Higher Education.

Yet, even if white faculty do recognize the impact of these practices they may not know how, and may not make the effort to find out how, to do things differently.

Certainly transforming pedagogical practices does not necessarily come easily, nor is it within the traditional norms of higher education to encourage faculty to spend time focusing and reflecting on making changes in their pedagogy. Through faculty development efforts, institutions invested in diversity can help support all faculty in this process by providing opportunities, or perhaps even mandates, for them to develop transforming pedagogies in their own practices. Mayhew & Grunwald's (2006) research indicates that participation in workshops that promote the inclusion of these type of practices provide faculty with skills they then incorporate into their pedagogical approach.

The following are examples of how the white faculty in this study challenged Whiteness:

Disclosing personal Whiteness

- Sharing their racial identity in the classroom in the context of lessons and exercises designed to help students explore such issues. Such exercises offer students an opportunity to explore these issues themselves and occasional faculty participation can provide a model for doing so.
- A willingness to acknowledge that all students (but especially students of color) need to test the waters to determine how safe it is to engage in conversations about race with white faculty and students. Understanding this dynamic enables white faculty to recognize and act on this process of trust building in order to create a safe academic space for all students.

Acknowledging and attending to plurality/diversity

- Conceiving a variety of pedagogical approaches that permit students with different individually- or culturally-based learning styles to find their own best way of working/learning. Faculty reported including multiple voices in different ways, diversifying course materials and assignments or examinations, actively seeking the inclusion of different perspectives, and attending to and drawing students' attention to the interactive social arrangements of the classroom – such as the way people of different races/ethnicities sit together or communicate and relate with one another. By going beyond the dominant and traditional academic set of practices and tools white faculty can make space for and affirm non-dominant ways of learning.

Revealing hegemony and location in a system of White privilege

- Broadening understanding of racism by structuring the curriculum, classroom exercises and assignments, or reflecting on classroom dynamics, in ways that draws students' attention to the effects of patterns of White dominance. Challenging students to examine their own classroom behavior may result in greater understanding that they are not only observers but participants in racial patterns.

Creating alliances on diversity matters/issues.

- Paying special attention to or challenging the ways in which white students act out patterns of dominance and ensuring that students of color do not retreat from participating in class work. Attending to the needs and problems students of color often encounter in a White dominated educational and social environment,

challenging white students' racially inappropriate behavior so that students of color do not always have to, checking in after a potentially damaging racial exchange in class, and encouraging all students to have a voice in class can undermine the dominant norms that keep some students of color (and some white students) on the margins of academic life.

Acting to alter structures/cultures.

- Altering the ways in which the prevailing culture and pedagogical traditions or customs of the university system privilege Whiteness. Such steps include reorganizing courses or specific lessons/lectures in ways that overtly or covertly challenge the typical ways that race operates in a university classroom, changing patterns of instruction and interaction with students, accepting/surfacing conflict as a normal and potentially constructive part of transformative pedagogy, and addressing departmental or university norms that support White hegemony.

There are several reasons why transforming approaches are imperative and at the same time difficult to implement. All of the white faculty in this study who engaged in transforming practices talked in some way about the difficulties, complexities and thorny situations they faced. As one professor said, working on these issues means “You have to embrace conflict and not be scared of it, not be scared of emotion”. Implicit here is the requirement for white faculty to gain greater clarity about their own racial identity, their understanding of racial issues, and the role they themselves play in maintaining the racial structure – even as they may work to alter it. Working these issues in the classroom raises the possibility that teacher and students can mutually engage in a racial learning process

and that all have to work to reduce their limited awareness of Whiteness and racism. O'Brien (2004) takes a further step, reporting her response to being challenged (fairly gently) by students of color for overlooking them, thus outing her own implicit racism. She indicates that, "My response was to tell the class this was another excellent example of how well-intentioned people may not realize how their behavior is being perceived, and that we must be ever-vigilant and mindful of falling into patterns of injustice that require great effort to struggle against" (p. 84-85).

Most of the benefits of doing this work are double edged. This is largely because this type of teaching bumps up against the traditional paradigm of higher education *as well as* the larger racial hierarchy. White faculty are required to unpack and constantly reflect on their own "invisible knapsack" of White privilege (MacIntosh, 1989) and accustomed (White dominant) practices. They face and work with students – white students and students of color – who will be shocked, challenged and perhaps resistant to transformative pedagogical practice and its critique of normative assumptions. This type of pedagogy requires white faculty to seek out innovative forms of teaching, and this takes place alongside colleagues and within collegial and institutional, practices and structures themselves embedded in White hegemony. Indeed, the personal and institutional challenges Bourdreau and Eggleston (1992) faced demonstrate that learning to change one's teaching practices challenges the normative assumptions of what teaching should look like. Practicing transforming approaches is a continual process of growth and struggle, one that requires learning that often takes place in public, inside and outside of the classroom.

Faculty development structures and educators can support white faculty from all disciplines in their efforts to implement transforming pedagogy. Learning these practices also can benefit anyone doing classroom work, especially graduate student instructors and undergraduates involved in peer-facilitated training for intergroup relations or service learning courses. The central benefit to a white professor or instructor open to learning new ways of teaching is the impact he/she can have on students of all races. By demonstrating a continuous attempt to be alert to the impact of race and racism and being willing to risk dislike and embarrassment, a white professor simultaneously signals to white students that it is okay to do this and interrupts patterns of White racism. In the process, white faculty further develop their own sense of racial awareness and positioning; they sharpen their abilities through greater systematic understanding and improve their own teaching skills. In other words, the value of engaging in transformative pedagogy is not a paternalistic attempt to help out students of color as much as it is to act on one's own self-interest. By learning how to be a better teacher and changing traditional teaching practices white faculty challenge the hegemony of Whiteness in both the process of teaching and in how white students and students of color come to understand their social world.

While white people and white faculty have in common a privileged social location and styles of enactment based on race, it is also true that Whiteness is differentiated and stratified by gender, rank/status, age, sexual orientation, physical appearance and mental ability, socioeconomic class and – in the academy – discipline. Intersecting with normative practices of higher education and the pedagogical practices presented here are gender and disciplinary differences in response patterns. It is important to understand

these patterns in order to support faculty efforts to transform their pedagogies. Among the reports of reproducing pedagogies there was a tendency for faculty to pose themselves as external to the issue, as out of sight and out of mind. In the reports of transformative pedagogical practices faculty acted with more agency as they assumed a more internal positioning to the issues, considering racial issues in the classroom and in the material. In contrast to reproducing practices, these reports more often posed faculty in relation to the issues and assumed a responsibility to address them.

Generally, the white men faculty did this by acting proactively in addressing the issues from a position of authority and external control. The white women faculty more often than the men addressed the issues in a more personal and vulnerable manner exposing themselves to discomfort or conflict. Where this was not the case, the descriptions of pedagogical practice the white women faculty provided suggest compliance with normative assumptions. There was some indication in the data that differences in status (tenured/non-tenured) and discipline influence to what extent a white woman professor is willing to push back. Overall, disciplinary differences showed up in the strong tendency for reproducing practices to be reported by white faculty in the natural sciences, and transformative practices to more often be reported by faculty in the humanities and social sciences. This is not surprising given the disciplinary norms and subject matter differences that underlie the pedagogical practices in these groups. However, it does mean that professionalization and disciplinary norms must be considered for effective faculty development around transformative pedagogical practices. As TuSmith and Reddy (2002) argue, “our unique subject positions play a significant role in our pedagogy. This means that each of us must develop classroom

strategies suited to our specific combination of racial and ethnic designation, field of expertise, and institutional setting” (p. 317). It is my hope that the discussion and analysis of transforming pedagogical practices presented here help strengthen an initiative for change among white faculty and in the normative social context of higher education itself.

I offer an examination of one space where the macro and micro aspects of Whiteness intersect in regenerating ways, and by focusing attention on one institutional structure where this occurs. Institutions of higher education are significant locations for this examination because of the significant role education at all levels has played in policies and practices aimed at addressing racial inequality. *Brown vs. Board of Education* was a precipice of social change in this respect. However, racial inequality persists despite similar policy efforts and individual achievement. There has been less of a focus, and no real policy effort, to address the processes by which the structure of Whiteness influences higher education. Doing so can inform policy and practice, perhaps providing us with different answers to whether or how education can be one solution to racial inequality. I have offered a framework for examining one slice of this project. Clarity about enactments of Whiteness as reproducing or transforming the structure of Whiteness can lead to shifts in how Whiteness is constructed and understood theoretically and how pedagogical practice can be a pragmatic approach to challenge the dominance of White hegemony. This study will serve as one voice in the examination of Whiteness, and only one of a few speaking to the relationship between Whiteness and pedagogy. Other questions need to be asked and I hope this project encourages additional research in this area.

Implications for Further Research

A probing question related to the interplay of structure and agency demonstrated in this project but which is not directly addressed in this project is the question of why white faculty chose to teach in the transforming ways I identified in the data. This study is an examination of enactments, behaviors stemming from group or cultural norms, not of actors. People act from a place of compliance or resistance to these norms and are not always conscious of why they react in these ways or even that how they react reflects their cultural or group membership. This is also true of the white faculty in this study. For example, when Pamela, a natural science professor, decided to show a documentary illustrating the use of DNA in making ancestral connections linked to racial identity, she knew she was pushing up against the norms of a science classroom and acted in ways that indicate this consciousness by checking in with a Graduate Student Instructor (GSI) about potentially offending someone. Yet when John, also in the natural sciences, decided to design and make available tutorial resources in an effort to address the differential test scores between white and Black students he seemed unaware of the larger structural issues related to national trends in racial gaps in scores and performance measures, or of the fact that his action pushed against the underlying influence of these White hegemonic structures.

However, the data do provide some direction for investigating this question. The presence of reproducing and transforming enactments of Whiteness in pedagogical practice varied by gender and discipline and further exploration of these groupings will likely give insight into why, and under what circumstances, some faculty used one form of pedagogy over the other. Certainly one's background, personal interactions, level and

type of exposure to unfamiliar people and places, and countless other factors shape one's tools of engagement. McIntosh's (1989) concept of an invisible knapsack of White privilege is an example that is particularly relevant here. The compilation of these pieces of a professor's life can influence when and why they engage in reproducing or transforming pedagogies, including the experience some white faculty have with the struggles involved in efforts to implement transforming pedagogy. After deciding to practice transforming pedagogy and becoming engaged in moments of struggle, some white faculty may decide to incorporate more transforming practices into their teaching repertoire. Experience, and survival, in these teaching moments may make them seem more accessible. Of course, the opposite could happen as well as white faculty try to avoid the uncertainty and tensions that are often a part of these attempts. However, as faculty become more skilled and comfortable in these situations they may struggle less and act in more transforming ways. An intermediary force or characteristic generated out of these cultural components and encounters is a relatively heightened racial awareness. The level of awareness a professor (or individual) has about their own and other groups' racial identity and related social location may very well help explain, at least in part, why some white faculty teach in ways that comply with or reshape the structure of Whiteness.

In order to further tease out the processes by which White hegemony structures the academy, enactments of Whiteness need to be examined from different points of view and in different contexts. White students' and students' of color perspectives on how White faculty enact Whiteness, and how these students learn about Whiteness from these professors, need to be included. Contextual factors, such as the level of exposure to diversity, also need to be considered. Perry's (2000) findings illuminate the importance

of recognizing that Whiteness is mediated by contact with diverse populations and by spatial location. She found that the scope of diversity in schools affects the racial identification of White students differently. It is important to investigate similar aspects by looking at how Whiteness is enacted in classes that are made up of primarily White students versus classes that are racially diverse. Through interactions with people different from themselves, students learn how to negotiate and benefit from the diversity of people and ideas that surround them, as well as develop an enhanced appreciation of the importance of equality and interdependence as democratic elements (Gay, 1997; Gurin, 2003; Gurin, et al., 2002). More broadly speaking, we need to look at how Whiteness impacts efforts to support diversity on college campuses, and in what ways Whiteness influences diversity efforts. Tied to this is application of the theoretical framework of enactments of Whiteness I present here to other groups of white faculty that differ from this group in important ways, such as level of expertise or experience teaching in diverse classrooms, non-tenure track faculty, and faculty teaching at liberal arts, community or technical colleges.

It is also important to examine and compare how white faculty and faculty of color resist and adopt policies, practices and norms of Whiteness in pedagogical practices, and consider the benefits and risks involved for all groups. For both groups pedagogical practices are not likely to be simply a reflection or reaction to the structure of Whiteness, but rather a much more complicated reflection of the ways pedagogy is impacted by the intersection of such power structures and identities as race/ethnicity, class, gender, age, discipline, and status *with* Whiteness. We need to ask who transforms Whiteness and who resists it, and by what methods. While I use the phrase transforming

pedagogies here, these practices can also be identified as radical or anti-racist pedagogies. The power in the language, who holds it and in what context, and the differential risks involved are important to examine. Comparative studies can offer insight into these and other questions such as, the role of power in executing transforming pedagogies; do white faculty transform Whiteness by virtue of their power and privilege whereas faculty of color resist Whiteness and in the process reshape it? The experiences of progressive white faculty, progressive faculty of targeted groups, compliant white faculty and compliant faculty of targeted groups are likely to vary in important ways. Here again, context is important, not only in terms of demographics but political atmosphere as well. The political climate at the institution involved may also impact the practices of these groups. Although these populations and issues are beyond the scope of this study I see this project as my own initiation into this research agenda and look forward to continuing this work in future projects.

APPENDIX

Faculty Diversity Interview Protocol (October 1999)

A. Biographical questions regarding academic career:

1. How central is teaching in your life as a faculty member?

How does this connect with why you wanted to be a faculty member originally?

2. What kind of classes do you teach? (Graduate/undergraduate, required/optional, large/small, etc.) [BE SURE TO GET SPECIFIC NAMES OF COURSES ALSO]

B: Teaching Philosophy and Practice

3. What kind of teacher are you trying to be? How would you describe your teaching styles?

3a. What are your greatest strengths as a teacher? Areas for improvement?

3b. What has been most influential for you in learning how to teach?

4. What makes you feel successful in the classroom? What does it look like when you are doing a successful job in the classroom? What's going on with the students? What's going on with you?

Tell me a story about a good teaching moment?

Tell me a story about a classroom experience you wish you'd handled differently?

Now we want to talk to you a bit about your own personal understandings and experiences with race. Please answer all the questions in the way that is most comfortable to you...

C: Personal understandings about the importance of race

5. Do you feel like you are a member of a racial group?

[If yes]

5a. Which? What does it mean to you?

6. What role do you think race has played in your daily life?
 - 6a. What role has it played in your life at the University of Michigan?
 - 6b. Do other people find your race to be important? How? In what ways? Under what circumstances?
7. Have you had much experience with racially diverse situations? [**probe for details**]

Now I want to ask you a few questions about the role of racial diversity in your teaching...

D: Teaching and Diversity

8. How do you deal with issues of racial diversity and multiculturalism in your classroom? Do they have an impact on your teaching practices? On your students? [**probe for concrete examples**]
 - 8a. How public are you in class about your racial group memberships/identities (about which aspects, why/why not)? Do you think about it? To the extent that you do think about it, do you think it has an impact on what happens in class? [**probe for specific details**]
9. How did you learn or first consider how to deal with racial diversity in the classroom?
 - 9a. What have you found useful in helping you to improve your ability to successfully deal with diversity in the classroom? [**probe for specific details**]
10. What kind of *knowledge, skills and temperament* do you think a faculty member needs to possess in order to be able to do a good job teaching in a racially diverse classroom? What is most important? [**probe for specific details**] of the kind of concrete things they do or think others need]
11. Can you remember a time in class when a racial 'event' created strong emotional feelings for you - nervousness, disconcertedness, anxiety, fear or anger? [Ask for a fearful time and an angry time] what happened? What did you do?
12. Are there things can and/or can't get away with or do or can do easier because of who you are (in terms of race, gender, status)?
 - 12a. Are there things others can do or get away with that you can't?

12b. Are there times when you feel like your authority was undermined in interactions with students?

13. Can you teach effectively without paying attention to issues of diversity in the class?

Now I'm going to ask you some questions about white students and then about students of color:

14. Where are white students on these issues of racial diversity (how do they react)?

14a. How do you deal with white students' sometimes racially problematic behavior in the classroom? How do you deal with white students' resistance?

14b. How about interracial ignorance, awkwardness, or separation?

14c. Are things that white students say and/or do that consciously or unconsciously express racial privilege or advantage? Do you see evidence of this in your classes? Have you ever proactively dealt with this issue?

15. What's going on with students of color? Where are they on these issues of racial diversity?

15a. We've just been talking about the things that white students do in class that are problematic. Are there things that students of color do that are problematic on these *racial* issues? What kinds of things?

15b. How do students of color react to white students "**stuff**"...the things white students do in class? (*elaborate if necessary*) How do you deal with it when/if students of color buy-out/pull out or withdraw from the classroom space? (if necessary, clarify that we mean figuratively withdraw rather than literally withdrawing from the class)

15c. Do students of color and white students generally have the same skills, talents and learning styles? If not, how do you deal with the differences?

16. How do you deal with conflict between racial groups (or racial conflict) in the classroom? Can you remember any specific examples?

17. Do you see yourself as a "diversity advocate"?

17a. What does that mean for you?

17b. What arenas or action are involved? What things do you do as a result?

18. Have you ever been accused either by students or colleagues of being racist?

What happened? What did you do?

18a. Have you ever been accused of being soft or of bending over backwards for minorities?

What happened? What did you do?

18b. Have you ever been accused of being soft or bending over backwards for white students?

What happened? What did you do?

19. Is there anything more about how are you perceived by your colleagues on these issues? How do you know? Are they supportive?

19a. What happens when racial issues come up with colleagues more generally? What brings them up? What do you feel or do *when these issues come up*?

19b. Do you know of colleagues who are especially attentive, creative or effective in dealing with issues of race and racism in classes?

Who are they?

What do they do?

What makes them effective?

19c. Do you have a community here in which you (do/can) discuss teaching? If yes, what's that community like? If no, would you like one? Do you belong to any teaching related organizations?

20. What advice would you give a new faculty member of your race/ethnicity at Michigan about the kind of issues we've been talking about?

21. There's been a lot of debate about Affirmative Action, about who ought to be a part of the University community. What's your take on what's really going on in the debate? Where are you on what kind of students and faculty ought to be a part of the University?

22. Do you think this interview would have been different, would your answers have been different if I had been more like you in terms of race, gender, discipline, etc.? If yes, how?

[Request any handouts, examples of exercises, assignments or other things they'd be willing to share.]

REFERENCES

- Adams, M., Bell, L. A., & Griffin, P. (1997). *Teaching for diversity and social justice: A sourcebook*. New York: Routledge.
- Alcoff, L. M. (2006). *Visible identities: Race, gender, and the self*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Allen, W., Epps, E., Guillory, E., Suh, S., & Stassen, M. (2002). Outsiders within: Race, gender and faculty status in U.S. higher education. In W. Smith, P. Altbach & K. Lomotey (Eds.), *The racial crisis in American higher education* (pp. 189 – 220). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Anderson, J., & Adams, M. (1992). Acknowledging the diverse learning styles of diverse student populations: Implications for instructional design. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 49, 19-33.
- Andersen, M. L. & Hill-Collins, P. (2004). *Race, class and gender*. Belmont, California: Wadsworth.
- Astin, H., Antonio, A., Cress, C. & Astin, A. (1997). *Race and ethnicity in the American professoriate, 1995-1996*. Los Angeles: University of California, Higher Education Research Institute, Graduate School of Education and Information Studies.
- Auletta, G. S. & Jones, T. (1994). Unmasking the myths of racism. In D. Halpern (Ed.), *Changing college classrooms: New teaching and learning strategies for an increasingly complex world* (pp. 165-173). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Auster, C., & MacRone, M. (1994). The classroom as a negotiated setting: An empirical study of the effect of faculty members' behavior on student participation. *Teaching Sociology*, 22, 289-299.
- Back, L. (2004). Ivory towers? The academy and racism. In I. Law, D. Phillips, & L. Turney (Eds.), *Institutional racism in higher education* (pp. 1-6). Sterling, VA: Trentham Books.
- Bell, L., Washington, S., Weinstein, G., & Griffin, P. (1997). *Teaching for diversity and social justice*. NY: Routledge.

- Bernstein, A. & Cock, J. (1997). Educating citizens for participation in a strong democracy. *Social Education*, 53:355-56, 370.
- Bobo, L. (1999). Prejudice as group position: Microfoundations of a sociological approach to racism and race relations. *Journal of Social Issues*, 55, 445-472.
- Bobo, L., Kluegel, J., & Smith, R. (1997). Laissez-faire racism: The crystallization of a kinder, gentler anti-black ideology. In S. Tuch & J. Martin (Eds.), *Racial attitudes in the 1990s: Continuity and change* (pp. 14-42). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2001). *White supremacy and racism in the post-Civil Rights era*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2006). *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in the United States*, (2d Ed). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Bonilla-Silva, E., & Forman, T. (2000). I'm not a racist but ...: Mapping college students' racial ideology in the USA". *Discourse and Society*, 11, 50-85.
- Bourdieu, P. & Passerson, J.C. (2000). *Reproduction in education, society and culture*, 2nd ed. (R. Nice, Trans.). London: Sage. (Original work published 1977)
- Boudreau, B., & Eggleston, T. (2002). Traps, pitfalls, and obstacles: Challenges to confronting racism in Academia. In B. TuSmith and M. T. Reddy Eds., *Race in the college classroom: Pedagogy and politics* (pp. 200-209). Piscataway, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Bush, M. (2004). *Breaking the code of good intentions: Everyday forms of whiteness*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Chaisson, R. L. (2004). A crack in the door: critical race theory in practice at a predominantly white institution. *Teaching Sociology*, 32, 345-357.
- Calhoun, C. (1995). *Critical social theory: Culture history, and the challenge of difference*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Checkoway, B. (2002). Renewing the civic mission of the American research university. *The Journal of Public Affairs*, 6, 265-293.
- Chesler, M., Lewis, A., & Crowfoot, J. (2005). *Challenging racism in higher education: Promoting justice*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

- Chesler, M., Peet, M., & Sevig, T. (2003). Blinded by whiteness: The development of white college students' racial awareness. In A. Doane & E. Bonilla-Silva (Eds.), *White out: The continuing significance of racism* (pp. 215-230). New York: Routledge.
- Chesler, M., & Young, A. (2007). Faculty members' social identities and classroom authority. *New Directions in Teaching and Learning*, 111, 11-19.
- Collett, J. & Serrano. (1992). Stirring it up: The inclusive classroom. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 49, 35-48.
- Cornell, S., (1996). The variable ties that bind: Content and circumstance in ethnic processes. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 19, 265-289.
- Crenshaw, K. (1997). Color-blind dreams and racial nightmares: Reconfiguring racism in the post-civil rights era. In T. Morrison & C.B. Lacour (Eds.), *Birth of a nation 'hood*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Crowfoot, J., & Chesler, M. (1996) White men's roles in multicultural coalitions. In B. Bowser & R. Hunt (Eds.), *Impacts of racism on white America*, (2d Ed) (pp. 202-229). Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE.
- Delgado, R. & Stefancic, J. (2001). *Critical race theory*. New York University Press.
- Degler, C. N., (1971). *Neither black nor white: Slavery and race relations in Brazil and the United States*. New York: Macmillian.
- Dixson, A. D. & Rousseau, C. K. (2005). And we are still not saved: critical race theory in education ten years later. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 8(1), 7-27.
- Doane, A. W. (2003). Rethinking whiteness studies. In A. Doane & E. Bonilla-Silva (Eds.), *White out: The continuing significance of racism* (pp. 1-18). New York: Routledge.
- Dovidio, J. & Gaertner, S. (1986). Prejudice, discrimination and racism: Historical trends and contemporary approaches. In J. Dovidio & S. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination and racism* (pp. 1-34). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. (1994/1903). *The souls of black folk*. New York: Dover.
- Emerson, R. M., Fretz, R. I. & Shaw, L. (1995). *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Feagin, J. R. (2000). *Racist America: Roots, current realities, and future reparations*. New York: Routledge.

- Feagin, J. R., & Feagin, C. (1986). *Discrimination American style: Institutional racism and sexism*. Englewoods Cliff, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Feagin, J.R., & Vera, H. (1995). *White racism*. New York: Routledge.
- Fine, M. (1997). Witnessing whiteness. In M. Fine, L. Weis, L. C. Powell, & L. M. Wong (Eds.), *Off white: Readings on race, power, and society*. New York: Routledge.
- Flagg, B. (1993). Was blind but now I see: White race consciousness and the requirement of discriminatory intent. *Michigan Law Review*, 91, 953-956.
- Forman, T. & Lewis, A. (2006). Racial apathy and hurricane Katrina: The social anatomy of prejudice in the post-civil rights era. *DuBois Review*, 3(1), 175-202.
- Foster, L. (2001). The not-so-invisible professors: White faculty at the Black college. *Urban Education*, 36(5), 611-629.
- Frankenberg, R. (1993). *White women, race matters*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Freire, P. (2002). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (Maya Ramos, Trans.). New York: Continuum.
- Gair, M. & Mullins, G. (2001). Hiding in plain sight. In E. Margolis (Ed.), *The hidden curriculum in higher education*. NY: Routledge.
- Gallagher, C. (2003). White reconstruction in the university. In M. Kimmel & A. Ferber (Eds.), *Privilege* (pp. 299-318). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Garcia, M., & Smith, D. (1996). Reflecting inclusiveness in the college curriculum. In R. Rendon, L. Hope & Associates (Eds.), *Educating a new majority* (pp. 265-288). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Gaurasci, R. & Cornwell, G. H. (1997). *Democratic education in an age of difference: Redefining citizenship in higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gay, G. (1997). The relationship between multiculturalism and democratic education. *The Social Sciences*, January/February: 5-10.
- Giroux, H. A. (1997). Racial politics and the pedagogy of whiteness. In M. Hill (Ed.) *Whiteness: A critical reader* (pp. 294-315). New York: New York University Press.

- Glaser, B. G. & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.
- Goodman, D. (2001). *Promoting diversity and social justice: Educating people from privileged groups*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Gossett, T. F. (1965). *Race: The history of an idea in America*. New York: Shocken.
- Gurin, P. (2003). Expert Report of Patricia Gurin, Gratz, et al. v. Bollinger, et al., No. 97-75321 (E.D. Mich.) and Grutter, et al. v. Bollinger, et al., No. 97-75928 (E.D. Mich.) [Electronic version]. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, Retrieved August 2003.
- Gurin, P., Dey E.L., Hurtado, S., and Gurin, G. (2002). Diversity and higher education: theory and impact on educational outcomes. *Harvard Educational Review*, 72 (3), 330-366.
- Hall, S. (1996). New ethnicities. In D. Morley & K. H. Chen (Eds.), *Stuart Hall: Critical dialogues in cultural studies*. NY: Routledge.
- Hall, S. (Ed.). (1996). *Questions of cultural identity*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Harris, D. & Sims, J. (2002). Who is multiracial? The fluidity of racial identity among U.S. adolescents. *American Sociological Review*, 67(4), 614-627.
- Headley, C. (2004). Delegitimizing the normativity of "whiteness": A critical African philosophical study of the metaphoricity of "whiteness". In G. Yancy (Ed.), *What white looks like: African-American philosophers on the whiteness question* (pp. 87-106). NY: Routledge.
- Herrnstein, R. J. and Charles M. (1994). *The bell curve: Intelligence and class structure in American life*. New York: The Free Press.
- Hill-Collin, P. (1990). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. Boston: Unwin Hyman.
- hooks, b. (1981). *Ain't I a woman*. Boston: South End Press.
- hooks, b. (1989). *Talking back*. Boston: South End Press
- hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. NY: Routledge.

- Hunter, M. (2002). Decentering the white and male standpoints in race and ethnicity courses. In A. A. Macdonald and S. Sanchez-Casal (Eds.), *Twenty-first century feminist classrooms: Pedagogies of identity and difference* (pp. 251-279). NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Jordon, J. (2001). Report from the Bahamas. In M. L. Andersen & P. Hill-Collins, *Race, class, and gender*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Iverson, S. V. (2007). Camouflaging power and privilege: A critical race analysis of university diversity policies. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 43(5), 586-611.
- Jencks, Joe. (2007). Come with me. On The candle and the flame [CD]. Seattle, WA: Turtle Bear Music.
- Johnson, A. (2006). *Privilege, power & difference*, (2d Ed). Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Johnsrud, L., & Sadao, K. (1998). The common experience of 'otherness': Ethnic and racial minority faculty. *The Review of Higher Education*, 21, 315-342.
- Jordan, W. (1968). *White over black*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Jordon, J. (2001). Report from the Bahamas. In M. L. Andersen & P. Hill-Collins (Eds.), *Race, Class, and Gender*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Katz, J. (1991). White Faculty Struggling with the Effects of Racism. In P. G. Altbach and K. Lomotey (Eds.), *The racial crisis in American higher education* (pp.187-198). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Kendall, F. (2006). *Understanding white privilege*. NY: Routledge.
- Kincheloe, J., Steinberg, S., Rodriguez, N., & Chennauet, R. (Eds.). (1998). *White reign: Deploying whiteness in America*. NY: St. Martin Press.
- Kinder, D., & Sears, J. (1981). Prejudice and politics: Symbolic racism versus threats to the good life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 40, 414-431.
- Kivel, P. (1996). *Uprooting racism: How white people can work for social justice*. Philadelphia: New Society Press.
- Kolb, D. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. New York: Prentice Hall.

- Law, I., Phillips, D., & Turney, L. (2004). Tackling institutional racism in higher education: An antiracist toolkit. In I. Law, D. Phillips, and L. Turney (Eds.), *Institutional racism in higher education* (pp. 93-104). Sterling, VA: Trentham Books.
- Leonardo, Z. (2004). The color of supremacy: Beyond the discourse of 'white privilege'. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 36(2), 137-152.
- Lewis, A. E. (2002). Studying Whiteness: Past research and future directions. *African American Research Perspectives*, 8(1), 1-16.
- Lewis, A. (2002). What groups?: Studying whiteness in the era of colorblindness. *Sociological Theory*, 22(4), 623-646.
- Lindholm, J., & Astin, H. (2008). Spirituality and pedagogy: Faculty's spirituality and use of student-centered approaches to undergraduate teaching. *The Review of Higher Education*, 31(2), 185-207.
- Lindholm, J., Szelenyi, K., Hurtado, S., & Korn, W. (2005). *The American college teacher: National norms for the 2004-2005 HERI faculty survey*. Los Angeles: University of California, Higher Education Research Institute, University of California.
- Lippin, L. B. (2006). Making whiteness visible in the classroom. In V. Lea and J. Helfand (Eds.), *Identifying race and transforming whiteness in the classroom* (pp. 109-131). Washington, DC: Peter Lang.
- Lorde, A. (1984). *Sister outsider*. Trumansburg, NY: Crossing Press.
- Maher, F., & Tetreault, M. (2003). Learning in the dark: how assumptions of whiteness shape classroom knowledge. In A. Howell & F. Tuitt. (Eds.). *Race and higher education in the classroom: rethinking pedagogy in diverse college classrooms* (pp. 69-96). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Publishing Group.
- Martin, B., (1991). From negro to black to African American: The power of names and naming. *Political Science Quarterly*, 106, 83-107.
- Margolis, E., & Romero, M. (1998). The department is very male, very white, very old and very conservative: The functioning of the 'hidden curriculum' in graduate sociology departments. *Harvard Educational Review*, 68(1), 1-23.
- Mathieson, G. (2004). Reconceptualizing our classroom practice: Notes from an antiracist educator. In V. Lee & Judy Helfand (Eds.), *Identifying race and transforming whiteness in the classroom* (pp.235-256). NY: Peter Lang.

- Marchesani, L., & Adams, M. (1992). Dynamics of diversity in the teaching-learning process: A faculty development model for analysis and action. *New Directions in Teaching and Learning*, 52, 9-20.
- Maxwell, K. (2004). Deconstructing whiteness: Discovering the water. In V. Lee & J. Helfand (Eds.), *Identifying race and transforming whiteness in the classroom* (pp. 153-168). New York: Peter Lang.
- Mayberry, K. (Ed.) (1996). *Teaching what you are not*. New York University Press.
- Mayhew, M. J., and Grunwald, H. E., (2006). Factors contributing to faculty incorporation of diversity –related course content. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77, 148-168.
- McConaghy, J. (1983). Modern racism, ambivalence and the modern racism scale. In J. Dovidio and S. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination and racism: Theory and research* (pp. 91-126). New York: Academic Press.
- McIntosh, P. (1989). White privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack. *Peace and Freedom*, July/August, 10-12.
- McKinney, K. D. (2002). Whiteness on a white canvas: Teaching in a predominately white university. In B. TuSmith & M.T. Reddy (Eds.), *Race in the college classroom: Pedagogy and politics* (pp. 126-139). Piscataway, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Messner, M. (2000). White guy habitus in the classroom. *Men and Masculinities*, 2(4), 457-69.
- Mills, Charles. (1997). *The racial contract*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Montejano, D., (1987). *Anglos and Mexicans in the making of Texas, 1836-1986*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Montgomery, S. & Groat, L. (1998). Student learning styles and their implications for teaching. *CRLT Occasional Papers # 10*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Center for Research on Learning and Teaching.
- Moraga, C. (2001). La guerra. In M. L. Andersen & P. Hill-Collins (Eds.), *Race, class, and gender*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Morey, A., & Kitano, M. (1997). *Multicultural course transformations in higher education: A broader truth*. Needham, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Morgan, E. S. (1975). *American slavery, American freedom: The ordeal of Colonial Virginia*. New York: Norton.

- Morfin, O. J., Perez, V. H., Parker, L. Marvin, L. & Arrona, J. (2006). Hiding the politically obvious: A critical race theory preview of diversity as racial neutrality in higher education. *Educational Policy*, 20(1), 249-270.
- O'Brien, E. (2004). I could hear you if you would just calm down: Challenging eurocentric classroom norms through passionate discussions of racial oppression. In V. Lee & Judy Helfand (Eds.), *Identifying race and transforming whiteness in the classroom* (pp.68-86). New York: Peter Lang.
- Omi, M. & Howard W. (1994). *Racial formation in the United States*. New York: Routledge.
- Ortiz, A. M. & Rhodes, R. A. (2000). Deconstructing whiteness as part of a multicultural educational framework: From theory to practice. *Journal of College Student Development*, (41)1, 81-93.
- Parker, W. C. (2003). *Teaching democracy: Unity and diversity in public life*. New York: Teacher's College Press.
- Parker, W. C. (1997). The art of deliberation. *Education Leadership*, 54, 18-21.
- Perry, P. (2002). *Shades of white: White kids and racial identities in high school*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Proudman, W., Welp, M., & Morris, J. (2005). *Diversity partnership tips for white men*. Portland, OR: White Men as Full Diversity Partners.
- Reddy, M. T. (2002). Smashing the rules of racial standing. In B. TuSmith & M.T. Reddy (Eds.), *Race in the college classroom: Pedagogy and politics* (pp. 51-61). Piscataway, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Roediger, D. R. (2005). *Working toward whiteness: How America's immigrants became white*. New York: Basic Books.
- Roediger, D. R. (2006, July 14). Whiteness and its complications. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.
- Scheurich, J., & Young, M. (2002). White racism among white faculty. In W. Smith, P. Altbach & K. Lomotey (Eds.), *The racial crisis in American higher education* (pp. 221-242). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Schneider, C. G. (2001). Toward the engaged academy: new scholarship, new teaching. *Liberal Education*, 87, 18-27.
- Schoem, D., Frankel, L., Zuniga, X., & Lewis, E. (Eds.). (1993). *Multicultural teaching in the university*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

- Schuman, H., Steeh, C., Bobo, L., & Krysan, M., (1997). *Racial attitudes in America: Trends and interpretations*, (Revised Edition). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sewell, W. H., Jr., (1992). A theory of structure: Duality, agency, and transformation. *American Journal of Sociology*, 98(1), 1-29.
- Sonn, C. (2008). Educating for anti-racism: Producing and reproducing race and power in a university classroom. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 11(2), 155-166.
- Srivastava, S. (2005). You're calling me a racist? The moral and emotional regulation of antiracism and feminism. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 31(1), 29-62.
- Stanley, C. (2006). Coloring the academic landscape: Faculty of color breaking the silence in predominantly white college and universities. *American Educational Journal*, 43(4), 701-736.
- Sweet, S. (1998). Practicing radical pedagogy: Balancing ideals with institutional constraints. *Teaching Sociology*, 26, 100-111.
- Tatum, B. (1997). *Why are all the black kids sitting together in the cafeteria? And other conversations about race*. New York: Basic Books.
- Terry, R. (1981). The negative impact on white values. In B. Bowser & R. Hunt (Eds.), *Impacts of racism on white Americans*, (2d Ed) (pp. 119-151). Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE.
- Thompson, B. (2001). *A Promise and a way of life: White anti-racist activism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Thompson, C., Schaefer, E., & Brod, H. (2003). *White men challenging racism: 35 personal stories*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Thompson, E.P. (1975). The plantation as a race-making situation. In B. E. Griessman, *Minorities*. Hinsdale, IL: Dryden.
- Turner, C., & Myers, S. (2000). *Faculty of color in Academe: Bittersweet success*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- TuSmith, B. and Reddy, M. T. (2002). *Race in the college classroom: Pedagogy and politics*. Piscataway, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- TuSmith, B. and Reddy, M. T. (2002). Conclusion: Teaching to make a difference. In B. TuSmith & M.T. Reddy (Eds.), *Race in the college classroom: Pedagogy and politics* (pp. 315-318). Piscataway, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

- TuSmith, B. & Reddy, M. T. (2002). Transformative practices. In B. TuSmith & M.T. Reddy (Eds.), *Race in the college classroom: Pedagogy and politics* (pp. 211-212). Piscataway, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Vargas, L., (Ed.) 2002. *Women faculty of color in the white classroom: Narratives on the pedagogical implications of classroom diversity*. New York: Lang.
- Wagner, A. E. (2005). Unsettling the academy: Working through the challenges of anti-racist pedagogy. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 8(3), 261-275.
- Waters, M. (1990). *Ethnic options: Choosing identities in America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Weinstein, G, and O’Bear, K. (1992). Bias issues in the classroom: Encounters with the teaching self. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* 52, 39-50.
- Williams, E. (1961). *Capitalism and slavery*. New York: Russell and Russell.
- Weiss, R. S. (1994). *Learning from strangers: The art and method of qualitative interview studies*. New York: The Free Press.
- Wise, T. (2005). *White like me: reflections on race from a privileged son*. New York: Soft Skull Press.
- Yancy, G. (2004). Fragments of a social ontology of whiteness. In G. Yancy (Ed.), *What white looks like: African-American philosophers on the whiteness question* (pp. 1-24). New York: Routledge.
- Yosso, T. J. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, (8)1, 69-91.
- Zamundio, M. M. & Rios, F. (2006). From traditional to liberal racism: Living racism in the everyday. *Sociological Perspectives*, 49(4), 483-501.