University of Nebraska Lincoln
digitalcommons.unl.edu

# Negotiating Asian American Identities: Collaborative Self-Study of Korean Immigrant Scholars' Reading Group on AsianCrit

Taeyeon Kim,[1] Soo Bin Jang,[2] Jin Kyeong Jung,[3] Minhye Son,[4] and Sun Young Lee[5]

1 Department of Educational Administration, University of Nebraska Lincoln
2 Department of Educational Studies, St. Mary's College of Maryland
3 Language, Diversity, and Literacy Studies, Department of Curriculum & Instruction, Texas Tech University
4 Teacher Education Division, College of Education, California State University, Dominguez Hills
5 School of Education, College of Applied Studies, Wichita State University

All authors share equal authorship.

*Correspondence* — Taeyeon Kim, Department of Educational Administration, University of Nebraska Lincoln, 1400 Vine Street Teachers College Hall 126, Lincoln, NE 68588, United States. *Email* tkim@unl.edu

**ORCID** Taeyeon Kim https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2020-9851

**Abstract**
The purpose of this study is to understand how Korean immigrant women early career scholars in higher education in the United States explore their Asian American identities in the identity-based community space. The study considered qualitative data generated by five authors in a collaborative reading group learning more about AsianCrit literature. Our analysis revealed that AsianCrit was used as a tool

Published in *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education,* 2023
doi:10.1037/dhe0000481
Copyright © 2023 National Association of Diversity Officers in Higher Education. Published by the American Psychological Association. Used by permission.
Submitted April 27, 2022; revised October 22, 2022; accepted January 10, 2023; published 13 April 2023.



"This paper is not the copy of record and may not exactly replicate the authoritative document published in the APA journal."

for revisiting our racialized experiences, negotiating tensions around key constructs of AsianCrit informed by transnational perspectives, and embracing Asian American identities in pursuit of solidarity. The findings contribute to expanding the scholarship of AsianCrit by highlighting its utility and possibilities to support transnational or first-generation Asian immigrants' identity exploration in higher education. Moreover, the findings signify the identity-informed peer mentoring as a way to build Asian solidarity.

**Keywords:** AsianCrit, collaborative self-study, identity-based peer mentoring, Korean immigrant/Korean American faculty, Asian solidarity

나도 계속 뭔가 그런 거 있잖아. 경계를 살아가는느낌.
거기에서내가,내가낸나의목소리는도대체어디에 속 할까.
어디에서 누구에게 들려줄 수 있을까.
그것이이필드안에서는누가공감해줄수 있을까약간 그런.
계속 찾아헤매왔던그런것들이,이같이나누는공간에 서 이루어질 수 있어서
참 다행이다라고 생각했어요. 감사드립니다.

I have always been having something like this. The feeling of living on the border.
Where can the voice that I made here belong to?
Where and to whom can I share this voice?
Who can understand and can sympathize with these feelings in this field?
I thought it was very fortunate to be able to do the things I had been looking for over and over again in this shared space.
Thank you.

—(Excerpt from one of the authors in Meeting 7, September 20, 2021)

*The feeling of living on the border* is a common tension we, the five authors of this project, have all experienced, and it became the source of shared inquiry. Each of us came to the United States as an international student from South Korea (Korea, hereinafter) to pursue advanced degrees in education, and after obtaining a terminal degree, all landed on a tenure-track assistant professor position in higher education institutions across the United States. Upon our arrival to the

United States, each author had a wide range of racialized experiences (An, 2017; Chang, 1993), starting with the automatic and involuntary categorization into Asian or Asian American. We had to learn what it means to live like Asians or Asian Americans in the United States and began thinking about our identity in association with this newly prescribed racial label. For instance, selecting the "Asian" or "Asian American" category in every admission and application process is not something we were used to while living in Korea. For 9 years (on average) of studying and working in the United States as doctoral students and later as higher education faculty, we have been searching and sometimes struggling to find "who we are" in this highly racialized social context. We had to find our voice, see where we stand, and think about how we respond to the ways that others view, categorize, and label us racially.[1,2]

Our inquiry exploring the racialized experiences grew more amidst the COVID-19 pandemic, when anti-Asian, anti-immigrant sentiment increased with hate incidents targeting Asian Americans (Horse et al., 2021). Fueled by former U.S. President Trump's continued to use the phrase, "Chinese Virus," and the Atlanta shootings in March 2021, our desire to find our voice and to survive the range of racism from subtle microaggressions and alienation to overt, oppressive marginalization and discrimination in schools and society escalated. Amidst the upsurge of the anti-Asian American violence in 2021, one of the authors suggested forming a reading group to study more about AsianCrit, a subgroup of critical race theory (CRT), and explore our own and others' various Asianization stories.

1 When we refer to the Asian American community in this article, we are referring to any Asian who lives in the United States including those who reside on a permanent or long-term basis with or without proper authorization (Aoki & Takeda, 2009). Such an inclusive definition is to acknowledge the Asian American community's history suffered from the "past efforts to prevent Asian immigrants from naturalizing" (Aoki & Takeda, 2009, p. viii). We also decided to use an inclusive term because all Asian-bodied individuals, regardless of citizenship status or fluency in English, were subject to anti- Asian sentiment during the COVID-19.

2 Throughout the article, we use different terms—for example, Asian, Asian American, Korean, first-generation immigrant, foreigner, international, and transnational—to describe our multilayered positions in spaces in-between because that is most true to our sense of self in the United States. While we do acknowledge the different nuances of each term, as a minority, we are perceived as one way or another by the majority despite how we feel about ourselves. Previous research has also found that Asian Americans use multiple labels to describe themselves reflecting the "notion identities are fluid, adaptable, and heavily depended on the context" (Collet & Koakutsu, 2009, p. 184).

In our first online meeting in May 2021, after a short introduction, we shared what brought each of us to this reading group. We were surprised to hear that we had so many similar experiences (as an international graduate student, as a non-White, non-U.S.-born faculty, etc.), despite our different academic disciplines and trajectories. Given these commonalities, we connected with each other quickly and each other's stories resonated with us. Another extraordinary experience was that we all communicated in our mother tongue, Korean, throughout the meetings. This was a rare and unique experience for all of us as we work in the U.S. higher education system. Although all of us are comfortable speaking and writing in English, as English is our primary language for our work and life in the United States, the power of communicating in Korean, our native language, liberated us in a way that we never felt in academia, which further helped us bond and build closer relationships even from our early meetings.

For example, in the first meeting, Robin[3] shared her child's birth story—how she went to the hospital alone taking a subway in New York City while her husband was working. This short story made everyone in the group teary-eyed as we imagined Robin alone and afraid during a glorious moment that deserved a big celebration. This is a kind of story that Robin would never share where she is in a room of full of her "American" colleagues, as she shares later. At that moment, we realized that in this space we created together, we can "be ourselves" talking about our academic and migration journeys, histories, and even some pains. Although Robin's birth story was not directly related to AsianCrit, this became the catalytic moment for us to know that we would be able to build strong relationships based on trust, transparency, and respect with a great amount of empathy because we understood our shared experience living in a foreign country with an accent, on a temporal visa, with a name that is hard to pronounce for people who do not speak Korean, and as someone who has been invisible in many parts of the academic society.

During our first meeting, we felt the need to document how our conversations within this "hybrid" and "safe" space (Gutiérrez, 1995, 2008) would unfold and evolve utilizing AsianCrit, as a lens and tool to explore and understand our own identities. After preliminarily reviewing and discussing existing research on Asian-Crit (e.g., Chang,

3 In this article, we pseudonymized our names to add minimal protection to our identity.

2013; Iftikar & Museus, 2018; Museus & Iftikar, 2014), we developed the idea for a collaborative self-study examining the AsianCrit theory from a Korean transnational perspective to address the educational needs of the Korean American community, as well as the larger Asian and Asian American community.

The purpose of this study is to explore how Korean immigrant women early career scholars in higher education in the United States negotiate their Asian American identities using AsianCrit as a tool through a collaborative reading group which later transformed into an identity-based peer support group. Specifically, we together answer the guiding research question: *How do we as Korean immigrant women early career scholars explore our identities as Asian Americans in the identity-based community space?* The literature on AsianCrit examines racialized experiences of Asian Americans in the United States and offers a lens to resist White supremacy and racism and to foster solidarity. This nonlinear, complex process involved revisiting racialized experiences we encountered and negotiated tensions around key constructs of AsianCrit—perpetual foreigners (PF) and model minority myth (MMM; Chang, 1993; Museus et al., 2013)—in eyes of in-betweenness ("Korean" and "American") when exploring our Asian and Asian American identities.

While this collaborative self-study draws from our personal experiences, our findings have broad implications for defining positive aspects of identity-based learning communities in higher education. Through this inquiry, we explore the ways that we contribute to the academia and how collaboration and community reshape our experience and perceive the academia as we found the solidarity that we formulated throughout this process was the main source of power and motivation to navigate our identities from shared experiences, a deep sense of empathy, and emotional connectedness. Finally, by examining the ways in which community is successfully created within higher education from early career faculty members' points of view, we formulate recommendations for building safer cooperative spaces among other ethnically and linguistically marginalized groups. This collaborative self-study contributes to the understanding of our Asianization process in the United States as Korean immigrant women, our individual and collective sense-making of being an Asian American–how we experience, understand, and negotiate Asianization.

## Identity-Based Peer Mentoring for Early Career Faculty Development

In higher education across the United States, a small but significant number of faculty members are women immigrants from Asian countries. These faculty members often find insufficient mentoring and support (Kim et al., 2014; Mancl & Lee, 2016), particularly in their early career, because of a lack of colleagues with similar life experiences within the same institution. They participate in mentoring programs provided in the department, college, and university levels, as well as other regional and national professional organizations, which often match junior faculty members with seniors (Paul et al., 2002). Despite the benefits that early career faculty get from those support programs, faculty of color find them partially meaningful in that the majority of those mentoring programs do not address the concerns that originate from racial, ethnic, and linguistic diversity, and other related issues (Gray-Nicolas & Nash, 2021; Murrell et al., 2021).

Given fewer resources to navigate issues related to diversity, identity-informed peer mentorship can be a powerful tool to support faculty of color (Hsieh & Nguyen, 2020). Identity-based peer mentoring aims to provide academic and personal support as well as a sense of belonging to assist members in higher education (see Kodama & Park, 2021). It highlights the development of a collective support system among people who share the same social identity in a similar career stage. As a nonhierarchical model of mentorship, peer mentoring characterizes the fluidity in an individual's roles both as a mentor and a mentee. This "coequal relationship" (Driscoll et al., 2009, p. 5) centers on each member's agential roles in promoting knowledge of the profession, personal competence, and self-efficacy. Members in the identity-based peer-mentoring groups develop that knowledge by sharing their life experiences that are often silenced in the dominant narratives of the society. As Kodama and Park (2021) underlined, sharing stories further leads the members with the same identity to develop solidarity because, by sharing their stories, they learn the ways to connect the dimensions of professional work and personal experience (Maramba & Kodama, 2018).

Recent research points out the importance of sharing social identity for faculty success through peer mentoring, which is often found in

the external networks beyond one specific institution (Bottoms et al., 2013; Morton & Gil, 2019; Murrell et al., 2021). This literature commonly suggests the need to challenge "epistemic exclusion" (Settles et al., 2021), which systematically perpetuates traditional norms in higher education that do not align with the authentic strengths and interests of historically underrepresented faculty members (Murakami & Núñez, 2014). In response to this, identity-based peer mentoring searches for ways to provide collective support by developing strategies that are unique to their shared identity.

Although identity-based peer mentoring has been suggested in exploring and supporting historically underrepresented faculty's struggles, such as Latina faculty (Murakami & Núñez, 2014) or African American faculty (Gray-Nicolas & Nash, 2021), Asian and Asian American faculty's experiences on the barriers to their career advancement and their solidarity efforts have not been highlighted much. As Mancl and Lee (2016) point out, one of the reasons that explain Asian faculty members' low participation in mentoring programs is the social stereotype that this group feels successful enough without mentorship. This individualistic success story is the reflection of the continuing "model minority myth" (see also Petersen, 1966; Ng et al., 2007), which stereotypes the image of self-sufficiency among Asian immigrant populations, compared with other racially and ethnically marginalized groups.

The MMM is imposed to explain Asian immigrant populations' success stories in the United States by emphasizing the continuation of Asian cultural values in U.S. contexts and its impacts on the individual's unfavorable attitude toward seeking help (Kim & Lee, 2014; Yi & Todd, 2021). This model minority myth is *problematic* because it appears not to challenge anti-Black racism and White supremacy by separating the racial issues from Asians' success stories. Despite the empirical evidence supporting the fact that Asian faculty members' experiences cannot be explained by the MMM as well as the fact they do actually experience the racialized discrimination (for these counter examples, see Poon et al., 2016; Yoon, 2019), the MMM continues in higher education, inscribing the stereotyped view that Asian faculty members have internalized this myth and are reluctant to actively participate in support systems (Tran, 2017).

In this collaborative self-study, we map out how the solidarity efforts among early career Asian immigrant faculty members offer counternarratives to the MMM. We particularly focus on the learning experiences in a reading group on AsianCrit (Asian critical theory). This group started voluntarily; yet, because of the social identity shared by each member, as well as the contents that addressed the racialized experiences of Asian immigrant populations and how to challenge them, the reading group became identity-based peer-mentoring support. The readings and discussions have led us to revisit our past and current experiences living in the United States through the lens of racialized epistemologies (Ladson-Billings, 1995). This collaborative self-study process was not solely theory-driven or practice-oriented, but we found ourselves negotiating and transitioning multiple expectations that we have as Korean immigrant women faculty members in U.S. higher education. Our study contributes to diversifying the strategies that diverse faculty develop through the identity-based peer-mentoring process.

## AsianCrit and Intersectional Understanding of "Asian American" Identities

We utilized AsianCrit framework to situate our racialized experiences in the United States. AsianCrit is a useful tool to analyze the ways that White supremacy and global colonial and imperial project, intersecting with other structural forces such as capitalism, patriarchy, ableism, sexism, and monolingualism subjugate racially marginalized people particularly in the United States (Iftikar & Museus, 2018; Museus et al., 2013). AsianCrit was introduced as a subdivision of CRT to illuminate the racialized experiences specific to Asian Americans (An, 2017; Chang, 1993). By centering Asian Americans' experiences and voices, AsianCrit can help researchers and practitioners expand knowledge about Asian racialization processes, question dominant racial narratives and U.S. imperialism, and engage in coalition building to advocate for the end of all oppression (Iftikar & Museus, 2018).

Among seven tenets of AsianCrit (Iftikar & Museus, 2018), our article focuses on Asianization, the process of racially marginalized people in the United States becoming "Asian" because of pervasive

White supremacy and nativistic racism, a critical tenet of AsianCrit (Iftikar & Museus, 2018; Museus & Iftikar, 2014). Within U.S. society, people with different ethnicity, culture, and language are homogenized, positioned in a specific location, and similarly racialized as "model minorities," "yellow perils," "perpetual foreigners," and "emasculated men/hypersexualized women" (Hwang, 2021; Iftikar & Museus, 2018).

One of the dominant Asianization discourses is "model minority myth (MMM)." MMM was socially invented to undercut the political advancement of other minority communities (i.e., African Americans and Latino/as) in the context of the Civil Rights Movement (Wang, 2008). It positions Asian Americans as examples of the "correct" way to be a person of color in the United States—quiet, hardworking, and compliant with White supremacy (Lee et al., 2017). As naturalizing discourse, MMM treats all who belong to the "Asian" group as equally sharing such attributes; however, Asian Americans are an extremely heterogeneous group that contains large disparities in education, economic and social capital, language, culture, and emigration trajectories (Teranishi & Nguyen, 2012). Particularly, there is a notion that East Asian Americans are more heavily racialized as model minorities compared to other subgroups within the Asian American community (e.g., Southeast Asian refugees; Yi et al., 2020). As a result, Southeast Asian Americans may be further marginalized within MMM discourse (Yi et al., 2020). Moreover, MMM pressures Asian Americans to "keep their heads down," so as not to offend White communities while experiencing isolation from other minority groups (Museus, 2022).

Another dominant discourse contributing to the racialization of Asian Americans is "perpetual foreigner (PF) ideology." PF emerged from xenophobia, and it was used to justify discriminatory immigration laws against many Asian groups in the United States for a long time (Hwang, 2021). PF portrays Asian American individuals as fresh-off-the-boat immigrants who are culturally distinct and in the process of learning English (Hsieh & Kim, 2020). As a part of day-to-day racialization experiences, all Asian Americans are often asked, "Where are you from?" or told "Your English is good" (Kim, 2020; Yoon, 2019). PF functions to deny Asian Americans' access to being fully "American," while depicting them as a threatening "Yellow Peril" who cannot

be trusted (Hwang, 2021). With COVID-19 and the escalation of the United States–China political conflict, PF continues to aggravate anti-Asian sentiment and violence (Hwang, 2021).

Research has shown that after they arrive in the United States, international students from Asian countries experience similar racial discriminations to Asian Americans (Lee & Rice, 2007; Yao, 2018; Yao et al., 2019; Yu, 2022). Through such lived experiences, those Asian international students go through the Asianization process: They learn that they are perceived as "Asians" in the United States based on their appearance (Yu, 2022). For instance, Yu's (2022) analyses of Chinese international students' responses during COVID-19 showed that those students, who used to conceptualize race from a nationality-based identity in their home country, came to realize that anyone who looks "Asian" could be a target of racism in the United States. Such an Asianization process adds another layer to Asian international students and scholars who already experience othering in U.S. higher education as a result of their nationality, language, and cultural background (Yao, 2018). While that racism plays a central role in international students of colors' educational experiences, relatively little literature has discussed the role and responsibilities of higher education institutions (Yao et al., 2019).

As CRT utilizes marginalized racial groups' experiences as their primary knowledge, AsianCrit centers Asian Americans' experiential knowledge to inform theories and praxis (Iftikar & Museus, 2018). Within AsianCrit, we prioritize examining our voices; experiences; situated knowledge; and perspectives as raced, gendered, and classed individuals. The idea of intersecting identities highlights the fact that every individual has multiple identity markers—race, ethnicity, gender, class, sexuality, religion, language, nationality, ability, and so forth—and the meaning of those identities is historically, politically, economically, and socially constructed (McKinzie & Richards, 2019). Intersectionality is "the critical insight that race, class, gender, sexuality, ethnicity, nation, ability, and age operate ... as reciprocally constructing phenomena that in turn shape complex social inequalities" (Collins, 2015, p. 2). First introduced by U.S. legal scholar Crenshaw (1991), the concept of intersectionality has been effective in revealing the invisible violence Black women experience in the context of the United States. We use intersectionality to refer to how each of us as

individuals and as a group is uniquely positioned through discourses and practices of racialization, gendering, culturalization, and "othering" in the context of U.S. society (Dhamoon, 2011). By situating our stories of struggle and transformation at the center, we aim to understand how the process of Asianization is shaped by interconnected systems of domination.

## Methodology

Our methodological inquiry is informed by self-study (Hamilton & Pinnegar, 2013; LaBoskey, 2004) as well as collaborative autoethnography approaches (Ngunjiri et al., 2010). The collective inquiry project began by the five authors forming a voluntary reading group on AsianCrit. This section details our positionalities and methodological approaches, including how and why this research group was formed as well as data generation and analyses.

### *Author Positionalities: Who We Are*

The authors share a generational and immigrant identity as transnationals living in the United States (Skerrett, 2015) who maintain strong social and personal bonds with our country of origin, South Korea. We deeply acknowledge our academic and socioeconomic privileges, among many, given that we are employed as faculty at 4-year universities. We also recognize the heterogeneity among the subgroups under the category of Asian Americans.

*Yuna* sees herself as Korean and Asian American throughout her experiences with the immigration process and racialized incidents in the United States. Yuna also embraces her border-crossing identities as a Korean American, wanting to support Asian American communities and ethnic Koreans around the globe, those who may share her struggles with "living on the border." *Mimi* spent most of her formative years in Poland where her Asian body was hypervisible. She identifies herself as a cosmopolitan person who is culturally Korean, Asian, and American. She married a Singaporean which complicates her thinking about being "Asian." She centers her complex positionality in her research and advocacy for Asian Americans. *Jiwon* has

a fluid identity as a Korean-born transnational because she moved across multiple nations and states for her teaching and study. Her transnational experiences have influenced her research in language and literacy studies. She is particularly interested in underrepresented populations including Asians. *Robin* identifies herself as a Korean and transnational scholar rather than Asian American, which is distinct from her U.S.-born children's ethnic identity. She carries her hybrid and "non-native" identity in her research and teaching, working with teachers of color and immigrant bilingual families in urban, multicultural settings. *Hannah* has experienced her career transition from an international student (which she saw as temporary residency) to a tenure-track faculty (which she now sees as permanent residency) in the United States. She has expanded her research and teaching to examine how transnationality, Asianness, and foreignness are included and excluded in the American notions of race, racism, and racialization.

### *The Collaborative Study*

We agree that ongoing encounters with race, ethnicity, and gender in and outside the United States have shaped our worldviews, research interests, and lived experiences. This collective ethnographic self-study pushed our thinking and opened opportunities to reflect on our experiences in the United States, echoing what Hamilton and Pinnegar (1998) expressed about self-study:

> The study of one's self, one's actions, one's ideas, as well as the "not self." It is autobiographical, historical, cultural, and political ... it draws on one's life, but it is more than that. Self-study also involves a thoughtful look at texts read, experiences had, people known and ideas considered. (p. 236)

Self-study shares characteristics with autoethnography in terms of centering the self in research and practice (Hamilton et al., 2008). As we discussed the readings on AsianCrit together and explored our practices and understandings in larger social contexts, our self-study also draws on collaborative autoethnography (H. Chang, 2013; Ngunjiri et al., 2010), emphasizing the self and our social and cultural aspects (Chang et al., 2013).

Researchers use personal experiences as primary data in autoethnography (Chang, 2013) to explore how interactions with others or sociocultural contexts have influenced their lived experiences. Collaborative autoethnography is distinct from individual autoethnography because "author-researcher-participants are encouraged to listen to each other's voices, examine their own assumptions, and challenge other perspectives" (Chang, 2013, pp. 111–112). This method allowed us to share our individual stories, thoughts, and experiences as data, regarding the shared interest during COVID-19 along with the surge of Asian hate crimes. As Francis and Hester (2012) highlighted how "the researcher is as much as a part of the social world as anyone else" (p. 35), we were constantly connected to the self and others in this study and our larger society through collaborative meeting times and reflective discussions of the rich data we generated.

Collaborative autoethnography in this way well supports self-study (Hamilton et al., 2008; LaBoskey, 2004) as it enables us to center our experiences, reflect on readings, and learn from one another. LaBoskey (2004) characterized self-study as self-initiated, challenging the researcher's understanding through interactions with others, and employing multiple methods. By interacting with the texts and one another, focusing on AsianCrit, we reflected on our individual experiences and negotiated our understandings individually and collaboratively through dynamic interactions. These approaches allowed us to complicate and expand AsianCrit based on our different and similar experiences, engaging with our lived experiences with the texts on AsianCrit. In this collaborative self-study, we collaborated fully from the data generation, analysis, and writing, hoping to transform ourselves as the first step to seek institutional and societal changes (LaBoskey, 2004).

### *The Reading Group*

The present study came out of a voluntary reading group on AsianCrit. Our initiatives emerged from joining a virtual mentoring session for early career faculty members offered by the Korean-American Educational Researchers Association in April 2021. After the session, the mentoring committee members created a KakaoTalk[4] group chat for early career faculty members to share resources and build

4 KakaoTalk is a popular messaging mobile app in South Korea operated by a Korean company.

relationships. Through the chat, Hannah initiated a reading group to study AsianCrit during the summer of 2021. The rest responded to her call voluntarily and we met for the first time via Zoom for the reading group.

In our first meeting, we introduced ourselves, discussed the direction of our study group, and more importantly, spent some time sharing what led us to join this "study group." In that conversation, we found comparable current and past struggles in both our academic and personal lives as minority individuals across our doctoral studies and early career faculty. Our being Asian women in White dominant towns, Korean scholars in U.S. academia, or first gen-immigrant parents of U.S.-born kids, became an impetus to our voluntary study about AsianCrit to make sense of our experiences. The increasing media coverage of hate crimes against Asian individuals and communities across the United States compelled us to learn about AsianCrit, which we thought might give us language and perspectives to challenge systematic racism placed upon Asian American communities. We all noticed that we had few opportunities in academia to engage in literature centering the perspectives of Asian Americans on racism and racialized experiences. We wanted to have a safe space where we could candidly share our thoughts and feelings regarding our cognitive dissonance on our race-related identities in our first language. By studying the literature, we shared a goal to contribute to Asian individuals or Asian American communities who might share similar struggles with us. This led us to conduct the current collaborative self-study on our learning process to share our stories with the broad audiences.

### *Data Generation and Analysis*

Over 10 months (May 2021–March 2022), we generated multiple data sources through our reading group and conducted several rounds of data analysis. Autoethnography requires "carefully organized research designs, process-oriented questions, and the intentional engagement of self" (Blalock& Akehi, 2018, p. 93).When we first met as a group, we discussed how we would proceed with the reading group—including our collective decisions on the reading list (see Appendix A[5]). Dr. Sohyun An, one of the seminal scholars in AsianCrit, shared a list of

5 Appendix A is available online at https://tinyurl.com/298npxyf .

recommended readings. Each member chose from the list and added additional readings by considering research interests in connection with the list. In total, we read 11 articles and discussed them together.

Between June 2021 and September 2021, we convened seven biweekly meetings to discuss our selected readings. The seventh meeting was intended for us to share our overall reading group reflections and our written essays. Each meeting typically lasted for 90–120 min, and we discussed takeaways from the readings including questions, reflections, and our related experiences. We recorded each meeting and documented our individual and collective thoughts via group meeting notes, KakaoTalk conversations, and individual reflections and memos. Our meetings were convened (and transcribed) in Korean, our mother tongue, although we used several code-switching phrases and comments as Korean–English bilinguals. Most documents were also written in Korean, with several key terms, phrases, and comments recorded in English.

Data analysis of this study was iterative and collaborative, which entailed five group meetings, eight small group meetings, analytic memos, and regular email exchanges between September 2021 and March 2022. We first engaged in analysis by reading multiple data sources line by line, individually (Saldaña, 2021). Each member then shared key themes and reflections they found in the following whole group meeting and developed initial codes (e.g., exploring racialized experiences, sharing stories of struggle, negotiating intensively, embracing Asian identities). In the second phase, each of us engaged in coding, and we compared our coding within the group, revised the initial codes and created a codebook with definitions and examples of thematic codes (e.g., encountering imposed identity, storying racialized struggle, negotiating Asian identities, seeking solidarity). Using the codebook, the individual and collective coding processes were repeated more than three times, respectively. After three group meetings on data analysis, we found Asianization, one of the critical tenets of AsianCrit, as an overarching theme.

The third stage of analysis involved aligning our coded data with Asianization elements, generating the headings of our finding section: (a) navigating Asianization as imposed task, (b) collaborative storytelling regarding MMM and PF, and (c) negotiating for solidarity. Finally, we drafted the findings while conducting small group and whole

group meetings to discuss and confirm arguments and evidence, as well as search for disconfirming evidence in making collective decisions. By sharing our drafts within the group throughout the analysis and writing processes, we received and gave feedback multiple times. Our collaborative analysis and interactions were essential to triangulate our interpretations and understandings (Vanassche & Kelchtermans, 2015). In this article, we added direct quotes in English only due to limited space. The original quotes in Korean are available in online Appendix B.[6]

## Findings

### *Encountering the Moments of Racialization: Navigating Asianization as Imposed Task*

No matter how hard we try to resist or reject the label of "Asian American" as an imposed identity with accompanying myths, sexual fantasies, and fears that are constructed by others, we realized we were no longer free from discourse of Asianization as we entered and became a part of racialized U.S. society. Our reading group discussion helped us understand how we were drawn to learn about Asianization, which we think is an "imposed task," something we must do to be able to attain language and agency to challenge the imposed stereotypes on Asians. Our thinking about who we are is constantly invaded by "external racial identification" (Warnke, 2007, p. 65) established within a racial typology in the U.S. context (see Yu, 2022). The preimposition of identities by race as a priori (Callahan, 2012) has been shaping our experiences of Asianization, regardless of our will to defy them.

Individual and collective discussions on readings naturally led us to share moments when we were categorized and viewed through the lens of race in the United States. Recalling racially informed labels used by others to define us—"women of color," "Asian women," and "victims of sexual violence,"—we agreed that making meaning of race and navigating our racial identities have been "imposed tasks" as we live in the United States. While we held understandings of "race" as diversity, differences, power, or culture, based on our lived experiences

6 Appendix B is available at https://tinyurl.com/4kjez648 .

in Korea and outside the United States, we had experienced Asianization in our daily lives in the United States as minoritized individuals, which further extended our understanding of race as a means of exercising power at the center of social interactions and systems in the U.S. context.

For example, Robin shared how she was constantly categorized as Asian, “Whenever I register [for something], I always need to do a check box [to indicate my race].” Comparing our experiences in South Korea, where surveys or institutional forms do not necessarily include questions of race, Hannah also said, “Seeing people through the lens of color was very new to me,” when recalling her first encounter of the racialized U.S. society. Even though we were reluctant to apply the racialized lens to ourselves, the complex process of Asianization in the United States applied the racialized lens and reshaped our identities. Race and racial categorization became an inevitable topic in our lives in the United States. However, we all noted that those moments in our transition to the U.S. academia lacked institutional support and racially informed mentoring tailored for newcomers like us, or international students, as addressed in existing studies (see Yao, 2018; Yao et al., 2019); thus remained as fragmented wandering pieces up until our reading group.

Moreover, we learned encountering racialization was often situated against racialized images based on racial, ethnic, or gender stereotypes. For example, most group members have had moments when others viewed us or behaved against us using images of Asian females as infantilized or feminized (Mayuzumi, 2015). Among many, Robin’s past traumatic experience with a White male doctor who looked to be in his 60s in New York was the most provoking. She described that incident,

> … I was sitting there [the doctor’s office], and he [the doctor] opened the door and came in. He said, “Hi” and pinched my cheek. And he was shaking my cheek like this [pinching her cheeks with two hands]. Like you do to babies. I was so dumbfounded and said, “What was that?” Then he said, “No. That’s uh … just a way of saying hi.”

The other members sighed or opened their eyes wide while listening to Robin, who was a mother of two children at that time. While

she complained about the incident to hospital leadership, she was told there was no evidence to charge him with racism. She reflected, "My gender, my race, and the fact that I was sitting there [as a patient]. Everything made this doctor possible to do it to me. That doctor thought he could do that to me." We lament how our bodies are read and attacked by others, not just on the streets, but in professional settings.

The reading group opened a safe space where we started collecting our racialized moments that caused us high levels of mental and physical stress as graduate students, with tears, anger, and frustration. These shared stories led us to revisit collectively through the lens of Asianization and affirmed that our experiences being Asian are linked to systemic racism and oppression in the United States. Yuna articulated our understanding of Asianization as "the consequence of living in a racialized society." For all five of us, being called Asian or Asian Americans was not a naturally given identity. Becoming a member of the racialized U.S. society forced us to navigate and make meaning of our Asian American identities in our personal and professional lives.

### *Making Invisible Stories of Struggle Visible: Collaborative Storytelling*

We used AsianCrit as a mirror to reflect our experiences and see our lives and experiences as part of the racial injustice prevalent in U.S. society. The AsianCrit texts we chose offered us both familiar and strange views and gave us language to name our racialized experiences. We found our struggles as Asian immigrants to the United States are widely shared with U.S.-born Asian Americans. At the same time, we found AsianCrit texts are somewhat reactive to the view on "Asian" that is framed by the White gaze in the U.S. context and do not speak to images and discourses we had embodied about ourselves in our Korean context. Our collective reading and discussions provided self-affirmation—to become in peace with and to fully embrace our past and present struggles as immigrant Asian women early career scholars across U.S. higher education.

*Questioning the Meritocratic Principle in MMM*

All five of us thought we had to spend extra time and effort to survive and/or compete with our American peers as non-native, international scholars. We started to question the value of hard work as we discussed Chang's (1993) article about how the meritocratic thesis embedded in MMM disguises the oppressions of Asian Americans. Chang (1993) argued that the meritocratic thesis of MMM is untrue "when individual income, geographic location, educational attainment, and hours worked are considered" (p. 1263). But many Asian Americans work extra hard, often to the level of self-exploitation, to disguise that their efforts and investment in education do not have the same rate of return as their White peers. For example, Mimi made her point:

> Although it may seem like there's not much difference between how much Asians make from whites, I think it is an illusion because [those statistics] often neglect the fact that many Asians work extra hours and have higher credentials. It was like that in the past, [like in Chang's (1993) article], but I think it is still true today. (June 25, 2021)

Reading and discussing the MMM helped us question the taken-for-granted virtue of hard efforts: Whose interest does it serve? Robin suggested that the value of hardworking comes from our upbringing to some extent. We recognized that many Asian friends and colleagues, alongside us, share such education. On one hand, we discussed how our upbringing makes it difficult to admit our struggle and failure as meritocracy has been considered a powerful tool for individuals' social mobility in the long history of Korean education and also during the national building after the Korean War. On the other hand, we noted how our status as international and/or immigrants makes us feel insecure and threatened in the U.S. context, forcing us to be "faultless" in our past work as graduate students and now as faculty.

We recognized that MMM has made it difficult to admit our struggle with pressure "to do well" and keep up with standards "set by others," especially in relation to English. With the prevalent expectation for academic success, we often felt "anxiety," "insecurity," and "marginalization" coming from our use of English. We would keep such struggles

to ourselves, without a space to share or challenge them. We all resonated with Robin's experience with the English language. Robin said:

> I always felt insecure. Whenever I had to write in English, I always went to the writing center. I tried to hide such [insecurity]. I always got [editing service] from native English speakers; [so] it always took more time ...But I can't even fully verbalize the anxiety I felt inside. Like those authors [Hsieh and Nguyen (2020)] felt alienation, marginalization, and imposter syndrome, I always felt self-doubt while in school. My positionality—Asian, foreigner, immigrant, and non-native speaker-, these things strangle me. (July 23, 2021)

Regardless of her academic success, she was constantly questioning her capability, like all of us. We reflected that such struggles could be attributed to, and aggravated by, MMM prevalent in U.S. academia.

### *Noticing the Internalized White Gaze*

As we tried to make sense of how AsianCrit explains privilege and oppression in relation to other racial groups in the United States, we realized that we have developed "a sense of guilt" for taking "American people's jobs" because of shaming statements that criticize our identities as international women of color. We shared the multiple episodes in our doctoral programs that may have instilled guilt and shame. Those shaming statements were subtle but powerful enough to frame our identities negatively. For example, Mimi shared her interactions with a professor almost right after she arrived in the country. Mimi said:

> There was a comment that surprised me. One of the professors, who was a white male ... I think he wasn't careful. It seemed like those words came out by accident ... I was talking about my worries of getting a job in the U.S., and he said, "You are neither a white nor a man [therefore, you will get a job, like diversity hire]." What he meant was that [women of color] take jobs away [from white males] ... That just came out like that. He really believed that [we] take away [white men's positions]. So, I wanted to apologize for who I am. (June 25, 2021)

The professor expressed his entitlement by sharing his White-centered perspective that current American universities prioritize hiring women and People of Color. With the interaction with that professor in her first year, Mimi learned that her racial and gender identity is seen as a threat to White people. Instantly, she felt like her presence in the U.S. higher education is, by nature, a burden to society regardless of her hard work and experiences. Such an implicit "norm" shared within the academia imposed mentally and emotionally challenging hurdles for Mimi. Even as faculty, she has been aware of the White-centered perspective seeing her as a "diversity hire" and has constantly feared that she is not evaluated by her scholarly capability but by her racial, ethnic, and gender identity.

Additionally, the White gaze we have internalized as transnational scholars pressure us to "prove our worth" more than White and native English-speaking domestic scholars. For instance, Robin was not able to fully celebrate when she landed a tenure-track faculty position while her close White peers were still in the job market, fearing that her White colleagues would think Robin stole their job with her ethnic and racial identity and as a "foreigner."

It took a couple of sessions and many discussions to understand our sense of guilt. We found we have gradually internalized the White people's view of us (e.g., Asian, women, international) in American academia. Our examples suggest we unconsciously internalized the racial triangulation positioning Asian Americans' relatively valorized status as compared to Black, Indigenous, and other communities of color while being inferior to Whites (C. Kim, 1999), which has been often utilized to blame other minority groups. In such a view of Asian Americans, we are a threat to White colleagues, simultaneously a privileged minority group that does not deserve attention. It stifles our natural expression of the oppressions we face. In the last session, Yuna summed it up nicely:

> Where and why does oppression occur [for Asians in the U.S.]? Like Mimi said, [We] have discussed that it is very difficult to identify that point yet it's crucial .... When you say you're less oppressed than your Black and Brown colleagues, but that's also someone else's perspective, looking through others' lens to say that we [Asian Americans] are not oppressed enough. Then, we must speak against such a narrative [shaped by white supremacy].

In our early sessions, we repeated the dominant perspective on viewing Asians, not knowing how much we had been deeply influenced by such a narrative constraining us from expressing and fully being ourselves. However, by reading and discussing the critical analysis of MMM and yellow peril discourse together, we realized how much we have been abided by White's gaze that made us devalue the oppressions we experience and prohibit forming genuine relationships with other racially minoritized groups. We were able to understand how MMM and yellow peril discourses take away both our space and language to discuss the oppressions and isolations we experience.

*Making Sense of PF Ideology*

One of the themes we constantly revisited was a sense of foreignness and lack of Americanness—why we constantly feel that we do not belong to this country. During our last session, Hannah said that she was astonished to learn that we all undoubtedly see ourselves as foreigners. Through our discussions, we learned that all of us had multiple experiences where we felt unwelcomed. For example, Robin shared her interaction with a professor when she first arrived in the United States.

> I was just 20 years old. A professor said to me, "A yellow fish belongs to a yellow pond." I didn't know whether it was a race-related comment .... Thinking about it now, it's a seriously problematic statement. But I have multiple experiences similar to that ... (July 23, 2021)

Robin now understands that what her professor meant then was that she was unwelcomed at her institution. As Robin continues to encounter these xenophobic behaviors and learned more about the American culture that permits such othering intents, she felt helpless about her Asian immigrant woman identities. As we shared similar experiences and insights, it made sense that those xenophobic attacks prohibited us from developing a sense of belonging. Because these upsetting experiences occur too frequently, it made it harder for us to build a connection with the American society.

We continue to struggle developing a sense of belongingness as faculty members. Although we are affiliated with different subfields in

education, all five of us had similar sentiments about academic conferences. For example, Jiwon said:

> I got a doctorate and became a faculty member. However, as a Korean American or Asian American scholar, [I'm always marginalized]. When I go to any conference, white professors are the mainstream. I'm always marginalized unless I'm a professor in Korean studies or something like that. Of course, everyone is marginalized in some way, but I thought it would be extremely difficult for me to be a part of the mainstream. (July 23, 2021)

We all deeply emphasized Jiwon's frustration and tried to make sense of our helplessness. In our first few meetings, particularly as we discussed the readings written by Asian American authors, we thought that the primary reason we feel isolation and marginalization in our departments, conferences, and research sites is because of the language barrier. We identified similarities and differences between second- and third-generation Asian American authors' and ourselves—foreign-born, first-generation immigrants, and nonnative English speakers.

However, when we discussed Yoon's (2019) autoethnography— a second-generation Korean American scholar who grew up in a white neighborhood and speaks English as her first language and still finds herself being a ghost in a liminal space as a field researcher in white dominant field—we began to understand the ramification of PF ideology. Yuna said:

> I think this society wants me to feel that I don't belong to them, thus making me accept it [perpetual foreigner narrative]. So, we [as the first-generation immigrants] voluntarily accept a foreigner [label] and think that [second and third generation] Asian-Americans are different. But, in a way, people also see them as foreigners. [Moreover, because we have internalized the PF narrative] when we ourselves meet other Asian Americans, we also ask, "Where do they come from?" I just realized the PF [ideology] might have affected my way of looking at myself and others. (September 20, 2021)

The experiences of U.S.-born Asian American authors overlapped with ours: No matter where you were born and your English fluency, if you look Asian, people question your belongingness. Toward the last session, we recognized these challenges are common "Asian" experiences in the United States. Moreover, we discussed ways in which PF ideology could hinder pan-Asian solidarity. For example, Hannah said:

> I don't think that people would ask every person of color what country they're from. But when they look at Asians, they [ask] "Which country are you from?" The idea of foreignness is closely linked with the concept of nation. So [PF ideology] makes it very difficult to build Asian American solidarity [across different national backgrounds]. (June 25, 2021)

Hannah's comment suggests that PF ideology may reinforce nation-bounded cultural heritage among Asian American individuals (e.g., Chinese, Korean, Vietnamese) by continually reminding them of their foreignness, which excludes them from being American. By constantly being asked where she is from, Hannah thought that PF ideology makes her more closely attached to Korean nationality, language, and culture. She interpreted that if other Asian American communities feel the same way about their sense of (non)belonging to the United States, building pan-Asian American solidarity could be challenging. Of course, recognizing heterogeneity within Asian American communities and valuing the cultural heritage of each ethnic group is important. However, when constant reminders of foreignness come from a stance of "othering," our belonging to the U.S. society is challenged, which possibly reinforces a "foreign" flag as shared in our experiences. Therefore, PF ideology can hinder building Asian American solidarity, especially for the first generation of immigrants like us, when shared voices and political engagement are necessary as a pan-Asian American group.

### *Negotiation Toward Solidarity: Self, Other, and Categorization*

Our collected stories of struggle led us to realize the importance of solidarity as early career scholars dealing with our fluid identities. Our analysis revealed that AsianCrit was used as a tool for embracing

"being Asian" in the United States and pushing the boundary of our identities. This process involved intensive negotiations by asking critical questions, exchanging perspectives, and expanding worldviews throughout our shared interactions.

*Expanding Asian Identities in the Racialized Society: Seeking Solidarity*

Our stories of struggle reminded us of the importance of solidarity as Asian Americans. For instance, commenting on our early conversations recognizing a distance between Asian American experiences depicted in literature *and* our own as transnational scholars in the United States, Yuna shifted the narrative to highlight why viewing Asian as a collective identity matters within racialized society. She shared her conversation with a Korean American taxi driver in Hawaii a few years ago:

> I met a taxi driver who migrated from Korea 20 years ago. Heard more than half of the population in Hawaii are Asian. At that time, there was dissonance between Korea and Japan due to economic sanctions. When asked about any conflicts between Japanese and Korean descendants among Asian communities, the driver told us: "Most Asian people have been living here for a long time .... We knew if there was any trouble among Asians, it would ruin us [Asian Americans living in Hawaii] ... So people would compromise quickly to cooperate." ... Nationality might matter more to the first-generation of immigrants, but that is a different story for Asian Americans—the second, third, and fourth generations. (June 25, 2021)

Here, Yuna brought the meaning of being "Asian" as a collective identity beyond nationality or ethnicity. Her story suggested why Asian solidarity is important to live in a racialized society. Subsequently, Mimi shared her powerful moment when she "became an Asian American from being a Korean American."

> It was in my fifth year [in the doctoral program]. I was teaching elementary social studies methods, and racism was one of the topics in the curriculum. But it was mostly about Black

> and white, nothing about Asian .... There was a new professor, a Chicana scholar, who helped me realize that my curriculum was completely silent about Asian experiences .... She modeled a lesson about the Vincent Chin case ... which blew my mind .... In 1982 ... a white guy and his son killed an Asian man named Vincent Chin using a baseball bat ... in Detroit ...However, they were not charged with first-degree murder .... After watching the documentary film, right at that moment, my identity changed to an Asian- American from a Korean American .... Such [awakening] experience is so crucial ...to be able to see that Asians in the U.S. experience [racism] together. The more we realize the similarities in our experiences, there are better chances for solidarity. (June 25, 2021)

It was a powerful moment, followed by silence. Mimi emphasized the necessity of realizing the similarities in racial oppression we had to experience because of us being "Asian" in the United States. She continued, "solidarity [among Asian Americans] is built not because we just live together, but because we share the oppressed experiences caused by 'others' who categorize us as one group [Asian]." Her statement resonates with why we joined this reading club to be away from isolation, recognizing a lack of space to share our racialized experiences in the midst of Asian hate crimes and the COVID-19 pandemic.

Our reflection at the conclusion confirmed that the reading group, as a safe, peer-mentoring space, enabled each of us to expand our Asian American identities and seek Asian solidarity. Although the starting point of emerging and embracing our Asian American identities varied depending on personal background and lived experiences, the space and moments of reflection on when and why we saw ourselves as Asian and Asian Americans galvanized our efforts to expand and fully embrace Asian Americanness. Such expansion of our identities is necessary to building and strengthening solidarity.

*Embracing Categorization as "American Equity Grammar"*

Acknowledging the importance of Asian solidarity, we spent a substantial time discussing racial categorization as we made meaning of the

process of Asianization. These conversations involved scholarly concepts from disciplines as well as ontological questions we held about Asianization and racialized society. In our first meeting discussing the framework of AsianCrit by Iftikar and Museus (2018) and Museus and Iftikar (2014), Jiwon pointed out gaps between her self-defined identities and how others define her.

> Like other articles keep saying, but these are perceptions of others [about Asian American] .... Like multicultural education often discusses, there is a gap between how I identify myself versus how others view myself .... People keep seeing me as a woman of color, marginalized population, although I do not see myself [that way]. (June 8, 2021)

In response, Hannah brought in the idea of "double consciousness" by W. E. B. Du Bois (1897), saying "the sense of looking at oneself with the sense of others by Du Bois can be further discussed in our conversation." Our interactive discussion commented that the image of Asians depicted in AsianCrit literature offers a counter perspective, in opposition to Western and White-centered views on Asians, not necessarily a view on Asians that is initiated and owned by Asians. For example, Robin said,

> ... When Westerners say Asia, they mention Said. His term of "exotic" is not derived from a neutral stance of seeing a difference. Like what Mimi said, it is about being inferior, deviant, because [Asian-centered views] are marginalized and cannot be normalized .... The standard of comparison is the Western view. (June 8, 2021)

Robin's statement above reconfirmed Mimi's comment that what constructs Asia and Asian was shaped by the Western and Eurocentric viewpoint, and AsianCrit scholarship resists such forces. Further, our recognition of double consciousness about Asian identity led us to question the role of categorization to name races. It is imperative to point out that our transnational identities made such questioning possible as we lived in Asia and understood multiple ways of being Asian in different countries.

As many of us felt Asianization as an ongoing process is forced by White, Western norms, we often encountered conversations about

the meaning of categorization to name "Asian" American. In the second session, Yuna expressed two directions categorization can work, recognizing the possible unintended impact of categorization on racialization.

> I had tough feelings regarding categorization. On one hand, categorizing itself [with the label of Asian] can be an effort to make invisible voices visible. On the other hand, efforts to keep finding differences and putting people into different categories could be like, you keep the label, "Asian" American, not just American. And here white American is default without any adjective .... And seeing the world through the lens of racial categorization feels like I am subordinated to the process of being racialized. (June 25, 2021)

Like Yuna's comment, we agreed that Asianization is not initiated by Asians' own efforts but by others. We continued to discuss conflicting perspectives on racial categorization. Mimi later summarized our discussion in the second session saying, "We now started asking about this process: Is what we are doing [in the reading group] a way to resist racism, or are we being racialized as we view ourselves as Asian [American]?" Hannah added,

> I do not think those two can be separated. Without seeing the society racialized, I don't think we can challenge [racism]. That being said, we have to enter the inevitable trap [of being racialized] to challenge racism. To uncover white supremacy and to challenge it, solidarity started in the CRT scholarship. (June 25, 2021)

These earlier conversations evolved throughout the following sessions. In our fifth session, we concluded that "categorization is American equity grammar" to "acknowledge differences in affirmative ways." As we were raised in a relatively racially and linguistically homogeneous culture, as compared to the United States, we had to relearn the necessity of categorization that can be used to identify and amplify the voices of marginalized groups, like Asian Americans. The following dialogue shows how we made sense of and fully accepted the equity grammar in the U.S. context.

Mimi: *The categorization here is intended not to erase differences. So CRT affirms differences and does not link them to hierarchical approaches. Like being different doesn't mean who is inferior to the other.*

Hannah: *Yes, as far as I know, CRT emphasizes differences. In the mindset of Koreans, we would assume that we need to have a shared understanding, one united group [to achieve equality and fairness]. I think it is very much the Korean mind and would not work here [in the US] ... I feel [people] focus very much on differences and how these differences can make unique contributions.*

Yuna: *If people do not recognize differences, they cannot see privilege and how certain groups are structurally marginalized. So [marginalized groups] cannot find their voices because dominant groups keep their power, and hegemony follows in a way to serve the interests of the dominant group .... I continuously have been experiencing and embodying the understanding that to be able to find any marginalized voice I have to admit the significance of this [categorization]. (August 4, 2021)*

Here, our discussion posited that categorization is used to identify existing oppression and find subgroups needing more resources, otherwise differentiated voices and experiences might be marginalized by dominant groups. Additionally, we reminded ourselves of the logic behind subgroup entitlement policies aimed to ensure opportunities and more resources for groups in need (e.g., Title 1 for lower income students, Title III for English Learners, Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act), admitting subgroup categorization is often intended to accomplish equity in U.S. education.

The conceptual framing of categorization as "equity grammar" indeed was illuminated in our reflection where we found language and voice to name our racialized experiences. This also led us to ask "so what" questions to resist racism. In her reflection essay, Robin confirmed that AsianCrit was a useful tool to explore the incidents she experienced due to her "racial minority status" as Asian.

> I've learned that AsianCrit is a way of understanding myself and the world through the lens of challenging a variety of

> assumptions and stereotypes .... I have been hurt by everyday interactions that remind me about my racial minority status that sends a subtle and sometimes explicit "othering" message. I want to respond to these past incidents of hate, violence, harassment, discrimination, and shunning by writing more about it. (Reflection essay)

Echoing Robin's statement, all of us discussed changes we made in our scholarly and professional work as products of our interactive and collective engagement in this reading group. These efforts included changes in our teaching, such as increasing and/or adding readings about Asian American or AsianCrit perspectives, writing letters and opinion pieces to advocate for Asian American Pacific Islanders students, and pushing the boundary of scholarship on AsianCrit and the field as we write this current article. This process led us to own our Asian American identities as early career faculty, which in turn facilitated our efforts to search and advocate for the voices of Asian Americans to resist White supremacy as scholars and teachers in the field of education.

## Discussion

### *Expanding AsianCrit: Its Utility and New Possibilities*

Our analysis illuminates the capacities and the potentials of CRT in empowering Asian-immigrant or international scholars in navigating and challenging socially and institutionally racialized experiences in the United States. By examining AsianCrit, we were able to reflect our own Asianization experiences as part of the larger human experience pervasive in American society and were empowered to break the silence. Key concepts of AsianCrit, such as MMM, PF, or yellow peril (Iftikar & Museus, 2018; Museus et al., 2013), helped us to understand how and why racism is rooted in our day-to-day experiences. Specifically, our analysis provides a detailed account of how MMM and PF discourses are revealed and experienced in the lives of early career Asian immigrant women scholars in American academia.

More importantly, we find AsianCrit conducive to realizing the internalized White gaze in defining and understanding ourselves.

Both our data and analysis well captured the moment we become enlightened to the truth about unconscious Whiteness. Further, our article highlights our agency as transnational Asians working in U.S. higher education institutions who can challenge and reconstruct the American notion of race and racism, which has been overlooked in the existing studies (see Yao et al., 2019). Such findings suggest that AsianCrit could be useful for Asian immigrants or international students/scholars seeking to make sense of their identities and develop their belongingness in American academia (Yu, 2022; Yao et al., 2019). Our transformative experiences immersing in AsianCrit are powerful counter-storytelling in the recent drive to challenge CRT in education.

Beyond the utility of AsianCrit, we also want to highlight that our analysis informed by transnational perspectives can extend the scholarship of AsianCrit. Our perspectives as "newcomers" holding transnational identities as Korean immigrant women faculty in the United States offer a unique analysis of our racialized experiences. Our frames of reference to see race as "diversity," "differences," and sometimes "power" in the global contexts had been shifted toward an understanding of race as "majorly about exercising power" entangled with White supremacy, as we had been racialized in the United States where race is the primary fabrication of society. Moreover, a wide range of images of Asians reflected in other societies we had experienced and embodied did not necessarily speak to images of Asians shaped by the White and Western perspectives we learned in the United States. In this sense, we felt the AsianCrit literature is limited to American society and Asian Americans and does not fully address transnational perspectives held by first-generation Asian immigrants and/or newcomers in the United States. The cognitive dissonance coming from our transnational perspectives led to our intensive negotiation of Asian identities by *resisting* Asian American identities that are *imagined by* Western views in the United States (e.g., yellow peril, model minority, perpetuated foreigners) and also *embracing* them as a way of strategic essentialism, seeking solidarity (Chang, 1993; Iftikar & Museus, 2018; Museus et al., 2013).

As such, our transnational perspectives depicted in this study offer possibilities of extending AsianCrit scholarship by embracing ideas and experiences of first-generation immigrants, newcomers, or Asians

"living on the border" like us. As identities are fluctuating and socially constructed that are bound to time and space, future studies can be benefitted by using a transnational lens to intersectionally analyze the Asianization experienced by Asians holding various backgrounds (see Moon, 2022). As Asian is a rapidly growing racial group in the United States (Budiman & Ruiz, 2021), teaching and mentoring informed by AsianCrit and transnational perspectives can better support Asian students and communities in U.S. academia.

### *Identity-Informed Peer Mentoring: Building Asian Solidarity*

This study documents and analyzes experiences where Korean immigrant early career scholars make sense of their racial and ethnic identities as first-generation Asian Americans in the United States. Our inquiry journey first started as a reading group. As we gained a better understanding of what brought us to this group, we recognized the values of collaborative inquiry—our collective storytelling, self- and group-reflection, as well as critical frameworks—that guided us to think and reimagine different approaches to diversity in higher education. Our group went beyond a study/reading group or a research team; we developed a sense of belonging based on empathy and genuine care informed by connecting reading contents with our experiences in U.S. higher education that came from shared cultural, linguistic, and ethnic identity backgrounds. This identity-based sharing led us to become each other's third space and safe space (Gutiérrez, 1995, 2008). As evidenced in the level of transparency and straightforwardness in data, even with our most disconcerted or painful memories, we were able to candidly share our stories and history. Our meeting was the time and place for healing and liberation (Castillo-Montoya et al., 2022; Hooks, 2003; H. Kim, 2020).

From this relational space, we were able to build Asian solidarity by seeing ourselves in Asian American communities through collaborative reading, shared stories, interactive discussion and negotiation, courage to challenge each other's boundaries of identity, and finally by embracing Asian American identities with empathy. While we benefitted from the solidarity that we built based on our Korean identity, we also recognized the possible limit that such closed groups may not fully address other subgroups of Asian populations in higher

education. Bringing these multiple perspectives, cultivating empathy, and establishing solidarity across Asian American communities can be the direction of future research.

In addition to presenting the work from the vantage point of immigrant early career scholars, we also realized how little opportunity and space we had to engage in this kind of conversation as graduate students in the United States. Much of the work we do in the academy is in a commune or concerning one another. However, our educational training and/or institutional support oftentimes disregards this aspect of promoting solidarity and humanizing approaches over "quantity" of scholarly production (Yoon & Templeton, 2019). Furthermore, unlike many higher education institutions' diversity, vision, and mission statements, many international and transnational students, especially when their first language is not English, are still framed as someone who is lacking, needing help, and who are not enough (Wang & Sun, 2021). What does it really mean to have "diversity" in academia? How do we formulate a support group? We hope to illuminate and think critically about higher education experiences that have led to students feeling a sense of belonging, as well as encounters that have left linguistically and culturally diverse students on the periphery.

The concept of identity-based community and peer mentoring within higher education is underdefined, yet central to transformative collaborative research. Realizing the lack of opportunities and spaces to share and reflect on our experiences affected by the racialized lens and a wide range of racism, we call for urgent institutional and systemic support from schools to "see" and "recognize" our presence in academia. This guides our future work and desire to further develop this topic of thinking about community in academia. The power of our words and narratives will further illustrate the role ethnicity-based or identity-based communities in higher education play in formulating and cultivating researcher identities. Furthermore, we are committed to interrupting the alienation and marginalization we experienced by making our own experiences a site for research. We are taking ownership of our positions as members in academia and the product of U.S. higher education; we center ourselves as sites of positive change by critically thinking about our own positionality and identity. Future studies will help us learn how identity-based

mentoring communities can be developed across disciplines and how educational spaces can provide safe, inclusive, and nurturing environments in higher education.

## Implications

The findings of this study offer implications for research and practice to support diverse faculty in higher education. First, identity-based faculty development should happen beyond the institution with which the faculty member is affiliated. Given the rarity of resources and lack of support systems to help diverse faculty members feel "safe" enough to discuss their experiences related to their social identity within their institutions, we recommend building communities to connect faculty members with the same identity across institutions. Online mentoring groups could be one way for doing this. Also, as seen in our case, which started as a voluntary effort and later grew into a peer-mentoring group, many identity-based peer-mentoring communities are informally organized, even if they continue to evolve to be a support group. We suggest institutions acknowledge those efforts that faculty members who voluntarily initiate or collaborate in peer-mentoring efforts as part of the formal review process for faculty development. Through such a structured system of acknowledging identity-based professional development, diverse faculty members could continue to seek and generate new forms of support within and beyond the institution.

Also, sharing life experiences through storytelling and narrative should be part of professional programs for diverse faculty development. As our study has shown, through the process of individuals sharing their stories, those stories become the collective narrative, and personal life cannot be separated from professional life. Sharing those stories together and being reflexive on the mundanity of everyday life also generates new potential to (re)connect the scholarship, teaching, and services of each faculty member. To do this successfully, we suggest interdisciplinary community building among diverse faculty members. The different disciplinary background of each member generates fruitful and fluid connections to better understand our life experiences. While the limited space of this article does not allow us to elaborate on how the story-sharing and the interdisciplinary nature

of the group influenced our scholarship, teaching, and service to community, institution, and professional organizations, we suggest future research to explore the ongoing efforts and outcomes of the identity-based peer-mentoring groups.

Last, we want to be cautious of using the umbrella term "faculty of diversity." As our shared story has highlighted, the authors' shared identity as an Asian immigrant faculty does not fit into the preexisting categories of diversity. Although the frame of diverse faculty contributes to justice education and society, there is diversity even within this well-intended frame. Our study shares one potential way to expand the concept of diversity in higher education by highlighting the transnational aspects (Cruz et al., 2020),which are underexamined in the current literature on diversity. Rather than trying to fit the cultural assets that immigrant faculty members bring into U.S. higher education, we need to expand our current frames of diversity by bringing the transnational aspects as part of the diversity, equity, and inclusion.

## Conclusion

The purpose of this collaborative self-study is not to generalize our experiences as Korean immigrant women faculty, nor to denunciate how much we had to suffer from racism in higher education and in this country as an outsider. Rather, this is both a reflective and forward-looking journey on how we navigate our constant "feeling of living on the border" to find our voice and make sense of our existence in this highly racialized society. This project reminded us not only how we explore and understand our newly formed Asian American identity, but how much we longed for this opportunity just to talk about our experiences, and how little space and time we had to listen to each other's stories and empathize in the past. *The feeling of living on the border* still remains, and our journey to find our voice will continue individually and collectively. We hope other racially, ethnically, linguistically, and culturally minoritized groups of faculty and international students in higher education can find their solidarity, peace, and comfort by having an identity-based peer support group, participating in study or reading groups informed by critical theories, and creating space and opportunity to share their transnational experiences and knowledge.

**Acknowledgments** The authors want to thank Crystal Garcia who read and commented on the earlier draft of this work and all those who made this article stronger.

## References

An, S. (2017). AsianCrit perspective on social studies. *Journal of Social Studies Research*, *41*(2), 131–139. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jssr.2016.06.002

Aoki, A., & Takeda, O. (2009). *Asian American politics*. Polity Press.

Blalock, A. E., & Akehi, M. (2018). Collaborative autoethnography as a pathway for transformative learning. *Journal of Transformative Education*, *16*(2), 89–107. https://doi.org/10.1177/1541344617715711

Bottoms, S. A., Pegg, J., Adams, A., Wu, K., Risser, H. S., & Kern, A. L. (2013). Mentoring from the outside: The role of a peer mentoring community in the development of early career education faculty. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, *21*(2), 195–218. https://doi.org/10.1080/13611267.2013.813730

Budiman, A., & Ruiz, N. G. (2021). *Key facts about Asian Americans, a diverse and growing population*. Pew Research Center. https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2021/04/29/key-facts-about-asian-americans/

Callahan, L. (2012). Pre-imposition vs. In situ negotiation of group and individual identities: Spanish and English in U.S. service encounters. *Critical Multilingualism Studies*, *1*(1), 57–73. https://cms.arizona.edu/index.php/multilingual/article/view/8/26

Castillo-Montoya, M., Hunter, T., Moore, W. C., & Sulé, T. (2022). Why the caged bird sings in the academy: A decolonial collaborative autoethnography of African American and Puerto Rican faculty and staff in higher education. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *15*(5), 668–680. https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000395

Chang, H. (2013). Individual and collaborative autoethnography as method. In S. H. Jones, T. E. Adams, & C. Ellis (Eds.), *Handbook of autoethnography* (pp. 107–122). Routledge.

Chang, H., Ngunjiri, F. W., & Hernandez, K.-A. C. (2013). *Collaborative autoethnography*. Left Coast Press.

Chang, R. S. (1993). Toward an Asian American legal scholarship: Critical race theory, post-structuralism, and narrative space. *California Law Review*, *81*(5), 1241–1323. https://doi.org/10.2307/3480919

Collet, C., & Koakutsu, I. (2009). Does transnational living preclude panethnic thinking? In C. Collet & P. T. Lien (Eds.), *The transnational politics of Asian Americans* (pp. 168–186). Temple University Press.

Collins, P. H. (2015). Intersectionality's definitional dilemmas. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *41*, 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-073014-112142

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, *43*(6), 1241–1299. https://doi.org/10.2307/1229039

Cruz, J., McDonald, J., Broadfoot, K., Chuang, A. K., & Ganesh, S. (2020). “Aliens” in the United States: A collaborative autoethnography of foreign-born faculty. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *29*(3), 272–285. https://doi.org/10.1177/1056492618796561

Dhamoon, R. K. (2011). Considerations on mainstreaming intersectionality. *Political Research Quarterly*, *64*(1), 230–243. https://doi.org/10.1177/1065912910379227

Driscoll, L. G., Parkes, K. A., Tilley-Lubbs, G. A., Brill, J. M., & Bannister, V. R. P. (2009). Navigating the lonely sea: Peer mentoring and collaboration among aspiring women scholars. *Mentoring & Tutoring*, *17*(1), 5–21. https://doi.org/10.1080/13611260802699532

Du Bois, W. E. B. (1897). Strivings of the Negro people. *The Atlantic*. https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/1897/08/strivings-of-the-negro-people/305446/

Francis, D., & Hester, S. (2012). *An invitation to ethnomethodology: Language, society and social interaction*. SAGE Publications.

Gray-Nicolas, N. M., & Nash, A. M. (2021). First things first: Black women situating identity in the first-year faculty experience. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2021.1969907

Gutiérrez, K. D. (1995). Unpackaging academic discourse. *Discourse Processes*, *19*(1), 21–37. https://doi.org/10.1080/01638539109544903

Gutiérrez, K. D. (2008). Developing a sociocritical literacy in the third space. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *43*(2), 148–164. https://doi.org/10.1598/RRQ.43.2.3

Hamilton, M. L., & Pinnegar, S. (1998). Conclusion: The value and the promise of self- study. In M. L. Hamilton (Ed.), *Reconceptualizing teaching practice: Self-study in teacher education* (pp. 235–246). Falmer Press.

Hamilton, M. L., & Pinnegar, S. (2013). A topography of collaboration: Methodology, identity and community in self-study of practice research. *Studying Teacher Education*, *9*(1), 74–89. https://doi.org/10.1080/17425964.2013.771572

Hamilton, M. L., Smith, L., & Worthington, K. (2008). Fitting the methodology with the research: An exploration of narrative, self-study and autoethnography. *Studying Teacher Education*, *4*(1), 17–28. https://doi.org/10.1080/17425960801976321

Hooks, B. (2003). *Rock my soul: Black people and self-esteem*. Square Press.

Horse, A. J. Y., Jeung, R., Lim, R., Tang, B., Im, M., Higashiyama, L., Schweng, L., & Chen, M. (2021). *Stop AAPI Hate national report*. https://stopaapihate.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/Stop-AAPI-Hate-National-Report-Final.pdf

Hsieh, B., & Kim, J. (2020). Challenging the invisibility of Asian Americans in education. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, *42*(2), 95–103. https://doi.org/10.1080/10714413.2020.1760643

Hsieh, B., & Nguyen, H. T. (2020). Identity-informed mentoring to support acculturation of female faculty of color in higher education: An Asian American female mentoring relationship case study. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *13*(2), 169–180. https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000118

Hwang, W. C. (2021). Demystifying and addressing internalized racism and oppression among Asian Americans. *American Psychologist*, *76*(4), 596–610. https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000798

Iftikar, J. S., & Museus, S. D. (2018). On the utility of Asian critical (AsianCrit) theory in the field of education. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *31*(10), 935–949. https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2018.1522008

Kim, C. J. (1999). The racial triangulation of Asian Americans. *Politics & Society*, *27*(1), 105–138. https://doi.org/10.1177/0032329299027001005

Kim, E., Hogge, I., Mok, G., & Nishida, H. (2014). Work experiences of foreign-born Asian women counseling and psychology faculty. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *42*(3), 147–160. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-1912.2014.00051.x

Kim, H. J. (2020). “Where are you from? Your English is so good”: A Korean female scholar’s autoethnography of academic imperialism in U.S. higher education. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *33*(5), 491–507. https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2019.1681551

Kim, P. Y., & Lee, D. (2014). Internalized model minority myth, Asian values, and help-seeking attitudes among Asian American students. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *20*(1), 98–106. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0033351

Kodama, C. M., & Park, C. E. (2021). More than academics: The transformative effect of an identity-based peer mentor program for Asian American STEM students. *About Campus: Enriching the Student Learning Experience*, *26*(1), 17–25. https://doi.org/10.1177/1086482220969677

LaBoskey, V. K. (2004). The methodology of self-study and its theoretical underpinnings. In J. J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. K. LaBoskey, & T. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self- study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 817–870). Kluwer. https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-1-4020-6545-3_21

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Racialized discourses and ethnic epistemologies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 257–277). SAGE Publications.

Lee, J. J., & Rice, C. (2007). Welcome to America? International student perceptions of discrimination. *Higher Education*, *53*(3), 381–409. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-005-4508-3

Lee, S. J., Park, E., & Wong, J.-H. S. (2017). Racialization, schooling, and becoming American: Asian American experiences. *Educational Studies: Journal of the American Educational Studies Association*, *53*(5), 492–510. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131946.2016.1258360

Mancl, K., & Lee, K. (2016). Mentoring East Asian women science and engineering faculty. *The Ohio Journal of Science*, *116*(2), 28–33. https://doi.org/10.18061/ojs.v116i2.5033

Maramba, D. C., & Kodama, C. M. (Eds.). (2018). *Bridging research and practice to support Asian American students (New Directions for Student Services, No. 160)*. Jossey-Bass.

Mayuzumi, K. (2015). Navigating Orientalism: Asian women faculty in the Canadian academy. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, *18*(2), 277–296. https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2014.946495

McKinzie, A. E., & Richards, P. L. (2019). An argument for context-driven intersectionality. *Sociology Compass*, *13*(4), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12671

Moon, S. (2022). *The flows of transnationalism: Questioning identities and reimagining curriculum*. Routledge.

Morton, B. C., & Gil, E. (2019). Not a solo ride: Co-constructed peer mentoring for early-career educational leadership faculty. *International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education*, *8*(4), 361–377. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJMCE-02-2019-0026

Murakami, E. T., & Núñez, A. M. (2014). Latina faculty transcending barriers: Peer mentoring in a Hispanic-serving institution. *Mentoring & Tutoring*, *22*(4), 284–301. https://doi.org/10.1080/13611267.2014.945739

Murrell, A. J., Blake-Beard, S., & Porter, D. M., Jr. (2021). The importance of peer mentoring, identity work and holding environments: A study of African American leadership development. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *18*(9), Article 4920. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18094920

Museus, S. D. (2022). Relative racialization and Asian American college student activism. *Harvard Educational Review*, *92*(2), 182–205. https://doi.org/10.17763/1943-5045-92.2.182

Museus, S. D., & Iftikar, J. (2014). An Asian critical theory (AsianCrit). In M. Y. Danico (Ed.), *Asian American society: An encyclopedia* (pp. 95–98). SAGE Publications and Association for Asian American Studies.

Museus, S. D., Maramba, D. C., & Teranishi, R. T. (Eds.). (2013). *The misrepresented minority: New insights on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, and the implications for higher education*. Stylus Publishing.

Ng, J. C., Lee, S. S., & Pak, Y. K. (2007). Contesting the model minority and perpetual foreigner stereotypes: A critical review of literature on Asian Americans in education. *Review of Research in Education*, *31*(1), 95–130. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X07300046095

Ngunjiri, F. W., Hernandez, K. C., & Chang, H. (2010). Living autoethnography: Connecting life and research. *Journal of Research Practice*, *6*, Article E1.

Paul, S., Stein, F., Ottenbacher, K. J., & Liu, Y. (2002). The role of mentoring on research productivity among occupational therapy faculty. *Occupational Therapy International*, *9*(1), 24–40. https://doi.org/10.1002/oti.154

Petersen, W. (1966). Success story, Japanese-American style. *New York Times Magazine*, *9*(6), 20–43. https://www.nytimes.com/1966/01/09/archives/success-story-japaneseamerican-style-success-story-japaneseamerican.html

Poon, O., Squire, D., Kodama, C., Byrd, A., Chan, J., Manzano, L., Furr, S., & Bishundat, D. (2016). A critical review of the model minority myth in selected literature on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders in higher education. *Review of Educational Research*, *86*(2), 469–502. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654315612205

Saldaña, J. (2021). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. SAGE Publications.

Settles, I. H., Jones, M. K., Buchanan, N. T., & Dotson, K. (2021). Epistemic exclusion: Scholar(ly) devaluation that marginalizes faculty of color. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *14*(4), 493–507. https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000174

Skerrett, A. (2015). *Teaching transnational youth: Literacy and education in a changing world*. Teachers College Press.

Teranishi, R. T., & Nguyen, T. K. (2012). Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders: The changing demography of the United States and implications for education policy. *Asian American Policy Review*, *22*, 17–27. https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A306598126/AONE?u=googlescholar&sid=bookmark-AONE&xid=0d714e54

Tran, B. (2017). The impact of the model minority culture in higher education institutions: The cause of Asian Americans' psychological and mental health. In Information Resources Management Association (Ed.), *Gaming and technology addiction: Breakthroughs in research and practice* (pp. 404–445). Information Science Reference/IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-0778-9.ch020

Vanassche, E., & Kelchtermans, G. (2015). The state of the art in self-study of teacher education practices: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *47*(4), 508–528. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2014.995712

Wang, L. L. C. (2008). Myths and realities of Asian American success. In G. Li & L. Wang (Eds.), *Model minority myth revisited: An interdisciplinary approach to demystifying Asian American educational experiences* (pp. 21–42). Information Age Publishing.

Wang, X., & Sun, W. (2021). Unidirectional or inclusive international education? An analysis of discourses from U.S. international student services office websites. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *15*(5), 617–629. https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000357

Warnke, G. (2007). *After identity: Rethinking race, sex, and gender*. Cambridge University Press.

Yao, C. W. (2018). "They don't care about you": First-year Chinese international students' experiences with neo-racism and othering on a U.S. campus. *Journal of the First-Year Experience & Students in Transition*, *30*(1), 87–101. https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cehsedadfacpub/84

Yao, C. W., George Mwangi, C. A., & Brown, V. K. M. (2019). Exploring the intersection of transnationalism and critical race theory: A critical race

analysis of international student experiences in the United States. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, *22*(1), 38–58. https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2018.1497968

Yi, J., & Todd, N. R. (2021). Internalized model minority myth among Asian Americans: Links to anti-Black attitudes and opposition to affirmative action. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *27*(4), 569–578. https://doi.org/10.1037/cdp0000448

Yi, V., Mac, J., Na, V. S., Venturanza, R. J., Museus, S. D., Buenavista, T. L., & Pendakur, S. L. (2020). Toward an anti-imperialistic critical race analysis of the model minority myth. *Review of Educational Research*, *90*(4), 542–579. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654320933532

Yoon, H. S., & Templeton, T. N. (2019). The practice of listening to children: The challenges of hearing children out in an adult-regulated world. *Harvard Educational Review*, *89*(1), 55–84. https://doi.org/10.17763/1943-5045-89.1.55

Yoon, I. (2019). Hauntings of a Korean American woman researcher in the field. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *32*(5), 447–464. https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2019.1597211

Yu, J. (2022). The racial learning of Chinese international students in the U.S.: A transnational perspective. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2022.2106878

**Appendix I. List of Texts for the Reading Group**

Amos, Y. T. (2014). To lose is to win: The effects of student evaluations in a multicultural education class on a Japanese female faculty with a non-native English accent. *Understanding & Dismantling Privilege*, *IV*(2), 116–133.

An, S. (2017). AsianCrit perspective on social studies. *The Journal of Social Studies Research*, *41*, 131–139.

An, S. (2020). Disrupting curriculum of violence on Asian Americans. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, *42*(2), 141–156.

Chang, R. S. (1993) Toward an Asian American legal scholarship: Critical race theory, post-structuralism, and narrative space. *California Law Review*, 81, 1241–1323.

Hsieh, B. & Nguyen, H. T. (2021). Coalitional resistance: Challenging racialized and gendered oppression in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education,* 72(3), 355–367.

Iftikar, J. S. & Museus, S. D. (2018). On the utility of Asian critical (AsianCrit) theory in the field of education. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *31*(10), 935–949.

Kim, G. M. (2020). Challenging native speakerism in literacy research and education. *Journal of Literacy Research,52*(3), 368–375.

Kim, H. J. (2020). 'Where are you from? Your English is so good': A Korean female scholar's autoethnography of academic imperialism in U.S. higher education. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 33*(5), 491–507.

Kolano (2016). Smartness as cultural wealth: An AsianCrit counterstory. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 19*(6), 1149–1164.

Museus, S. D., & Iftikar, J. (2014). An Asian critical theory (AsianCrit). In M. Y. Danico (Ed.), *Asian American society: An encyclopedia* (pp. 95-98). Sage Publications and Association for Asian American Studies.

Yoon, I. (2019). Hauntings of a Korean American woman researcher in the field. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 32*(5), 447–464.

**List of Texts for the Reading Group**

| Meeting Date | Text |
|---|---|
| Session 1<br>June 8, 2021 | • Iftikar, J. S. & Museus, S. D. (2018). On the utility of Asian critical (AsianCrit) theory in the field of education. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 31*(10), 935–949.<br>• Museus, S. D., & Iftikar, J. (2014). An Asian critical theory (AsianCrit). In M. Y. Danico (Ed.), *Asian American society: An encyclopedia* (pp. 95-98). Sage Publications and Association for Asian American Studies. |
| Session 2<br>June 25, 2021 | • Chang, R. S. (1993) Toward an Asian American legal scholarship: Critical race theory, post-structuralism, and narrative space. *California Law Review, 81*, 1241–1323. |
| Session 3<br>July 9, 2021 | • Kolano (2016). Smartness as cultural wealth: An AsianCrit counterstory. Race Ethnicity and Education, 19(6), 1149–1164.<br>• Yoon, I. (2019). Hauntings of a Korean American woman researcher in the field. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 32*(5), 447–464. |
| Session 4<br>July 23, 2021 | • Hsieh, B. & Nguyen, H. T. (2021). Coalitional resistance: Challenging racialized and gendered oppression in teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 72(3), 355–367.<br>• Kim, H. J. (2020). 'Where are you from? Your English is so good': A Korean female scholar's autoethnography of academic imperialism in U.S. higher education. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 33*(5), 491–507. |
| Session 5<br>August 4, 2021 | • Amos, Y. T. (2014). To lose is to win: The effects of student evaluations in a multicultural education class on a Japanese female faculty with a non-native English accent. *Understanding & Dismantling Privilege, IV*(2), 116–133.<br>• An, S. (2020). Disrupting curriculum of violence on Asian Americans. Review of Education, *Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies, 42*(2), 141–156. |
| Session 6<br>August 17, 2021 | • An, S. (2017). AsianCrit perspective on social studies. *The Journal of Social Studies Research, 41*, 131–139.<br>• Kim, G. M. (2020). Challenging native speakerism in literacy research and education. *Journal of Literacy Research,52*(3), 368–375. |

## Appendix B. English-Korean Translation

| Encountering the Moments of Racialization: Asianization as Imposed Task | |
|---|---|
| …I was sitting there [the doctor's office], and he [the doctor] opened the door and came in, and he said, "Hi" and pinched my cheek like this. I said hi and he was shaking my cheek like this [pinching her cheeks with two hands]. Like you do to babies. I was so dumbfounded and said, "What was that?" Then he said, "No. That's uh... just a way of saying hi. (07/09/21) | …앉아 있었는데 그 뒤에서 이렇게 문 열고 딱 들어왔는데 "하이"하면서 내 볼을 이렇게 탁 꼬집는 거예요. 내가 하이 이렇게 하고 내 볼을 이렇게 약간 이렇게 하는거야. 애기한테 하는 것 처럼. 그래서 내가 What was that? 그러니까. No. That's uh.. just a way of saying hi. 이렇게 하는 거예요. |
| **Making Invisible Stories of Struggle Visible: Collaborative Storytelling** | |
| Although it may seem like there's not much difference between how much Asians make from Whites, I think it is an illusion because [those statistics] often neglect the fact that many Asians work extra hours and have higher credentials. It was like that in the past [like in Chang's (1993) article], but I think it is still true today. Don't we often "grind our souls" [Korean idiom meaning extremely hardworking]? I think it's not only for Koreans. I think it is true for most of (my) Asian friends. (6/25/21) | Asian들이 임금이 별로 White가 차이 나지 않는 것처럼 보이지만 사실은 노동 시간이 엄청나게 높고 학력이 더 높고 그렇다는 사실들이 간과되기 때문에 그냥 지표상으로 그냥 평균 값으로.<br>이렇게 보면 White과 마치 얼마 차이 나지 않는 것처럼 보이나. 그게 굉장히 착시인 거고 근데 사실은 그게 과거의 일만이 아니라 지금도 그렇다고 생각하거든요.<br>영혼을 많이 갈아 넣으면서 살지 않나요.<br>이 그게 한국에만 그런 게 아니라 아시아 친구들 대부분 그런 것 같은데. |
| I always felt insecure. Whenever I had to write in English, I always went to the writing center. I tried to hide such [insecurity]. I always got [editing service] from native English speakers; [so] it always took more time. It's the same for the presentation… But I can't even fully verbalize the anxiety I felt inside. Anyways, like those authors [Hsieh & Nguyen (2021)] felt alienation, marginalization, and imposter syndrome, I always felt self-doubt while in school. My positionality—Asian, foreigner, immigrant, and non-native speaker-, these things strangle me. (7/23/21) | 항상 그런 insecurity 가 많았고요. 영어 할 때나 이렇게 할 때 항상 저는 라이팅 센터 항상 갔고요. 그런 걸 뭔가 안 들키려고. 네이티브들한테도 다 이렇게 [에디팅] 받고. 항상오래 걸리고 그랬는데. 발표 이런 거 할 때도. 아무튼 그 이 저자들도 보면은 뭐 alien, marginalization, imposter [syndrome], 뭐 이런 거 느낀다. self-doubt 학교에 있으면서 항상 그걸 느꼈던 것 같아요. 나의 위치 때문에 Asian이고 foreign이고 immigrant이고 non-native speaker고 이런 것들이 계속 진짜 옥죄어 오고. |
| There was a comment that surprised me. One of the professors, who was a white male… I think he wasn't careful. It seemed like those words came out by accident… I was talking about my worries of getting a job in the U.S., and he said, 'You are neither a White nor a man [therefore, you will get a job, like diversity hire].' What he meant was that [women of color] take jobs away [from White males]...That just came out like that. He really | 약간 놀랐었던 멘트가 있는데, 전 지도 교수가 white 남자였어요. 우연히 튀어나온 말 같은데.. 너는 white도 아니고 남자도 아니잖아. 이렇게 애기하는 거야<br>그 말이 뭐냐 하면. 니네가 그거를 아이덴티티로 그걸 뜯어간다 이거지.<br>근데 그게 진짜 탁 나왔어. 진짜<br>그렇게 생각하는 거야. 그 가져간다고 생각하는 거지. 그래서 내 존재 자체가 민폐라고 생각했어. |

| | |
|---|---|
| believed that [we] take away [White men's positions]. So, I wanted to apologize for who I am. (6/25/21) | |
| Where and why does oppression occur [for Asians in the United States]? Like Soo Bin said, [we] have discussed that it is very difficult to identify that point yet it's crucial… When you say you're less oppressed than your Black and Brown colleagues, but that's also someone else's perspective, looking through others' lens to say that we [Asian Americans] are not oppressed enough. Then, we must speak against such a narrative.<br>In our early sessions, we repeated the dominant perspective viewing Asians not knowing (09/20/21) | 어디에서 그 oppress 되는 지점이 있는가. 수빈 선생님이 그 지점을 찾는 게 되게 힘든 일이고 잘 찾아야 할 것 같다라는 얘기를 했었는데… Black이나 Brown 애들보다 너네는 덜 oppressed 됐잖아 라고 이렇게 말은 하지만 그것도 그 누구의 아이 누구의 렌즈를 통해서 보면서 그래서 우리가 enough하게 억압받지 않는다라는 그런 말 자체도 어떻게 보면 누구의 관점에서 그 다음에 거기에 대항하는 우리가 대응의 관점에서 계속 AsianCrit을 얘기해야 되는. |
| When I came, I was just 20 years old. A professor said to me, 'A yellow fish belongs to a yellow pond.' I didn't know whether it was race-related [comment] then… Thinking about it now, it's a seriously problematic statement. But I have multiple experiences similar to that… I've always lived my life feeling that [some] people don't bother to say things like that [on my face because] I'm an immigrant, a woman, an outsider. (7/23/21) | 저도 처음 왔을 때 그때 막 스무 살 막 이렇게 왔을 때 나한테 그 교수가 'yellow fish belongs to yellow pond' 이러더라고요. 근데 나는 그때 처음에 그게 racial 그런 건지 그걸 몰랐어요. …지금 생각하면 진짜 엄청난 말인데…그런 말을 해도 상관없다는 그런 걸 항상 느끼면서 살아왔다 그런 것 같아요. 이민자로서 또 여자로서 아웃사이더로서. |
| I got a doctorate and became a faculty member. However, as a Korean American or Asian American scholar, [I'm always marginalized]. When I go to any conference, white professors are the mainstream. I'm always marginalized unless I'm a professor in Korean studies or something like that. Of course, everyone is marginalized in some way, but I thought it would be extremely difficult for me to be a part of the mainstream. (7/23/21) | 학자로서 공부를 좋은 데서 박사를 따고 교수가 됐다 한들, 학회에 가면 내가 Korea Foundation Korean Studies 가 아닌 이상. 학회에 어떤 가면 아무래도 White 그런 교수들이 일단 주류고. 나는 항상 약간 marginalized 되어 있거든요. 어떤 방 방면으로도. 물론 모든 사람이 다 어떤 방면으로 marginalized 되어 있지만 그래도 내가 그 주류에 끼기가 굉장히 어렵다는 생각을 했어요. |
| I think this society wants me to feel that I don't belong to them, thus making me accept it [perpetual foreigner narrative]. So, we [as the first-generation immigrant] voluntarily accept a foreigner [label] and think that [second and third generation] Asian-Americans are different. But, in a way, people also see them as foreigners. [Moreover, because we have internalized the PF narrative] when we ourselves meet other Asian Americans, we also | 이 사회 내가 belong하지 않다고 느끼게 만드는 그 자체가 이걸 더 강화하게 하지는 않는다라는 생각도 들었어요. 그러니까 우리가 자발적으로 나는 그냥 foreigner라는 거 accept하고 우리는 그래서 Asian-American는 다르다 라고 생각은 하지만 어떻게 보면 또 그냥 아시안으로서 살아가는 여기에 American 사람들도 사람들도, 남들도 다 그렇게 자꾸 foreigner 라고 보니까 우리도 당연히 그 사람들을 볼 때 Asian American드 볼 때 재는 어디서 어느 나라에 왔지. 이렇게 생각하게 되는 게 아닐까. 그리고 그럼으로써 그것이 나를 바라보는 나의 관점 나의 생각에도 |

<table>
<tr><td>ask, ‘Where do they come from?’ I just realized the PF [ideology] might have affected my way of looking at myself and others. (09/20/21)</td><td>영향을 주는 것은 아닐까라는 생각도 방금 들었었어요.</td></tr>
<tr><td>I don’t think that people would ask a Black person what country they’re from. But when they look at Asians, they [ask] ‘Which country are you from?’ The idea of foreignness is closely linked with the concept of nation. So [PF ideology] makes it very difficult to build Asian American solidarity [across different national backgrounds]. (6/25/21)</td><td>그 사람도 Black들에게는 어느 나라 출신이냐 안 물어볼 것 같거든요. 근데 아시안들한테는 ‘어느 나라 출신이냐’를 불어보니까. foreignness는  nation의 개념과 관련이 있어서. 이게 스며들어 있어서 Asian American의 Solidarity를 만든다는 것이 되게 어렵죠.</td></tr>
<tr><th colspan="2">Negotiation toward Solidarity: Self, Other, and Categorization</th></tr>
<tr><td>I met a taxi driver who migrated from Korea 20 years ago. Heard 70% of the population in Hawaii are Asian. At that time, there was dissonance between Korea and Japan due to the economic sanctions. When asked about any conflicts between Japanese and Korean descendants among Asian communities, the driver told us: “Most Asian people have been living here for a long time… We knew if there was any trouble among Asians, it would ruin us [Asian American living in Hawaii]....So people would compromise quickly to cooperate.” What I want to say is, nationality might matter more to the first generation of immigrants, but that is a different story for Asian Americans, the second, third, and fourth generations of immigrants. (6/25/21)</td><td>하와이에 가서 한인 택시 하시는 분을 만난 적이 있었어요. 근데 하와이는 진짜 거의 Asian이 되게 많잖아요. 한 70% 정도.  근데 그 당시에 한일 양국간에 저희 말이 많았잖아요. 경제적인 제재라든지. 국적 관련해서 그렇게 서로 다른 나라 출신들끼리 뭔가 트럭을 얻느냐라고 했을 때 그분들이 여기서 오래 살았고 사람들이 그러니까 자기네들끼리 싸우면 망한다는 거 아는 거예요. 우리 같은 경우는 1세대니까 nationality가 그렇지만 그렇지 않은 자 자식들 여기서 태어난 애들 그런 사람들 생각해 보면 또 그건 다 다른 얘기겠구나라는 생각도 좀 들었었어요.</td></tr>
<tr><td>It was in my fifth year [in the doctoral program]. I was teaching elementary social studies methods and racism was one of the topics in the curriculum. But it was mostly about Black and white, nothing about Asian…Then, there was a new professor, a Chicana scholar, who helped me to realize that my curriculum was completely silent about Asian experiences…  She modeled a lesson about the Vincent Chin case… which blew my mind… In 1982… a white guy and his son killed an Asian man named Vincent Chin using a baseball bat… in Detroit…. However, they were not charged with first-degree murder. …After watching the documentary film [as a part of her lesson], right at that moment, my</td><td>박사 5년 차 때였는데 제가 계속 초등 사회를 가르쳐 왔거든요. 초등 사회 방법론을. 근데 racism 되게 많이 다루죠.이게 계속 Black 앤 White로 다뤘고요. 근데 새로운 라틴계 교수가 하나 왔어... 빈센 친 다큐멘터리로 수업을 하나 모델로 짜 줬어. 1982년에…디트로이트 한복판 맥도날드 앞에 공중전화 부스에서 통화를 하고 있는 거를 야구 배트로 백인 아들과 아버지 부자가 사람들 다 보는 앞에서 머리통을 깨서 죽인 거예요. 근데 결국엔 1급 살인도 안 받고. 근데 어쨌든 그런데 그 다큐멘터리를 내가 딱 보고 났는데. 순간 내가 코리안에서 Asian이 되는 거예요. 경험이 너무 중요하다. …Asian이기 때문에 공통으로 어쩔 수 없이 겪게 되는 경험치가 쌓이면 쌓일수록 그 solidarity를 말할 개연성이 높아지는 것 같아요.</td></tr>
</table>

| | |
|---|---|
| identity changed to an Asian-American from a Korean-American. What I'm saying is that such [awakening] experience is so crucial… to be able to see that Asians in the U.S. experience [racism] together. The more we realize the similarities in our experiences, there are better chances for solidarity. (6/25/21) | |
| Like other articles keep saying, but these are perceptions of others [about Asian American]….Like multicultural education often discusses,  there is a gap between how I identify myself versus how others view myself….People keep seeing me as a woman of color, marginalized population, although I do not see myself [that way]. (6/8/21) | article도 아까 계속 얘기하지만 다른 사람의 perception이나. 그러니까 multicultural education 수업 같은 거 박사 때 들으면 그런 얘기 맨날 하잖아요. 남이 나를 그런 보는 시선하고 내가 어떻게 identify 하는지. 거기에 대한 괴리감이 좀 좀 크잖아요. 나는 그렇게 생각 안 해도 저쪽에서는 계속 나를 women of color, marginalized population 이렇게 계속 보는 거랑 또 내가 스스로 나를 어떻게 보는지 좀 그거에 대해 좀 생각해 볼 필요가 있는 것 같아요. |
| … When Western say Asia, they mention Said. His term of 'exotic' is not derived from a neutral stance of seeing a difference. Like what Soo Bin said, it is about being inferior, deviant, [as opposed to the West] because [Asian-centered views] are marginalized and cannot be normalized… The standard of comparison is the Western view. (6/8/21) | 서구가 보는 Asian할 때는 항상 사이드를 얘기하는데. 사이드가 말한 이 exotic한 거는 neutral 한 difference 이런 게 아니라 아까 말했던 것처럼 수빈 쌤 말씀하셨던 것처럼, inferior하다거나 deviant거나 이제 minority. 그니까 marginalized 되고 norm이 아니라 이제 그렇게 자기들의 [서양 중심의] 기준으로 비교했다는 거니까. |
| I had tough feelings regarding categorization. On one hand, categorizing itself [with the label of Asian] can be an effort to make invisible voices visible. On the other hand, efforts to keep finding differences and putting people into different categories could be like, you keep the label, "Asian" American, not just American. And here White American is default without any adjective…. And seeing the world through the lens of racial categorization feels like I am subordinated to the process of being racialized. (6/25/21) | 저는 카테고리제이션에 대한 힘듦이 있었어요. 한편으로 라벨링 그 자체는 보이지 않는 목소리를 드러나게 하는 거지만, 또 다른 한편으로는 계속해서 다른 부분을 찾고 사람들을 서로 다른 카테고리로 분류하는 것은, 아시안 어메리칸을 강조하지 그냥 어메리칸은 아니라는 거잖아요. 여기서 어메리칸은 와이트라는 거죠. 어떤 수식어 없이 디폴트로 정의된다는 거…. 그리고 세상을 이런 레이셜라이즈드 된 렌즈로 바라보는 거 자체가, 내가 Being racialized의 프로세스 안으로 속하게 되는 것은 아닌가. 고민하게 되더라구요. |
| **Mimi:**  The categorization here is intended not to erase differences. So, CRT affirms differences and does not link them to hierarchical approaches. Like being different doesn't mean who is inferior to the other.<br>**Hannah**:  Yes, as far as I know, CRT emphasizes differences. In the mindset of Koreans, we would assume that we need to have a shared understanding, one united group [to achieve equality and fairness]. I think it is very much the Korean mind and would not | **Mimi**: 그 차이를 지우지 않는다는 거죠.  그러니까 CRT는 오히려 차이를 긍정하고 우리가 다르고 그렇지만 내가 다르다. (다르다는 게) 열등한 게 아니고.<br>**Hannah:**: 네, 제가 이해하기로는, CRT는 그 차이를 더 강조하는 거 같아요. 차이를 통해서 뭔가 하나를 만들어야 된다고 생각하는 게 한국적인 마인드 같아요. 그니까 뭔가 한 하나의 공통된 인간상 뭐 이런 것처럼… 근데 여기는 모르겠어요. 그거까지 제가 연구해 보진 않았지만 그 차이를 되게 강조하고 그리고 어떻게 unique하게 contribution할 수 있는지 그 강조가 되는 거 같아요. |

| | |
|---|---|
| work here [in the US]....I feel [people] focus very much on differences and how these differences can make unique contributions.<br>**Yuna:** If people do not recognize differences, they cannot see privilege and how certain groups are structurally marginalized. So [marginalized groups] cannot find their voices because dominant groups keep their power, and hegemony follows in a way to serve the interests of the dominant group….I continuously have been experiencing and embodying the understanding that, to be able to find any marginalized voice I have to admit the significance of this [categorization]. (8/4/21) | **Yuna**: 이게 다름을 인정하지 않으면 그 privilege를 볼 수도 없고 그렇지 않은 사람들이 왜 이렇게 스트럭쳐럴 하게 계속 marginalized하게 되는게. 그 보이스를 찾아내지 못한다는 거 그 왜냐면 항상 dominant한 그룹들은 계속 dominant한 그룹들의 파워를 유지하고 헤게모니가 계속 이렇게 흘러가니까… 그 안에서의 하나 다른 또 다른 보이스들이 나오기 위해서는 아 이걸 인정을 하고 가야 돼 가야지만 그렇게 되는 거 같구나 라는 거를 그냥 계속 깨닫는 시간들을 체험하는 거 같아요. |