


Summer 7-9-2019

# A DIALECTICAL RELATIONAL ANALYSIS OF TESOL QUARTERLY 2006 SPECIAL ISSUE ON RACE: DISCOURSE, RACE, AND WHITE SUPREMACIST IDEOLOGY

Ginger A. Looney

*University of New Mexico - Main Campus*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/educ\\_llss\\_etds](https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/educ_llss_etds)

 Part of the [Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons](#), [Curriculum and Instruction Commons](#), [Curriculum and Social Inquiry Commons](#), [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#), [Elementary Education Commons](#), [Language and Literacy Education Commons](#), [Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Commons](#), and the [Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Looney, Ginger A.. "A DIALECTICAL RELATIONAL ANALYSIS OF TESOL QUARTERLY 2006 SPECIAL ISSUE ON RACE: DISCOURSE, RACE, AND WHITE SUPREMACIST IDEOLOGY." (2019). [https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/educ\\_llss\\_etds/114](https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/educ_llss_etds/114)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Education ETDs at UNM Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Language, Literacy, and Sociocultural Studies ETDs by an authorized administrator of UNM Digital Repository. For more information, please contact [amywinter@unm.edu](mailto:amywinter@unm.edu).

Ginger A. Looney

*Candidate*

Language, Literacy, and Sociocultural Studies

*Department*

This dissertation is approved, and it is acceptable in quality and form for publication:

*Approved by the Dissertation Committee:*

Christine Sims, Ph.D., Co-Chairperson

Julia Scherba de Valenzuela, Ph.D., Co-Chairperson

Pisarn “Bee” Chamcharatsri, Ph.D.

Susana Martínez Guillem, Ph.D.

**A DIALECTICAL RELATIONAL ANALYSIS OF *TESOL QUARTERLY*  
2006 SPECIAL ISSUE ON RACE: DISCOURSE, RACE, AND WHITE  
SUPREMACIST IDEOLOGY**

**BY**

**GINGER A. LOONEY**

B.S., Education, University of New Mexico, 1994

M.A., Math, Science, and Technology Education, University of New Mexico, 1999

DISSERTATION

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of

**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**  
**Language, Literacy, and Sociocultural Studies**

The University of New Mexico  
Albuquerque, New Mexico

**July, 2019**

**DEDICATION**

To my beloved parents and first teachers, Marilyn and Lynn Looney. I am here because of your hard work, tireless patience, and enduring love. Thank you for always being there for me. I love you.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I want to acknowledge my advisor and co-chair, Dr. Christine Sims. I deeply appreciate your wise guidance and advisement over the years. I could always count on you for keen questions and insights to keep me focused and forward thinking about how my work might help improve students' schooling experiences. I also want to acknowledge co-chair Dr. Julia de Scherba de Valenzuela. Thank you for your generosity of time and attention to my work. I appreciate your patience, guidance, and insight on this journey. To my committee members, Dr. Susana Martínez Guillem and Dr. Pisarn "Bee" Chamcharatsri, thank you for your support and feedback on my work. Dr. Martínez Guillem, thank you for valuing my work and helping me move it forward. I also want to thank Dr. Ricky Lee Allen for all of your teachings and conversations about race and race theory. I deeply appreciate your humility, support, and wisdom over the years. I am deeply grateful to Paulita Aguilar for all your research help over the years. You welcomed me to the library as a researcher and enabled me to access many worlds of knowledge and possibilities.

I extend my sincere gratitude to everyone at Doc Group. Thank you for your time and feedback over the years. I am also grateful for Paulita Aguilar, Nancy Alzate, Donna Boynton, Kristina Brewer, Khoi Bhui, Dr. Linka Crosby, Layla Dehaiman, Apolonia Doñez, Marina Doñez, Moira Ellis, Jesse Hall, Sjonja Harper, Lisa Hendrickson, Joann Henry, Joycelyn Jackson, Dr. Elisheva Levin, Deryl Looney, Carla Manzanares-Murray, Dr. Emillia Masaka, Cristy McBride, Gail Niemann, Veronica Nolan, Dr. Annette Rodríguez, Teresa Looney Roeder, Dr. Daisy Thompson, Dr. Gene Thompson, Dr. Lillian Torrez, Zarghuna and Hashim Zaki, all of my students and their families, and the

rest of my friends, my family, and my colleagues. Your kindness, encouragement, prayers, insights, edits, messages, love, laughter, meal breaks, silent work sessions, friendships, memes, and wisdom helped get me to the finish line with my heart still kind, my pencil sharp, and my sense of humor intact.

Lastly, I want to acknowledge Dr. Joseph Henry Suina. I began this Ph.D. because you believed in me, and you believed that my questions were important. Thank you for starting me on this journey.

**A DIALECTICAL RELATIONAL ANALYSIS OF *TESOL QUARTERLY* 2006  
SPECIAL ISSUE ON RACE: DISCOURSE, RACE, AND WHITE  
SUPREMACIST IDEOLOGY**

**By**

**Ginger A. Looney**

B.S., Education, University of New Mexico, 1994

M.A., Math, Science, and Technology Education, University of New Mexico, 1999

Ph.D., Language, Literacy, and Sociocultural Studies, 2019

**ABSTRACT**

Although the field of TESOL is not racially neutral this dialectical relational analysis examined (1) what discourses did the authors use to deploy race in the articles in the 2006 *TESOL Quarterly* Special Issue on Race (*TQSIR*)? and (2) how do these discourses work to either conform to, or resist white supremacist ideology? Analysis of the texts identified four key discourse: racialization, whiteness, emotional labor of racism, and sonic and optic negation of racism. These discourses were examined in the domains of scholarship, curriculum, teachers, and students. In 21 instances, these four discourses work to resist white supremacist ideology. In five instances, these discourses work to conform to white supremacist ideology. Results point to the need for further research regarding racism in the field of TESOL.

## Table of Contents

<b>Chapter One .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Background of the Problem .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Statement of the Problem.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Purpose of the Study and Questions to be Addressed .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Rationale .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Background information of <i>TQ</i> .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Significance of the <i>TQ</i>.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Rationale for Selecting <i>TQ</i> .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Importance of the Study .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Theoretical Framework and Underlying Assumptions .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Race .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>CRT Ontology Regarding Race and Racism.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Researcher Positionality .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Operational Definitions .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Race .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>White Supremacy.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>White Supremacist Ideology .....</b>	<b>15</b>



<b>TESOL .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Scope and Delimitation of the Study .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Chapter Two.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Literature Review .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Ethnicity Theory .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Traditions of Theorizing Ethnicity.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Pre-1930 .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>1930s to 1965.....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Post-1965.....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Critique of Ethnicity Theory.....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Race Theory.....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Racial Formation: Racial Meanings Created.....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Racial meanings permeate U.S. society.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Process of racial formation .....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Race: unstable and decentered .....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Political contestation over racial meaning.....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Critique of RFT.....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Critical Race Theory.....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Principle Tenets of CRT.....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Racism as a normal aspect of society .....</b>	<b>28</b>

<b>Racism is a permanent aspect of society .....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Critique of liberalism.....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Race as a social construction.....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Interest convergence .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Counterstorytelling .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Locating property rights in whiteness.....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Intersectionality.....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Eliminating racial oppression and all forms of oppression.....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Race and TESOL .....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Related Research.....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Linguistic Anthropology.....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Language into whiteness studies.....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Race-language policies.....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Theoretical Frameworks Used to Study Race in TESOL .....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>CRT. ....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>AsianCrit.....</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Capital, habitus, and field. ....</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Critical pedagogy. ....</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>Critical multicultural education. ....</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>Critical whiteness studies. ....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>TESOL Teacher Perspectives Based on Racial Background.....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>Native speaker, non-native speaker, and ideal speaker of English .....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>White TESOL professionals. ....</b>	<b>37</b>

<b>Race and TESOL Curricular Materials .....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>My Research Within This Field.....</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>Chapter Three .....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Methods.....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Description of Methodology .....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>The Field of DA .....</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>CDA .....</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>Interpretive Context of CDA .....</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>Meaning of text specific to CDA .....</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>CDA Research Agenda .....</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>DRA Methodological Steps .....</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>Stage one: focus on a social wrong in its semiotic aspect. ....</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>Stage two: identify potential hurdles to addressing the social wrong. ....</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>Stage three: examine how the social order relies on the social wrong. ...</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>Methods.....</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>Data Collection .....</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>Tools .....</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>Zotero. ....</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>Nuance.....</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>Dedoose. ....</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>Analysis .....</b>	<b>53</b>

Analysis using Dedoose.....	53
Chapter Four.....	55
Findings.....	55
Discourses Deployed by Authors.....	57
Discourse of Racialization.....	58
Discourse of racialization in discussion of scholarship.....	58
Discourse of racialization in discussion of curriculum.....	64
Discourse of racialization in discussion of teachers.....	65
Discourse of racialization in discussion of students.....	67
Discourse of Whiteness.....	70
Discourse of whiteness in discussion of scholarship.....	70
Discourse of whiteness in discussion of curriculum.....	72
Discourse of whiteness in discussion of teachers.....	73
Discourse of whiteness in discussion of students.....	75
Discourse of Sonic and Optic Negation of Racism.....	76
Discourse of sonic and optic negation of racism in discussion of scholarship.....	77
Discourse of sonic and optic negation of racism in discussion of curriculum.....	78
Discourse of sonic and optic negation of racism in discussion of teachers.....	79
Discourse of sonic and optic negation of racism in discussion of	

students .....	80
<b>Discourse of Emotional Labor of Racism .....</b>	<b>80</b>
Discourse of emotional labor of racism in discussion of scholarship .....	81
Discourse of emotional labor of racism in discussion of curriculum .....	83
Discourse of emotional labor of racism in discussion of teachers .....	86
Discourse of emotional labor of racism in discussion of students .....	91
<b>Chapter Five .....</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>Discussion .....</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>Summary of the Findings .....</b>	<b>93</b>
Discourse of racialization .....	94
Discourse of whiteness .....	94
Discourse of sonic and optic negation of racism. ....	95
Discourse of emotional labor of racism.....	95
<b>Discussion of the Findings .....</b>	<b>96</b>
Discourse of racialization .....	97
Discourse of whiteness .....	100
Discourse of sonic and optic negation of racism .....	101
Discourse of emotional labor of racism.....	103
<b>Limitations.....</b>	<b>106</b>
<b>Implications .....</b>	<b>107</b>
Field of TESOL Not Racially Neutral.....	107
Implications For My Positionality .....	109

<b>Implications for Theory and Methodology.....</b>	<b>111</b>
<b>Recommendations for Future Research .....</b>	<b>111</b>
<b>Contributions to the Field .....</b>	<b>112</b>
<b>Conclusion .....</b>	<b>112</b>
<b>References .....</b>	<b>113</b>

## Chapter One

### Introduction

My research interests originated in my experience as a classroom teacher. As a middle school English as a Second Language (ESL)<sup>1</sup> teacher, I struggled to understand issues of ethnicity and race. In particular, I wanted to learn more about the connections between race and languages. Being that I worked with students learning English as an additional language, I was specifically interested in the relationships between race and the English language.

At the time, I taught middle school ESL at a school with a racially diverse student body. The students' racial and ethnic demographics varied from within the U.S. and all over the world. To give you an idea, some of my students self-identified as Mexican, Mexican American, Guatemalan, Hispanic, Navajo, Kurdish, Pueblo of Zuni, Pueblo of San Felipe, Palestinian, Iraqi, Israeli, Vietnamese, Chinese, Cuban, Afghani, Pueblo of Santo Domingo, Lebanese, Ethiopian, and Nigerian. Although the students were from a variety of racial and ethnic backgrounds, most of my colleagues where I taught were racially white, and were women like me.

Many of my white colleagues often avoided my attempts to discuss my questions about race. My experience was that somehow my colleagues interpreted my desire to discuss race as me accusing them of being racist. There was the occasional conversation with white monolingual English teachers who were complaining about my ESL students speaking in their home/native languages. My colleagues most often told me they worried the students might be talking about

---

<sup>1</sup> ESL was the title of the class, as stipulated by the particular school district where I worked. I was well aware that several of my students already spoke two or more languages and English was simply an additional language in their repertoire.

them and they would not know what the students were saying. I often responded by questioning why might the students be talking about the teacher? Was s/he doing something to spark student critique? Perhaps the students were discussing kind things about the teacher? Were the students helping each other understand? Speaking about social events? If the students had those conversations in English, what difference would that make? As one might imagine, some of my colleagues were not easily understanding of my suggested alternatives.

I also sought out conversations with colleagues whom I considered confidants. With one confidant, I shared my concerns and quandaries of what to do about some of my students from Mexico, who had darker skin, and reported perceiving a white teacher treating them as inferior in intellect and English language proficiency in comparison to another of my lighter skinned, blonde, blue-eyed students from Palestine. I clearly remember my colleague's response—"Oh, Mr. X? He's an equal opportunity racist; he treats everybody like shit" and then my colleague got up and left. I sat there with my concerns still hanging in the air.

My students were not alone in their experiences with Mr. X. I, too, had a perplexing conversation with him. Mr. X inquired why a student from Palestine was in ESL. Mr. X perceived that this particular student was more proficient in English than he actually was. I asked why he perceived this student to be more proficient in English and the teacher explained that the student looked like an American. I was befuddled. At that time, I lacked knowledge on how to address, even discuss, the situation. I did have a hunch, however, that my colleague's perception had more to do with race than simply language, ethnicity, or culture. This student had just moved to the United States and was learning English for the first time. In district and school English language assessments, he scored at the very beginning levels. When this student first enrolled, I had a parent teacher conference with his mother. His mother explained, through an interpreter,



that she was worried her son would not do well in school because he lacked even survival English. Knowing the mother's worries, the student's assessment scores, and my knowledge of the student, I stumbled through a conversation with Mr. X. I asked him what having white skin, blonde hair, and blue eyes had to do with language proficiency. That conversation did not end well. Yet again, another colleague thought I was calling him a racist because I brought up what I interpreted as questions about race.

My middle school ESL teaching experiences brought to light many events such as these. I considered these experiences dehumanizing for my students of color. My colleagues seemed to perceive my lighter skin students as more intelligent than my students who had darker skin, regardless of their English proficiency. I knew on some deep level I also was not innocent in these encounters. After all, I am a white woman who was teaching mostly students of color. I lacked a deep understanding of even my own ethnic and racial positioning. I may unknowingly have been perpetrating racist acts against my students, too. The heartache over what I saw my students experiencing and my troubling sense of complicity prompted me to seek out resources and people to help me better understand how racism was part of the problem. I hoped that I was not the first person to question the connections between racism and the English language in the field of teaching English to speakers of other languages (TESOL). However, I discovered at the time in 2003, race scholarship in TESOL seemed to be non-existent. Consequently, I began a Ph.D. to research race in the field of TESOL.

Before I continue to the background of the problem, I want to stress that this dissertation research was not simply about equating race with skin color. Race is a social construction that organizes and structures society "for the subordination and oppression of different social groups" (Omi & Winant, 2015). Some might believe that race is simply based on a person's skin color. I

do not. In chapter two, I will address in greater depth the socially constructed notion of race. For now, I want to clarify that in this dissertation, I will use terms such as American Indian, Asian, Black, Native American, white, etc. to refer to racial groups. I clearly recognize and respect that within each racial group, there is a remarkable diversity among people. I want to point out that my use of these racial categories is not arbitrary, not dismissive, and not disrespectful. Within race scholarship, the use of these socially constructed terms are common-place (e.g., Allen, 2006, 2004; Anderson, 2009; Bell, 1992, 1980; Bonilla-Silva, 2004, 2003, 1999, 1997; Coates, 2011; Curtis & Romney, 2006a, 2006b; Kubota & Lin, 2009a, 2009b; Delgado & Stefancic, 2013, 2001; Dixson & Rousseau, 2006; Fecho, 2004; Gillborn, 2006, 1990; Haney López, 2013; Haque & Morgan, 2009; Harris, 1993; Herrera, 2009; Hill Collins, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1999, 1998; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 2006; Lee, 2005; Lewis, 2003; Liggett, 2009; López, 2003; Luke, 2009; Malsbary, 2014; Marx, 2009, 2008; Omi, 2010; Omi & Winant, 2015, 2009, 2002, 1994; Orelus, 2013; Parks & Rachlinski, 2009; Quach, Jo, & Urrietta, 2009; Rivers & Ross, 2013; Rossatto, Allen, & Pruyn, 2007; Ryan, 1999; Shuck, 2006; Smedley & Smedley, 2011; Taylor-Mendes, 2009; Trechter & Bucholtz, 2011; Weiner, 2012; Werito, 2008; Winant, 2000). As you, the reader, proceed through this dissertation, I ask you to kindly keep in mind that race is socially constructed and based on more than simply skin color. After all, my colleague perceived the seemingly white student to be a first-language English-speaking American. I now move to the background of the problem for this study.

### **Background of the Problem**

Although ethnicity and race are often used interchangeably, they differ from each other. In this section, I will give a brief overview of ethnicity theory followed by a brief overview of race theory. I will end with a brief discussion of studies of ethnicity and race in education. I

provide these overviews to distinguish ethnicity theory from race theory and as such, to position my research in the realm of race theory. I will discuss these concepts more in-depth later.

Ethnicity theorists emphasize notions of cultural and nationality associations (Barth, 1969). In ethnicity theory, race is considered one of many malleable indicators of ethnicity (Jones, 1997). Ethnicity, deeply rooted in cultural anthropology (Boas, 1940), problematically interprets and understands human bodies through a lens of cultural determination (Hitchens, 1994). I argue that from a critical race theory standpoint (CRT), cultural determinism ignores the problems of systemic racism and therefore, white supremacy is left unchallenged.

Contrary to ethnicity theorists, race theorists identify race as the organizing principle of society. CRT is comprised of several approaches to race that race, not cultural determinism, as the principle organizing factor of society (Delgado, 2013, 2001; Ladson-Billings, 1998; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 2006). Omi and Winant (2015) theorized the workings of racial formation of human bodies. Bonilla-Silva (1997) examined the structural ways that racialized human bodies are differentially valued. Hill-Collins and Bilge (2016) highlighted the importance of examining the intersectionality of oppression, including racism.

Ethnicity and cultural approaches are common topics in the field of education. For example, some scholars focus on ethnicity and education (e.g., Gumbert, Young, Safa, & Raynor, 1983; Law, & Swann, 2011; Scott, 1987; Stolarik, & Friedman, 1986;). Other scholars focus on race, ethnicity, and education (e.g., Arber, 2008; Fuchs, 1990; Gillborn, 1990; Ryan, 1999). Scholars in special education study the overrepresentation of culturally and linguistically diverse students in special education (e.g., de Valenzuela, Copeland, Huaqing Qi, & Park, 2006). Culturally responsive pedagogy (e.g., Gay, 2000) and multicultural and multiethnic education (e.g., Banks, 2005, 1994; Delpit, 1995) are also well-respected approaches in education.

Race in the general field of education is also a common focus of study. For example, scholars investigate race in relation to critical pedagogy and education (e.g., Allen, 2004; Darder, Baltodano, & Torres, 2003; Rossatto et al., 2006). The study of race in education also includes CRT approaches (e.g., Bell, 1980; Dixson & Rousseau, 2006; Ladson-Billings, 1999, 1998; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 2006; Werito, 2011). Scholars also investigate race in schools (e.g., Lee, 2005; Lewis, 2003; López, 2003). Uncommon in race theory approaches to education, however, are studies of race in the field of TESOL. The absence of race scholarship within TESOL leads me to the problem I sought to address with this dissertation research.

### **Statement of the Problem**

Although race is a common topic of study in the general field of education, studies of race were notably absent in the field of TESOL in 2006. In recognition of this deficit of scholarship, *TQ* issued a special issue focusing on race and TESOL (Canagarajah, Kubota, & Lin, 2006). Suresh Canagarajah, the *TQ* editor at the time, introduced the special issue through his *Editor's Note* (Canagarajah, 2006, p. 469). I quote Canagarajah (2006) at length:

Our profession has managed to continue business as usual without letting itself be troubled by issues of race that continue to create havoc outside the classroom. At times, we have managed to finesse race and address it under other categories, such as native versus nonnative speaker. However, some professionals have seen a need to address racial identity more explicitly to do justice to critical concerns in language acquisition and teaching. Scholars in other areas of education have made even greater strides in studying the place of race in schooling. Therefore, in keeping with its policy of drawing attention to emerging concerns in the field, *TESOL Quarterly's* editorial board recently approved a proposal by Ryuko Kubota and Angel Lin to guest-edit a special topic issue

on race and TESOL. (p. 469)

In his introduction quoted above, Canagarajah (2006) summarized poignantly the lack of studies of race within the TESOL field. Indeed, outside this special issue of *TQ* (Canagarajah, Kubota, & Lin, 2006), the studies of race in the field were sparse (e.g., Curtis & Romney, 2006a, 2006b; Kubota & Lin, 2009; Rivers & Ross, 2013). The few studies outside of this 2006 *TQSIR* and not in *TQ* studied race in four different subjects: race in association with identity (Kubota & Lin, 2009a); CRT narrative inquiry regarding the experiences of TESOL professionals of color (Curtis & Romney, 2006a, 2006b); and a preference of white TESOL teachers over TESOL teachers of color (Rivers & Ross, 2013).

I argue that *TQ* focusing on race as a *special issue* demonstrated that race has been considered an abnormal topic of conversation in TESOL (Canagarajah, 2006). This abnormality of race as a topic is also shown in the dearth of literature specific to race and TESOL. I agree with Canagarajah (2006) that the lack of openly addressing race in the field of TESOL encourages an environment of "business as usual without letting itself be troubled by issues of race that continue to create havoc outside the classroom" (Canagarajah, 2006, p. 469). I argue that this business as usual stance of not addressing race basically allows racial dynamics to also conduct business as usual. Business as usual racial dynamics, according to a CRT framework, correlates to a white supremacist structure (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Gillborn, 2006; Ladson-Billings, 1999; Marx, 2008). The racial havoc outside of TESOL also happens inside of TESOL because of the endemic nature of racism (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Gillborn, 2006; Ladson-Billings, 1999; Marx, 2008). Although some scholars acknowledged the presence of race and investigated race within the field of TESOL, none have specifically challenged the white supremacist structure within. The business as usual, what I argue is the white supremacist

structure of racism in TESOL, is the problem I sought to address with this dissertation.

### **Purpose of the Study and Questions to be Addressed**

The purpose of this study was to analyze what discourses authors used to deploy race in one aspect of the field of TESOL. The facet I focused on was the publication *TESOL Quarterly* (*TQ*). The questions I investigated in this research were the following:

1. What discourses did the authors use to deploy race in the articles in the 2006 *TESOL Quarterly* Special Issue on Race (*TQSIR*)?
2. How do these discourses work to either conform to, or resist white supremacist ideology?

### **Rationale**

I chose the *TQ* as the focal point of my study for several reasons. I will first give some background information on the publication. Next, I will discuss the significance of the publication within the field. I will end this section by reviewing my rationale for selecting *TQ* for my research.

### **Background information of *TQ***

*TQ* is a peer-reviewed scholarly international journal published quarterly by the organization "Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc." (TESOL International Association, 2015b). This organization is widely known by the acronym TESOL<sup>2</sup>; hence, the full

---

<sup>2</sup> The acronym TESOL is also widely used to refer to "teaching English to speakers of other languages" as an instructional approach. Within this dissertation proposal, when I use the acronym TESOL, I will be referring to teaching English to speakers of other languages. When I am referring specifically to the TESOL Organization, I will write "the TESOL Organization."

name of the publication: *TESOL Quarterly*. The TESOL Organization August 2018 membership statistics listed 10,112 members from 170 countries (TESOL International Organization, current as of August 2018). The countries with the top five enrollment percentages for August 2018 are (a) United States at 73.4%, (b) Japan at 2.8% (c) Canada at 2.7%, (d) China at 2.3%, and (e) Ecuador at 1.0% (TESOL Organization, 2019). The remaining 165-member countries *each* contribute less than 1% of total membership (TESOL Organization, 2019). From a viewpoint of North America, total TESOL Organization membership from Canada, Mexico, and the United States is 76.8% (TESOL Organization, 2019). I include these membership statistics to emphasize that even though the TESOL Organization is an international organization, the bulk of membership is from North America (TESOL Organization, 2019). In addition to the bulk of membership being in North America, the TESOL Organization and the publication for *TQ* are located in Alexandria, Virginia (Wiley Online Library, 2015c). Organization members must pay to subscribe to *TQ* (TESOL International Organization, 2015c).

The TESOL Organization asserts that *TQ* "fosters inquiry into English language teaching and learning by providing a forum for TESOL professionals to share their research findings and explore ideas and relationships in the field" (TESOL International Association, 2015b). *TQ* describes their readership to include researchers, English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) teacher educators, applied linguists, ESOL teachers, and teacher learners (TESOL International Association, 2015b).

*TQ* article submission information encourages original submissions from "English language contexts around the world...[and]...on topics of significance to individuals concerned with English language teaching and learning and standard English as a second dialect" (Wiley Online Library, 2015b). The publication represents cross-disciplinary topics including theoretical

and practical articles, and asks for submissions from "psychology and sociology of language learning and teaching; issues in research and research methodology; testing and evaluation; professional preparation; curriculum design and development; instructional methods, materials, and techniques; language planning; [and] professional standards" (Wiley Online Library, 2015b). In asking for submissions in these categories, *TQ* aims to bridge practice and theory and asks that submissions "address the implications and applications of research in, for example, anthropology; applied and theoretical linguistics; communication education; English education, including reading and writing theory; psycholinguistics; psychology; first and second language acquisition; and sociolinguistics" (Wiley Online Library, 2015b).

*TQ* stated the publication "is committed to publishing manuscripts that contribute to bridging theory and practice" (Wiley Online Library, 2015a). *TQ* calls for manuscript submissions in these categories: forum; full-length articles; brief reports and summaries; book reviews and review articles; and research issues and teaching issues (Wiley Online Library, 2015a).

### **Significance of the *TQ***

In 2017, the *TQ* ranked 42 out of 239 in education and educational research journals and 10 out of 181 in linguistic journals (JCR Clarivate, 2019a). These rankings position *TQ* in the top 18% of education and education research journals, and in the top 6% of linguistic journals. Annually, only 8% of submissions are accepted for publication in the *TQ* (JSTOR, 2015). The five-year *TQ* impact factor of 2.828 indicates that the *TQ* texts published within the past five years have each been cited approximately one and a half times (JCR Clarivate, 2019b).

### **Rationale for Selecting *TQ***

The previous information regarding the background of the TESOL Organization, the



selective article acceptance rate of the *TQ*, and its relatively high ranking within its publication categories positions *TQ* as a prominent text in the field of TESOL. With this prominence, *TQ* is fitting for examining what discourses are used to deploy race within this aspect of the field of TESOL.

### **Importance of the Study**

I aimed for this study to be of importance to the field of TESOL in several ways. First, this study will contribute scholarship on what discourses are used to deploy race within an aspect in the field of TESOL. Second, this study will contribute to the understanding of how race is discussed within scholarly works within the *TQ*. Third, this will be the first dialectical relational analysis (DRA) within the field of TESOL that investigated:

1. What discourses did the authors use to deploy race in the articles in the 2006 *TESOL Quarterly* Special Issue on Race (*TQSIR*)?
2. How do these discourses work to either conform to, or resist white supremacist ideology?

I anticipate that my study will contribute scholarship that will shed light on how white supremacist ideology works with the *TQ*. Additionally, I believe that my research will help inform efforts to abolish structural racism within the field of TESOL. Above all, I hope my research will help inform TESOL education so that students learning English as another language might not face the same dehumanizing experiences I witnessed in my practice as a TESOL teacher.

### **Theoretical Framework and Underlying Assumptions**

In this study, I used critical race theory (CRT) as my theoretical framework. Although I will discuss CRT in greater detail in chapter two, I will give a brief overview here. Originating in

critical legal studies, CRT was later introduced in the field of education (Ladson-Billings, 1998, 1999; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Marx, 2000). Following, I provide a brief overview of how CRT considers race and CRT ontology regarding race and racism.

## **Race**

Contrary to a common belief that race is a natural, biological categorization of human bodies, CRT asserts the divergent approach that race is a social construction (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Gillborn, 2006; Haney López, 2013; Omi, 2010; Weiner, 2012). The social construction of race naturalizes the categorization of human bodies into different races through "human interaction rather than natural differentiation" (Haney López, 2013, p. 243.) This process of human interaction includes cultural, political, and historical constructs that result in the different hierarchical racialization of human bodies. This hierarchical racialization of bodies infused with hierarchical domination is referred to as racial formation (Haney López, 2013; Omi & Winant, 1994; Weiner, 2012). When using a CRT approach, race is recognized as the central organizing aspect of society (Bell, 1992; Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Gillborn, 2006; Haney López, 2013; Ladson-Billings, 1999; Marx, 2008). In this dissertation, I used these concepts of race, racialization, and racial formation as my working definitions. Next, I discuss CRT ontology regarding race and racism.

## **CRT Ontology Regarding Race and Racism**

To many, CRT "is a set of interrelated beliefs about the significance of race/racism and how it operates in contemporary Western society, especially the United States" (Gillborn, 2006, p. 250). Gillborn (2006) and Weiner (2012) argued for the expansion and use of CRT on a global scale, as white supremacy and racism are global concerns. In the following section, I give a brief overview of the underlying assumptions, or principles, of CRT. Although I will discuss them

sequentially, the principles are not hierarchical when using a CRT approach. Please note this is a brief overview, as I will discuss CRT more in depth in chapter two.

There are nine general principles of CRT that are common across CRT scholars. The first principle of CRT is that racism exists as a normal, endemic, embedded, aspect of society (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Gillborn, 2006; Ladson-Billings, 1999; Marx, 2008). This normal and endemic aspect of race is referred to as *racial realism* (Bell, 1992; Dixson & Rousseau, 2006). The second principle of CRT is that racism is a permanent aspect of society (Bell, 1992; Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Gillborn, 2006; Ladson-Billings, 1999; Marx, 2008). The third principle is a critique of liberalism (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001) that challenges "claims of neutrality, objectivity, colorblindness, and meritocracy" (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 2006, p. 20). The fourth principle, as I discussed in the previous section, is that race is a social construction (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Gillborn, 2006; Haney López, 2013; Marx, 2008; Omi, 2010; Weiner, 2012). The fifth principle is the notion of interest convergence, where the Civil Rights of persons of color are only advanced as far as white people also benefit (Bell, 1992, 1980; Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Gillborn, 2006; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 2006; Marx, 2008). The sixth principle of CRT is the use of storytelling and counter-storytelling (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Dixson & Rousseau, 2006; Ladson-Billings, 1998; Marx, 2008). CRT scholars use storytelling and counter-storytelling techniques to center experiences of persons of color to challenge issues of race and racism (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001). The seventh principle of CRT is locating property rights in whiteness (Harris, 1993). The eighth principle is that of intersectionality of systems of oppression, such as race, class, and gender (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Hill Collins, 2000). The ninth and last principle of CRT is to the goal of abolishing racism and all forms of oppression (Dixson & Rousseau, 2006; Marx, 2008).

### **Researcher Positionality**

As a researcher, I approach this study with all that encompasses me as a person, conscious, subconscious, and unconscious. I am a 48-year-old white woman, born and raised in Albuquerque. I am also a graduate of K-12 Albuquerque Public Schools, a public-school educator and professional development specialist of 24 years, the youngest sister of three brothers, and a product of parents who did not graduate high school. Although my parents were not formally schooled, they are brilliant in more ways than I could ever measure. Their humble and profound love of learning, justice, and humanity instilled in me a drive to work towards a better world.

I come to this research with biases, as well as an undying hope that scholarship can help create a better world. I am a critical theorist and idealist at heart. Some might say this is a contradictory position. However, I believe this positionality enables me to use critical theory to focus on the betterment of life towards equity. I very much agree with all the tenets of CRT I discussed previously. I also believe that systemic racism permeates all contexts of life and that my study will work to expose some workings of structural racism within the field of TESOL.

### **Operational Definitions**

Within this dissertation, I use the use *race*, *white supremacy*, *white supremacist ideology*, and *TESOL* in very specific ways. In the following sections, I will operationally define these four concepts.

#### **Race**

At the center of my study is the concept of *race*. I define race is a socially, politically, historically, and culturally contentious construct that is used to differentially value and hierarchically categorize human bodies. As a social construction, there is an accompanying

social reality. The social reality brought about by the social construction of race produces real effects and consequences for humans whose bodies have been differentially and hierarchically racialized (Bonilla-Silva, 2003; Omi & Winant, 1994).

### **White Supremacy**

In this dissertation, I use the term *white supremacy* to mean a hierarchical structure of racism that privileges those racialized as white. In this structure, whites are positioned to receive the most privileges and benefits in society, often at the expense of persons of color.

### **White Supremacist Ideology**

In this study, *white supremacist ideology* includes the notion of *white supremacy* as operationalized above joined together with ideology. Ideology is composed of “ideas and beliefs which help to legitimate the interests of a ruling group or class” (Eagleton, 1991, p.30) and these ideas or beliefs function as “meaning in the service of power” (Thompson, 1984, p. 7). Based on this information, I operationalize *white supremacist ideology* as the ideas or beliefs that work to uphold the power of white supremacy.

### **TESOL**

My use of the acronym TESOL in this research refers to teaching English to speakers of other languages. Under this umbrella term, I include English as a foreign language (EFL), English as a second language (ESL), teaching English language learners (TELL), teaching English as a second language (TESL); English language teaching (ELT); and English for speakers of other languages (ESOL). I will use TESOL unless a specific source I am discussing uses a different term and only then will I use the term of the author's use.

### **Scope and Delimitation of the Study**

In this study, the scope of my research is limited to the articles within the 2006 *TQSIR*. I

did not include any other texts from the 2006 *TQSIR*, or texts from any other issue of the *TQ*.

## **Chapter Two**

### **Literature Review**

In this chapter I will discuss my theoretical framework and review literature relevant to the purpose of this dissertation, which was to investigate:

1. What discourses did the authors use to deploy race in the articles in the 2006 *TESOL Quarterly* Special Issue on Race (*TQSIR*)?
2. How do these discourses work to either conform to, or resist white supremacist ideology?

This chapter is organized into five major sections. In the first two sections I discuss the differences between ethnicity theory and race theory to firmly ground my theoretical framework in race. Then in the third section, I will discuss critical race theory. In the fourth section, I will review ways race has been analyzed in relation to TESOL. Finally, in the fifth section, I will end by situating my research within this literature.

### **Ethnicity Theory**

I start this literature review with a discussion and problematization of ethnicity to help distinguish the difference between ethnicity and race, keeping in mind that I will use CRT as my theoretical framework. The term ethnicity entails belonging to "culturally ascribed identity groups, which are based on expression of real or assumed shared culture and common descent" (Jones, 1997, p, 84). As a term, ethnicity categorizes persons as part of group sharing cultural characteristics such as language, religion, value orientations, and nation-state formation histories (Smedley & Smedley, 2012). It is also important to note that ethnicity is a social construction (Barth, 1969; Bonilla-Silva, 1999; Omi & Winant, 2015).

### **Traditions of Theorizing Ethnicity**

Modern debates of ethnicity vary from constructivism, primordialism, instrumentalism, situationism, essentialism, to modernists (Wimmer, 2008). As discussed by Wimmer (2008), Barth's constructivism of ethnicity initiated the break from strict anthropological notions of ethnic identity "as an identity based on the shared culture and values of a group" (p. 985). Rather, Barth (1969) constructed ethnicity as a social process; an organizational type of identity he located in the characteristics of ethnic boundaries. In other words, Barth (1969) considered ethnicity not created only by individual groups in isolation but in definition in relation to other ethnic groups. Basically, Barth (1969) asserted that ethnic identity is maintained and differentiated in relation to other ethnic groups' identities.

However, primordialists such as Edward Shils and Clifford Geertz continued adherence to notions that ascribed ethnic membership at birth, negating constructivist notions of a social construction of ethnicity (Tilley, 1997; Wimmer, 2008). The instrumentalists asserted individual choice in strategic deployment of ethnic identities, with these strategic deployments based in self-interests and political positioning (Eriksen, 2010; Wimmer, 2008). The situationalists, though, based on the work of Gertz (Rex, 1995), emphasized ethnicity differentially based on the logic of the situation opposing the essentialists assertion "transcontextual stability provided by ethnic cultures" (Wimmer, 2008, p. 971). Lastly, the modernists connected the salience of ethnicity to the rise of the modern nation-state, "while 'perennialists' insisted that ethnicity represented one of the most stable principles of social organization in human history" (Wimmer, 2008, p. 971). Not clear-cut in reality, these constructions of ethnicity often overlapped and worked in conjunction in different ways (Wimmer, 2008). I now turn to how these constellations and combinations play out.

The perspectives on ethnicity I presented so far are based in social anthropology (Barth,



1969) and subsequently sociology (Wimmer, 2008). In the U.S., there were three major phases of interpreting ethnicity theory: pre-1930s, 1930s to 1965, and post 1965 (Omi & Winant, 1994).

### **Pre-1930**

During the 18<sup>th</sup> century, U.S. immigration policy was considered an "open-door" policy engendering the belief that new immigrants would assimilate and contribute to the standing culture of the U.S.—that of the white Anglo-Saxon (Ratner, 1984). A majority of the immigrants during this period hailed from predominantly European countries (Ratner, 1984). As more immigrants came from non-Christian and non-western European roots, anti-immigrant sentiment rose resulting in restrictive immigration legislation in the late 1800s to late 1920s (Ratner, 1984).

In 1875, the first exclusionary immigration legislation passed in the U.S. barred prostitutes, convicts, and Chinese contract laborers known as "coolies" (Open Collections Program, 2015). The Quota Act served to restrict immigrants from eastern and southern Europe (Open Collections Program, 2015). Subsequent legislation from 1924 to 1929 severely reduced the per annum immigration cap, established the U.S. Border Patrol, and instituted a 70% preference to northern and western Europeans, with the remaining 30% from southern and eastern Europe (Open Collections Program, 2015).

Race, post-emancipation, constituted biological, naturalized notions of heredity of race (Omi & Winant, 2015). The color of one's skin indicated either superiority for whites, or "exotic mutations which had to be explained" for persons of color (Omi & Winant, 1994, p. 15). This biologicistic notion of race used skin color as markers of dispositions, levels of intelligence, and sexuality (Omi & Winant, 1994). These distinctions, based solely on beliefs about biological differences, pathologized persons of color and normalized whites as superior (Omi & Winant, 2015). Eugenicists, Spencerists, and Social Darwinists used these racial beliefs to construct

miscegenation as a sin, with any resulting children believed to be "biological throwbacks" (Omi & Winant, 1994, p. 15).

Omi and Winant (1994) argued that the ethnicity approach to interpreting race appeared to challenge these naturalized biologicistic notions of race. During this time prior to the 1930s, notions of ethnic groups were a divisive approach to challenging implicitly racist and biologist notions of race that were common and dominant at the time (Omi & Winant, 1994). Ethnicity theorists instead defined race as a social construction where racial status is seen as "more voluntary and consequently less imposed, less 'ascribed.' ... Guided by ethnicity theory, Americans have come to view race as a cultural phenomenon" (Omi & Winant, 2015, p. 22). Dominant conceptions of ethnicity during this period relied on primordialist notions of descent and culture which resulted in formation of groups (Omi & Winant, 1994; Wimmer, 2008). Gradually, in response to immigration, ethnicity theorists challenged primordialism with positions of constructivism through assertions of cultural pluralism and assimilation (Wimmer, 2008; Omi & Winant, 1994).

### **1930s to 1965**

From the period of 1930 to 1965 ethnicity theory engrained itself as the common-sense approach to understanding and explaining race and racial relations in the United States (Omi & Winant, 1994). During this period, ethnicity theorists further developed two main approaches to explain race in the U.S.: assimilation and cultural pluralism (Wimmer, 2008; Omi & Winant, 1994). The assimilationist perspective arose from what Omi and Winant (1994) referred to as the Chicago school of sociology headed by Robert E. Park. Based on the experiences of white ethnic immigrants to the United States, assimilationists argued that to become successful Americans equated immigrants as working hard and adopting the customs and beliefs of the Anglo-Saxon

British decedents (Ratner, 1984). At the time, ethnicity theorists studied how ethnic identities were constructed in relation to other ethnicities. Because these studies focused on white ethnics, the racial aspect of ethnicity did not stand out as an immutable aspect of ethnicity (Omi & Winant, 1994).

Yet, ethnicity theorist continued noting that race persisted (Park, 1950). On challenging someone who saw Blacks differently than whites, Park (1950) wrote:

It is very curious that anyone in America should still think of the Negro, even the Negro peasant of the 'black belts,' as in any sense an alien or stranger, since he has lived here [the U.S.] longer than most of us, has interbred to a greater extent than the white man with the native Indian, and is more completely a product than anyone of European origin is likely to be on the local conditions under which he was born and bred. (p. 76)

Park (1950) dismissed the salience of race in this instance, as well as in what he called the persistence of white ethnocentric categorization of people of color as other-than-American. Park (1950) relied on the construct of social distance to dismiss the salience of race in consideration of who had, and had not, assimilated as an American. He chalked-up the acknowledgments of racial differences to being:

Naïve assumptions, which are matters of common sense in one class, caste, sect, or ethnic group but not in others, that seem to constitute the final obstacle to the assimilation of peoples. They reveal social distances between individuals and peoples otherwise unsuspected. (Park, 1950, p. 77)

In essence, Park believed that if persons from different classes, castes, sects, or ethnic groups would simply get to know others unlike themselves, race would no longer be an obstacle of assimilation. If the social distance among whites and Blacks, and whites and Native Americans

persisted even though, as Park stated, Blacks had lived longer in the U.S. than most of "us" (presumed to be whites), I argue that the social distance issue would not be resolved for Park's version of assimilation to take place. I assert that this is an example of the immutability of race.

However, not everyone advocated assimilation. Horace Kallen (1998), in contest of assimilationism, argued for what he termed as cultural pluralism. Kallen's cultural pluralism established that every ethnic group maintained their cultural heritage instead of the assimilationist approach of "the destruction of all the distinctive cultural group traits other than those of the dominant Anglo Saxons" (Ratner, 1984, p. 187). Cultural pluralism, Kallen argued, would build an American society more like an orchestra instead of the melting pot assimilationists cooked up (Kallen, 1998). Although Kallen supported different ethnic groups maintaining their heritage languages, he also asserted that the "common language of the commonwealth... would be English" (Kallen, 1924, p. 124). According to Ratner (1984), U.S. educational intellectuals supported cultural assimilation. Yet Ratner (1984) noted Dewey challenged cultural pluralism's inherent notion of segregation of cultural groups.

### **Post-1965**

Post-1965, Omi & Winant (1994) argued that ethnicity theory interpreted race from the position of conservative and neoconservative stances on race. This phase introduced attacks on group rights and moved towards egalitarian individualism. Policies and behaviors implemented at the state level engendered notions of equality and opportunity for individuals instead of groups (Omi & Winant, 1994).

### **Critique of Ethnicity Theory**

A major critique of ethnicity theory is that of the diminished role of racialization in accounting for "qualitatively different historical experiences" of people of color (Omi & Winant,

1994, p. 20). By treating racial minorities as ethnic minorities, the struggles associated with racialized experiences in life are left to the faults of the racial minorities (Omi & Winant, 1994). In essence, ethnic minorities, from an ethnicity theory standpoint, have no structural mechanism to justify their racial oppression, as ethnicity theory sees race as a mutable aspect of ethnicity (Omi & Winant, 1994).

Another critique of ethnicity theory is that by subsuming race as an aspect of ethnicity, Omi and Winant (2015) asserted, all Blacks, for instance, regardless of their ethnic diversity, simply just look alike. Ethnicity theorists pay little attention to the vast ethnic diversity among Blacks in the same way they do whites (Omi & Winant, 1994). I argue that this problem would be faced by all persons of color, not simply Blacks.

What ethnicity theory lacks is an analysis of race "as an autonomous field of social conflict, political organization, and cultural/ideological meaning" (Omi & Winant, 1994, p. 48). Analyses of racial differences "understood as a matter of cultural attributes *à la* ethnicity theory, or as a society-wide signification system, *à la* some poststructural accounts—cannot comprehend such structural phenomena as racial stratification in the labor market or patterns of residential segregation" (Omi & Winant, 1994, p. 56, emphasis in original). It is for this very reason that I will utilize CRT as my theoretical. In the next section, I will review pertinent theories of race.

### **Race Theory**

In this section, I first focus on Omi and Winant's (2015) racial formation theory (RFT) as one of the foundational pieces in race theory. I will then discuss Bonilla-Silva's (1999) critique of RFT. I will end this section by discussing CRT, which is the theoretical framework I will use in this study.

### **Racial Formation: Racial Meanings Created**

A foundational assertion of the racial formation theory (Omi & Winant, 1994) is that race "is a concept which signifies and symbolizes social conflicts and interest by referring to different types of human bodies" (p. 55). The meanings ascribed to the bodies—the meanings categorized as race—are constructed through the process of racial formation. Omi and Winant (1994) defined racial formation as a sociohistorical process that created racial categories, inhabited them, as well as transformed and destroyed racial categories. Following, I discuss how Omi and Winant (2002, 1994) conceptualized this process.

**Racial meanings permeate U.S. society.** A basic premise of RFT is grounded in the assertion that racial meanings permeate throughout U.S. society (Omi & Winant, 1994; Winant, 2000). In contrast to ethnicity theory, RFT places race as the central organization principle of everyday experiences (Omi & Winant, 1994). This racial organization of social interactions happens at both the micro level and macro level of society, as well as linking the levels together through what Omi and Winant (1994) term racial projects. Racial projects relate what race means in a certain discursive practice and how both everyday experiences and social structure are racially organized (Omi & Winant, 1994).

**Micro level.** At the macro level, racial formation is seen as a matter of individuality through identity construction (Omi & Winant, 1994). Omi and Winant (1994) explained that our understanding of racial meanings and awareness of race shape not only the ways we conceptualize ourselves and interact with others, but also in the shaping of our day to day lives as racialized beings. Only analytically, is the micro level distinct from the macro level (Omi & Winant, 1994).

**Macro level.** Understanding race at the macro level involves framing it socially structurally (Omi & Winant, 2002). In other words, Omi and Winant (1994) explained race is a

matter of the collectivity, of the formation of social structures. The formation of social structures in the cultural, political, ideological, and economic realms through political projects shapes how race is defined (Omi & Winant, 2009). For example, at the macro level, political ideology of the neoconservatives dictates that even though we may notice racial differences, it is not valid to treat people differently through legislation, schooling, etc. based on those racial differences (Omi & Winant, 2002). We may see race but not act on it, further reinforcing colorblindness ideology (Omi & Winant, 1994). This point illustrates how understandings of race function on the macro level, with implications for the micro level.

**Process of racial formation.** Having a basic understanding of race at the micro and macro levels is only part of the picture of RFT. RFT includes understanding that race as an organizing element of social interactions provides a classification for U.S. racial phenomena but needs a description of how racial categories are created (Omi & Winant, 1994). To better define how racial categories are formed, it is essential to understand how the phenomena of race is contested at the political level (Winant, 2000).

**Race: unstable and decentered.** According to RFT, race is continuously unstable and uncentered (Omi & Winant, 2002). Taking this into account, according to Omi and Winant (1994) with the understanding of race as the central organizing element of society, it is essential to look at how race is continuously contested. This process of how race is continuously contested, defined, transformed, and formed is what Omi and Winant (2002, 1994) refer to as the racial formation process.

I argue that recognizing that the meaning of race as unfixed challenges prevalent ideas of race being something concrete, objective, or fixed in biological notions. Another challenge in understanding racial formation as a continuous process lies in beliefs that race is "a mere

illusion" that can be abolished through societal order. Omi and Winant (1994) emphasized the need to abandon these perspectives. They theorized this could be done through understanding races as a continuously politically contested construct (Omi & Winant, 1994).

**Political contestation over racial meaning.** This contestation happens through hegemony and racial projects (Omi & Winant, 2002). Racial projects, through their actions of linking macro and micro, work as hegemonic tools to establish common sense notions of race, e.g., treating everyone "equal" regardless of skin color (Omi & Winant, 1994). Recalling that race is the central organizing principle of society and thus permeates everything, Omi and Winant (1994) argued that we must examine how race is used to rule.

Racial rule, argued Omi and Winant (2002), "is the slow and uneven historical process which has moved from dictatorship to democracy, from domination to hegemony" (p. 113). Racial projects help extend and broaden racial ruling capacity (Omi & Winant, 2002). It is through this racial ruling that the meaning of race and racial formation are consistently politically contested (Omi & Winant, 2002).

### **Critique of RFT**

Bonilla-Silva (1997) argued that RFT (Omi & Winant, 1994) lacked consideration of the structural aspects of race and racism. Specifically, Omi and Winant (1994) overemphasized racial projects of the political far right (Bonilla-Silva, 1997). I argue they also lack discussion of how racial projects of the political left and political center operate to re/produce racial formation. Additionally, Bonilla-Silva stated that the RFT lacks an analytical apparatus (Bonilla-Silva, 1997).

Bonilla-Silva (1997) posited that even though race is a social construct, it has independent and real affects in social life. After racialization happens in a society, race becomes



an organizing element of a vertical hierarchy of power in society (Bonilla-Silva, 1997).

"Therefore different races experience positions of subordination and superordination in society and develop different interests" (Bonilla-Silva, 1997, p. 475).

To account for this racialized societal hierarchy, Bonilla-Silva, (1997) questioned the workings of the racialized hierarchy. He agreed with Omi and Winant (1994) on the premise of race as the central organizing element of society. Based on this, Bonilla-Silva (1997) argued "societal struggles based on class or gender contain a racial component because both of these social categories are also racialized; that is, both class and gender are constructed along racial lines" (p. 473).

When Bonilla-Silva (2004) theorized the hierarchy as such, he challenged the older held notions of race as a simplistic Black-white binary. Instead, he theorized that the U.S. racial hierarchy is becoming more like that of Latin America where whites are positioned at the top, honorary whites in the middle, and Blacks at the bottom (Bonilla-Silva, 2004). This tri-racial stratification theory can work together with Omi and Winant's RFT to address race, racism, and racial formation in multiple dimensions of society. RFT and Bonilla-Silva's theories inform how I operationalize race, and how I believe race and racism to be socially and materially constructed.

### **Critical Race Theory**

As I mentioned in chapter one, I will use CRT as my theoretical framework. CRT originated in critical legal studies in the 1970s through the work of critical legal scholars Derrick Bell, Mari Matsuda, and Kimberlé Crenshaw, among others (Marx, 2008). CRT was later introduced to the field of education in the 1990s (Ladson-Billings, 1998, 1999; Ladson-Billings, & Tate, 1995; Marx, 2008). Offshoots of CRT such as LatCrit, FemCrit, Tribal Crit, and

AsianCrit, to name a few, enable scholars to customize CRT to particular research agendas (Marx, 2008). While CRT scholars are mostly based in the U.S., some have pushed for a global CRT approach (Gillborn, 2006; Weiner, 2012).

### **Principle Tenets of CRT**

The principle tenets of CRT might vary slightly across scholars. In my review of literature, I have identified nine general tenets on which I believe scholars would agree. These nine general principles are interrelated beliefs and approaches about the significance of race and racism, and how the two operate in society (Gillborn, 2006). In the following sections, I discuss these principles of CRT.

**Racism as a normal aspect of society.** For CRT scholars, racism exists as a normal, structural, determining aspect of society (Allen, 2006; Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Gillborn, 2006; Ladson-Billings, 1999; Marx, 2008). This normalizing structural, determining aspect of racism is a structure of white supremacy (Allen, 2006). These normal and endemic aspects of race and racism are referred to as *racial realism*, meaning that even though race and racism are social constructions, there are very real elements and with very real, material outcomes attached to these social constructions (Bell, 1992; Dixson & Rousseau, 2006).

**Racism is a permanent aspect of society.** CRT believes that racism is a permanent aspect of society (Bell, 1992; Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Gillborn, 2006; Ladson-Billings, 1999; Marx, 2008).

**Critique of liberalism.** CRT challenges liberalism, and liberalists claims of objectivity, neutrality, meritocracy, or colorblindness (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 2006). Liberalism works to structure and maintain the status quo, and from a CRT perspective, the status quo is that of a white supremacist racist structure (Delgado & Stefancic, 2013).

**Race as a social construction.** Unlike the common belief that race is a natural, biological categorization of human bodies, CRT asserts the contrary: race is a social construction (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Gillborn, 2006; Haney López, 2013; Omi, 2010; Weiner, 2012). The social construction of race naturalizes the categorization of human bodies into different races through "human interaction rather than natural differentiation" (Haney López, 2013, p. 243.) This process of human interaction includes cultural, political, and historical constructs that result in the different hierarchical racialization of human bodies. This hierarchy places people into categories correlated to geographic origins of a group, phenotype, and other socially ascribed characteristics (Bonilla-Silva, 1997; Omi and Winant, 2015).

**Interest convergence.** Another tenet of CRT is interest convergence. Interest convergence argues that the Civil Rights of persons of color are only advanced as far as whites also benefit (Bell, 1992, 1980; Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Gillborn, 2006; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 2006; Marx, 2008). A key example of the interest convergence principle is that white women have benefited more from affirmative action than have women and men of color (Marx, 2008).

**Counterstorytelling.** Counterstorytelling is a methodology of CRT to counter majoritarian stories. Solórzano and Yosso (2002) explained that these majoritarian stories sometimes are referred to as, "monovocals, master narratives, standard stories, or majoritarian stories" (p. 28). Majoritarian stories serve as a tool of white supremacy to construct the dominant paradigm of race (Liggett, 2014). Counterstories or counternarratives from persons of color recognize the knowledge and experience of people of color. Often the main voices or experiences valued are those of whites, and CRT works to counter this domination through the use of storytelling or counter-storytelling that value and recognize the experiences and

knowledge of people of color (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Dixson & Rousseau, 2006; Ladson-Billings, 1998; Marx, 2008).

**Locating property rights in whiteness.** Another tenet of CRT is locating property rights in whiteness (Harris, 1993). This is recognition that "the origins of property rights in the United States are rooted in racial domination" (Harris, 1993, p. 716). Property ownership was constructed and limited by one's racial status. I argue that this precedent goes back before the formation of the U.S. when whites, racially constructed as owners, enslaved Blacks and claimed them as property. Once the U.S. was established, the enactment of the 3/5<sup>th</sup> Compromise blatantly demonstrated the location of property in whiteness.

**Intersectionality.** According to Delgado and Stefancic (2001), the notion of intersectionality tells us "no person has a single, easily stated, unitary identity" (p. 9). Everyone has "potentially conflicting, overlapping identities, loyalties, and allegiance" (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001, p. 9). A perfect example is Patricia Hill Collins' (2000) foundational work *Black Feminist Thought*. In this work, Hill Collins (2000) examined the intersection and conditions of systems of oppression from a historical and social approach.

**Eliminating racial oppression and all forms of oppression.** At the heart of CRT is the overarching goal of abolishing racial oppression and all forms of oppression (Dixson & Rousseau, 2006; Marx, 2008). Marx explained that through the workings of the central tenets of CRT, one works towards abolishing structural racism and its consequences. Although Bell (1992) asserted that racism is permanent, I am hopeful that it is possible to somehow eliminate racial oppression and all forms of racism.

### **Race and TESOL**

In this section, I will purposefully omit any scholarship on race and TESOL published in

the *TQSIR*. I omit these works because I will be analyzing them in depth in this research. I begin my review of the literature by briefly mentioning research related to my study. Subsequently, I follow with a discussion of research pertinent to this study. After that, I review theoretical approaches to discussing race within the extant literature on race and TESOL. Next, I will discuss TESOL teachers' perspectives based on their racial background. Last, I will discuss race and TESOL curriculum. I close this chapter by discussing absences in the literature and positioning my research interests within my findings.

### **Related Research**

A number of authors have examined subjects that I consider indirectly related to my dissertation research. A discussion of these works is beyond the scope of discussion in this dissertation. However, I will briefly mention some the topics I found peripherally related to my research. Lippi-Green (1997) researched ideology, language, and discrimination in the U.S. and exposed how discrimination based on accent works to uphold and continue unequal power relations and social structures. Fecho (2004) conducted a critical inquiry of race, language, and culture in a high school English language class. *The Hegemony of English* (Macedo, Dendrinos, & Gounari, 2003) examined the hegemonic working of English within the U.S., particularly in relation to perceptions and status of bilingual individuals and bilingualism. On a similar note, Orelus (2013) addressed the oppression of whitecentricism and English hegemony. Anderson (2009) conducted a longitudinal critical ethnography of bilingual education and policy, race, and the notion of being a cultural citizen.

**Linguistic Anthropology.** In this section I will discuss two pieces from linguistic anthropology. Both pieces deal specifically with critical whiteness studies in relation to language. First, I will discuss *White Noise: Bringing Language into Whiteness* (Trechter &

Bucholtz, 2001). The second piece I will discuss is "Will this Hell Ever End?": Substantiating and Resisting Race-Language Policies in a Multilingual High School (Malsbary, 2014, emphasis in original).

**Language into whiteness studies.** Trechter and Bucholtz (2001) examined a relationship between race and language. Although the focus of this piece is only on language, not specifically on TESOL, I include it here as it provides a link between race and language. Utilizing tools from semiotics (Waugh, 1982), Trechter and Bucholtz (2001) distinguished English as an unmarked language, and all other languages as marked. They then overlapped this approach with whiteness theory and asserted that whiteness was unmarked and all persons of color are then marked semiotically (Trechter & Bucholtz, 2001).

**Race-language policies.** Christine Malsbary (2014) conducted a CRT ethnographic study of a high school ESL program examining language policy negotiation between students and teachers. Part of her analytical framework included the use of Gail Shuck's (2006) work on the racialization of nonnative English speakers. Shuck (2006) posited that the relationship between race and language, particularly for nonnative English speakers, could be imagined as a race-nationality-language matrix. Malsbary (2014) utilized this matrix to demonstrate how language ideologies evoke racial categories.

Malsbary (2014) found that students and teachers used two main narratives to describe race-language policy processes. The first narrative her results yielded was that of embodied nativist policies. This narrative supported English-only in class and among peer groups. According to her findings, the embodied nativist policies used by students and teachers reproduced continued advantage for whites and institutional white supremacy (Malsbary, 2014). The second narrative of language was that of dynamic bilingual policies. This narrative

supported the use of multiple languages in class and among peers. These policies of dynamic bilingualism were used to expose and challenge the racist "ahistorical belief that more English equals higher achievement for EL-designated<sup>3</sup> youth of color" (Malsbary, 2014, p. 385).

### **Theoretical Frameworks Used to Study Race in TESOL**

Scholarly investigations of race in the fields of TESOL and second language acquisition pales in comparison to the fields of education, anthropology, sociology, and composition studies (Canagarajah, 2006; Kubota & Lin, 2009a). Of the research I reviewed, Kubota and Lin appear to be the foundational researchers studying race in the area of TESOL. According to Kubota and Lin (2009b), current investigations of race and TESOL utilize various theoretical approaches. These approaches include studies of AsianCrit (Quach et al., 2009); Bourdieu's capital, habitus, and field (Kubota & Lin, 2009b; Luke, 2009; Grant & Lee, 2009; Taylor, 2009); CRT (Marx, 2009; Quach et al., 2009; Luke, 2009; Austin, 2009; Curtis & Romney, 2006a, 2006b; Kubota & Lin, 2009b); critical multicultural education (CME) (Kubota & Lin, 2009b); critical pedagogy (CP) (Kubota & Lin, 2009b; Luke, 2009); and critical whiteness (CW) (Grant & Lee, 2009; Kubota & Lin, 2009a; Kubota & Lin, 2009b; Liggett, 2009; Marx, 2009; Taylor-Mendes, 2009). Following, I provide brief overviews of these approaches.

**CRT.** Sources in TESOL agree that CRT originated in critical legal studies (Curtis, 2006a; Kubota & Lin, 2009b; Liggett, 2014). The TESOL scholarship I reviewed used CRT to investigate the effects of race and racism in institutions, actions, ideas, beliefs, and power in order to dismantle oppressive systems (Austin, 2009; Kubota & Lin, 2009b; Marx, 2009). These

---

<sup>3</sup> EL-designated is a term Malsbary (2014) uses to specify students who were designated as English Learners.

scholars have used CRT to investigate the racialization of non-native speakers of English; racialized images in TESOL textbooks; racialization of TESOL professionals of color; the historical factors limiting persons of color into the TESOL field; and institutionalized racism experienced by ELLs (Curtis & Romney, 2006a; Kubota & Lin, 2009b; Marx, 2009).

**AsianCrit.** As an offshoot of CRT, AsianCrit scholars utilize CRT's main theoretical framework (Quach et al., 2009). Yet, scholars distinguish AsianCrit from CRT by asserting that Asians differentially experience issues of race and racism in comparison to other groups of people of color (Quach et al., 2009). Quach et al. (2009) acknowledged that AsianCrit bears similarities to LatCrit in their approaches. However, they established the differences in "the diverse experiences each community has in racialization processes, discrimination, representation, history, and politics" (Quach et al., 2009, p. 122). AsianCrit is also used to explore the denigration and oppression of Asians as they are positioned as the "model minority," the "reticent minority," and marked as the perpetual foreigner (Quach, et al., 2009).

**Capital, habitus, and field.** Scholars rarely use Bourdieu's notions of capital, habitus, and field to investigate issues of race and TESOL (Kubota & Lin, 2009b). Investigating race from a capital, habitus, and field perspective, Kubota and Lin (2009b) asserted the scholars examining the social construction of race comprised aspects of both individual and group identities; with these identities influencing thoughts, beliefs, and actions. This constellation of dispositions, in conjunction with "cognitive structures which generate perceptions, appreciations, and actions" comprise Bourdieu's idea of the *habitus* (Kubota & Lin, 2009b, p.11). Luke (2009) positioned habitus as existing through involvement in overlapping social fields such as houses of worship, school and classroom, and community groups. Race and language, always working in concert with each other as well as with other constructions, contribute to a person's habitus



(Luke, 2009).

Kubota and Lin (2009b) explained that Bourdieu's construct of the field accounts for "particular social space[s]" (p. 11) in which a habitus achieves dominance. School accounts for one example of a field (Luke, 2009). The creation of "hierarchical positions of power" (p. 11) happen in the field, with the resulting in a dominant habitus and thus, creating *cultural capital* (Kubota & Lin, 2009b). Teachers often evaluate various forms of capital such as language, cultural background, and beliefs, and then assign hierarchical value within the field of school (Luke, 2009).

**Critical pedagogy.** A critical pedagogy (CP) approach promotes "social justice and equity through critical examinations of power and politics that produce and maintain domination and subordination in various dimensions of local and global society" (Kubota & Lin, 2009b). From a CP perspective, what counts as mainstream knowledge privileges "dominant white male middle-class heterosexual culture" (p. 12) through normative instruction and curricula (Kubota & Lin, 2009b). CP, according to Kubota and Lin (2009a), identifies and critiques the inherent racialization and racism in mainstream knowledge, curriculum, and instruction.

Although Kubota and Lin provided a discussion of the core tenets of CP, they failed to link a CP examination of race and second language acquisition. However, Luke (2009) contended that CP, in conjunction with antiracist education and critical literacy, can be used to study how linguistic and racial domination works, and to examine whom benefits.

**Critical multicultural education.** Critical multicultural education (CME), as a form of anti-racist education, often employs CP (Kubota & Lin, 2009b). CME interrogates how normative knowledge is based on white beliefs and practices of constructing people of color as the romanticized "other" through celebrating surface aspects such as food, music, heroes, and

holidays (Herrera & Morales, 2009; Kubota & Lin, 2009b). The invisibility of white power and privilege is exposed, enabling teachers and students, as individuals and groups, to challenge racism and injustice (Austin, 2009; Kubota & Lin, 2009b). Like CP, CME is commonly used in TESOL scholarship to address social justice concerns. Kubota and Lin (2009b) asserted that more investigations are needed specifically into race and TESOL using CP and CME.

**Critical whiteness studies.** Critical whiteness studies (CWS), is also referred to as whiteness studies (WS) (Kubota & Lin, 2009b). WS critically examines white privilege, the social and discursive construction of whiteness, and the invisibility of whiteness as the norm (Grant & Lee, 2009; Kubota and Lin, 2009b; Liggett, 2009; Marx, 2009; Taylor-Mendes, 2009). Specific to examining race and TESOL, Kubota and Lin (2009b) highlighted the key role of CWS in studying the global spread of English and in English language teaching.

### **TESOL Teacher Perspectives Based on Racial Background**

**Native speaker, non-native speaker, and ideal speaker of English.** Grant and Lee (2009) asserted that the hegemonic reproduction of a series of social privilege (e.g., native-speaker privilege, white privilege, middle-class privilege, and American privilege) outside the United States mirrors the social privileges within its borders with respect to language, class, and race. Grant and Lee (2009) argued that due to the legacy of compulsory illiteracy laws targeting Africans who were enslaved in the United States, and past and current racist structures limiting Blacks' educational opportunities, racialized linguicism prevails in pathologizing speakers of African American Vernacular English as inferior, hence promoting the supremacy of Standard English. Standard English, according to Grant and Lee (2009), connotes whiteness, which is often linked to a white person, or persons enacting whiteness. The authors juxtaposed the economic and linguistic capital of Blacks in the U.S. to South Koreans learning English as an

additional language.

**White TESOL professionals.** How does the racialization of white teachers play out while the TESOL professionals of color experience what I discussed above? Following, I discuss the few sources investigating the specific racialized experiences of white TESOL professionals.

***Reacting emotionally.*** Taylor-Mendes (2009) conducted research with regarding race and textbook images. She reported initially being upset that her research participants would interact with her based on race.

The interviews merely provided a space within which *some* of the participants could discuss the inequitable connections between race and power. I suspect the research interview allowed the white participants to speak more openly about whites appearing most frequently with the most power in the images in the textbooks, largely because I, the researcher, am white also. Initially, I found this idea upsetting, as I realized that I might not be able to interact with all the participants in the same way. Today, I think I was naive to assume that everyone would want to treat me in the same way" (Taylor-Mendes, 2009, p. 77, emphasis original).

Both EFL students of color and white EFL students comprised the research participants exploring how EFL textbook images are racially marked (Taylor-Mendes, 2009). The EFL students of color responded with anger to the abundance of whites pictured in powerful positions, while whites responded with sadness (Taylor-Mendes, 2009). Taylor-Mendes (2009) interpreted the students' responses saying "I had the impression that many of the participants were already aware of the stereotypes and inequities in the images. The interviews merely provided a space within which only *some* of the participants could discuss the inequitable connections between race and power" (Taylor-Mendes, 2009, p. 77).

*Denying involvement in race and racism.* Some white TESOL educators view race as an issue not for whites but for people of color, specifically Blacks (Haque & Morgan, 2009). Morgan reflected on this belief early in his professional career: "I'm not Black, and I don't have the right to speak about or for such experiences, [race and/or racism] or their relevance for second language education" (Haque & Morgan, 2009, p. 272). He explained he lacked "the 'authentic' voice forged through the pain of racial taunts and exclusion" yet hoped others did not interpret his silence regarding race as a lack of concern on his part (Haque & Morgan, 2009, p. 272).

Yet, Morgan acknowledged several examples from his later professional years where he realized his white privilege as a U.S. TESOL teacher living and teaching abroad (Haque & Morgan, 2009). It was from his colleagues of color that Morgan (Haque & Morgan, 2009) gleaned understandings of his involvement in racial dynamics. Haque and Morgan (2009) discussed Morgan's experiences as similar to other white TESOL professionals as often oblivious to their involvement in racial dynamics. They missed that they could use constructivists, antiracist, and critical multicultural pedagogies with greater ease than TESOL professionals of color. TESOL professionals of color, on the other hand, they argued, are racially "marked" and held to higher standards and scrutiny (Haque & Morgan, 2009).

### **Race and TESOL Curricular Materials**

Taylor-Mendes (2009) conducted a critical discourse analysis interview study of images found in both EFL and ESL textbooks. Taylor-Mendes was interested in how students learning English as an additional language, and TESOL teachers identified the ideal English speaker by race and cultural characteristics. Study participants lived in Brazil and were white, Mulatto, Black, and Asian (Mendes-Taylor, 2009 p. 69). The books used in the study were produced in

both the United States and Great Britain (Taylor-Mendes, 2009). Taylor Mendes (2009) noted that her study participants reported three major themes communicated through the images. First, the images reflected the United States as the land of white elite (Taylor-Mendes, 2009). Second, Blacks were portrayed as living in poverty and occupying powerless positions, where whites dominated wealth and power (Taylor-Mendes, 2009). Taylor-Mendes (2009) mentioned that some of the white students, connecting to the notions of whites having more opportunities "expressed this connection with sadness" (p. 77) while some students of color "expressed this connection with anger" (p. 77). Third, and last, continents were racialized through stereotypical images, i.e., only Blacks live in Africa, Asians live in Asia, whites in the United States, and Arabs in the Middle East (Taylor-Mendes, 2009). Of particular note, Taylor-Mendes (2009) emphasized that:

The research interview did not necessarily increase the participants' awareness of bias in the images in their textbooks; indeed I had the impression that many of the participants were already aware of the stereotypes and inequities in the images...I suspect the research interview allowed the white participants to speak more openly about whites appearing most frequently with the most power in the images in the textbooks, largely because I, the researcher am white also" (p. 77).

To me, these findings of the participants being aware of the biases and racialized/stereotyped images is a stark reminder that curriculum is not neutral.

### **My Research Within This Field**

Of all the literature I reviewed above, I found no dialectical relational analyses, neither to ascertain what discourses authors used to deploy race, nor to examine how discourses work to either conform or resist white supremacy. This lack of literature positions my research to

contribute to the field of scholarship concerning race and TESOL.

## **Chapter Three**

### **Methods**

The purpose of this study was to analyze what discourses authors used to deploy race in one aspect of the field of TESOL. The facet I focused on was the publication *TESOL Quarterly* (*TQ*). The questions that guided my research were the following:

1. What discourses did the authors use to deploy race in the articles in the 2006 *TESOL Quarterly* Special Issue on Race (*TQSIR*)?
2. How do these discourses work to either conform to, or resist white supremacist ideology?

In my study, as I stated above, I analyzed the *TQSIR*. In 2006, *TQ* issued a special issue focusing on the topic of race. I purposely chose this special issue to see how race was discussed in the articles of the special issue. The findings of this analysis will speak to my research questions of what discourses did the authors use to deploy race in the articles in the 2006 *TESOL Quarterly* Special Issue on Race (*TQSIR*), and how do these discourses work to either conform to, or resist white supremacist ideology.

In this chapter, I first give a brief description of the DRA methodology I used in my research. Second and third, I will contextualize DRA within the broader field of discourse analysis (DA) and critical discourse analysis (CDA). Fourth, I will discuss in-depth the steps of a DRA approach. Fifth, I will explain the methods I used in my study. Sixth, I will discuss my data collection. Last, I will discuss my analysis of the data.

#### **Description of Methodology**

The methodology I used is a type of CDA that Norman Fairclough (2009) first delineated in 2009. Fairclough (2009) named this particular approach DRA. He described DRA as a

transdisciplinary social science research methodology. In this transdisciplinary approach, the researcher utilizes a theoretical process that focuses on the object of research. The object of research specific to DRA is the larger injustice the researcher seeks to address, also known as the *social wrong* (Fairclough, 2009). The social wrong can be "understood in broad terms as aspects of social systems, forms or orders which are detrimental to human well-being, and which could in principle be ameliorated if not eliminated, though perhaps only through major changes in systems, form or orders" (Fairclough, 2009, pp. 167-168). Specific to this research, the social wrong I sought to address was the white supremacist racist structure. To better contextualize DRA within the larger field of discourse analysis, I will first examine the general field of DA and then the field of CDA.

### **The Field of DA**

Researchers use DA to investigate how language, in the forms of discourse, is used to create meanings; signify institutional ways of understandings, activities, and relationships; as well as examine how language impacts the ways people construct knowledge and truth (Bogdan and Biklen, 2007). According to Gee (2004), some scholars discuss the simple act of interrogating discourse through using DA as being critical and indicate critical discourse analysis with all lowercase letters. Other scholars (e.g., Fairclough, 2009; Titscher, Meyer, Wodak, & Vetter, 2000; van Dijk, 1993) make no such distinction, and instead use CDA to refer only to discourse analysis grounded in critical theory. In this dissertation, I use *critical discourse analysis* and *CDA* to refer to critical discourse analysis specifically based in critical theory. In the next section, I discuss the background of CDA and connect it to the specific approach I used in my dissertation research.

### **CDA**



CDA more formally emerged in the 1990s as an organized approach to critically interrogate discourse (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). In some instances, CDA is also known as critical discourse studies (CDS) (van Dijk, 2011). In this research, I use CDA to encompass both CDA and CDS.

As I previously discussed, a critical approach to discourse analysis entails an approach based on critical theory and critical applications (van Dijk, 2011). CDA is committed to showing how talk and texts serve the interests of those with power in a society (Tracy, Martínez Guillem, Robles, & Casteline, 2011). Additionally, CDA scholars explicitly state their political and social positions and they "take sides, and actively participate in order to uncover, demystify or otherwise challenge dominance with their discourse analyses" (van Dijk, 1997. p. 22). As a form of critical social research, CDA works to address issues of social injustice by tackling their sources and exposing power relations and domination (Fairclough, 2009). CDA seeks to "get more insights into the crucial role of discourse in the reproduction of dominance and inequality" (van Dijk, 1993, p. 253).

Researchers use CDA to unmask the political, social, and cultural implications of the texts that humans encounter and produce (Hoey, 2001). According to Hoey, those who use discourse analysis not based in critical theory can be held complicit in maintaining the status quo of which the texts are a cultural product. CDA, on the other hand, explicitly works to expose such implications and as a result, challenges the status quo (Hoey, 2001).

### **Interpretive Context of CDA**

CDA, and subsequently DRA, are based in a critical hermeneutical tradition (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). Hermeneutics, simply put, is the framework people use for interpretation (Rudestam & Newton, 2007). Some might associate hermeneutics with the interpretation of

religious documents; however, scholars in all fields use hermeneutics (Gallagher, 1992). Critical hermeneutics asserts that objects are socially and politically constructed. A key understanding of critical hermeneutics is that there are real aspects outside of language (Gallagher, 1992). This knowledge that there are real aspects outside of language contradicts a more moderate hermeneutic approach where language is, and contains, everything (Gallagher, 1992). Understanding the extralinguistic aspects of language is found in understanding the dialectical aspect of language, hence a dialectical relational approach (Fairclough, 2001; 2009). Specifically, language—through discourses—*affects* social structures. At the same time, language—through discourses—*is determined by* social structures (Fairclough, 2001). By using CDA that is based in critical hermeneutics, meaning is *interpreted*, not imposed. The concept of meaning being imposed hails from conservative and moderate hermeneutics, akin to the belief that language is all-encompassing (Gallagher, 1992).

**Meaning of text specific to CDA.** As part of a critical approach of CDA, text can be understood in different ways:

A text does not uniquely determine a meaning, though there is a limit to what a text can mean: different understandings of the text result from different combinations of the properties of the text and the properties (social positioning, knowledges, values, etc.) of the interpreters. (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999, p. 67)

As I previously mentioned, CDA researchers do not impose meanings of the text. An essential component of CDA's analysis is the analysis of interpretations (Fairclough, 2001), which is positioned above the analysis of the conjecture (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999). According to Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999) CDA does not advocate a specific understanding of a text. CDA, however, may argue for a particular interpretation or explanation of the text through

critical theory.

### **CDA Research Agenda**

Although there is no one, unified approach to CDA, the approaches do share common agendas of research interests (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). These authors elaborated these six major research agendas in the following ways:

1. Analysing, [sic] understanding and explaining the impact of the Knowledge-based Economy [KBE] on various domains of our societies; related to this, the recontextualization of KBE into other parts of the world and other societies ('transition').
2. Integrating approaches from cognitive sciences into CDA; this requires complex epistemological considerations and the development of new tools. Moreover, we question in which ways such approaches depend on Western cultural contexts and how, related to these issues, Eurocentric perspectives could be transcended.
3. Analysing, [sic] understanding and explaining new phenomena in Western political systems, which are due to the impact of (new) media and to transnational, global and local developments and related institutions. More specifically, phenomena such as "depoliticization" and "participation" need to be investigated in detail.
4. Analysing [sic] understanding and explaining the impact of new media and related genres, which entails developing new multimodal theoretical and methodological approaches. Our concepts of space and time have changed, and these changes interact in dialectical ways with new modes and genres of communication.
5. Analysing [sic], understanding, and explaining the relationship between complex historical processes, hegemonic narratives and CDA approaches. Identity politics on

all levels always entail the integration of past experiences, present events and future visions. The concepts of intertextuality and recontextualization are inherently tied to interdisciplinary approaches.

6. Avoid 'cherry picking' (choosing the examples which best fit the assumptions) by integrating quantitative and qualitative methods and by providing retroductable, self-reflective presentations of past or current research processes. (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, p. 11)

Investigating the research agenda items explained above, CDA scholarship utilizes six major approaches: the sociocognitive approach associated with van Dijk; the dispositive analysis associated with Jäger and Maier; the discourse-historical approach associated with Wodak and Reisigl; the social actors approach associated with van Leeuwen; the corpus-linguistics approach associated with Mautner; and lastly, DRA associated with Fairclough (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). I used DRA in this research.

### **DRA**

A key aspect in understanding DRA is in the operationalization of terms. Fairclough (2009) defined *discourses* as "semiotic ways of construing aspects of the world (physical, social, or mental) which can generally be identified with different positions or perspectives of different groups of social actors" (p. 164). Fairclough (2009) used *semiosis* to capture broad notions of discourse. "Discourse will be treated as a general mode of semiosis, i.e., meaningful symbolic behavior" (Blommaert, 2005, p. 2). Semiosis includes meaning making as integral to social processes. Also included in the notion of semiosis is knowing that ways of interpreting dimensions of the world are related to a particular social perspective. Lastly, semiosis and language are connected to a particular social practice or social field (Fairclough, 2009).

Fairclough (2009) explained that semiosis in relation to a DRA approach is considered “as an element of the social process which is *dialectically* related to others—hence a 'dialectical-relational' approach" (p. 163, emphasis in original). In other words, elements of social processes are related, yet different, and not fully separate from one another (Fairclough, 2009). Essentially, each element "internalizes" the other without being diminishable to them (Fairclough, 2003).

In the following bulleted list, I outline additional terms specific to DRA that informed my analysis:

- *Texts* are the semiotic dimensions of events (Fairclough, 2009).
- *Styles* "are identities, or 'ways of being,' in their semiotic aspect—for instance, being a 'manager' in the currently fashionable way in business or in universities is partly a matter of developing the right semiotic style" (Fairclough, 2009, p. 164).
- *Genres*, specific to DRA, "are semiotic ways of acting and interacting, such as news or job interviews, reports or editorials in newspaper, or advertisements on TV or the Internet" (Fairclough, 2009, p 164).
- *Orders of discourse* are described as "the semiotic dimensions of (networks of) social practices which constitute social fields, institutions, organizations, etc." (Fairclough, 2009, p. 164) and can be conceptualized as arrangements of different discourses, different genres, and different styles (Fairclough, 2009). Additionally, orders of discourse “is really a social order looked at from a specifically discursal perspective—in terms of those types of practice into which a social space is structured which happen to be discourses types (Fairclough, 2001, p. 24).

Specific to this research, the *texts* I examined were the articles in the 2006 *TQSIR*. The *styles* specific to this research are dependent upon the individual articles, and not a focus of this

research. The *genre* for my research was the *TQ*, a scholarly journal. The *orders of discourse* specific to this research is the field of TESOL.

The general question a DRA approach asks is, "What is the particular significance of semiosis, and of dialectical relations between semiosis and other social elements, in the social processes...under investigation?" (Fairclough, 2009, p. 166). In relation to my research, the particular significance of semiosis I sought to understand was stated in my first research question of identifying what discourses the authors used to deploy race in the articles in the 2006 *TQSIR*. The semiosis was the discourses the authors used to deploy race. These discourses, or in Fairclough's terms, semiosis, enabled me to then address the second question of my research. My second research question, how these discourses work to either conform to, or resist white supremacist ideology, corresponds to the latter half of the general question of DRA. The social elements in the social processes, specific to this study, represent white supremacist ideology. Next, I will identify the DRA methodological steps and their relation to this research.

### **DRA Methodological Steps**

The DRA approach is a modified version of Bhaskar's explanatory critique (Fairclough, 2009). Fairclough's DRA consists of four stages, with each stage including smaller steps (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999; Fairclough, 2009). Though the methodology is delineated in stages and steps, Fairclough (2009) stressed that they are not to be "interpreted in a mechanical way ... [and that] the relationship between them in doing research is not simply that of sequential order" (p. 167). As I discuss the stages and steps, I explain how my research relates to the particular stage and or step. Even though I will discuss the stages and steps sequentially, this is not necessarily how my research progressed.

**Stage one: focus on a social wrong in its semiotic aspect.** As opposed to starting with a

research question, beginning with a social problem foregrounds the critical intent of this approach (Fairclough, 2003). By beginning the research with a social problem in its semiotic aspect, the research works to produce knowledge that can work towards emancipatory change (Fairclough, 2003). This stage happens in two steps.

*Step one.* The scholar identifies a research topic that highlights a “social wrong that can productively be approached in a transdisciplinary way with a particular focus on dialectical relations between semiotic and other 'moments'" (Fairclough, 2009, p. 168). The social wrong I chose to focus on in this research is white supremacist ideology. I examined this by analyzing what discourses the authors used to deploy race in one aspect of the field of TESOL, namely the 2006 *TQSIR*.

*Step two.* In step two, the researcher constructs "objects of research for initially identified research topics by theorizing them in a transdisciplinary way" (Fairclough, 2009, p. 168). In other words, constructing an object of research requires relying on bodies of theories from varied disciplines that are external to the topic, making sure these theories include theories of discourse and semiosis (Fairclough, 2009). In my proposed research, my theoretical framework together with the underlying theory and hermeneutics of my methodological approach enable me to examine white supremacist ideology from outside the theoretical constructs of TESOL.

**Stage two: identify potential hurdles to addressing the social wrong.** The objective of stage two is to apprehend how the problem develops and how the problem is rooted in the organization of social life, "by focusing on its resolution—on what makes it more or less intractable" (Fairclough, 2003, p. 209). In this stage, the researcher comes at the social wrong somewhat indirectly "by asking what it is about the way in which social life is structured and organized that prevents it from being addressed" (Fairclough, 2009, p. 169). This action,

Fairclough (2009) argued, requires involvement of analyses of the social structure as potential points of entry to studying the social wrong. Fairclough (2003) identified the following three steps to accomplish this.

**Step one.** The first step entails analyzing the dialectical relations between "semiosis and other social elements: between orders of discourse and other elements of social practices, between texts and other elements of events" (Fairclough, 2009, p. 169). It is essential to analyze "the network of practices within which it is located" (Fairclough, 2003, p. 209). I will complete this step when I discuss the findings to answer my second research question of how do the discourses I identified in my analysis of *TQSIR* either conform to, or resist white supremacist ideology in chapter five.

**Step two.** The second step includes selecting texts, focuses, and categories for analysis of these texts; keeping in mind the texts are specific to and "appropriate to the constitution of the object of research" (Fairclough, 2009, p. 169). Additionally, this step includes an analysis of the association of semiosis to other elements within the specific practices concerned (Fairclough, 2003). For this research, the texts I selected are the articles in the 2006 *TQSIR*.

**Step three.** The third step encompasses textual analysis, both interdiscursive analysis, and linguistic and semiotic analysis (Fairclough, 2009). Analysis of the semiosis itself happens in two steps: "structural analysis; the order of discourse" and, two, "textual/interactional analysis—both interdiscursive analysis, and linguistic (and semiotic) analysis" (Fairclough, 2003, p. 209).

It is in this step that the researcher utilizes various methods of textual analysis (Fairclough, 2009). These methods of textual analysis can include both quantitative and qualitative methods. Common text analysis methods include content analysis, grounded theory, ethnographic methods, membership categorization device analysis, narrative semiotics, and



functional pragmatics to name a few (Titscher et al., 2000). I will delineate how I completed this step later in this chapter in my analysis section.

**Stage three: examine how the social order relies on the social wrong.** In this stage, researchers consider their results from stage two and ask questions such as "in what way/s might the social order require this?" (Fairclough, 2009). DRA researchers explore how the social injustice at the focus of the research:

Is inherent to the social order, whether it can be addressed within it, or only by changing it. It is a way of linking 'is' to 'ought': if a social order can be shown to inherently give rise to major social wrongs, then that is a reason for thinking that perhaps it should be changed. It also connects with questions of ideology: discourse is ideological in so far as it contributes to sustain particular relations of power and domination" (Fairclough, 2009, pp. 170-171). The point here is to explore how those who benefit most from the way social life is now organized are invested in the problem persisting. (Fairclough, 2003)

The stage three portion of my DRA research is found in my analysis of my findings to answer my second research question: How do these discourses work to either conform to, or resist white supremacist ideology?

**Stage four: identify promising means to overcoming obstacles.** At this stage of the analyses, the researcher, focusing on the dialectical relations between semiosis and other elements, identifies possibilities within the standing social process for dismantling obstacles to address the social wrong in question (Fairclough, 2009). To do this, Fairclough explained, the researcher creates a semiotic point of entry into the research on how these impediments are actually tried, challenged and resisted. These points of entry could be within existing social or political groups or movements, or simply by people through everyday living experiences

(Fairclough, 2009)." A specifically semiotic focus would include ways in which dominant discourse is reacted to, contested, criticized and opposed in its argumentation, its construal of the world, its construal of social identities" (Fairclough, 2009, p. 171). I discuss stage four in the discussion of the findings section of chapter five where I address how the discourses I identified work to either conform to, or resist white supremacist ideology.

### **Methods**

As discussed in the previous sections about stages and steps of the DRA methodology, various methods were involved. As discussed in stage two, step two, I collected focuses, and categories for analysis of these texts. In the following section regarding data collection, I will explain my selection of text. Subsequently, I will discuss the different methods I used to conduct the DRA of the textual data I selected.

### **Data Collection**

My textual data consisted of all electronic files from the 2006 *TQSIR*. I used online access to download the files from the University of New Mexico (UNM) online library resources. I downloaded all files as portable document files (.pdf) and saved them to my laptop computer. Next, I discuss the tools I used to collect, record, and analyze the data in the next section.

### **Tools**

For my data processing and analysis, I used three main tools. These tools included Zotero, Nuance pdf to text converter, and Dedoose.

**Zotero.** Zotero is a bibliographic software that utilizes a web-based interface to facilitate downloading and cataloging of sources ("Zotero | Your personal research assistant," n.d.). I used Zotero to download and catalog all *TQSIR* files into individual collections on my laptop.

**Nuance.** I used nuance is a pdf. to text converter (“Power PDF,” n.d.) to convert all pdfs to Microsoft Word (Word) documents. At the time I analyzed my documents, Dedoose lacked capability to analyzed pdf so I used Nuance to convert my files to Word documents for use in Dedoose. I converted all five 2006 *TQSIR* articles pdfs to Word documents. Then, I compared the original pdf to the Word document, word by word, to ensure each Word file was an exact copy of the original pdf.

**Dedoose.** Dedoose is web-based data analysis software (“Home | Dedoose,” n.d.). I uploaded all of my *TQSIR* Word documents to Dedoose. I then used Dedoose for coding and analysis of my data. Within Dedoose, I used features to excerpt, code, and add analytic memos.

### **Analysis**

In this section, I will discuss how I conducted my DRA step two stage three textual analysis of the articles from the 2006 *TQSIR*.

#### **Analysis using Dedoose**

I first uploaded to Dedoose all five Word document versions of the articles from the 2006 *TQSIR*. After reading each document at least ten times, I began creating excerpts within each document. The excerpts I created were chunks of texts specific to discussions of race. I then would attach a code to each excerpt. The code I attached would be a word or short phrase that captured what I thought to be the essence of my interpretation of the excerpt. In Dedoose terminology, these initial codes I created were considered “parent codes.” Once I completed this process with all documents, I began the next step of creating what I call affinity groups of codes.

By creating *affinity groups* of codes, I mean I would look for parent codes that shared affinity of meaning or similar interpretations that I surmised could speak to a larger discourse/s. Then, I would group these parent codes under a new code. In Dedoose terminology, this new

code would now become the parent code with all the prior parent codes now child codes. I repeated this entire sequence until I reduced my total parent codes to the four discourses I will discuss at length in chapter four: racialization; whiteness; sonic and optic negation of racism: emotional labor of racism.

The child codes under each of these discourse parent codes were excerpts that exemplified the different expressions of the discourses. I identified that each discourse had expression specific to scholarship, curriculum, teachers, and students. I will discuss these in chapters four and five.

## Chapter Four

### Findings

In this chapter, I report the findings of my DRA critical discourse analysis of the *TESOL Quarterly Special Issue on Race (TQSIR)* (2006). In this chapter, my findings answer the first question below. I will answer the second question in chapter five. The purpose of this study was to analyze what discourses authors used to deploy race in one aspect of the field of TESOL. My dissertation questions were:

1. What discourses did the authors use to deploy race in the articles in the 2006 *TESOL Quarterly Special Issue on Race (TQSIR)*?
2. How do these discourses work to either conform to, or resist white supremacist ideology?

Before I present my findings, I briefly overview the articles I analyzed. As I discussed in chapter three, I focused my analysis on the five articles published in the 2006 *TQSIR*. I will discuss the texts in the order of the publication. Of note, all of the authors were women as identified through the pronouns *she* and/or *her* in their articles (Kubota & Lin, 2006; Motha, 2006; Taylor, 2006; Hammond, 2006; Lee & Simon-Maeda, 2006).

The first article, “Race and TESOL: Introduction to Concepts and Theories” written by Ryuko Kubota and Angel Lin (2006) opened with short vignettes from the authors. The authors detailed personal experiences of racism connected to their call for the need to study race in the field of TESOL. They followed with an overview of key ideas and theories related to race and TESOL. The authors differentiated race, ethnicity, and culture from each other, and defined racialization and types of racism. In addition to examining racism intersecting with other injustices, Kubota and Lin also reviewed the notion of a racialized nonnative and or native

speaker. Additionally, they discussed theoretical orientations for investigating race in the field of teaching and learning English. Kubota and Lin ended their article by overviewing the works included in the special issue, as they served as the guest editors for the *TQSIR*.

Suhanthie Motha's article "Racializing ESOL Teacher Identities in U. S. K-12 Public Schools" (2006) came second in the *TQSIR*. Motha conducted a year-long critical feminist ethnography of four new TESOL teachers in four public schools in the United States. Motha focused on the new teachers' racial identities and racialized experiences in their teaching. Only one of the teachers was a person of color; the other three teachers were white. Motha also considered the implications of these teachers being native English speakers in settings where students were predominantly students of color, and African American Vernacular English was dominant among the student population. Motha also focused on how the teachers navigated classes and students being classified as "World English," (p. 508) and how racialization was inherent in these classifications.

The third article, "Wrestling with Race: The Implications of Integrative Antiracism Education for Immigrant ESL Youth" by Lisa Taylor (2006) analyzed a three-day Freirean-styled antidiscrimination leadership program in Canada. This investigation of 30 immigrant ESL high school students used an "integrative antiracism analytical framework" (p. 519) for the students to assess their own experiences with discrimination. Taylor analyzed implications of the students' experiences with discrimination in connection with their identities as immigrant ESL learners. Taylor's findings suggested "that integrative antiracism education can support immigrant language learners' intersectional and multilevel understanding of discrimination" (p. 519).

The fourth article, Kay Hammond's article "More than a Game: A Critical Discourse

Analysis of a Racial Inequality Exercise in Japan” (2006,) was set in an EFL class at a Japanese university. Hammond, a white teacher from New Zealand (p. 562), conducted a critical discourse analysis. She analyzed Japanese EFL students’ written reflections of a racial discrimination exercise based on the 1968 Jane Elliot brown-eyed/blue-eyed racism simulation exercise in the United States. Hammond’s findings showed her students recognized discrimination as majority-on-minority situation, and as predominantly overt acts. Hammond also identified that her students resorted to what she called a discourse of distraction: her students resorted to discussing other forms of discrimination instead of racial discrimination. Pointedly, Hammond highlighted the importance of language teachers critically approaching racial simulation exercises. Lastly, Hammond problematized her positionality as a white teacher working to increase students’ awareness of racism.

The fifth and last article, “Racialized Research Identities in ESL/EFL Research,” reported on separate studies by Ena Lee and Andrea Simon-Maeda. Simon-Maeda delineated “her experiences as a White female academic living, working, and conducting research in Japan;” and Lee detailed “her experiences as a Chinese-Canadian conducting research in a diverse multilingual/multicultural city in Canada” (Lee & Simon-Maeda, 2006, p. 574). Lee and Simon-Maeda initially submitted separate articles. However, the editors requested they write a joint article focusing on their experiences with racialization as researchers. Their joint article addressed researcher reflexivity and racialization. Simon-Maeda explained her experiences as a white woman “studying the other” (p.574). Lee detailed her researcher experiences of “studying my own kind” (p. 581). Next, I will discuss what I identified as the major discourses the authors used to deploy race in these five texts.

### **Discourses Deployed by Authors**

In my analysis of what discourses the authors used to deploy race in these texts, I identified four major discourses: racialization; whiteness; sonic and optic negation of racism; and emotional labor of racism. I then examined these discourses specific to scholarship, curriculum, teachers, and students. These four domains represent the major facets of education considered by the authors of the texts I analyzed. In the following sections, I discuss each discourse and how it functioned in the four domains of scholarship, curriculum, teachers, and students.

### **Discourse of Racialization**

The discourse of racialization I identified in the articles of *TQSIR* contained discussions of creation and reproduction of racial meanings (Gonzales-Sobrinno & Goss, 2019) through racial categorization of people, languages, and/or identities. The *TQSIR* authors' discussions of racialization inherently referred to a hierarchical valuing of racial categories, with the highest value assigned to whiteness. In the following sections, I will discuss examples of the discourse of racialization I identified in these authors' discussions of scholarship, curriculum, teachers, and students.

**Discourse of racialization in discussion of scholarship.** From my analysis of the 2006 *TQSIR* articles I identified four main examples of discourse of racialization specific to scholarship: defining racialization in association with racism, racialized identities, racialization of language, and experiencing racialization. I will begin by discussing how the authors defined racism and/or racialization.

***Racism in relation to racialization.*** Kubota and Lin (2006) characterized racialization, at its most basic, as a categorization of people based on race. However, this categorization of people is not neutral. Kubota and Lin positioned racism as the organizing factor of racialization. In the following quote, they explained how racialization uses racism to create the Other:



Underlying the categorization is the discourse supported by a specific power dynamic that excludes certain racialized groups as the inferior Other while maintaining the status quo of the Self. Such discourse can be identified as *racism*...Racism can be viewed as both discourse and social practice that construct and perpetuate unequal relations of power through inferiorization, a process in which the Other is rendered inferior to the Self. (pp. 477-478, emphasis in original)

The essence of racialization, as Kubota and Lin explained above, is the hierarchical valuation of human beings. This hierarchical valuing of human beings is, at the simplest level, based in the racialization of the human beings' bodies. The missing aspect in Kubota and Lin's discussion of racialization is which racialized groups of human beings' bodies are valued more and which racialized human beings' bodies are valued less. I assert that through this process of racialization as explained by Kubota and Lin, they missed a key component: white supremacy. White supremacy works as a normalizing aspect of racism in society (Allen, 2006). Lacking an explicit discussion of white supremacy's role in racism and racialization in Kubota and Lin's (2006) work leaves white supremacy as an implicit assumption at best (Fairclough, 2011).

The discourse of racialization works to re/produce white supremacy by valuing white human beings' bodies more than human beings' bodies of color (Gonzalez-Sobrino & Goss, 2019). If we omit discussions of human beings' bodies, we lose the grounded referent of racialization, which re/produces an aspect of dehumanization of humans. Next, I discuss an example of the removal of racialization from the human body: racialized identities.

***Racialized identities.*** The article authors in *TQSIR* predominantly discussed racialized identities as dynamic and constructed in relationship with others' racialized identities, with no connection of the racialized identities to human bodies. Gonzalez-Sobrino and Goss (2019)

asserted that racialization is corporeal, meaning grounded in the body. The implicit assumption of the *TQSIR* texts was that there were no corporeal connections in the racialization of identities. I will discuss two examples; one regarding racialized identities that informed how TESOL is not a racially neutral space, and the second example connecting the racialization to power relations.

First, Motha (2006) connected the construction of racialized identities in the space of TESOL in schools as an indication that TESOL is not a racially neutral language learning site.

She explained:

The social and educational practices surrounding the school category of ESOL have shaped it into an ideological category that comprises a collection of racialized identities...School and classroom practices provide the terrain in which meanings of racialized identities are dynamically and continuously constructed and negotiated. Neither race nor linguistic minority status are clear-cut or absolutely defined categories. They, like all dimensions of difference, evolve in relationship with others, and their meanings are both subjective and negotiable. These negotiations contribute to the shaping of ESOL students' and teachers' racial identities and lives beyond school. As such, ESOL practitioners cannot afford to pretend that the school category ESOL is a racially neutral site of language learning. (p. 497)

Motha explained how racialized identities are continuously constructed and negotiated but did not connect these racialized identities to the bodies of the identity holders. I do not want to dismiss the importance of Motha's assertion that TESOL is a racialized space that contributes to the racialization of students and teachers within this context. However, I argue that we must also account for the body to which the racialized identity is connected. With the absence of accounting for the bodies to which these racialized identities are linked, our scholarship risks the

dehumanization of the human beings who simply become reduced to seemingly homogenous identities interacting with other identities. A diverse, complex, multifaceted human being (Hill Collins, 2000) becomes boiled down to this seemingly simplex racialized identity.

Second, Taylor (2006) connected racialized identities to the racialization of English language teaching and learning. Taylor specifically illuminated the racialized hierarchies of speaker identities:

A growing body of TESOL scholarship has begun to grapple with the complexities of racialization in the historical development and contemporary practice of English language teaching and learning. This literature explores the ways that, as a discipline intimately linked to the imperial expansion of English as well as national politics of immigration and integration, TESOL is permeated by racialized power relations that create hierarchies of speaker identities and resilient images of linguistic impurity and Otherness. (pp. 519-520)

In this excerpt, Taylor pointed out the element of racialized power relations involved in the hierarchical valuing of speaker identities. Like Motha (2006), Taylor's discussion of racialization within the TESOL space debunks the notion of TESOL being a racially neutral space. Taylor's work differed from Motha because Taylor explicitly named racialized power relations as the fuel in the identity de/valuation and differentiation process.

I argue that the authors not considering the human being's body connected to a racialized identity, we as scholars are omitting the concrete referents of said racialized identity.

Racialization, I discussed above, is creation and reproduction of racial meanings (Gonzalez-Sobrinó & Goss, 2019). Without account of the racialized aspect of the persons' bodies, identities can appear fleeting and detached from the power referent of the body, which could

result in the objectification of the subjects (Fairclough, 2011). As Taylor clearly stated, the power relations are racialized. This discourse of racialization re/produces the power relations inherent in the racial hierarchy, and specific to this example, the linguistic hierarchy. The implicit assumption in this text (Fairclough, 2011) is that the norm at the top of the hierarchy in this instance is white, native English speaker. All others in this linguistic hierarchy Taylor discussed are marked with the racialized identity of the linguistically impure Other. The assumption in this text is that when a person is marked with an inferior racialized identity of the linguistically impure other, they lose their subjectivity (Fairclough, 2011).

***Racialization of language.*** Next, I discuss how the *TQSIR* article authors examined scholarship specific to the racialization of language. The predominant discourse centered on the racialization of the English language manifested as that of a so-called “World English” (Motha, 2006, p. 508). In the following excerpt from Motha, she discussed the racialization of English, and consequently, the devaluation of the English variations predominantly used by people of color:

I suggest that race is the most significant factor keeping many language variations, including Jamaican English, from amassing the same linguistic power as, for instance, British, American, and Canadian English. I contend that Jamaican English was categorized as a World English simply because that country's population is predominantly of color...Brutt-Griffler (2002) notes that "the center-driven narrative of English language spread writes people residing outside the West out of their central role in the spread of English and their place in making the language we call English" (p. viii). I believe that the scope of the "center-driven narrative" extends far beyond "people residing outside the West" to reach people living in Western countries—if they are not

White. (Motha, 2006, pp. 508-509)

Motha connected the racialization of English with the racialization of the persons speaking the particular English. Specifically, for those residing not in the West, and people of color, their varieties of English do not carry the same linguistic power. This lack of power associated with “World English” (Motha, 2006, p. 508) is simply due to the racialization of the speakers of color speaking the non-Western, read non-white, varieties of English. The default that is unspoken here is that white (Haney López, 2013), Western English is the norm and all other varieties spoken by people of color around the world are considered speakers of World Englishes.

*Experiencing racialization.* The last example I identified of the authors’ discussions of scholarship specific to racialization concerned researchers experiencing racialization. A good example of experiencing racism comes from Lee and Simon-Maeda (2006). Ena Lee, an Asian-Canadian researcher discussed how her research participant, Lisa, also Asian-Canadian racialized her as the researcher. Lee explained this experience:

In viewing me as a fellow Asian, Canadian, native speaker of English, and ESL professional, Lisa positioned me [Lee] as both a legitimate speaker and listener to her experiences as a visible minority in the field of TESOL. She believed I mirrored her hybrid identity (cf. Hall, 1992)— caught between being too Asian on the one hand, but being too White on the other. Thus, when I concurred that I had, indeed, also experienced incidents of racialization, my claims of understanding her experiences (at least to a certain degree) appeared to be interpreted as legitimate rather than as patronizing (a possible interpretation had similar claims of understanding been made by a White ESL researcher). I believe Lisa's turning to me as a researcher of color for validation of her struggles showed her desire and need for personal and professional support—support that

she was unable to find among her colleagues. (Lee & Simon-Maeda, 2006, p. 584)

In this example, Lisa, the research participant, used racialization as a source of belonging and validation for her own less-than-positive experiences of racialization (Gonzalez-Sobrinio & Goss, 2019). Lisa sought comfort in knowing that she was not alone in having experienced racialization and counted on Lee's experiences of racialization as validation. I next turn discourse of racialization in discussions of scholarship.

**Discourse of racialization in discussion of curriculum.** In my analysis, I pinpointed that the authors in the *TQSIR* articles discussed the discourse of racialization regarding curriculum in one major way: racialization of language. Specifically, the discourse focused on how the English language was racialized in relation to instruction. Motha (2006) connected this racialization of the English language to the entanglement of the spread of English and the power of white people. Motha expounded on some of the implications of this relationship of whiteness and English:

Racialization is inevitably salient in English language teaching. Because the spread of the English language across the globe was historically connected to the international political power of White people, English and Whiteness are thornily intertwined (Kumaravadivelu, 2003; Pennycook, 2001). However, throughout the year of this study, the dominant discourses surrounding race in the ESOL teachers' contexts supported silences about racial identity, which created a challenge for teachers seeking to craft antiracist pedagogy. (pp. 495-496)

Motha's discussion of racialization in association with whiteness is unique in that she connected racialization to whiteness. Although racialization encompasses all racial categories, it is usually discussed in relation to persons of color, not whiteness. This happens because the dominant

discourse of whiteness is the invisible, unspoken norm (McIntosh, 1990). Motha's text illuminated this connection between the invisibility of whiteness in TESOL context—she called it silences—in relation to racial identity. These silences around the racialization of English as a white language inhibited the teachers crafting antiracist pedagogy.

Additionally, the challenge in crafting antiracist pedagogy in connection with racialization of the English language was further elucidated by Kubota and Lin (2006). Kubota and Lin asserted that “it is vital that our field move beyond its color-blind vision imagining itself to be inherently filled with understanding and sensitivity toward diverse cultures and people” (p. 488). I argue that these color-blind visions of the TESOL field contribute to the dominant discourses that inhibit addressing race and racism through TESOL curriculum.

**Discourse of racialization in discussion of teachers.** The article authors of *TQSIR* used one major expressions of the discourse of racialization specific to teachers: racialized teacher identities. Specific to this discourse of racialization, teachers' racialized identities functioned as indicators of legitimacy as an English teacher. Motha (2006) discussed how the racialization of ESOL teachers' identities is not neutral and that this racialization happens in relation to differential values associated with race.

ESOL teachers' racial identities are not neutral in any interaction they have with students. Several theorists have recently discussed the ways in which race interacts with teaching identity in the lives of TESOL practitioners. For professionals of color, establishing a teaching identity is often complicated by an unspoken assumption that White English teachers are more legitimate than those of color (Amin, 1997; Lin et al., 2004; Ng, 1993; Curtis & Romney, 2006). (Motha, 2006, p. 498)

This hierarchical rating of an TESOL teacher's identity is based on the assumed supremacy, and

as Motha said, legitimacy of white English teachers. With this assumption of white English teachers being seen as more valid, English teachers of color are simultaneously racialized as less authentic. Although the text discussed the identities of the teachers being racialized, we must remember is it the teachers' body that is the basis for these racializations. The implicit assumption is that a teacher in this context is seen as more, or less, valid simply based on the racialization of their body (Appleby, 2016; Bonilla-Silva, 1997).

Later in this same article, Motha discussed the racialization experiences of Katie, the only teacher of color in her study. Motha discussed how Katie experienced her professional capabilities diminished because of her racial and gender identities. Motha quoted Katie's deliberation about being seen and valued as a credible teacher by her white male colleague:

I want to come to an understanding with Mr. Maccesfield [Katie's colleague], but it's hard because I don't know what approach to take. He doesn't see me as a credible teacher, as a credible equal peer. Because ... I'm a woman and I'm a minority ... How am I going to be able to advocate for my students? I'm not Caucasian, I'm not male, and I'm not a mainstream classroom teacher. It's a tough thing to negotiate. I just have to do what I can for my students (Katie, Afternoon Tea, November 1). (p. 506)

Katie's experiences of being othered through the intersection of her gender and racial identities affected how she felt as a professional (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001). Katie's unspoken assumption was that particularly in relation to a Caucasian male teacher, Katie knew her racialization as a minority woman relegated her to positions of lower power. However, she continued seeking a way to position herself as a credible colleague, and do what she needed to for her students. This example of a racialized teacher identity points out the necessity of the person's body as referent, particularly because the colleagues' racialized identities were



interacting with one another through their physical presence within the school. I next turn to discourse of racialization in discussion of students.

**Discourse of racialization in discussion of students.** I found in my analysis that the authors of the *TQSIR* articles used two main discourses of racialization in relation to students: authentic Canadianness, and racialization of language in association with students' race.

*Authentic Canadianness.* Taylor (2006) asked her study participants whom they considered to be authentic Canadian. She found that the immigrant ESL high school students primarily conceptualized real Canadians as persons of color. The immigrant ESL high school students also associated authentic Canadianness with notions of indigeneity, specifically First Nations and Indian peoples of Canada. Taylor explained the noteworthiness of her students explicitly rejecting "the kinds of White identity status imagined by Eurocentric discourses of Canadian identity" (p. 538). In the following excerpt, I quote at length two students' responses to Taylor's query of "Do you feel Canadian? Who is Canadian in your opinion?" (p. 538). Taylor's students, Nadia and Natalia, contemplated:

Nadia: [Pause] Hmm, that is interesting, my point is that Canadian is to be every color...So now, everybody is so different, it's really hard to say who is and is not a Canadian now...I would say once you have your citizen [ship], you are Canadian. But the Indians are the real real Canadian. So maybe we should not apply to government immigration but to ask the Indian people to become a citizen, to say, "Will you accept me"?

Natasha: [Pause] First you have to know what it is, Canadian! For me, Canadian is [pause] I don't really know! [Laughing] [Pause] Probably I do feel, because I just feel at home here, first. Second, I respect this country. And Canadian person is not White

Canadian! I don't think so, so probably that's one of the reasons too I like to feel Canadian! (p. 538)

Taylor discussed these students' responses as thus:

Both born in Russia and comparatively Whitenized in their school, Nadia and Natasha recognize the paradox of claiming membership in a collective identity so broadly defined in ethnoracial, historical, or political terms. They are clear, however, that the Canadian identity they claim is one predicated on recognition of the unique status and rights of First Nations, and one which is explicitly multi-ethnoracial. (p. 538)

As Taylor pointed out, the students' responses challenge the Eurocentric discourses of Canadian identity which is based on whiteness. Even though Taylor explained these Russian students are "comparatively whitenized," I read this as racialized as white in comparison to other students.

With whiteness, comes privileges (Allen, 2006; Haney-Lopez, 2013; Harris, 1993). These two students chose their racialized identity in association with a notion of authentic Canadianness as non-white, associated with First Nations peoples. What would be interesting is how these two students might play out their positionality when others racialized them as white, as even Taylor did by explaining them as being "comparatively whitenized." Could this excerpt give an example of persons racialized as white choosing identities associated with Indigenous/Native American/First Nations Peoples identity as a romantic notion of what accounts for being authentic? Perhaps this excerpt offers a glimpse into the layers of intersectionality of person's identities: would these students' beliefs about their Canadianness be the same if they were not EFL students?

***Racialization of language in association with students' race.*** The second discourse of racialization in relation to students was the racialization of the English language in association

with students' race. The predominant discussion I identified was related to students of color and the category of "World English" (Motha, 2006, p. 508). The TESOL teachers in Motha's 2006 study received a class list at the beginning of the school year. Included in this class list would be students' names, ages, class assignments, countries of origin, and native languages. The county TESOL office administered an informal assessment. Based on the students' results, the county placed students in corresponding TESOL classes. Motha explained:

In both counties, many of the students were listed as speaking "World English" as a first language. In one county, the most frequently spoken languages of students receiving ESOL services were categorized under the umbrella term *World English*. The term *World English* has come to refer to any of the varieties of English that have emerged in postcolonial (Bhatt, 2005) and other international (Llurda, 2004) contexts. Through the lens of this study, I perceived that World English became constructed as marked and devalued, and that furthermore, the factor that relegated a language to World Englishes status was not degree of language variation, but race...World Englishes were constructed as socially illegitimate rather than as "an additional resource for linguistic, sociolinguistic, and literary creativity" (Bhatt, 2005, p. 25). This construction contributes to a devaluing of people of color globally and to assimilationist pressure to coax into Anglicization the varieties of English spoken by people of color. (Motha, 2006, p. 508, emphasis in original)

This excerpt showed how the school categorizing students of color as "World English" (Motha, p. 508) acted as racialization of non-standard varieties of English as English spoken by students of color only. Recalling that racialization is partly a valuing, hierarchical process (Omi & Winant, 2002, 2015), World English speaking students, and their bodies, become marked as

“socially illegitimate” (p. 508) and devalued. Additionally, the students placed in ESOL because they were speakers of so-called World English became marked as deficient even though they spoke English as first languages. An implicit assumption in this excerpt is that standard English is the prestige language, the unmarked white language (Fairclough, 1995). Which leads me to my next discourse, the discourse of whiteness.

### **Discourse of Whiteness**

Intrinsic in the concept of racialization is the organizing element of whiteness (Bonilla-Silva, 2004). The discourse of whiteness I identified the authors of the *TQSIR* articles using positioned whiteness as the most valued, normalizing, invisible element of the racial hierarchy. In the following subsections, I examine how the authors used the discourse of whiteness specific to scholarship, curriculum, teachers, and students.

**Discourse of whiteness in discussion of scholarship.** I identified the *TQSIR* articles’ authors main discourse on whiteness in association with scholarship as asserting that the field of TESOL is a space that works on behalf of white supremacy. The authors critiqued the construction of TESOL as a neutral space conceals whiteness at work. Whiteness works in the services of white supremacy (Allen, 2006). An example is found in Taylor (2006) where she connected the discourses of racialization and other oppressions within the TESOL context to the importance of acknowledging the discourses of whiteness at work. Taylor pointed out the importance of paying attention to white teachers’ bodies as a part of the hidden curriculum.

Taylor explained:

This research [Taylor’s study] urges us to recognize that our practice of TESOL is never neutral but always embedded within racialized and imperialist (as well as gendered, heteronormative, classed, ethnocentric, and nationalist) discourses that our pedagogy

might either perpetuate or challenge. TESOL and ESL are border sites where the cultural, racial, national, and linguistic Other is produced as much as taught (Luke, 2004, p. 25), and where racialized cultural and language difference is reified as much as negotiated (Kubota, 2001). White Anglophone TESOL and ESL teachers need to recognize that our bodies are themselves part of the hidden curriculum, that they reinforce dominant images of English as a White language and of White native speakers as the most qualified teachers (Amin, 2000; Braine, 1999). (p. 540)

Taylor explained the multiple discourses constantly at work within the TESOL context. She stressed that white Anglophone teachers must recognize that they, and their bodies, are part of the hidden curriculum that re/produces dominant images. In Taylor's challenging the reproduction of whiteness, her discourse of whiteness works to call out white supremacy at work. Taylor's challenging this often-perceived neutrality of TESOL works to point out the implicit assumptions that white supremacy is at work constructing race as an invisible factor (Harris, 1993; Fairclough, 1995).

Motha (2006) agreed, asserting that ignoring the racial terrain of TESOL by "portraying the TESOL profession as racially neutral is part of a larger social movement toward a liberal multiculturalist ideology that professes to be antiracist but actually serves to sustain racism (Bonilla Silva, 2003)" (p. 514). The presuppositions in Motha's statement is that whiteness is the norm, which in turn points to white supremacy at work (Haney-Lopez, 2013). TESOL scholars must work to challenge the perceptions that TESOL is racially neutral site that enables discourses of whiteness that construct English as a white language, with white native English speakers constructed as the most qualified. Simply put, we must work to challenge and dismantle these discourses of whiteness within our field. Next, I examine the discourse of whiteness

regarding curriculum.

**Discourse of whiteness in discussion of curriculum.** The central conversation regarding the discourse of whiteness particular to curriculum centered on the need for strategic curricular choices. Specifically, the *TQSIR* authors' discourse on whiteness highlighted that educators must be aware that their curricular choices can either re/produce or challenge social practices, including white supremacy. Taylor (2006) highlighted some of the critical pedagogical approaches teachers can choose to challenge whiteness through TESOL curriculum. Taylor clarified:

We can work to challenge these dominant discourses in many ways: through curriculum choices (Who is represented and how in our teaching materials? Whose knowledge counts in our classrooms?), student-centered classrooms and whole school environments (Whose faces are on the walls? Whose voices give the announcements?); through professional alliances to effect changes in school and educational policy (including prioritizing faculty diversification) (Banks & Banks, 2004; Coelho, 1998; Cummins, 2001). (Taylor, 2006, p. 540)

By following some of Taylor's suggestions, practitioners can unmask and name the dominant discourses at work through TESOL curriculum. By implementing critical or antiracist pedagogy, practitioners can work to avoiding re/producing discourses of whiteness that portray TESOL as a racially neutral space. The unspoken assumption in Taylor's arguments (Fairclough, 2001) is what I argue is really at work is white supremacy working as common sensical notions of standard practice.

Hammond (2006) also discussed the importance of purposeful curricular choices which I assert challenge discourses of whiteness. She asserted that when using racial inequality

simulation exercises, teachers must be mindful of group sizes and composition. Specifically, Hammond explained that to duplicate similar real-life dynamics, instruction must create the simulated dominant/oppressive group intentionally as a smaller in number than the size of the simulated oppressed group. This positioning of the dominant/oppressive group as smaller in number, Taylor argued, reflected many of the racist structures around the world where white people are smaller in number yet exercise dominant power over larger numbers of people of color. Hammond's unspoken assumption in the structure she described is one of white supremacy where whiteness is marked as the norm (Haney-Lopez, 2013).

**Discourse of whiteness in discussion of teachers.** Regarding the discourse of whiteness in relation to teachers, the *TQSIR* authors' discussions I identified centered on white, native English-speaking teachers being positioned a more legitimate than mainstream or native English-speaking teachers of color. Kubota and Lin (2006) contended that even though these constructs had been problematized by some in TESOL, the criticisms focused only on linguistic identities. Kubota and Lin explained the lack of attention to the aspect of inherent whiteness:

Various facets of the native speaker construct—dominance and norm as the linguistic model for students—have been problematized in TESOL in recent years (e.g., Amin, 1997; Braine, 1999; Kamhi-Stein, 2004; Mawhinney & Xu, 1997; Leung, Harris, & Rampton 1997; Lin, Wang, Akamatsu, & Riazi, 2002; Rampton, 1990). Critics have discussed how the myth of the native speaker influences hiring practices and the construction of students' view of the ideal speaker of English. However, as Lee (in press) points out, the discussions on native/nonnative issues have tended to address linguistic aspects only (e.g., accent, standard/nonstandard use of language) without paying sufficient attention to the racialized aspect of native/nonnative speakers. The problem lies

in the tendency to equate the native speaker with White and the nonnative speaker with non-White. These equations certainly explain discrimination against nonnative professionals, many of whom are people of color. Unfortunately, this essentialized dichotomy (i.e., *native speaker = standard English speaker = White* versus *nonnative speaker = nonstandard English speaker = non-White*) has tended to blind us to the discrimination experienced by teachers who do not fit this formula (e.g., Asian or Black native speaker of English, White native speaker with southern U.S. accent). (p. 481, emphasis in original)

Kubota and Lin problematized the concept of native English speakers being assumed to be only a white person. They pinpointed the unspoken assumption of whiteness in the native speaker of English construct. This assumption points to the normalcy of whiteness as an indication of white supremacy at work (Lee, 2005).

Motha (2006) approached the same concept from the lens of teachers' racial identities first, instead of their linguistic identities first as Kubota and Lin discussed. Motha explained:

In a discussion of English language teaching, it would be naive to attend to teachers' racial identities without addressing their linguistic identities. On a superficial level, these two may appear to be distinct, if loosely related, dimensions of difference, but a careful deconstruction of Whiteness helps us to see that they are actually inextricable one from the other. Just as White teachers are assumed to be more legitimate than English teachers of color, teachers who speak mainstream English, with its silent inextricability from Whiteness (Treichler & Bucholtz, 2001), are perceived to be more legitimate than speakers of English that is not mainstream, including English spoken by nonnative English speakers. The identities of English language teachers are multilayered and cannot



be examined without an eye toward race and language. (p. 499)

Both Kubota and Lin, and Motha point to the integral relationship of race and linguistic identity to whiteness. As they discussed, whiteness acted as a value-added factor, where its absence devalued the person's identities. The discourse of whiteness inherent in these examples is unspoken yet very present in categorization of persons' worth. The presupposition in this discourse (Fairclough, 2001) is the structure of white supremacy that structures the racial hierarchy (Bonilla-Silva, 1997).

**Discourse of whiteness in discussion of students.** Similar to the discourse of whiteness in relation to teachers, I identified that the *TQSIR* article authors also discussed whiteness in relation to students' intertwined racial and linguistic identities. However, the discussion specific to students centered on how degrees of whitening directly informed students' linguistic identity and immigrant statuses (Taylor, 2006). Taylor described the students at her study site as "almost half of the students are non-native speakers of English, representing over 160 language groups (Toronto District School Board, 2001)" (p. 524). Nico, one of the students from the over 160 language groups in Taylor's study, described not being seen as an immigrant, unless he identified himself as so. This invisibility of his immigrant background was due to him being "comparatively whitened" in the particular school setting (p. 536). Taylor highlighted Nico's understanding of how his linguistic and racial identities affected his experiences with racism:

Researcher: Why do you think you experienced less discrimination than friends?

Nico: I guess, well, my conversational English was pretty good. And I guess it seems the accent is less of a problem for Serbian speakers than other first languages. So that way people that might have been racist towards non-Canadians or whatever, they couldn't really see that I was an immigrant unless I told them I was. And I guess that's why I didn't

encounter as many racial problems. But, I don't know, I guess other people from ESL that had a thick accent, I think that they could have had a little more of a problem, as far as fitting into the Canadian concepts, and on the other side I guess more racial problems.

Researcher: So do you think the discrimination was because of language or race?

Nico: Hm. Um, both. Because I look like the stereotype of a Canadian, still, even though this is changing. So it was easier for people to accept me speaking English. (p. 535)

Nico's unspoken understanding that the stereotypical Canadian was white helped him to rationalize why he seemed to experience less discrimination than other friends. He also understood that his being able to pass physically as a stereotypical Canadian enabled him to be more accepted as an English speaker, regardless of his slight accent. I argue that this example of Nico's racial and linguistic identities being intertwined exemplifies how whiteness is the power feature. As Nico said, others would not know he was an immigrant unless he would tell him. This tells me that Nico knew his whiteness mattered more than his immigrant status. Although Nico attributed his experiencing less discrimination to both his linguistic and racial identities, I argue that without being seen as a stereotypically white Canadian, he probably would have experienced more discrimination. The implicit assumption in Taylor's (2006) text is that white supremacy structures whiteness as more valuable and the closer to whiteness one is, the more valuable and less marked/normal one is (Haney-Lopez, 2013).

### **Discourse of Sonic and Optic Negation of Racism**

The discourse of sonic and optic negation of racism I identified in the articles of *TQSIR* contained discussion of sonics associated with race and/or optics associated with race. The sonics the authors attributed to race included, but are not limited to, noise, being silenced, or silences. The optics the authors attributed to race included, but are not limited to, muted, shrouded, and

in/visible. And in some instances, authors used both sonic and optical dimensions. In the following sections, I will discuss examples of the discourse of sonic and optic negation of racism in the authors' discussions of scholarship, curriculum, teachers, and students.

**Discourse of sonic and optic negation of racism in discussion of scholarship.** The authors' textual discussions of sonic and optic negation of racism specific to scholarship focused on noise or silences resulting in obscuring, or negating issues of racism. I will discuss two examples, the first regarding white noise silencing women of color and the second colorblindness veiling issues of racism.

The first example of the discourse of sonic negation of racism I identified used by the article authors in the *TQSIR* was "white noise" silencing women of color. Andrea Simon-Maeda, a "white female academic" (Lee & Simon-Maeda, 2006, p. 574) highlighted white noise as something she sought to avoid in her research. Simon-Maeda explained "white noise" specific to racism:

Just as a combination of many different sound frequencies will result in white noise that prevents our hearing any one individual sound in isolation, likewise, an unreflexive assemblage of multiple voices of women of color simply for the sake of diversity without an appreciation of the layered complexities in their lives will result in White noise that drowns out the unique ways these individuals "are produced as subjects in historically and culturally specific ways by the societies in which they live and act as agents"

(Weedon, 1999, p. 192). (p. 577)

Simon-Maeda explained how her reflexivity prevented her from drowning out the contributions of her participants of color. Her astute recognition that unchecked whiteness can result in noise that negates the racism at work belies an unspoken assumption (Fairclough, 1995) of how racism

works to silence contributions of women of color, and in this instance women of color (Hill Collins, 2000). In this instance, had Simon-Maeda not actively taken measures in her design study and implementation, she could have simply reproduced this negation of racism with the distraction of white noise. Instead, she sought to intentionally value and highlight contributions made by women of color.

The second example of optic negation of racism in discussions of scholarship in the articles of the *TQSIR* pointed out the importance of challenging colorblindness and undifferentiated treatment of students. Motha (2006) explained that colorblindness and arguments that students received the same treatment served only to obscure and veil issues of race. Motha clarified:

All who are involved in this nation's schools should have a deliberate awareness of the processes and conditions that support racial discrimination, including the ways in which colorblind and no-differential-treatment arguments obscure issues of power and privilege and consequently perpetuate racial and linguistic hierarchies. An unambiguous highlighting of this distinction can equip those who teach minority children to recognize and name veiled issues of race. (Motha, 2006, p. 514).

The obscuring and veiling of issues of race Motha discussed serve to distract and re/produce racial (Bonilla-Silva, 2003) and linguistic hierarchies. It is through identifying elements of this discourse of optic negation that we can access another avenue to challenge colorblindness.

**Discourse of sonic and optic negation of racism in discussion of curriculum.**

Discussions of the discourse of sonic and optic negation of racism in relation to curriculum similarly pointed to colorblindness (Bonilla-Silva, 2003). However, specific to curriculum, silences served in association with colorblindness to negate racism in language teaching and

learning in the TESOL field. Kubota and Lin (2006) made the following claim:

The idea of race, racialization, and racism are factors that shape social, cultural, and political dimensions of language teaching and learning. English language teaching entails complex relations of power fueled by differences created by racialization. The silence in our field on topics about racialization and racism is peculiar given increased attention to them in other academic fields as well as the tremendous amount of racialized diversity manifested in TESOL. It is vital that our field move beyond its color-blind vision imagining itself to be inherently filled with understanding and sensitivity toward diverse cultures and people. (p. 488)

Kubota and Lin pointed out the oddity of the silences surrounding race, and named one of the contributing factors to these silences: colorblindness. Both sonic and optic negation of racism are at work in this example. I argue that silence and colorblindness function together to re/produce the perception that the field of TESOL is racially neutral. The underlying assumption (Fairclough, 1995) in this example for the sonic negation of racism is that colorblindness works in multiple dimensions, not just in the visual dimension.

**Discourse of sonic and optic negation of racism in discussion of teachers.** I identified the authors discussions of sonic and optic negation of racism in one major way: whiteness as an optic negation of racism. Motha explained that acknowledging veiled whiteness in the construct of mainstream English was integral to understanding teachers' linguistic and racial identities. Motha (2006) wrote, "I consider linguistic identities to be inextricable from racial identities because I believe Whiteness to be an intrinsic but veiled element of the construct of mainstream English" (p. 497). Motha referred to whiteness as being a veiled element of the construct of mainstream English. Even though some consider whiteness to be veiled, it is still present and

must be accounted for, whether or not one discusses standard or mainstream English. If whiteness is left veiled, it works as an optic negation to racism and permits the re/production of racism.

**Discourse of sonic and optic negation of racism in discussion of students.** The *TQSIR* article authors discussed sonic and optic negation racism in relation to students attending TESOL classes. In these ideas, the authors discussed their use of class time to discuss issues of race that tend to be silenced by mainstream classrooms. Lee and Simon-Maeda (2006) cited Kubota and Lin (2002) to make their point about racism being obscured:

Kubota (2002) has argued how "the discriminations and injuries faced by (Asian and Asian American) *students* remain hidden because they try to either walk away from them without confrontation or blend into the mainstream by negating difference in order to survive" (p. 88). She argues that hegemonic discourses of Asianness presume such silences to be a characteristic of Asian shyness and, in turn, serve to obscure issues of race and racism from critical analysis. (p. 587, emphasis mine)

Lee and Simon-Maeda connected how the silences of hegemonic discourses of Asianness worked to obscure, and re/produce issues of racism. I propose, though, if these silences were indeed broken, the obscured issues of race and racism still would be obscured.

### **Discourse of Emotional Labor of Racism**

The discourse of emotional labor of racism I identified in the articles of the *TQSIR* encompassed discussions of the emotional work that a person or persons endured as a result of experiencing racism, either practicing or perpetrating racism, or being the target or victim of racism. This emotional labor included the spectrum of emotions any person can experience. In the following sections, I will discuss examples of the discourse of emotional labor of racism in

these authors' discussions of scholarship, curriculum, teachers, and students.

**Discourse of emotional labor of racism in discussion of scholarship.** The scholarship discussed in the *TQSIR* articles structured the discourse of emotional labor of race in three main ways. The first structuring element was the researchers acknowledging that experiencing racism entails emotions. The second structuring element is that even hesitating to, or avoiding addressing racism in the field TESOL has emotional components as well. The last structuring element is that even though the anguish suffered in the emotional labor of race would justify the field of TESOL addressing racism, the reasons not to address racism seem to outweigh the emotional costs for victims of racism.

**Precautions to be taken.** First, Hammond (2006) discussed research precautions one should take when conducting racial discrimination simulation exercises with students. One of the precautions Hammond considered was that such simulation exercises could evoke unpleasant feelings. To help avoid the potential risk of unpleasant feelings, she discussed the importance of a researcher building rapport with the students, and also offering students choice to opt out to avoid the risk of experiencing adverse feelings. The implications are that unpleasant feelings are a potential risk. Additionally, researchers must account for the emotional work participants might do to handle these feelings. Meanwhile, those who experience real-life acts of racism on a daily basis often do not have the option to opt out of the emotional labor of their experiences. We must include precautions for our students in our curriculum, particularly white students who participate in the oppressed group. The precautions must warn white students that simply because they might have experienced emotional labor in a simulated setting where they were portraying a member of a group of color, this is not necessarily what it might be like for actual persons of color. No matter what a white person may try, do, or say, there is no way that they can

truly and deeply have the same experiences as a person of color. I argue that discourses of racialization and whiteness in societal processes would prevent this.

***Hesitating or avoiding racism.*** Second, hesitating to, or avoiding addressing racism entails emotional labor as well. Lee and Simon-Maeda (2006) explained:

A resistance to recognizing racism in ESL/EFL research not only by those who racialize, but by those who are racialized and, more important, resistance to recognizing the emotional effects of racist actions in our research serves only to perpetuate the continued (re) production of such incidents (pp. 587-588).

Lee and Simon-Maeda discussed here that simply resisting the recognition of the emotional effects of racism outweighs the resistance to recognition of racism in general in ESL/EFL research. Emotional effects equate emotional labor. According to Lee and Simon-Maeda, these forms of resistance to simply recognizing racism in ESL/EFL research only benefits the (re)production of racism. We must work to acknowledge the uncomfortable emotional labor instead of avoiding it. In the simple act of avoiding the discomfort, I argue, discourses of racialization and whiteness thrive.

Additionally, Lee and Simon-Maeda (2006) pointed out the cost of devaluing the emotional labor of race. They argued:

Negotiating a perceived lack of space for emotional engagement in our research around issues of race that, in effect, may downplay the emotional impact and consequences of such racializations and minimize the significance of racist occurrences in our field (p. 587).

Simply put, there is little room for researchers to engage emotionally in research around race in the TESOL field. This detachment serves to minimize the magnitude of how racism plays out



emotionally in TESOL. Without valuing emotional labor of race, TESOL researchers could serve in (re)producing racism. By ignoring one of the dynamics of being human—experiencing emotion—we work in service of decontextualizing racism from the human body referents, which in turn acts as another method of dehumanization through racism.

***Minimized emotional costs for victims of racism.*** Lastly, Kubota and Lin (2006) discussed one of their participant’s emotional suffering related to race. Kubota and Lin asserted that this emotional labor of race warrants deliberate scrutiny in scholarship. However, scrutiny is lacking. Kubota and Lin suggested:

The lack of discussion could be related to the stigma attached to the term race, as...it evokes racism which is often interpreted as overt forms of bigotry, rather than structural or institutional inequalities, and this undertone tends to prevent open dialogue (p. 472).

The value attributed to contending with the human costs of the emotional labor of race is minimized in scholarship. The “stigma attached to the term race” (p. 472) seems to far outweigh the emotional costs. I contend that again emotional labor is the expense paid for (re)producing racism. Of note in this excerpt is that there is no mention of race being a social construct connected to human bodies, specifically human bodies who matter. I assert the humans in these bodies are stigmatized beings. These racially stigmatized human beings pay for the silences around racism through their emotional labor.

**Discourse of emotional labor of racism in discussion of curriculum.** I identified two primary expressions of the discourse of emotional labor of racism specific to curriculum in the *TQSIR*. I will discuss two examples that showcase discussions of students’ emotional labor as part of the curriculum the authors discussed. The first approach used students’ recounting their prior experiences of their emotional labor of racism as a key aspect of the curriculum. The

second expression of emotional labor of racism in curriculum used the students' emotional labor of racism as the heart of the curriculum.

*Students' emotional labor as an element of curriculum.* The first approach to curriculum using students emotional labor of racism was exemplified in an integrative antiracism camp in Toronto, Canada (Taylor, 2006). The curriculum focused on an integrative, what might also be considered an intersectional, analysis on racism. Of note, Taylor interchanged the terms *racism* and *discrimination* throughout her article. In the following excerpt, Taylor explained how the participants' volunteered examples of discrimination (read also racism) enhanced the camp curriculum:

As all and any personal examples of discrimination were sought from participants, the complexity of their lives enriched the camp curriculum. The integrative framework facilitated their analysis of racism intersecting with and inflected by xenophobia, classism, sexism, and other forms of discrimination based on contextually specific markers of first language, nation of birth or immigrant status, gender, and poverty (p. 528).

These participants' emotional labor of racism was captured in the excerpt as "personal examples of discrimination...[where] the complexity of their lives enriched the camp curriculum" (p. 528). Without these participants' emotional labor of racism examples, the camp curriculum would have been less enriched.

I contend that using examples of emotional labor of racism from the participants' lives can be seen from two positions. First, this augmentation of curriculum could be considered more authentic curriculum. The examples of emotional labor of racism are from real-life instances outside of the classroom, from experiences that were not contrived in a classroom simulation

activity. However, I could also argue that this curriculum enhancement is at the expense of the participants' emotion labor of racism. The assumption was that these experiences were not positive, life enhancing; the term was "enhancing the curriculum" but I argue it was the participants' pain that enhanced the curriculum. Either way, without the participants' examples, one wonders what the camp curriculum would rely on instead. Perhaps, the camp curriculum might have followed the second example of emotional labor of racism in curriculum I discuss next.

*Students' emotional labor as the curriculum.* The second instance of curriculum used the students' emotional labor of racism as the nucleus of the curriculum instead of as an enhancement. Hammond (2006) explained part of her simulation exercise curriculum that centered the students' emotional labor of racism:

I informed the students of (a) the aim of the simulation to help them understand what discrimination felt like (I assumed due to the context of the course that they would understand this to be racial discrimination), (b) the structure of exercise in that I would separate them into groups and treat one group less favorably and then switch the groups (the details of the less favorable treatment were not specified in advance of the class). (p. 554)

Hammond created the simulation exercise to evoke feelings of racial discrimination (read as racism). She specifically planned how she would treat students by degrees of favorability, with known and unknown behaviors and degrees of behaviors. Hence, her created curriculum elicited the emotions from the students, specifically the emotional labor of the students, to process the racial discrimination exercise. Hammond wanted the students to "understand what discrimination felt like" (p. 554) so she created the curriculum with the intended results in mind. The students'

emotional labor of racism was the driving force of Hammond's curricular planning and implementation. I assert that as with most curriculum, curriculum does not function without students' labor. However, what percentage of curriculum explicitly centers students' emotional labor of racism might not be as common.

**Discourse of emotional labor of racism in discussion of teachers.** The predominant expression of the discourse of emotional labor of racism in discussion of teachers in the *TQSIR* articles concerned issues of justice, and lack thereof. Specifically, teachers' emotional labor of racism resulted in perceptions of justice or injustice. I will first discuss an example of a teacher perceiving her emotional labor of racism paying off as justice. I will then end this section with discussion of teachers' emotional labor of racism directly connected to perceptions of injustice.

*Emotional labor of racism paying off as justice.* Motha (2006) discussed how Alexandra, a white ESOL teacher, changed her instruction because she felt sorry for her students. Motha explained this emotional labor of feeling sorry and how Alexandra changed her instruction:

Alexandra...recognized that students were receiving mixed messages about the nature of English and sympathized with them: "I feel sorry for these kids [ESOL students] because they're learning three different languages and they all sound like English." Part of her antiracist agenda included challenging the supremacy of standard English. In order to decenter the unjustified authority carried by standard English, she chose not to teach it and focused instead on teaching colloquially used [English] language: "What's most important is speaking with your peers and being part of." (Afternoon tea, June 19th).

(Motha, 2006, p. 512)

Motha interpreted Alexandra's emotional labor of racism—feeling sorry for her students learning

different registers of the English language—as part of Alexandra’s antiracist agenda. Alexandra was feeling sorry for her students simply for learning the English language and how it can vary in context and register. Yet, Alexandra decided to not teach her students standard English. Motha interpreted this as Alexandra working “to decenter the unjustified authority carried by standard English,” (p. 512) which seems to imply that Alexandra was doing so to achieve justice for her students. However, I assert that Alexandra’s actions instead resulted in injustice for her students because they will lack familiarity and experience with standard English. If Alexandra were to teach her students standard English also, the students would in turn have knowledge and power of using standard English to work against the white supremacy of standard English in all registers. If we as teachers seek to empower students and to work towards justice, we should not limit their access to curriculum, but should instead offer the standard curriculum and empower students to critique the power within that curriculum.

*Emotional labor of racism directly connected to perceptions of injustice.* Next, I turn to two discussions of emotion labor of racism specific to teachers. The two examples I will discuss are connected to injustice. First, Lee and Simon-Maeda (2006) examined the emotional labor of racism experienced by an instructor named Lisa. Lee and Simon-Maeda described Lisa as a “an Asian instructor (one of only two visible minority instructors in the program at the time)” (p. 582). The remainder of the instructors in the program were white. The program administrators solicited biographies and photographs from the instructors for a new program marketing brochure. There would be a devoted “Our Instructors” section in the brochure. However, due to space restrictions, the program administrators notified the instructors that not all instructors would be included. Lisa submitted her photograph and biography for potential inclusion in the instructor section. This brochure would also spotlight past students on the front and back covers,

and in a few spots on the inside pages.

However, when the administrators distributed the final copies of the brochures, Lisa's photograph was included as a past student, not current instructor. Lee and Simon-Maeda described Lisa feeling "pretty shitty" (p. 586) because the administrators in her program mistook her for a past student. I quote Lee at length:

When the program brochure arrived from the printer, however, I was puzzled to see Lisa's picture on the back cover among the many faces of past students. What made this error all the more obvious was the fact that within the program booklet, the instructors section highlighted the pictures and short biographies of some of the White instructors.

When I brought up the marketing brochure during our interview, Lisa said she felt "pretty shitty" when she first saw the brochure. She told me that because she estimated that ten thousand copies of the brochure had already been printed, she felt there was nothing she could do about the situation and did not raise the issue with the program administrators. However, in discussing the incident further, it became apparent that the most disappointing aspect of the experience for Lisa was the fact that she felt none of her colleagues realized there was anything wrong with the new brochure in the first place:

Ena: Has anyone else pointed it [your misplaced photo] out to you?

Lisa: My mom. My dad.

Ena: No one else?

Lisa: No. No instructors. No one. *You*. That's about it. I don't think other instructors—see, that's my point. I don't think other instructors *care*. (pp. 586-587, emphasis in original)

Lisa's emotional labor of racism originated in three experiences. The initial misplacement of her photo by the administration creating the brochure relegated Lisa to inclusion in the group of

former students. One wonders how this misplacement happened, more especially since her photo included a biography about her being an instructor in the program. I wonder if the other instructor of color was also relegated to the former student section, leaving only white instructors to represent all instructors in the “Our Instructors” section.

The next aspect of Lisa’s emotional labor of racism was that she felt as though there was nothing to be done about her being misplaced in the former student section of the brochure. Lisa “estimated that ten thousand copies of the brochure had already been printed” (Lee & Simon-Maeda. p. 586). It seems that Lisa felt helpless and decided to not raise the concern with her program administrators, those who presumably misplaced her photo in the first place. We could also wonder if the administrators selected the white instructors to sell the program as being taught by, as discussed previously, perceptions of a more legitimate English teacher.

The third aspect of Lisa’s emotional labor of racism is that other than herself, the only other persons who noticed her misplaced as a past student in the marketing brochure were her parents and the researcher interviewing her. She interpreted this lack of noticing as the other instructors, her fellow colleagues, not caring. I assert that Lisa’s emotional labor was definitely connected to notions of injustice. In these examples, the injustice was rooted in being mistaken as a past student, no one in her program noticing the error and working to correct it, or even discussing it with her. As a “visible minority teacher,” one must question how visible she really was to her program.

The last example of emotion labor of racism specific to teachers came from Kubota and Lin (2006). Angel Lin, one of the articles authors, described being passed over for a promotion at the expense of a less qualified Caucasian native English speaker. Lin explained the root of her agony:

Several years ago when I was teaching at my former university in my native city of Hong Kong, I was the deputy leader of our undergraduate TESL program. One day, my program leader, who is Chinese, told me that he would like to appoint my colleague (a Caucasian, native English who did not have a doctoral degree, as I did) as the deputy program to boost the public profile of our program in the local communities. I protested via e-mail to him, saying that what he proposed would reproduce the society's denigration of local, non-Caucasian English teaching staff. He replied that he wouldn't enter into such an unfruitful argument with me and that all he cared about was the good of the program. I held nothing personal against my Caucasian colleague or program leader, and they both remain good friends of mine. However, I agonized that all my years of training and research to develop expertise in language education had only earned me a second-class status in my profession. The belief held by my program leader was well-intentioned, but he had let the perceived superiority of White native speakers exercise its power, and he was unaware (or refused to be aware) of the injustice done to me through reproducing this ideology” (Kubota & Lin, 2006, p. 471).

Nowhere in Kubota and Lin (2006) do the authors specifically racially identify Angel Lin. We, as the readers, are left to presume that she is perhaps Asian based on this text, “I was teaching at my former university in my native city of Hong Kong” (p. 471), but definitely non-Caucasian as explained in the block quote above. Lin’s emotional labor of dealing with being passed over for a less-qualified Caucasian woman caused her agony and feelings of injustice. In the instance, the injustice was enacted by the white supremacy racializing her as less-than, or in her words, of a “second-class status.” I assert that the dehumanization of Lin through her emotional labor of the racism she suffered was seen as justified by the program manager, all to boost the public profile



of the program. In my opinion, injustice through the human emotional labor cost Lin experienced indeed.

**Discourse of emotional labor of racism in discussion of students.** The prominent emotional labor of racism in association with students focused on white surprise in the *TQSIR* articles. In other words, the emotional labor of white students regarding racism expressed surprise at the racism experienced by students of color. However, the surprise expressed was not being surprised about racism happening to people. In the following excerpt, Taylor discussed Nico's surprise at the *severity* of the discrimination/racism<sup>4</sup> experienced by some of his campmates. Taylor retold Nico explaining:

Researcher: Do you remember things that surprised you at camp?

Nico: Well, [*pause*] kind of surprised ... yeah, I think I was surprised a couple of times at the *severity* of the discrimination. But I knew it happens sometimes ... I mean, it didn't happen to *me* exactly. Because I think the neighborhood of the school is pretty good. But I'd heard stories from friends of mine in other places or on the media ... lots of examples of, um, of how different uh nationalities or cultures would be, treated. (p. 535, emphasis in original)

Of particular interest here is that Nico at first minimized his surprise by saying "kind of surprised" but then clarified that his surprise regarded the severity of discrimination/racism. But only two times so this might be his clarification to match with him saying that he was "kinda surprised." I argue that in his quote, he was trying to reconcile how people could experience such severe instances. He is comparing what he heard from his campmates and the media to his

---

<sup>4</sup> Taylor (2006) used *racism* and *discrimination* interchangeably

not having experienced anything similar because the school was in a “good” neighborhood. “Good neighborhood” is often a code for a white neighborhood and that these types of things (racism) do not happen in neighborhoods like this (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002). What Nico’s discourse of emotional labor of racism betrayed was that he had not experienced similar occurrences because he lived in a good neighborhood—read “white neighborhood—and as I previously discussed in the discourse of whiteness section, Nico was racialized as white. However, what he also shared was a seeming willingness to acknowledge that racism, severe at that, does happen even though he had not experienced as his campmates or others on media or in other, non-white neighborhoods had. Basically, Nico’s emotional labor of racism of surprise revealed more about his experiences with racism and his own racialization than others.

## Chapter Five

### Discussion

The purpose of this study was to analyze what discourses authors used to deploy race in one aspect of the field of TESOL. The questions that guided this analysis were:

1. What discourses did the authors use to deploy race in the articles in the 2006 *TESOL Quarterly* Special Issue on Race (*TQSIR*)?
2. How do these discourses work to either conform to, or resist white supremacist ideology?

As I discussed in chapter three, I used CRT for my theoretical framework, and DRA (Fariclough, 2009) for my methodology. In this chapter, I will first summarize my findings of the discourse analysis of the texts of the 2006 *TQSIR*. This summary of my findings will answer my first research question. Subsequently, I will discuss these findings to answer my second research question. Following this, I will discuss the limitations of this study. Subsequently, I will consider implications and recommendations for future research. I will end with a conclusion.

### Summary of the Findings

As I discussed in chapter three, the second stage of DRA includes textual analysis. The specific textual analysis I used was an analysis of discourses the authors used to deploy race in the 2006 *TQSIR* articles. The findings I report in this section are the results of this analysis.

I identified four major discourses that the authors used to deploy race in the articles of the *TQSIR*: a) racialization; b) whiteness; c) sonic and optic negation of racism; and d) emotional labor of racism. Within each discourse, I analyzed how the particular discourse articulated within the domains of scholarship, curriculum, teachers, and students. In the following sections, I summarize these findings by discourse.

**Discourse of racialization.** The first discourse the *TQSIR* authors used to deploy race was a discourse of racialization. This discourse of racialization contained discussions of categorization of people, languages, and/or identities by racial categories. The authors' discussions of racialization constructed a hierarchical valuing of racial categories, with the highest value assigned to whiteness.

Specific to scholarship, I pinpointed four expressions of the discourse of racialization: a) defining racialization in association with racism; b) racialized identities; c) racialization of language; and d) experiencing racialization. Regarding curriculum, the main articulation of racialization was racialization of language. The dominant expression of racialization specific to teachers was racialized teacher identities. Lastly, in discussions of students, the two articulations of the discourse of racialization were authentic Canadianness, and racialization of language in association with student race.

**Discourse of whiteness.** The second discourse the *TQSIR* authors used to deploy race was a discourse of whiteness. Inherent in the concept of racialization is the organizing element of whiteness. The authors of the *TQSIR* articles discussed in their work that whiteness was the most valued, normalizing, invisible element of the racial hierarchy.

The main discourse on whiteness specific to scholarship expressed that TESOL is not a racially neutral space, implicating that the perceptions of TESOL being a neutral space equating that neutrality of space being a white space. The central conversation regarding the discourse of whiteness in discussions of curriculum centered on strategic curricular choices to be made, specifically critical pedagogy and antiracism pedagogy to counter whiteness. Regarding whiteness in relation to teachers, the main expression of whiteness centered on white, native English-speaking teachers being positioned as more legitimate than mainstream English-

speaking teachers of color. In discussions of whiteness in relation to students, the authors discussed how the degrees of whitening of students, by their peers or by educators, added value to, or erased, the students' linguistic and/or immigrant status.

**Discourse of sonic and optic negation of racism.** I identified the discourse of sonic and optic negation of racism in the *TQSIR* articles contained discussion of sounds and/or visuals associated with race. Some of the sonics the authors attributed to race included noise, being silenced, or silences. Some of the optics the authors attributed to race included actions to visually mute people of color, shroud them, or render them in/visible. In some instances, authors used both sonic and optic dimensions.

Specific to discussion of scholarship, the authors' textual discussions of sonic and optic negation of racism focused on noise or silences resulting in obscuring issues of race. The discourse of sonic and optic negation of racism in relation to curriculum pointed to colorblindness in association with silences around race in the TESOL field. Regarding teachers, discussions of sonic and optic negation of racism centered on teachers' linguistic and racial identities. The discussions regarding students focused on how the silences of hegemonic discourses of Asianness worked to obscure issues of racism.

**Discourse of emotional labor of racism.** The discourse of emotional labor of racism I identified in the *TQSIR* encompassed the emotional work of racism. Specifically, this emotional labor included any emotional work that a person or persons endured as a result of experiencing racism. Also included in this discourse were the emotional labor of either practicing or perpetrating racism, or being the target or victim of racism.

The scholarship discussed in these articles structured the discourse of emotional labor of racism in three main ways: researchers acknowledged that experiencing racism entails emotions;

even hesitating to, or avoiding addressing racism in the field of TESOL has emotional components; and even though the anguish suffered in the emotional labor of race would justify the field of TESOL addressing racism, the reasons not to address racism seem to outweigh the emotional costs for victims of racism. I identified two primary expressions of the discourse of emotional labor of racism specific to curriculum: a) the use of students' emotional labor as the foundation of the curriculum; and b) the use of students' emotional labor of racism as the nucleus of the curriculum. The predominant articulation of the discourse of emotional labor of racism in discussion of teachers concerned issues of justice, and lack thereof. The predominant emotional labor of racism in association with students was white surprise at the severity of racism faced by students of color.

### **Discussion of the Findings**

In this section, I will discuss the findings of my research. I identified four discourses that the authors used to deploy race in the articles of the 2006 *TQSIR*. These four discourses I identified, as I summarized above, are a) racialization; b) whiteness; c) sonic and optic negation of racism; and d) emotional labor of racism. At the heart of the DRA methodology is examining the dialectical relational aspects of these discourses (Fairclough, 2009). The dialectical relational aspect of interest to my research is addressed in my second research question: how do these discourses work to either conform to, or resist white supremacist ideology?

As I discussed in chapter one, I operationalized white supremacy as a hierarchical structure of racism that privileges those racialized as white. In this structure, whites are positioned to receive the most privileges and benefits in society, often at the expense of persons of color (Allen, 2006; Dixson & Rousseau, 2006; Marx, 2008). As I also discussed in chapter one, white supremacist ideology specific to this research includes the ideas or beliefs that work

to uphold the power of white supremacy (Allen, 2006; Gillborn, 2006). Of the four discourses the authors used to deploy race within the articles of the 2006 *TQSIR*, I identified 21 examples of how these four discourses work to resist white supremacist ideology. I identified only five examples of these discourses conforming to white supremacist ideology. Following, I will examine each discourse and how it works to conform to, or resist, white supremacist ideology.

**Discourse of racialization.** The discourse of racialization the authors deployed in the texts of the 2006 *TQSIR* conforms to white supremacist ideology in two instances. However, in seven instances, the discourse of racialization resists white supremacist ideology. In the following sections, I will discuss these conformities and resistances in relation to scholarship, curriculum, teachers, and students.

**Scholarship.** Regarding the discourse of racialization specific to scholarship, I will discuss five ways this discourse worked to conform to, or to resists white supremacist ideology. First, racialization based on racism (Kubota & Lin, 2006) conforms to white supremacist ideology because the authors' discussions of racialization fail to consider that white supremacy is inherent in the racialization process. White supremacist ideology works to structure the racial hierarchy (Allen, 2006). Bonilla-Silva (1997) argued that racialization positions different races in positions of subordination and superordination, with whites in the highest position of superordination.

Second, the discussion of racialized identities indirectly resists white supremacist ideology as exposing racialized identities points to TESOL as a racially non-neutral space. This challenging of the status quo conceptualization of TESOL as a racially neutral space indirectly recognizes the invisibility of whiteness in the space (Motha, 2006). CRT's assertion that racism exists as a normal, structural, determining aspect of society (Allen, 2006; Delgado & Stefancic,

2001; Gillborn, 2006; Ladson-Billings, 1999; Marx, 2008) refutes the idea that TESOL could ever be a racially neutral space. The racialization of identities works at the micro level to shape meanings of race and racism (Omi & Winant, 2015). The authors of the 2006 *TQSIR* articles discussion of the scholarship regarding racialization of identities refuting the idea of a racially neutral TESOL context resists white supremacist ideology because it recognizes racism as a normalizing aspect within TESOL.

Third, critiques of racialized power relations that create linguistic hierarchies including notions of resilient identities of impure linguistic otherness (Taylor, 2006) resists white supremacist ideology. I assert this element of the discourse of racialization challenges white supremacist ideology because the discussion provides an entry point for exploration of the racialized power relations that serve as the organizational element of the hierarchy (Bonilla-Silva, 1997; Fairclough, 2003). Specific in this instance, the entry point for exploration of the racialized power relations provides scholars an opportunity to examine the racialized linguistic hierarchy.

Fourth, the analysis of racialization of language (Motha, 2006) works to resist white supremacist ideology. The text described ways in which the English language is used to either uphold prestige for white speakers or devalue people of color speaking “nonstandard” English. I argue the authors’ discussion helped lay bare the machinations of the institutionalized linguistic racism that upholds white supremacy (Liggett, 2014).

Fifth and last, the analysis of experiencing racialization (Lee & Simon-Maeda, 2006) did not directly challenge white supremacist ideology. However, it holds potential if the persons experiencing racialization were to use those experiences to build alliances and work toward dismantling white supremacy. Without any action beyond finding belonging with fellow-



racialized-mates, white supremacist ideology is untouched. If, however the researcher and research participant storytelling worked to counter majoritarian, white supremacist stories, their stories would indeed work to resist white supremacist ideology (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Dixson & Rousseau, 2006; Ladson-Billings, 1998; Marx, 2008).

**Curriculum.** Specific to curriculum, the discourse of racialization expressed resistance to white supremacist ideology. The author connected her discussion of racialization of the English language in direct connection to whiteness (Motha, 2006). This express connection of whiteness and racialization pointed out white supremacist ideology in the racialization of English (Liggett, 2014). As race permeates all aspects of life (Bell, 1992), I argue that language systems are also permeated by race and racism, and reflect the racial hierarchy, as shown in Motha's discussion.

**Teachers.** Regarding the discourse of racialization specific to teachers (Motha, 2006), the discourse worked to resist white supremacist ideology. I argue that the authors disputing the neutrality of teachers' racialized identities focused on challenging the supremacy of white English teachers. This supremacy of white English teachers happened at the deficit categorization of teachers of color teaching English. I argue that this analysis keenly exemplifies structuration of the racial hierarchy (Bonilla-Silva, 2004) and as a result, directly works to resist white supremacist ideology.

**Students.** The discourse of racialization specific to students both conformed to and resisted white supremacist ideology. The conformation to white supremacist ideology came through the analysis of students' discussion of authentic Canadianness (Taylor, 2006). The author missed the opportunity to critique the comparatively whitened students' (Taylor, 2006) identifying authentic Canadianness in association with people of color. Some could see this as a counter to Eurocentric notions of Canadianness which defines, as Taylor (2006) discussed,

Canadianness as a “white identity.” However, I argue that the Taylor failed to critique the opportunism in the students’ avoidance of claiming whiteness and instead associating themselves with people of color, specifically First Nations Peoples (Deloria, 1998). There is a long history of white, or whitened people as in this instance, associating themselves and/or their heritage with a romantic notion of Indigenous heritage (Deloria, 1998).

The resistance to white supremacist ideology came in the analysis of classification of students of color as World English students (Motha, 2006). The critique of this racialization works to resist white supremacist ideology because it challenged the institutionalized racism of placement of students of color in World English. Motha’s analysis highlights Omi and Winant’s (1994) assertion that racial meanings permeate U.S. society on macro and micro levels.

**Discourse of whiteness.** The discourse of whiteness the authors deployed in the texts of the 2006 *TQSIR* conforms to white supremacist ideology in zero instances. However, in four instances, the discourse of whiteness resists white supremacist ideology. Following, I discuss these conformities and resistances in relation to scholarship, curriculum, teachers, and students.

**Scholarship.** The authors’ discourse of whiteness specific to scholarship resisted white supremacist ideology. Their discussion of scholarship challenged the perceptions of TESOL as racially neutral (Motha, 2006; Taylor, 2006). Their analysis pointed out that the movement in TESOL towards a liberal multiculturalist ideology re/produces discourses of whiteness that uphold white supremacist ideology. This analysis illustrates CRT’s penchant for critiquing and challenging liberal claims of neutrality that uphold white supremacist ideology (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 2006).

**Curriculum.** Whiteness discourse particular to curriculum specifically works to resist white supremacist ideology. The discussions centered on how strategic curricular choices could

be made to highlight and challenge dominant discourses, including whiteness and white supremacy (Hammond, 2006; Taylor, 2006). The curricular choices included critical pedagogy and antiracism with specific focus on exposing power structures, who/what benefits, and why (Zembylas, 2018). These strategic curricular choices demonstrate a CRT move towards eliminating racial oppression (Dixson & Rousseau, 2006; Marx, 2008).

**Teachers.** The authors' discourse on whiteness regarding teachers works to resist white supremacist ideology. The authors critiqued the notion that the native speaker/nonnative speaker concept within TESOL neglected consideration for race (Kubota & Lin, 2006; Motha, 2006). The authors' critiques included pointing out the inherent whiteness in the category of native speakers and that persons of color are by default placed in the category of nonnative speakers. I argue that this analysis directly resisted white supremacist ideology because it examined the processes involved in creating value added in the supremacy of the white speaker (Curtis & Romney, 2006b; Liggett, 2014).

**Students.** The discourse of whiteness specific to students works to resist white supremacist ideology. The authors' analysis challenged how degrees of whitening worked to add value to, or erase, students' linguistic and immigrant statuses (Taylor, 2006). I argue Taylor's analysis demonstrates how racial meanings are constructed in relation to linguistic and immigrant status at the micro level (Omi & Winant, 2015).

**Discourse of sonic and optic negation of racism.** The discourse of sonic and optic negation of racism the authors deployed in the texts of the 2006 *TQSIR* conforms to white supremacist ideology in one instance. However, in four instances, the discourse of sonic and optic racism resists white supremacist ideology. In the sections that follow, I will discuss these conformities and resistances in relation to scholarship, curriculum, teachers, and students.

**Scholarship.** The authors' discourse of sonic and optic negation of racism worked to resist white supremacist ideology in two ways. The first was through exposing how white noise can work to silence the contributions of women of color (Lee & Simon-Maeda, 2006). This is a resistance to white supremacy because the author explained how she, as a white woman researcher, worked on critical reflexivity to prevent simply using experiences of women of color to prop up her own whiteness. I argue that Lee and Simon-Maeda's working to prevent silencing women of color is an example of CRT's approach to eliminating racism and all forms of oppression (Marx, 2008).

The second way the discourse of whiteness specific to scholarship worked to resist white supremacist ideology concerned unveiling issues of race by challenging colorblindness (Motha, 2006). Colorblindness works in the service of the racial status quo, which I argue is white supremacy. I argue that this example of this discourse of sonic and optic negation challenges white supremacist ideology by challenging how colorblindness veils issues of racism (Delgado & Stefancic, 2013).

**Curriculum.** Regarding curriculum, the discourse of sonic and optic negation of racism loosely works to conform to white supremacist ideology. Authors highlighted the strangeness of the silences around race and the colorblindness in the field of TESOL (Kubota & Lin, 2006). However, I argue that their call for TESOL "imagining itself to be inherently filled with understanding and sensitivity toward diverse cultures and people" (Kubota and Lin, 2006, p. 488) can be problematic as many in TESOL could say they already do this. I argue that one can have understanding and sensitivity toward diverse cultures and people and still promulgate white supremacist ideology (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Gillborn, 2006; Ladson-Billings, 1999; Marx, 2008).

**Teachers.** Specific to teachers, the discourse of sonic and optic negation of racism works to resist white supremacist ideology. The resistance is exemplified in the authors acknowledging whiteness as an optic negation of racism through veiled whiteness in the construct of standard/mainstream English (Motha, 2006). I assert this analysis resists white supremacist ideology because the authors only recognized how whiteness veils race in the construct of mainstream/standard English. Motha's analysis supports a CRT approach to challenging whiteness (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001)

**Students.** The discourse of sonic and optic negation of racism regarding students works to resist white supremacy. The authors' examination of how hegemonic discourses of Asianness act as both sonic and optic negations of racism that prevent critical analysis (Lee & Simon-Maeda, 2006). Their naming of this process works to resist white supremacist ideology because it challenges the hegemonic discourses of Asianness (Quach, et al., 2009).

**Discourse of emotional labor of racism.** The discourse of emotional labor of racism the authors deployed in the texts of the 2006 *TQSIR* conforms to white supremacist ideology in three instances. However, in five instances, the discourse of emotional labor of racism resists white supremacist ideology. Following, I discuss these conformities and resistances in relation to scholarship, curriculum, teachers, and students.

**Scholarship.** The discourse of emotional labor of racism regarding scholarship both conforms to and resists white supremacist ideology in three ways. An example that both conforms to, and resists white supremacist ideology is TESOL researchers acknowledging that racism involves emotion so precautions must be taken when using racial simulation exercises (Hammond, 2006; Zembylas, 2018). If not carefully planned, the emotional components can cause extreme and adverse emotions that re/produce white supremacy (Hammond, 2006;

Zembylas, 2018). However, if the exercises were planned carefully, the authors discussed that participants could gain a better understanding of racism from their emotional labor and use this knowledge to address racism (Hammond, 2006; Zembylas, 2018).

Second, another instance of conforming to white supremacy comes in the authors proclaiming the importance of addressing racism regardless of emotions entailed but provided no further discussion or critique on how addressing racism would work to challenge white supremacy (Lee & Simon-Maeda, 2006). While it is a valiant attempt to address racism regardless of emotions involved, the authors did not detail any approach, or any variance by race. I assert that without careful consideration of how to not let emotional reactions derail antiracism work, the best planning can easily be derailed by some emotional reactions and cause further harm (Liu et al., 2019; Zembylas, 2018).

Lastly, the authors' discussions of the minimization of the emotional costs to victims of racism in TESOL field works to resist white supremacist ideology. The authors critiqued the avoidance of addressing race in the TESOL field even though the emotional costs of experiencing racism definitely warrants attention (Kubota & Lin, 2006). The authors pointed out that the focus on the stigma associated with the word *race* served as a distraction from the structural or institutional racial inequities within TESOL. The authors including a critique of the structural and/or institutional racial inequities serves as an opening to challenge white supremacist ideology (Fairclough, 2003; Smedley & Smedley, 2011; Solórzano & Yosso, 2002).

**Curriculum.** Regarding curriculum, the discourse of emotional labor of racism works to resist white supremacist ideology. The TESOL curriculum discussed in the texts that either used students' emotional labor as an element (Taylor, 2006), or as the foundation of curriculum (Hammond, 2006), worked to expose the workings of white supremacy (Zembylas, 2018).

Working to expose the working of white supremacy in turn works to resist white supremacist ideology (Dixson & Rousseau, 2006).

**Teachers.** The discourse of emotional labor of racism regarding teachers provided examples that both conform to, and resist, white supremacist ideology. One of the discussions regarding a teacher's emotional labor of racism paying off as justice conforms to white supremacist ideology is exemplified in the work of Motha (2006). This white teacher felt sorry for her TESOL students so she strategically chose to not teach standard English and instead stressed different varieties and registers of English. This white teacher categorized her choices as providing justice for her students. Had she also taught standard English and discussed racialized power associated with different varieties and registers, this would definitely resist white supremacist ideology.

However, this teacher's shorting her students of formal standard English instruction under the guise of justice smacks of white saviorism (Jenks, 2017). Jenks argued that white saviorism acts as a projection of white normativity. This white normativity, he argued, works to maintain the power imbalances in racial and linguistic hierarchies. I argue that this white saviorism working to maintain racial and linguistic hierarchies works to maintain white supremacy (Liu et al., 2019).

The second example resists white supremacist ideology. The authors discussed how different teachers' emotional labor of racism resulted in perceptions of injustice (Lee & Simon-Maeda, 2006). The authors analyzed white supremacy as the catalysts for the teachers' emotional labor of racism experienced (Liu et al., 2019).

**Students.** Specific to students, the discourse of emotional labor of racism resists white supremacist ideology. Taylor (2006) connected her discussion of a white student's surprise at the

severity of racism experienced by classmates of color to how others experience racism even though he had not in similar ways. This discussion of the different ways and levels of severity of racism experienced by differently racialized persons works to challenge white supremacist ideology because the author connected it to the workings of white supremacy, thus exposing the structuring factors (Gillborn, 2006; Liu et al., 2019).

### **Limitations**

This study was a qualitative DRA that relied on five articles in the 2006 *TQSIR*. A limitation of this study is that it only included five *TESOL Quarterly* articles from one special issue on race. This special issue on race was published in 2006. However, in the 50 issues of *TESOL Quarterly* since this 2006 *TQSIR*, only *thirteen* items published included significant discussion of race, racism, and/or racialization. The first *TQ* article to address race after the 2006 *TQSIR* was in the fall of 2009 (Holliday & Aboshiha, 2009). The remaining twelve texts were published 2013 and later. All thirteen items included:

- eight articles (Aneja, 2016; Chun, 2016; Kasun & Saavedra, 2016; Ruecker & Ives, 2015; Giroir, 2014; Motha & Lin, 2014; Pessoa & Freitas, 2012; Holiday & Aboshiha, 2009);
- one invited teaching issue (Brooks, 2018);
- two research issues (Appleby, 2013; Appleby, 2016); and
- one review (Ruecker, 2017), and one teaching issue (Guerrettaz & Zahler, 2017).

I argue that even though several of the 2006 *TQSIR* articles I analyzed called for more research on race within TESOL, the relatively small number of thirteen *TQ* texts in over 50 issues seem to indicate there is still a need for more research on race in TESOL to be published in *TQ*.

Additionally, my research did not focus on other systems of oppressions, e.g., sexism,



heteronormativity, classism, ageism, or ableism. Also, I did neither an in-depth examination of the concept of white supremacy, nor an in-depth examination of white supremacist ideology.

Lastly, this study is not generalizable as I analyzed a small number of texts.

### **Implications**

Three implications arise from my work. The first is that the field of TESOL is not racially neutral. The second implication I discuss concerns my positionality: as a white woman, as a novice researcher, and as a teacher educator. The last implication I will discuss are theories and methodologies implied by my analysis.

**Field of TESOL not racially neutral.** A major implication of this research is that the field of TESOL is not racially neutral in any aspect. Although one could rightly say this is an implication in some of the *TQSIR* articles I analyzed, I argue that my research also brings this implication. As I previously discussed, this *TQSIR* is the only special issue on race that *TQ* has published in its entire history (“Special-Topic Issues of TESOL Quarterly,” 2019). As I identified in my analysis, some of these discourses worked to conform to white supremacy while others did not. I argue that we must account for, and work to challenge white supremacist ideology through critically understanding the machinations of race and racism in all aspects of TESOL. In the following sections, I will discuss how this implication of racial non-neutrality pertains to scholarship, curriculum, and teachers.

**Scholarship.** The implication of racial non-neutrality of the field of TESOL specific to scholarship involves the necessity of research into how race and racism permeate all aspects of TESOL. We must not be content to the rationalizations of race and racism as something else, or as Canagarajah (2006) explained, the finessing of “race and address[ing] it under other categories, such as native versus nonnative speaker” (p. 469). I argue that settling for finessing

race under other categories diverts attention from the real issue of race and racism, and consequently leaves race and racism unaddressed. This diversion of attention in turn works as cover, so to speak, for white supremacist ideology to be re/produced. I also argue that diverting attention away from critically addressing race and racism also provides space for further dehumanization through what I identified in this study as the emotional labor of racism. Specifically, as I identified in the texts that the reasons to not address racism outweigh the anguish suffered by scholars of color in the emotional labor of racism implicates the urgent call to address race and racism in TESOL.

**Curriculum.** The implication of racial non-neutrality of the field of TESOL specific to curriculum points to the need for strategic, critical curricular planning. Just as the field of TESOL is not racially neutral, neither is TESOL curriculum. Based on my findings in this study, we must consider how the curriculum contributes or challenges: racialization of language; silences around race; and colorblindness. Additionally, I argue that care must be taken when using students' emotional labor of racism either as an addition to, or as the curriculum. The implications of uncritically using students' emotional labor could act as a tool of reproduction of racism.

**Teachers.** The implication of racial non-neutrality of the field of TESOL specific to teachers pertains to the integral importance of teachers' racialized identities, their bodies, and their perceptions of in/justice. Teachers' racialized identities and bodies are implicated in the curriculum and power dynamics in TESOL instruction. If a teacher has not interrogated their own racialized identities or how their body is part of the curriculum, they can be implicated in reproducing the racial status quo. Also, teachers must critically examine how their notions of in/justice might skew their intentions in instruction. Specifically, I argue that teachers must

consider the consequences of their social justice curriculum because in the end, this curriculum might incur other injustices for the students.

**Implications for my positionality.** In this section, I will discuss the implications regarding my positionality. First, I will discuss the implications of a white teacher addressing race and racism in the field of TESOL. Second, I will address the implication of a novice researcher addressing race and racism in the field of TESOL. Third and last, I will discuss the implications of a teacher educator addressing race and racism in the field of TESOL.

*White woman teacher addressing race and racism in field of TESOL.* As a white woman, it is essential that I continue my personal critical education and growth regarding race and racism. As I discussed in the introduction, I have and continue to encounter situations in my work as a teacher where I face issues of racism at work, be it with colleagues, students, and/or families. My research findings also reflect that racism happens relationally, never in isolation. It is important for me to know that for me to work towards CRT's goal of eliminating racial oppression and all forms of oppression (Bell, 1992; Dixson & Rousseau, 2006; Marx, 2008). In doing so, I must always acknowledge that as a white woman, I am racialized and positioned in whiteness with advantages and privileges I did not necessarily earn, but have simply because I am a white woman (Hill-Collins, 2000). I must purposefully work in concert with people of color and persons with diverse language backgrounds towards dismantling this racial system of unearned privilege and position, particularly in regards to TESOL education. I must be aware how my native English speaker status can be used as an unearned privilege as well as a tool of oppression against persons who are racialized as non-native English speakers. It is essential for me to use my knowledge of racism specific to TESOL to keep students' humanization as the ultimate goal without sacrificing their TESOL education because of racism. A last implication is

that I must account for the dialectical relations in racialization. Specifically, racialization does not happen in isolation, it happens in relationship. My students, colleagues, and students' families see me as a white native English-speaking teacher and with that comes assumptions of who and how I might be in the world. Likewise, I have perceptions about other human beings and must hold these to account as well.

***White woman novice researcher addressing race in the field of TESOL.*** An implication from my research is that as a white woman novice researcher addressing race in the field of TESOL is to know that no perfect solution/s to researching racism exist/s at this point. As my analysis found, even though the authors were well-intentioned on working against perpetrating racism in the field of TESOL, some of their discourses still worked to conform to white supremacist ideology. It is essential for me to work with others research race and racism in TESOL. As important for me would be to consider how research on race and racism is conducted in other fields and look at feasibility within TESOL.

***White woman teacher-educator addressing race and racism in TESOL.*** As a white woman teacher-educator addressing race and racism in the field of TESOL, my research findings implicate the importance of meeting teacher where they are at regarding understanding race and racism. It is important to gauge a teacher's understanding of race and racism and how they are present in TESOL. Again, my racialized subjectivity will always be present in all the work that I would do and this must be accounted for in my work. Specifically, if I as a white native English-speaking woman were to work with a group of teachers who were all teachers of color who from diverse linguistic backgrounds, my positionality must be critically addressed and accounted for in my work. This can be done through a variety of means, including accounting for phenomena such as "white noise" (Lee & Simon-Maeda, 2006) and through establishing rapport. It is also

essentially important for me to know and demonstrate that the teachers with whom I would be working hold vast amounts of knowledge and experiences that are of importance in the classroom as well.

**Implications for theory and methodology.** A last implication pertains to theory and methodology. An implication regarding theory is that CRT can be a productive theory for use in researching racism in the field of TESOL. An implication of this is that in other settings, one could use CRT to focus on specific experiences of K-12 students. Other forms of CRT could be used as needed, e.g., LatCrit, DisCrit, AsianCrit, FemCrit.

An implication specific to methodology would be the importance of using methodology to expose the workings and consequences of racism and white supremacy. In this study, I used DRA, a particular version of CDA. In other studies, different versions of CDA could be used, as well.

Last, regardless of the theory or methodology used, we all must keep in mind what our ultimate job is. I argue our job should *always* be a primary focus on our students. Specific to studying racism and TESOL, implications from this study show that in all roles, be it teaching, researching, or creating curriculum, we must always keep our students' as the guiding force. No theory or methodology is above critique. Specific to this research, CRT and DRA functioned for the what I needed. On this note, I turn to recommendations for future research.

### **Recommendations for Future Research**

My recommendation specific to curriculum is that more studies on implementation of antiracist pedagogy and critical pedagogy with a focus on race be conducted. I recommend that emotional labor be considered and specific plans be made for antiracists goals to not be derailed by emotional reactions that might work to re/produce white supremacist ideology.

My recommendations specific to teachers are that white TESOL teachers and white standard English speaking TESOL teachers need to examine how their bodies, and standard English-speaking status are used to perpetuate white supremacist ideology.

Additionally, there needs to be more consideration for the emotional labor of racism. Specifically, are there particular groups of people whose emotional labor is continuously exploited? Overlooked? Disregarded? How are racial macroaggressions and microaggressions related to experiences of emotional labor of racism? I recommend that the field of TESOL increase consideration of emotional labor of racism and the toll it takes on different people.

A last suggestion for future research would be for a comparison of this research with a DRA of the thirteen texts specific to race published in the *TQ* since the 2006 *TQSIR* I discussed above.

### **Contributions to the Field**

This research contributes to the field of TESOL research in two major ways. First, this research is the only DRA of any articles in the *TQ*. Second, this research is the only analysis of how the discourses authors used to deploy race in texts in *TQ* either work to resist or conform to white supremacist ideology.

### **Conclusion**

This study's findings illustrate first and foremost that the discourses used by the authors of the 2006 *TQSIR* articles were a) racialization, b) whiteness, c) sonic and optic negation of racism, and d) emotional labor of racism. For the most part, these discourses work to resist white supremacist ideology. The overarching implication of this study is that the field of TESOL is not racially neutral. As this study demonstrates, and as I argued in the implications above, we must work to expose the workings of racism in the field of TESOL.

## References

- Allen, R. L. (2006). The race problem in the critical pedagogy community. In C. A. Rossatto, R. L. Allen, & M. Pruyn (Eds.), *Reinventing critical pedagogy* (pp. 3–20). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Allen, R. L. (2004). Whiteness and critical pedagogy. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 36(2), 121–136.
- Anderson, K. S. (2009). *War or common cause?: A critical ethnography of language education policy, race, and cultural citizenship*. Charlotte, NC: IAP.
- Aneja, G. A. (2016). (Non)native Speakered: Rethinking (Non)nativeness and Teacher Identity in TESOL Teacher Education. *TESOL Quarterly*, 50(3), 572–596.
- Appleby, R. (2013). Desire in Translation: White Masculinity and TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 47(1), 122–147.
- Appleby, R. (2016). Researching Privilege in Language Teacher Identity. *TESOL Quarterly*, 50(3), 755–768.
- Arber, R. (2008). *Race, ethnicity and education in globalized times*. London, England: Springer.
- Austin, T. (2009). Linguicism and race in the United States: Impact on teacher education from past to present. In R. Kubota & A. Lin (Eds.), *Race, culture, and identities in second language education: Exploring critically engaged practice* (pp. 252–270). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Banks, C. A. M. (2005). *Improving multicultural education: Lessons from the intergroup education movement*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Banks, J. A. (1994). *Multiethnic education: Theory and practice*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Barth, F. (1969). *Ethnic groups and boundaries: The social organization of cultural difference*.

- Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company.
- Bell, D. A. (1992). *Faces at the bottom of the well: The permanence of racism*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Bell, D. A., Jr. (1980). Brown v. Board of Education and the interest-convergence dilemma. *Harvard Law Review*, 93(3), 518–533.
- Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse: A critical introduction*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Boas, F. (1940). *Race, language and culture*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. K. (2007). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2004). From bi-racial to tri-racial: Towards a new system of racial stratification in the USA. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 27(6), 931-950.
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2003). *Racism without racists*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (1999). The essential social fact of race. *American Sociological Review* 64(6), 899-906.
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (1997). Rethinking racism: Toward a structural interpretation. *American Sociological Review* 62(3), 465-480.
- Brooks, M. D. (2018). Pushing Past Myths: Designing Instruction for Long-Term English Learners. *TESOL Quarterly*, 52(1), 221–233.
- Canagarajah, S. (2006). Editor's note. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(3), 469.
- Canagarajah, S., Kubota, R., & Lin, A. (Eds.). (2006). TESOL Quarterly [Special issue]. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(3).
- Chouliaraki, L. & Fairclough, N. (1999). *Discourse in late modernity: Rethinking critical*



- discourse analysis*. Edinburgh, Scotland: Edinburgh University Press.
- Chun, C. W. (2016). Addressing Racialized Multicultural Discourses in an EAP Textbook: Working toward a Critical Pedagogies Approach. *TESOL Quarterly*, 50(1), 109–131.
- Coates, R. (2011). *Covert racism theories, institutions, and experiences*. Leiden, Netherlands: BRILL.
- Curtis, A., & Romney, M. (Eds.). (2006a). *Color, race, and English language teaching: Shades of meaning*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Curtis, A., & Romney, M. (Eds.). (2006b). Stories through perceptual frames. In *Color, race, and English language teaching: Shades of meaning* (pp. 37–48). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Darder, A., Baltodano, M., & Torres, R. D. (Eds.). (2003). *The critical pedagogy reader*. New York, NY: RoutledgeFalmer.
- De Valenzuela, J. S., Copeland, S. R., Huaqing Qi, C., & Park, M. (2006). Examining educational equity: Revisiting the disproportionate representation of minority students in special education. *Exceptional Children*, 72(4), 425-441.
- Delgado, R. (2013). Storytelling for Oppositionists and Others: A Plea for Narrative. In R. Delgado & J. Stefancic (Eds.), *Critical Race Theory: The Cutting Edge* (3rd ed., pp. 71–80). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2001). *Critical race theory: An introduction*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2013). *Critical race theory: The cutting edge* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Deloria, P. J. (1998). *Playing Indian*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

- Delpit, L. D. (1995). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York, NY: The New Press.
- Dixson, A. D., & Rousseau, C. K. (2006). And we are still not saved: Critical race theory in education ten years later. In A. D. Dixson & C. K. Rousseau (Eds.), *Critical race theory in education: All God's children got a song* (pp. 31–54). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Eagleton, T. (1991). *Ideology: an introduction*. London and New York: Verso.
- Earick, M. E. (2012). Ideology, Race, and Education. *International Critical Childhood Policy Studies Journal*, 3(1).
- Fairclough, N. (2009). A dialectical-relational approach to critical discourse analysis in social research. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (2nd ed., pp. 162–186). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and power* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. London, England: Longman.
- Fecho, B. (2004). *"Is this English?": Race, language, and culture in the classroom*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Gallagher, S. (1992). *Hermeneutics and education*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Gee, J. P. (2011). Discourse Analysis: What makes it critical? In R. Rogers (Ed.), *An*

- introduction to critical discourse analysis in education* (2nd ed., pp. 23–45). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Gillborn, D. (2006). Critical race theory beyond North America: Toward a Trans-Atlantic dialogue on racism and antiracism in educational theory and praxis. In A. D. Dixson & C. K. Rousseau (Eds.), *Critical race theory in education: All God's children got a song* (pp. 243–268). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Gillborn, D. (1990). *“Race,” ethnicity, and education: Teaching and learning in multi-ethnic schools*. London, England: Unwin Hyman.
- Giroir, S. (2014). Narratives of Participation, Identity, and Positionality: Two Cases of Saudi Learners of English in the United States. *TESOL Quarterly*, 48(1), 34–56.
- Gonzalez-Sobrino, B., & Goss, D. R. (2019). Exploring the mechanisms of racialization beyond the black–white binary. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 42(4), 505–510.
- Grant, R. A., & Lee, I. (2009). The ideal English speaker: A juxtaposition of globalization and language policy in South Korea and racialized language attitudes in the United States. In R. Kubota & A. Lin (Eds.), *Race, culture, and identities in second language education: Exploring critically engaged practice* (pp. 44–63). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Guerrettaz, A. M., & Zahler, T. (2017). Black Lives Matter in TESOL: De-Silencing Race in a Second Language Academic Literacy Course. *TESOL Quarterly*, 51(1), 193–207.
- Gumbert, E. B., Young, L., Safa, H. I., & Raynor, J. M. (1983). *Different people: studies in ethnicity and education*. Atlanta, GA: Center for Cross-cultural Education, College of Education, Georgia State University.
- Hammond, K. (2006). More Than a Game: A Critical Discourse Analysis of a Racial Inequality Exercise in Japan. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(3), 545–571.

- Haney López, I. F. (2013). The social construction of race. In R. Delgado & J. Stefancic (Eds.), *Critical race theory: The cutting edge* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed., pp. 238–248). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Haque, E., & Morgan, B. (2009). Un/Marked pedagogies: A dialogue on race in EFL and ESL settings. In R. Kubota & A. Lin (Eds.), *Race, culture, and identities in second language education: Exploring critically engaged practice* (pp. 271–285). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Harris, C. I. (1993). Whiteness as property. *Harvard Law Review*, *106*(8), 1707–1791.
- Herrera, S., & Morales, A. R. (2009). Colorblind nonaccommodative denial: Implications for teachers' meaning perspectives toward their Mexican-American English learners. In R. Kubota & A. Lin (Eds.), *Race, culture, and identities in second language education: Exploring critically engaged practice* (pp. 197–214). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hill Collins, P. (2000). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hill Collins, P., & Bilge, Sirma (2016). *Intersectionality*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Hitchens, J. (1994). Critical implications of Franz Boas' theory and methodology. *Dialectical Anthropology*, *19*(2/3), 237–253.
- Hoey, M. (2001). *Textual interaction: An introduction to written discourse analysis*. London, England: Routledge.
- Holliday, A., & Aboshiha, P. (2009). The Denial of Ideology in Perceptions of 'Nonnative Speaker' Teachers. *TESOL Quarterly*, *43*(4), 669–689.
- Home | Dedoose. (n.d.). Retrieved March 31, 2019, from <https://www.dedoose.com/>
- ISI Web of Knowledge. (2015a). Journal citation reports: Journal: TESOL Quarterly. Retrieved

from <http://admin->

[apps.webofknowledge.com.libproxy.unm.edu/JCR/JCR?RQ=RECORD&rank=1&journal=TESOL+QUART&req\\_from=TRENDS](http://apps.webofknowledge.com.libproxy.unm.edu/JCR/JCR?RQ=RECORD&rank=1&journal=TESOL+QUART&req_from=TRENDS).

ISI Web of Knowledge. (2015b). Rank in category: TESOL QUARTERLY. Retrieved from

<http://admin->

[apps.webofknowledge.com.libproxy.unm.edu/JCR/JCR?RQ=IF\\_CAT\\_BOXPLOT&rank=1&journal=TESOL+QUART](http://apps.webofknowledge.com.libproxy.unm.edu/JCR/JCR?RQ=IF_CAT_BOXPLOT&rank=1&journal=TESOL+QUART).

JCR Clarivate. (2019a). InCites Journal Citation Reports: Journal: TESOL Quarterly. Retrieved

from

<http://jcr.clarivate.com.libproxy.unm.edu/JCRJournalProfileAction.action?pg=JRNLPROF&journalImpactFactor=n%2Fa&year=2017&journalTitle=TESOL%20QUART&edition=SSCI&journal=TESOL%20QUART> .

JCR Clarivate. (2019b). InCites Journal Citation Reports Journal Profile: Journal: TESOL

Quarterly. Retrieved from

<https://apps-clarivate->

[com.libproxy.unm.edu/jif/home?journal=TESOL%20QUART&year=2017&editions=SSCI&pssid=H2-JkRqJnFYRcLALSmxxqAUAAEgDE0jjGbi1-](http://com.libproxy.unm.edu/jif/home?journal=TESOL%20QUART&year=2017&editions=SSCI&pssid=H2-JkRqJnFYRcLALSmxxqAUAAEgDE0jjGbi1-)

[18x2dEl0cSC8bDmx2Bix2BC4bxxs5fRAx3Dx3DAnxxNZyNGOx2Bbx2BB4nf9D61lw](http://18x2dEl0cSC8bDmx2Bix2BC4bxxs5fRAx3Dx3DAnxxNZyNGOx2Bbx2BB4nf9D61lw)

[x3Dx3D-WwpRYkX4Gz8e7T4uN15SUQx3Dx3D-wBEj1mx2B0mykql8H4kstFLwx3Dx3D](http://x3Dx3D-WwpRYkX4Gz8e7T4uN15SUQx3Dx3D-wBEj1mx2B0mykql8H4kstFLwx3Dx3D) .

Jenks, C. J. (2017). *Race and ethnicity in English language teaching: Korea in focus*. In *Critical Language and Literacy Studies: 22. Multilingual Matters*.

Jones, S. (1997). *The archaeology of ethnicity: Constructing identities in the past and present*.

- London, England: Routledge.
- JSTOR. (2015). TESOL Quarterly: Publication information. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.libproxy.unm.edu/journal/tesolquarterly>.
- Kallen, H. M. (1998). *Culture and democracy in the United States* (originally published in 1924). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Kasun, G. S., & Saavedra, C. M. (2016). Disrupting ELL Teacher Candidates' Identities: Indigenizing Teacher Education in One Study Abroad Program. *TESOL Quarterly*, 50(3), 684–707.
- Kubota, R., & Lin, A. (2006). Race And TESOL: Introduction to Concepts and Theories. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(3), 471–493.
- Kubota, R., & Lin, A. (2009a). Race, culture, and identities in second language teaching: Introduction to research and practice. In R. Kubota & A. Lin (Eds.), *Race, culture, and identities in second language education: Exploring critically engaged practice* (pp. 1–24). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kubota, R., & Lin, A. (Eds.). (2009b). *Race, culture, and identities in second language education: Exploring critically engaged practice*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ladson-Billings, G. J. (1999). Preparing teachers for diverse student populations: A critical race theory perspective. *Review of Research in Education*, 24, 211–247.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1998). Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a nice field like education? *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 11(1), 7–24.
- Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. F. I. (2006). Toward a critical race theory of education. In A. D. Dixson & C. K. Rousseau (Eds.), *Critical race theory in education: All God's children got a song* (pp. 11–30). New York, NY: Routledge.

- Law, I., & Swann, S. (2011). *Ethnicity and education in England and Europe: Gangstas, geeks and gorjas*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing.
- Lee, S. J. (2005). *Up against whiteness: Race, school, and immigrant youth*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Lee, E., & Simon-Maeda, A. (2006). Racialized Research Identities in ESL/EFL Research. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(3), 573–594.
- Lewis, A. E. (2003). *Race in the schoolyard: Negotiating the color line in classrooms and communities*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Liggett, T. (2014). The Mapping of a Framework: Critical Race Theory and TESOL. *The Urban Review*, 46(1), 112–124. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-013-0254-5>
- Liggett, T. (2009). Unpacking White racial identity in English language teacher education. In R. Kubota & A. Lin (Eds.), *Race, culture, and identities in second language education: Exploring critically engaged practice* (pp. 27–43). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lippi-Green, R. (1997). *English with an accent: Language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Liu, W. M., Liu, R. Z., Yunkyoungh Loh, G., Ji Youn, C. K., Chan, L., Ho, Y. C. S., & Yeung, C. W. (2019). Racial trauma, microaggressions, and becoming racially innocuous: The role of acculturation and White supremacist ideology. *American Psychologist*, 74(1), 143–155. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000368>
- López, N. (2003). *Hopeful girls, troubled boys: Race and gender disparity in urban education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Luke, A. (2009). Race and language as capital in school: A sociological template for language-education reform. In R. Kubota & A. Lin (Eds.), *Race, culture, and identities in second*

- language education: Exploring critically engaged practice* (pp. 286–308). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Macedo, D. P., Dendrinos, B., & Gounari, P. (2003). *The hegemony of English*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Malsbary, C. (2014). “Will this hell never end?”: Substantiating and resisting *race-language* policies in a multilingual high school. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 45(4), 373–390. (emphasis original)
- Marx, S. (2009). “It’s not them; it’s not their fault”: Manifestations in the schooling of Latinas/os and ELLs. In R. Kubota & A. Lin (Eds.), *Race, culture, and identities in second language education: Exploring critically engaged practice* (pp. 81–98). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Marx, S. (2008). Critical race theory. In L. M. Given, (Ed). *The Sage encyclopedia of qualitative research methods* (pp. 162-167). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- McIntosh, P. (1990). White privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack. *Independent School*, 49(2), 31.
- Motha, S. (2006). Racializing ESOL Teacher Identities in U.S. K-12 Public Schools. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(3), 495–518.
- Motha, S., & Lin, A. (2014). “Non-coercive Rearrangements”: Theorizing Desire in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 48(2), 331–359.
- Omi, M. (2010). “Slippin’ into darkness”: The (re)biologization of race. *Journal of Asian American Studies*, 13(3), 343–358.
- Omi, M. & Winant, H. (2002). Racial formation. In P. Essed & D. T. Goldberg (Eds.), *Race critical theories: Text and context* (pp. 123-145). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers Inc.
- Omi, M., & Winant, H. (2015). *Racial formation in the United States* (3rd ed.). New York: NY:



Routledge.

- Omi, M., & Winant, H. (1994). *Racial formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Omi, M., & Winant, H. (2009). Thinking through race and racism. *Contemporary Sociology: A Journal of Reviews*, 38(2), 121–125.
- Open Collections Program: Immigration to the US, Timeline. (2015). Retrieved July 10, 2015, from <http://ocptest.hul.harvard.edu/timeline.html>
- Orelus, P. W. (2013). *Whitecentricism and linguoracism exposed: Towards the de-centering of whiteness and decolonization of schools*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Park, R. E. (1950). *Race and culture*. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.
- Parks, G. S., & Rachlinski, J. J. (2009). Implicit bias, election '08, and the myth of a post-racial America. *Florida State University Law Review*, 37, 659-716.
- Pessoa, R. R., & Freitas, M. T. de U. (2012). Challenges in Critical Language Teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 46(4), 753–776.
- Power PDF. (n.d.). Retrieved March 31, 2019, from Nuance Communications website: <https://www.nuance.com/print-capture-and-pdf-solutions/support/power-pdf.html>
- Quach, L. H., Jo, J.-Y. O., & Urrietta, L., Jr. (2009). Understanding the racialized identities of Asian students in predominantly White schools. In R. Kubota & A. Lin (Eds.), *Race, culture, and identities in second language education: Exploring critically engaged practice* (pp. 118–137). New York; London: Routledge.
- Ratner, S. (1984). Horace M. Kallen and cultural pluralism. *Modern Judaism* 4(2), 185-200.
- Rivers, D. J., & Ross, A. S. (2013). Idealized English teachers: The implicit influence of race in Japan. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 12(5), 321–339.

- Rossatto, C. A., Allen, R. L., & Pruyn, M. (Eds.). (2006). *Reinventing critical pedagogy*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Rudestam, K. E., & Newton, R. R. (2007). *Surviving your dissertation: A comprehensive guide to content and process* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Ryan, J. (1999). *Race and ethnicity in multi-ethnic schools: A critical case study*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Ruecker, T. (2017). Race, Empire, and English Language Teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 51(2), 473.
- Ruecker, T., & Ives, L. (2015). White Native English Speakers Needed: The Rhetorical Construction of Privilege in Online Teacher Recruitment Spaces. *TESOL Quarterly*, 49(4), 733–756.
- Scott, R. (1987). *Education and ethnicity: The U.S. experiment in school integration*. Washington, D.C.: Council for Social and Economic Studies.
- Shuck, G. (2006). Racializing the nonnative English speaker. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 5(4), 259–276.
- Smedley, A., & Smedley, B. D. (2011). *Race in North America: Origin and evolution of a worldview* (4th ed.). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Solórzano, D. G., & Yosso, T. J. (2002). Critical Race Methodology: Counter-Storytelling as an Analytical Framework for Education Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 8(1), 23–44.
- Special-Topic Issues of TESOL Quarterly. (2019). Retrieved May 30, 2019, from <https://www.tesol.org/read-and-publish/journals/tesol-quarterly/special-topic-issues-of-tesol-quarterly>
- Stolarik, M. M., & Friedman, M. (1986). *Making it in America: The role of ethnicity in business*

- enterprise, education, and work choices*. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press.
- Taylor, L. (2006). Wrestling With Race: The Implications of Integrative Antiracism Education for Immigrant ESL Youth. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(3), 519–544.
- Taylor-Mendes, C. (2009). Construction of racial stereotypes in English as a foreign language (EFL) textbooks: Images as discourse. In R. Kubota & A. Lin (Eds.), *Race, culture, and identities in second language education: Exploring critically engaged practice* (pp. 64–80). New York, NY: Routledge.
- TESOL International Organization. (2015a). Membership statistics: Grand totals for basic membership, by member type and country. Retrieved from <http://www.tesol.org/docs/default-source/membership/march-2015-membership-statistics.pdf?sfvrsn=0>.
- TESOL International Association. (2015b). TESOL Quarterly. Retrieved from [www.tesol.org/read-and-publish/journals/tesol-quarterly](http://www.tesol.org/read-and-publish/journals/tesol-quarterly).
- TESOL International Organization. (2015c). TESOL membership brochure: Your partner for successful English language teaching. <http://www.tesol.org/docs/membership/tesol-brochure.pdf?sfvrsn=2>.
- TESOL Organization. (2019). Membership Statistics: Grand totals for basic membership, by member type and country. <https://www.tesol.org/docs/default-source/membership/1-monthly-membership-stats-for-public-revised4fc48f42f2fd6d058c49ff00004ecf9b.pdf?sfvrsn=0>
- Thompson, J.B. (1984). *Studies in Theory of Ideology*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- Titscher, S., Meyer, M., Wodak, R., & Vetter, E. (2000). *Methods of text and discourse analysis*. London, England: SAGE.

TQ member stats as of August 2018 [https://www.tesol.org/docs/default-source/membership/1-monthly-membership-stats-for-public-](https://www.tesol.org/docs/default-source/membership/1-monthly-membership-stats-for-public-revised4fc48f42f2fd6d058c49ff00004ecf9b.pdf?sfvrsn=0)

[revised4fc48f42f2fd6d058c49ff00004ecf9b.pdf?sfvrsn=0](https://www.tesol.org/docs/default-source/membership/1-monthly-membership-stats-for-public-revised4fc48f42f2fd6d058c49ff00004ecf9b.pdf?sfvrsn=0)

Tracy, K., Martínez Guillem, S., Robles, J. A., & Casteline, K. E. (2011). Critical discourse analysis and (U.S.) communication scholarship: Recovering old connections, envisioning new ones. In C. T. Salmon (Ed.), *Communication yearbook 35* (pp. 241–286). New York, NY: Routledge.

Trechter, S., & Bucholtz, M. (2001). Introduction: White noise: Bringing language into whiteness studies. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 11(1), 3–21.

van Dijk, T.A. (2011). Introduction: The study of discourse. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.) *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction* (2nd. ed.) (pp. 1-7). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.

van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Multidisciplinary CDA: A plea for diversity. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 95-120). London, England: SAGE.

van Dijk, T. A. (1997). The study of discourse. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.) *Discourse as structure and process: Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction, Vol. 1* (pp. 1-34). London: SAGE Publications.

van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 4(2), 249–83.

Waugh, L. R. (1982). Marked and unmarked: A choice between unequals in semiotic structure. *Semiotica*, 38(3-4), 299–318.

Weiner M.F. (2012). Towards a critical global race theory. *Sociology Compass*, 6(4), 332–350.

Wiley Online Library. (2015a). TESOL Quarterly: Author guidelines. Retrieved from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1002/%28ISSN%291545->

7249/homepage/ForAuthors.html

Wiley Online Library. (2015b). TESOL Quarterly: Overview. Retrieved from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1002/%28ISSN%291545-7249/homepage/ProductInformation.html>.

Wiley Online Library. (2015c). TESOL Quarterly: Society information. Retrieved from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1002/%28ISSN%291545-7249/homepage/Society.html>.

Werito, V. (2011). *The racialization of Diné (youth) in education*. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/1928/12119>

Wimmer, A. (2008). The making and unmaking of ethnic boundaries: A multilevel process theory. *American Journal of Sociology* 113(4), 970-1022.

Winant, H. (2000). Race and race theory. *Annual Review of Sociology* 26, 169-185.

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009). Critical discourse analysis: History, agenda, theory, and methodology. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (2nd ed., pp. 1–33). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Zembylas, M. (2018). Affect, race, and white discomfort in schooling: Decolonial strategies for ‘pedagogies of discomfort.’ *Ethics and Education*, 13(1), 86–104.

Zotero | Your personal research assistant. (n.d.). Retrieved March 31, 2019, from <https://www.zotero.org/>.