

Journal of International Students
Volume 14, Issue 4 (2024), pp. 679-701
ISSN: 2162-3104 (Print), 2166-3750 (Online)
jistudents.org



Academic Bullying as a Racialized Phenomenon in STEM Higher Education: Centering the Experiences of Asian International Doctoral Students

Peiwen Wang

Southern Connecticut State University, USA

ABSTRACT

While international students' experiences of academic bullying from their advisors have been documented in the literature (e.g., Moss & Mahmoudi, 2021), little is known regarding how race and other identities intersect in normalizing and perpetuating academic bullying within higher education. Utilizing Asian critical theory (Iftikar & Museus, 2018) and interpretative phenomenological analysis (Smith et al., 2022) as the theoretical and methodological lenses, this study examines five Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Asian international doctoral students' experiences of academic bullying specifically as a racialized phenomenon. Employing in-depth semi-structured interviews, it is found that racialized academic bullying is operationalized and perpetuated through racialized stereotypes, maintaining White supremacy, and oppressions compounded by intersecting identities. Implications and recommendations are offered as to what stakeholders can do collectively to address racialized academic bullying towards minoritized students and combat systemic inequities and oppression.

Keywords: academic bullying, Asian international students, Asian critical theory, STEM, intersectionality

Academic bullying in higher education, defined as “the abuse of authority by a perpetrator who targets the victim in an academic setting”, is typically manifested in punishing behaviors such as “overwork, destabilisation, and isolation in order to impede the education or career of the target” (Averbuch et al., 2021, p. 3). Higher education institutions can become hotbeds for the abuse of authority, where perpetrators, often those who in power, exploit their position to bully those

with less power. Examples include but are not limited to upper-level administrators or senior faculty members bullying junior ones (e.g., Dentith et al., 2015) and supervisors bullying students (e.g., Moss & Mahmoudi, 2021).

The complexity and severity of academic bullying can also intertwine with the racial/ ethnic and other identities of the individuals involved (e.g., Johnson-Bailey, 2015; Moss & Mahmoudi, 2021). Despite a burgeoning number of studies dedicated to examining academic bullying regarding its sources, contributing factors, and impacts within U.S. higher education institutions (e.g., Chapell et al., 2004; English et al., 2018; Morris, 2011; Moss & Mahmoudi, 2021; Yamada et al., 2014), few have specifically focused on how bullying is racialized within the experiences of international students, particularly Asian international students of color. Such oversight persists despite the significant contributions of these students and their substantial representation in STEM programs (Institute of International Education, 2023; National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics, 2020).

In addition to grappling with challenges arising from different social and academic landscapes, international students often remain frequent targets of various issues such as racial microaggression, discrimination (Wang et al., 2022) and hate crime (Zhang et al., 2023). For Asian international students across STEM disciplines in particular, the issue of academic bullying can be more salient given that as of 2020, they earned 40% and 43% of master and PhD degrees respectively in STEM graduate programs (National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics, 2020). They tended to suffer from more severe forms of bullying, which later may trickle down to impact future STEM students and scientists (Moss & Mahmoudi, 2021).

Thus, the current study examines academic bullying specifically as a racialized phenomenon, through centering the lived experiences of five STEM Asian international doctoral students of color at a Midwestern, predominantly White, research-intensive university. Drawing from Asian critical theory (AsianCrit) (Iftikar & Museus, 2018) and interpretative phenomenological analysis (Smith et al., 2022), this study aims not only to amplify the voices of victims of academic bullying, who were often found reluctant to voice their concerns (Morris, 2011), but to center the role of race, in addition to other identities (e.g., class and international student status), in sustaining inequities and oppression within higher education. This study also discusses implications for addressing racialized academic bullying through drawing from the experiential knowledge and insights of the impacted communities.

Research Questions

The current study is guided by the following research questions:

- RQ₁: What does racialized academic bullying look like and how is it operationalized within STEM higher education contexts?
- RQ₂: What can stakeholders do to combat racialized academic bullying?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Academic bullying encountered by students within higher education has been extensively documented and researched over the recent two decades, which showed that bullying behaviors not only undermine the personal but academic well-being of the students (e.g., Hoel et al., 2007; Cooper et al., 2011; Marraccini et al., 2015; Moss & Mahmoudi, 2021). Specifically, Marraccini et al. (2015) found that 18% of undergraduate students reported experiences of being bullied by faculty members, whereas this proportion was significantly higher (84%) among graduate students and postdocs in STEM fields (Moss & Mahmoudi, 2021). As revealed by a significant portion of this line of research, bullying behaviors inflicted upon the students often result in emotional distress, such as anxiety and depression (Courtney-Pratt et al., 2018; Al Makhamreh & Stockley, 2019), which can negatively impact their academic performance (Cooper et al., 2011). Worse still, victims also demonstrate less interest in learning and are more likely to withdraw from their academic program (Martin et al., 2015).

Despite well-documented cases of academic bullying and its detrimental and lingering impacts, higher educational institutions seem more inclined to tolerate and normalize bullying behaviors, due to its own hierarchical structure and value system (Dentith et al., 2015; Twale & De Luca, 2008). It is the perpetrators rather than the victims who are afforded more protection from the institutions (Dentith et al., 2015; Twale & De Luca, 2008). Even when victims choose to confront the perpetrators by filing complaints and reporting the bullying incidents, they are subjected to further rejections, causing them to doubt their own perception of the bullying incidents (English et al., 2018). Victims of bullying are consequently forced to bottle up their negative experiences and emotions because of the inaction, lack of intervention and support from department/ college sanctioning bodies and authorities, who, nonetheless, frame such issues as merely conflicts of personality and position victims as being weak or troublesome (English et al., 2018; Lutgen-Sandvik et al., 2007).

Scholars such as Marraccini et al. (2015) pointed to one of the gaps remained in the literature, i.e., students' perception of bullying behaviors from professors, which is an area of inquiry that the present study seeks to address. Moss and Mahmoudi (2021) remained one of the few and most recent studies that empirically examined bullying behaviors from the perspectives of the students in STEM fields. These authors used a survey with 15 items that measures abusive supervision, a 10-item checklist for abusive behaviors, and open-ended questions that allowed participants to further elaborate on their rationale. They found that bullying is imposed predominantly by the supervisors or PIs on those who are hierarchically inferior (e.g., postdocs and graduate students). In terms of the specific strategies that targets used when they encountered bullying, over two thirds of the participants in Moss and Mahmoudi's (2021) study chose not to report the incidents or sought support from their parents and friends, echoing the results of previous studies (e.g., Cooper et al., 2011). For less than one third of the participants, despite having reported the incidents, most of them revealed that

fairness and justice seemed absent from the handling and resolution of the issue (Moss & Mahmoudi, 2021).

What We (Do not) Know about the Causes of Academic Bullying

There are four widely acknowledged and heavily researched factors contributing to the prevalence of academic bullying. First, imbalanced power relations exist between the perpetrators and the targets of bullying (e.g., Morris, 2011; Moss & Mahmoudi, 2021). Second, the unique ecology of higher education fosters neoliberalism, meritocracy, “publish-or-perish” mentality, and competitiveness of tenure or promotion, thus potentially preventing some victims from contesting bullying (e.g., Yamada et al., 2014; Zawadzki & Jensen, 2020). Third, there lacks institutional support for the victims and penalty for the perpetrators (e.g., English et al., 2018). Fourthly, victims may be reluctant to report the perpetrators because of “fear of retaliation, mobbing, visa cancellation (for international targets)” (Mahmoudi & Moss, 2021, p. 82).

While scholars such as Moss and Mahmoudi (2021) provided evidence for the vulnerability of international students and scholars to more severe forms of bullying, the role of race in perpetuating bullying was not central to their investigation. Hence, the racialized nature of academic bullying remains underexamined in the literature. Studies that have shown that race has a role to play in aggravating the bullying patterns and behaviors, however, focused exclusively on bullying experienced by faculty members rather than by students (e.g., Frazier, 2011; Johnson-Bailey, 2015; Lampman, 2012). These studies have demonstrated that bullying is complicated not only by systemic power imbalances but the intersection of race with other identities (e.g., Frazier, 2011; Johnson-Bailey, 2015; Lampman, 2012).

For example, Lampman (2012) found that the intersectionality of one’s identities, e.g., a young woman professor who is a(n) ethnic or racial minority, without a PhD degree and with limited experiences, seemed more susceptible to students’ incivility and bullying. Echoing Lampman (2012), Johnson-Bailey (2015), a Black female professor, argued that the compounding impacts of race and gender resulted in her losing positional power and knowledge being discounted, consequently suffering from continuous incivility and bullying imposed by her students (White/ Black/ international) and White male subordinates. In contexts as such, racial and gender privileges as well as rights were afforded by the “androcentric and White-dominated systems that will, by default, support such hostile actions” (Johnson-Bailey, 2015, p. 43). According to Johnson-Bailey (2015), race adds more complexities and nuances to the types and level of bullying encountered, as simultaneously she had to grapple with intra-racial bullying imposed by Black female students, leading to more marginalization. Importantly, this study showed that bullying can also be perpetuated by those who come from the same gender/ racial group (in Johnson-Bailey’s case, Black women) and those who are generally considered having less authority and power (students).

International Students' Experiences of Academic Bullying

Studies on international students' experiences of academic bullying have shown that the degree and severity of academic bullying can be race/ ethnicity dependent (e.g., Moss & Mahmoudi, 2021). International students, postdocs, and scholars were found most vulnerable to severe forms of bullying, compared to their domestic counterparts (Moss & Mahmoudi, 2021). For one thing, Otherness and visa status contribute to this vulnerability in that maintaining legal status as international students or scholars in the US requires an F1 or J1 visa. The visa status might be at stake when their advisors threaten to take actions that would jeopardize students' visas, thus "increasing the severity of contextual bullying and their patterns" (Moss & Mahmoudi, 2021, p. 9). For another, with the percentage of international students in STEM majors increasing drastically in the past decades, bullying behaviors as such might be internalized and can further impact future scientists (Moss & Mahmoudi, 2021).

Despite the vulnerabilities to academic bullying exacerbated by intersecting identities (e.g., race and international student status) as discussed above, the racialized academic bullying experiences of Asian international doctoral students remain underexplored. In addition, these students may encounter unique challenges that intersect with racialized stereotypes such as the model minority myth that believes they will "achieve universal and unparalleled academic and occupational success" (Museus & Kiang, 2009, p. 6, as cited in Roksa et al., 2018), which can consequently mask the racialized, oppressive nature of academic bullying. In sum, visa dependency and racialized stereotypes collectively add layers of complexity and severity to the bullying experienced by Asian international students in STEM fields, who, like their domestic Asian counterparts, also wrestle with the model minority stereotype and the underlying cultural and social expectations (Roksa et al., 2018).

For all these considerations, this study examines academic bullying specifically as a racialized phenomenon through the experiences of five STEM major Asian international doctoral students of color. To inform and guide the analysis, I used Asian critical theory as the theoretical framework, as explicated in the section hereafter.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Asian Critical Theory

Derived from Critical Race Theory (CRT), Asian Critical Theory (AsianCrit) addresses and transcends CRT's black-white binary (Yosso & Solórzano, 2005) by focusing on the complex racialized experiences of Asian Americans (Iftikar & Museus, 2018; Museus & Iftikar, 2013). AsianCrit provides a critical theoretical lens into how race and racism shape the lived experiences of Asian Americans, particularly regarding intersectionality and racialization unique to their socio-historical contexts (Iftikar & Museus, 2018; Museus & Iftikar, 2013).

AsianCrit has seven central tenets. Asianization emphasizes unpacking the historical and current racialization of Asian Americans through individual- or structural-level policies and laws informed by White supremacy (Iftikar & Museus, 2018). Transnational context situates Asian American experiences and how White supremacy operates within the global political, economic, and social contexts (Museus & Iftikar, 2013), thus highlighting the global impacts of imperialism, colonialism, and neoliberalism on Asian Americans' identity formation and encounters of racism (Yoo et al., 2022). Similarly, (re)constructivist history centralizes Asian American history to provide contexts for their racialization at present while elevating Asian Americans' typically marginalized voices and recognizes their contribution (Iftikar & Museus, 2018). Strategic anti-essentialism empowers Asian Americans to actively intervene in their racialization, combat the monolithic, essentialized racialized images portrayed by the White dominant group, and recognize Asian Americans as a diverse group of people (Iftikar & Museus, 2018). Intersectionality emphasizes the multidimensional nature of oppression (Crenshaw, 1989/2013). Story, theory, and praxis highlights the power of the voices, stories, and experiential knowledge based on the reality of Asian American community as counternarratives to the dominant White epistemologies (Ladson-Billings, 2000, as cited in Iftikar & Museus, 2018). Commitment to social justice reflects the goals of AsianCrit, i.e., to "eradicate racism, sexism, heterosexism, capitalist exploitation, and other systemic forms of dehumanization and domination" (Iftikar & Museus, 2018, p. 941)

Particularly pertinent to the current study is the tenet of Asianization, which helps unpack the model minority myth. This myth essentializes Asian Americans into a monolithic group characterized by high achievement and compliance, often masking the discrimination and racism they face, thus denying their access to support (Spring, 2022). In the context of the current study, Asianization helps uncover how such racialized stereotype contributes to the normalization of racialized academic bullying experienced by Asian international doctoral students of color within the STEM realm, where these stereotypical assumptions are often more salient (Roksa et al., 2018).

Furthermore, the tenet of intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1989/2013) helps examine how different identities and social dimensions, such as race, class, and international student status, intersect to complicate Asian international students' experience of racialized academic bullying. Adopting this intersectional lens helps generate a more comprehensive understanding of the multilayered, interlocking oppressions that Asian international doctoral students of color may encounter, which further increase their vulnerability to bullying within academic settings.

While AsianCrit has been primarily utilized to investigate the experiences of Asian Americans, it can shed light upon the racialized experiences of Asian international doctoral students of color, who confront racism and xenophobia while navigating new educational and social settings (e.g., Saito & Li, 2022). Employing AsianCrit's core tenets, the current study critically examines academic bullying as a racialized phenomenon and interrogates its perpetuation and

normalization through centering the voices and lived experiences of the impacted community. Additionally, this paper draws from their insights to help develop targeted strategies and policies for the prevention and resistance of bullying and other forms of exploitation and oppression.

METHOD

Methodological Approach and Sampling

The current study draws on phenomenology, a qualitative approach used by researchers to explore “the common meaning for several individuals of their lived experiences of a concept or a phenomenon” (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 121). The purpose of phenomenology is to provide a description and understanding of the essence of the lived experiences of those experiencing a certain phenomenon (Lichtman, 2013). Hence, producing findings that are generalizable to broader contexts or populations has not been a goal of phenomenological studies.

Specifically, this study utilized interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA), which aims to examine participants’ experiences in detailed, interpretative accounts (Smith et al., 2022). IPA is built upon phenomenology and hermeneutics. IPA is hermeneutic as it involves a double hermeneutic process as the researcher strives to make sense of participants’ sensemaking of their experience (Smith et al., 2022). According to Smith and colleagues (2022), IPA typically involves small sample sizes to ensure a more profound examination of each participant’s lived experience. Therefore, the sample of five Asian international doctoral students aligns with IPA’s methodological considerations (Smith et al., 2022), thus helping generate rich, detailed accounts regarding their experiences with racialized academic bullying.

Data Collection

This study is part of a larger qualitative study that probes into the racialized experiences of Asian international doctoral students of color. While being part of the larger study, the salience of academic bullying was pronounced enough that it warranted further attention and theorization. During the recruitment, two students contacted me and indicated their interest in participating in the study. Later they shared with me that they were encouraged by Jinbei (Walden) Li, a Chinese international doctoral student, who published a post on LinkedIn and then Twitter in April 2022, which documented the mistreatment and harsh behaviors he experienced and witnessed in Dr. Ting Lu’s bioengineering lab at the University of Illinois-Champaign¹. What Li encountered was indicative of the intra-racial bullying (Johnson-Bailey, 2015) discussed in the literature review section, as the victims shared the same racial/ ethnic group as the perpetrators. Despite potential

¹ Please access the full content here:
https://drive.google.com/file/d/1G_0nzq5viS6pDTm6BiyRLoXdEbvpvMCh-/view

backlashes of doing this, Li argued that those who are often voiceless and marginalized can and should fight back, to prevent cases of academic bullying from happening in the future (Li, 2022).

Qualitative, in-depth semi-structured interviews were conducted during Spring and Fall 2022, each lasting 60 to 90 minutes. All interviews were recorded and automatically transcribed by Zoom. I then proofread the transcripts and marked expressions or sentences that I was uncertain about before sending them to the participants for clarification or/and correction. Through utilizing this member-checking strategy (Motulsky, 2021), the accuracy of the transcripts was enhanced.

Researcher Positionality

As a Chinese international doctoral student, I share similar international student identities and education backgrounds with my participants, thus enabling me to interpret the experiences of the participants through an insider (emic) lens (Markee, 2013). It is also important to acknowledge that while I have not experienced academic bullying in my program, I have STEM-major friends who encountered this, and I stand with them against any forms of discrimination, oppression, and bullying. Therefore, as a researcher, my sensemaking of their experiences (in this case, academic bullying) is simultaneously shaped by preconceived assumptions, beliefs, experiences, knowledge, and values I possess (Creswell & Poth, 2018). Qualitative researchers inevitably bring with them values, worldviews, perspectives, and insights when they strive to understand how participants are making sense of a certain phenomenon (Merriam & Tisdell, 2015). I am fully cognizant of and embrace such complexities. Interviewing them as a fellow student researcher also helped establish a more equitable and horizontal researcher-participant relationship, thus creating opportunities for generating a richer, thicker description of their experiences. In sum, having the awareness of these positionalities and reflexivity helped enhance the level of trust (Rose-Redwood & Rose-Redwood, 2017).

Participants

Table 1 provides the demographics of the participants, who are (were) Asian international doctoral students of color working as research assistants in STEM programs. Each of them was assigned a pseudonym. Given the sensitiveness of this topic, their major and specialization were not reported to protect their identity and privacy. At the time when data was collected, four participants were studying at a Midwestern, predominantly White, research-intensive university, while one graduated about a year ago and works as a postdoc at a different university. Their length of stay in the United States ranged from 2 to 7 years. All of them were first-generation college students who relied on their advisor's funding to further doctoral study.

Table 1: Demographics of the Participants (N = 5)

Name	Gender	Role	First-gen
Xin	Male	Research Assistant	Yes
Yiming	Male	Research Assistant	Yes
Zhexuan	Male	Research Assistant	Yes
Jay	Male	Research Assistant	Yes
Yiru	Female	Research Assistant	Yes

Data Analysis

I used IPA to guide the data analysis, which emphasizes not only detailed examination of participants’ experience case by case, but highlights their similarity, difference, convergence, and divergence (Smith et al., 2022). The data was coded through MAXQDA Version 2022, a qualitative software for coding and analyzing data. For the initial round of coding, I marked salient points of the interview data and wrote analytical memos besides the codes, drawing on Saldaña’s (2021) coding methods. Then I re-engaged with the data, merged similar codes, and categorized codes into broader themes. Three overarching themes were identified through analyzing the interview data and will be elaborated on hereafter.

FINDINGS

This section starts with a snapshot of the major types of academic bullying encountered by the five participants, then explicates the ways through which bullying is perpetuated as a racialized phenomenon and provides implications to combat bullying. The most common types of academic bullying (see Table 2) described by the participants included overwork, verbal abuse, bad advising, threats of violence, and threats of academic status or/ and financial stability, which validated bullying patterns found in previous studies (e.g., Marraccini et al., 2015; Mahmoudi, 2023).

While the bullying behaviors can be inflicted upon all students, it is indicated by the participants that Asian international students of color were most susceptible to severe forms of these bullying behaviors. Thus, it is important that we understand in what ways academic bullying is initiated and sustained as a racialized phenomenon, which will be elaborated hereafter through drawing from AsianCrit and its central tenets.

Labor exploitation was the most frequently reported bullying practice among STEM majors, which was disproportionately imposed on international students of color, based on the experiences of the five participants.

Table 2: Types and Examples of Academic Bullying

Type	Example
Overwork	“My previous advisor is very pushy. He just wants me to work harder and work overtime...He expects me to be in the lab all the time except eating and sleeping”
Verbal Abuse	“Please don’t call me f***ing stupid. I’m not f***ing stupid. I’m a human. I’m not your emotional trash.”
Bad Advising	“He took advantage of his position and took credit for the paper I wrote. Sometimes, he asked me to add more authors who have not contributed anything to the paper, which is against academic ethics.”
Threats of Violence	“He yelled at me and said, ‘If you work too slowly, you’ll never see the sunrise tomorrow’.”
Threats of Academic Status / Financial Stability	“My advisor threatened to cancel the visa and funding. So, I dared not to seek help.”

For example, Zhexuan described how his previous advisor set up expectations for him and other international students of color to be hardworking when they joined the lab.

He just said, “I don’t care, just stay here 24 hours, don’t go home, give me what I want. I want to see this result on my desk by tomorrow seven or eight.” And if you ask me, I would say that it’s the norm here, especially with my previous department. Everyone takes it so normal now.

Such overwork culture, nonetheless, has been normalized and prevalent in STEM disciplines (Kossek et al., 2021), although it is against the legally accepted 20-hour work limit for international students holding F1 student visa (see US Immigration and Customs Enforcement: <https://www.ice.gov/sevis/employment>). The participants were further subjected to surveillance of their advisor daily, who constantly checked upon whether they were working in the lab, thus resulting in fear and anxiety.

It is found that academic bullying manifested in overwork imposed upon Asian international doctoral students was legitimized and perpetuated through racialized stereotypes constructed by their advisor and other professors in the department. Participants revealed that Asian international doctoral students of color, especially those from China, were racialized as the model minorities in terms of their work ethics. They were often described by their advisors and professors (international/ White) using dehumanizing language that reduces their humanity to merely compliance and willingness to work overtime.

They said Chinese students here worked like cows. And they are more willing to hire those who are from China.

Not just them (referring to professors having international backgrounds), I think even the White professor here would have the wrong perception. They said that Chinese students, especially those coming from China, work so hard, so crazy.

When racialized stereotypes as such are circulated and reproduced within their program, it constructs and reinforces the model minority image for Chinese international students that pressures them to comply while legitimizing the underlying labor exploitation. Participants also noted that constant exposure to such dominant narratives among professors led to their own internalization of the racialized stereotypes, which further normalized exploitation. For instance, Yiru revealed her emotional burden resulting from overwork and her acquiescence to the exploitation.

I just felt very intense during that period. I'm more of a Ms. yes type of person. I just accepted these things as they are. I was brainwashed and trained to tell myself that I can do it. If professors want to exploit me, they will have their way.

Hence, Asian international doctoral students of color were not immune to racialization and racialized stereotypes based on U.S. racial logic (Yao et al., 2019), such as the model minority stereotype illustrated above (Roksa et al., 2018). Meanwhile, they were inadvertently trapped in and lived up to the racialization constructed by their advisors and professors. In sum, the stereotypes that depict Asian international doctoral students as hard-working, highly compliant, and having high work ethics as well as their own internalization of the racialized images have contributed to the normalization of academic bullying particularly in the form of overwork.

Operationalization of White Supremacy across Transnational Contexts

Perpetrators of bullying seemed more likely to be faculty of color having international backgrounds, based on what the participants experienced or witnessed. Many of the bullies shared similar cultural or racial/ ethnic backgrounds with the victims. Jay and Xin shared their thoughts about the perpetrators and targets of bullying:

In most of the bullying cases I've heard of, including my own, the perpetrators are Chinese PIs and sometimes those from international backgrounds, like India and Russia. They are more likely to bully you if you are Chinese.

What's the worst is that most of the Chinese professors here, they even abuse Chinese students. This is really happening in my department.

As shown by the above excerpts, intra-racial bullying remained a salient pattern identified from the experiences and observation of the participants. This echoed Johnson-Bailey's (2015) findings as the bullying behaviors were inflicted upon her (a Black women professor) by Black women students. As in the cases of Chinese advisors and Chinese international students, the bullying patterns

perpetuate and aggravate, despite similar or shared cultural, racial, social, and educational backgrounds prior to their transnational sojourns.

Participants also shared their insights regarding why intra-racial bullying was common. For instance, Yiru pointed out that some professors may have internalized, normalized, and then reproduced racialized bullying they encountered or witnessed in their PhD programs. Given the large proportions of international doctoral students and faculty in STEM, this could result in rippling effects on the ways they treat their future students (Moss & Mahmoudi, 2021):

I think it also has something to do with the education these professors had previously received. It's possible that they were also bullied and exploited a lot when they were doing their degree here in the US. I guess this made them think it's normal to do so to their students when they became professors.

Furthermore, race remains a key factor in granting or denying one's access to accommodations, flexibilities, and even basic human respect from the advisor. For instance, Zhexuan discussed how his advisor required him to work on the weekend while allowing his White, U.S. counterparts to travel back home.

In our group, we have Asian and American white, so I can really tell the way he's treating us is really different. Like he expects me to work on weekends for six hours a day. But for the American, he's like, "oh, you're going back to [city name], Okay then". He just said, "you can work on this on Monday. But for you, Zhexuan, let's work on this on Saturday and Sunday".

Jay echoed by mentioning that U.S. students were least likely to suffer from bullying behaviors such as overwork or verbal attack from his advisor. Jay further noted that White, European international students were also less likely to be bullied by their advisors, compared to those from Asia or Africa; instead, they were granted the same privileges as U.S. students in terms of working with flexibility and being treated with respect.

Compared to international students from Asia or Africa, they are really friendly and nice to American students. They would never let them work on the weekends or verbally abuse them. White people from European or developed countries will very less likely be bullied. They also enjoy preferential treatment and privileges like US students.

One possible reason for international students of color's greater susceptibility to severe forms of racialized academic bullying is White supremacy, "the presumed superiority of white racial identities...in support of the cultural, political, and economic domination of non-white groups" (Bond & Inwood, 2016, p. 719-720). White supremacy, in the above cases, is internalized and practiced by international professors, with many being people of color, through differential treatments of international students of color versus White American or European students. As argued by Christian (2019), White supremacy can be upheld and sustained by those who are constructed as not White. In the context of racialized

academic bullying, international faculty of color bought into whiteness when they granted flexibility and humanity to White US students and European students, while exploiting international students of color, thus perpetuating White supremacist notions of power and oppression in ways that maintain social and racial stratification (Christian, 2019).

To sum up, by employing the tenet of transnational contexts of AsianCrit (Iftikar & Museus, 2018), it is found that white supremacy is operationalized across transnational contexts in the form of intra-racial bullying that leads to continual oppression of Asian international doctoral students of color while privileges and preferential treatments are granted to White American and European students by international professors/ advisors.

Oppression Complicated by the Intersectionality of Identities

Despite the severity of racialized academic bullying, most participants resorted to silence and obedience, because of fear of retaliation. They were verbally threatened by their advisor about canceling their F1 visa, cutting down the funding, and/ or speaking against them in recommendation letters, as discussed by Xin. The power differentials between the bullies and targets positioned the latter in a vulnerable situation, thus leading to their silence and perpetuation of the status quo.

I just can't tell anyone about this. I don't want to lose my visa. I need funding from my advisor. I need all this to finish my degree.

Meanwhile, the intersectionality of their race, international student status, and socioeconomic status, increased their vulnerability to and complicated the patterns of racialized academic bullying. Being first-generation college students, the participants relied on funding provided by their advisor to continue their study in the United States, thus contributing to acquiescence. As explained by Yiming, such a vicious circle was further repeated and reinforced when the advisors sensed students' tolerance.

...so you can abuse them and they would never say a word, they would never fight back. I think most of them have this kind of impression towards international students.

On the other hand, two participants reported bullying incidents to their department chair. However, the severity of these behaviors was often dismissed and further rationalized by framing bullying merely as a personality issue rather than acknowledging the systemic inequities and oppression, echoing the experiences of targets in previous studies (English et al., 2018; Lutgen-Sandvik et al., 2007).

I talked about this with my department chair once. But he only said, "I guess it's just that you and Dr. [name] don't get along". And that's it. I was very disappointed, and I decided it was pointless to mention this to anyone.

Zhexuan echoed by expressing feelings of frustration when he received zero support from the department chair, despite having sought help several times regarding the bullying behaviors.

I talked to the department chair about “his behavior” for at least three times. I say that this is how I and another Asian get treated, and this is how Americans get treated, and then nothing improved. So, I thought I went to the department chair and talked about this, at least there will be some changes. I was hoping [for] some changes. Because he’s the department chair, he should be able to do something, but he chose to keep quiet, [which] means he chose allowing him to continue his way.

Department leaders had perceived victims’ bullying experiences as invalid before any investigation was conducted, as, according to Jay and Zhexuan, there were no follow-up emails, investigation, or intervention whatsoever. In addition to providing little support for the victims of bullying, there seemed to be no consequences or punishment for perpetrators, which held true particularly for professors who were tenured or in charge of grants. Xin pointed out:

They know you will not report this. You can do nothing about this. And if you quit, it doesn’t hurt them, it hurts you in particular. The university will not fire him or her. They bring large grants to the department and university.

The department leaders remained negligent over and thus became complicit with long-existing racialized academic bullying among STEM programs. Their dismissal of the victims’ experiences and protection for the bullies are also intertwined with the neoliberal and meritocratic nature of higher education institutions (Zawadzki & Jensen, 2020). In cases as elaborated above, racialized academic bullying is perpetuated through the tolerance and reinforcement of such behaviors among campus leaders (Cleary et al., 2013).

In summary, utilizing the tenet of intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1989/2013) of AsianCrit, Asian international doctoral students of color in STEM majors are particularly susceptible to multiple forms and layers of oppression, because of the intersectionality of various identities, including their race, international student status, and class.

What Can Stakeholders Do to Combat Bullying

The participants provided valuable insights into what stakeholders can do to curb racialized academic bullying and combat systemic inequities and oppression. One major point considered essential to combating racialized academic bullying and exploitation of international doctoral students is to make their voices heard and fight against it rather than remaining silent. As noted by Yiru:

Just fight for it! Speak up and find your community...If you keep silent, they will not care about you, so if you speak for yourself, fight back, and even though they could be very tough, you will overcome.

Meanwhile, participants argued that witnesses, including domestic students, international students, and faculties, should speak up for any dehumanizing, exploitative, and oppressive practices they have observed within the classrooms, the lab, the department, and the university. Indeed, research showed that those who witness bullying also matter in either preventing or perpetuating it in that they are reinforcing the bullies' power and reproducing the bullying culture when they choose not to report the incidents (e.g., Zawadzki & Jensen, 2020). Thus, it is vital that anti-bullying training is provided for both students and faculty to raise their awareness to intervene (Roche et al., 2009).

In addition, participants pointed to the necessity of establishing a more transparent and effective anti-bullying system. Many revealed their confusions and concerns about where they can go and from whom they can seek help. At this Midwestern university at least, there is no office or site specifically responsible for dealing with students' complaints of academic bullying, though there is one for faculty/ staff to file complaints. There is an urgent need for setting up a functioning office for keeping track of and investigating bullying cases filed by students, as suggested by Yiming:

The university needs to have a department/ office for addressing cases of academic bullying. Just like the measures tackling sexual harassment which are available in many colleges, they need to provide a place for receiving and dealing with bullying complaints.

It is also crucial that the results of the investigation and consequences of bullying (e.g., punishment or penalty), if any, be made publicly accessible, to inform current and future students and serve as a warning for faculty. In addition, participants suggested that the department and university offer more support for the victims and ensure that there are consequences rather than protection for the perpetrators. Once investigation is completed and bullying confirmed, abusive supervisory practices need to be incorporated into the decision-making processes regarding the professor's promotion and tenure as well as funding opportunities in the future, as put by Jay:

The university needs to consider the professor's moralities in terms of annual evaluation or tenure-track evaluation. The complaints filed against them need to have an impact on their reputation and evaluations.

In summary, anti-bullying work can hardly be advanced without the joint efforts made by all stakeholders, including the victims, witnesses/ bystanders, as well as the support from department and campus leaders and policy makers.

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The findings of this study align with research that examined academic bullying among STEM major students (e.g., Moss & Mahmoudi, 2021). Drawing from the tenets (particularly Asianization and intersectionality) of AsianCrit, this study

centers the racialized academic bullying experiences of Asian international doctoral students and adds to the literature by unpacking the intersecting roles that race, class, and international student status play in complicating and aggravating the bullying patterns. While scholars such as Moss and Mahmoudi (2021) pointed to the vulnerability of international students and scholars to bullying because of Othering and visa dependency, they did not delve deeper into how race may intersect with other identities to compound the ways international students of color were bullied and oppressed, as well as how White supremacist notions of power and oppression are internalized and upheld by some international faculty of color. Therefore, the racialized bullying experiences of international students of color need to be situated within the historical, social and global contexts where White supremacy and various forms of -ism and ideologies (racism, neoliberalism, and meritocracy etc.) continue to intersect to collectively shape Asian international students' experiences in academia (Iftikar & Museus, 2018).

This study offers important implications for policymakers and practitioners in higher education as well as researchers/ scholars. First, policies that address academic bullying and support victims of bullying need to be enacted and implemented, given the freedom professors are given in working with students and the absence of supervision of power (Hollis, 2019). Echoing Moss et al. (2022), in addition to the general anti-harassment policies typically featured in universities, there is a need for more discipline-specific policies taking into consideration the vulnerability to forms of bullying (e.g., overwork, threats to cancel visa or funding) particular to that discipline, particularly within STEM fields. Importantly, there should also be clear, written rules and regulations from university policies that ensure students are not exploited for their time or oppressed for their humanity. Clear reporting mechanisms should be developed to ensure that victims can report incidents without fear of retaliation or cancellation of their visa/ funding and that the cases are comprehensively investigated. Universities should implement strict policies to hold perpetrators accountable by making explicit sanctions and repercussions for confirmed cases of bullying (Faucher et al., 2014).

Secondly, institutions should establish mandatory anti-bullying training programs (Roche et al., 2009) and support systems for faculty members, staff, and students that help recognize and address academic bullying, such as workshops on racialized bullying and its detrimental, compounded impacts on international students. Furthermore, comprehensive support systems should be established for the targets of bullying. For example, ombudspersons or advocates need to work closely with international students to provide confidential advice and assistance to help them navigate the complexities and repercussions of academic bullying, while protecting their visa status. In addition, support regarding changing advisors needs to be available should bullying cases are confirmed, considering that student-faculty interaction remained a pivotal factor for international students' thriving (Jones et al., 2023) and that their level of advising satisfaction influenced their sense of belonging in higher education (Yuan et al., 2023).

Most importantly, I call for more researchers to conduct larger scale, longitudinal studies on racialized academic bullying encountered not only by

students of color but faculty/ administrators of color across different types of institutions. While many studies have been conducted to examine academic bullying, there are only a few studies that focused on the role of race in causing and aggravating the bullying patterns, as discussed in the literature review. The current study remains an initial attempt to unpack the operationalization of racialized academic bullying imposed on STEM-major Asian international doctoral students of color, often by international faculty of color. This is resonated with Moss and Mahmoudi's (2021) finding regarding the trickling-down impacts of bullying in STEM fields, which may lead to a cycle of generational trauma. As a result of my finding related to intra-racial bullying, there clearly is a need to further investigate how faculty of color may buy into the material aspects of White supremacy and meritocracy. How did faculty of color's experiences within their own doctoral programs shape the way they advise students in the future? What accountability do faculty have if they want to help their students navigate or change the academic space and disrupt the status quo? More efforts and research are needed to break the cycle of oppression and generational trauma inflicted upon both faculty and students of color.

CONCLUSION

This paper contributes to the current literature on students' experiences of academic bullying by interrogating how such bullying behaviors are sustained specifically as a racialized phenomenon. Implications for addressing such bullying behaviors are provided through drawing from the knowledge and insights of targets of bullying. Grounded in AsianCrit and phenomenology, this study intentionally and meaningfully centralizes the voices, lived experiences, and insights of five STEM Asian international doctoral students of color. This study strives to explore the two research questions: RQ1) What does racialized academic bullying look like and how is it operationalized within STEM higher education contexts? RQ2) What can stakeholders do to combat racialized academic bullying?

Responding to RQ1, the common types of academic bullying that participants in this study experienced included overwork, verbal abuse, bad advising, threats of violence, and threats of academic status or/ and financial stability, which echoed bullying patterns found in previous studies (e.g., Marraccini et al., 2015; Mahmoudi, 2023), often inflicted upon them rather than their White US/European counterparts. Racialized academic bullying towards Asian international doctoral students is legitimized and sustained through: a) racialized stereotypes such as the model minorities to rationalize dehumanizing and oppressive practices; b) maintaining White supremacy across transnational contexts through granting White US/Europeans humanity while perpetuating intra-racial bullying; and c) multilayered oppression that further marginalize and disadvantage international students because of the intersectionality of their race, international student status and socioeconomic status.

In response to RQ2, this study suggests two main aspects that might help create an environment which is conducive to fight against racialized bullying.

First, individuals, faculty, leaders, and policy makers need to work jointly and collaboratively to address racialized academic bullying and combat systemic oppression. At the individual level, victims and witnesses of academic bullying should be encouraged to report such behaviors to the university. Both faculty members and students should take mandatory anti-bullying training, thus preventing them from becoming perpetrators or victims of bullying. At the university level, an effective and transparent anti-bullying system needs to be built to enable anonymous reporting of the bullying incidents and provide unbiased and transparent investigation.

This study is a small-scale, qualitative, phenomenological inquiry that is situated in a Midwestern, predominantly White, research-intensive university. Thus, the purpose of the study is not to generate findings that can be generalizable in broader contexts, but to provide a detailed account of Asian international doctoral students' racialized bullying experiences through the theoretical lenses of AsianCrit. While the five participants' experiences are not intended to represent the diverse Asian international student population, their voices, perspectives, and lived experiences are amplified and valued as a small step to decolonize research in education. In addition, as an international student and a researcher, I call for more attention and efforts directed towards interrogating racialized academic bullying from my fellow researchers and scholars in the hope of advancing the enactment of university-/ nation-level policies and laws that address and eventually dismantle the systemic inequities and oppression embedded in such bullying behaviors.

Acknowledgment

The publication of this manuscript was supported by the Humane Letters Grant awarded by the STAR Scholars Network.

REFERENCES

- Al Makhamreh, M., & Stockley, D. (2019). Mentorship and well-being: Examining doctoral students' lived experiences in doctoral supervision context. *International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education*, 9(1), 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJMCE-02-2019-0013>
- Averbuch, T., Eliya, Y., & Van Spall, H. G. C. (2021). Systematic review of academic bullying in medical settings: dynamics and consequences. *BMJ Open*, 11(7), e043256. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2020-043256>
- Bonds, A., & Inwood, J. (2016). Beyond white privilege: Geographies of white supremacy and settler colonialism. *Progress in Human Geography*, 40(6), 715-733. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132515613166>
- Chapell, M., Casey, D., De la Cruz, C., Ferrell, J., Forman, J., Lipkin, R., Newsham, M., Sterling, M., & Whittaker, S. (2004). Bullying in College by Students and Teachers. *Adolescence*, 39(153), 53-64.

- <https://web.s.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=1&sid=3a51674d-a2c9-4e7b-ad8f-c2183fc4d6b5%40redis>
- Christian, M. (2019). A global critical race and racism framework: Racial entanglements and deep and malleable whiteness. *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity*, 5(2), 169-185. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2332649218783220>
- Cleary, M., Walter, G., Andrew, S., & Jackson, D. (2013). Commentary: Negative workplace behaviours at the University of Hard Knocks. *Contemporary Nurse*, 44(2), 253-256. <https://doi.org/10.5172/conu.2013.44.2.253>
- Cooper, J. R., Walker, J., Askew, R., Robinson, J. C., & McNair, M. (2011). Students' perceptions of bullying behaviours by nursing faculty. *Issues in Educational Research*, 21(1), 1-21. <https://search.informit.org/doi/abs/10.3316/aeipt.185984>
- Courtney-Pratt, H., Pich, J., Levett-Jones, T., & Moxey, A. (2018). "I was yelled at, intimidated and treated unfairly": Nursing students' experiences of being bullied in clinical and academic settings. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 27(5-6), e903-e912. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jocn.13983>
- Crenshaw, K. (1989/2013). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. In *Feminist legal theories* (pp. 23-51). Routledge.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). Sage.
- Dentith, A. M., Wright, R. R., & Coryell, J. (2015). Those mean girls and their friends: Bullying and mob rule in the academy. *Adult Learning*, 26(1), 28-34. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1045159514558409>
- English, S. J., Flaherty, A. J., & English, A. R. (2018). Gaslit! An examination of bullying on doctoral students. *Perspectives on Social Work*, 13(1), 20-32. <https://hdl.handle.net/10657/5276>
- Faucher, C., Jackson, M., & Cassidy, W. (2014). Cyberbullying among university students: Gendered experiences, impacts, and perspectives. *Education Research International*, published online. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2014/698545>
- Frazier, K. N. (2011). Academic bullying: A barrier to tenure and promotion for African-American faculty. *Florida Journal of Educational Administration & Policy*, 5(1), 1-13. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ961222.pdf>
- Hoel, H., Giga, S. I., & Davidson, M. J. (2007). Expectations and realities of student nurses' experiences of negative behaviour and bullying in clinical placement and the influences of socialization processes. *Health Services Management Research*, 20(4), 270-278. <https://doi.org/10.1258/095148407782219049>
- Hollis, L. P. (2019). Lessons from Bandura's Bobo Doll experiments: Leadership's deliberate indifference exacerbates workplace bullying in higher education. *Journal for the Study of Postsecondary and Tertiary Education*, 4, 085-102. <https://doi.org/10.28945/4426>
- 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>
- Institute of International Education. (2023). "International Student and U.S. Higher Education Enrollment, 1950/51 - 2021/22". *Open Doors Report on International Educational Exchange*. Retrieved from <https://opendoorsdata.org/>
- Johnson-Bailey, J. (2015). Academic incivility and bullying as a gendered and racialized phenomena. *Adult Learning*, 26(1), 42-47. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1045159514558414>
- Jones, A., Kim, Y. K., Schreiner, L. A., & Koo, K. K. (2023). Thriving among international students in the U.S. during the Trump presidency. *Journal of International Students*, 13(4). <https://doi.org/10.32674/jis.v13i4.4992>
- Kossek, E. E., Dumas, T. L., Piszczek, M. M., & Allen, T. D. (2021). Pushing the boundaries: A qualitative study of how stem women adapted to disrupted work–nonwork boundaries during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 106(11), 1615. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000982>
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2000). Racialized discourses and ethnic epistemologies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.) (pp. 257–277). Sage.
- Lampman, C. (2012). Women faculty at risk: US professors report on their experiences with student incivility, bullying, aggression, and sexual attention. *NASPA Journal About Women in Higher Education*, 5(2), 184-208. <https://doi.org/10.1515/njawhe-2012-1108>
- Li, J. (2022). Concerns about an Illinois Bioengineering lab. Retrieved from https://drive.google.com/file/d/1G_Onzq5viS6pDTm6BiyRLoXdEbpvMCh/view
- Lichtman, M. (2013). *Qualitative research in education: A user's guide* (3rd ed.). Sage.
- Lutgen-Sandvik, P., Tracy, S. J., & Alberts, J. K. (2007). Burned by bullying in the American workplace: Prevalence, perception, degree and impact. *Journal of Management Studies*, 44(6), 837-862. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2007.00715.x>
- Mahmoudi, M. (2023). Academic bullying slows the evolution of science. *Nat Rev Mater* 8, 301–303. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41578-023-00549-x>
- Mahmoudi, M., & Moss, S. (2021). Possible solutions to academic bullying in higher Education. In M. Mahmoudi (Ed.), *A Brief Guide to Academic Bullying* (p.77-95).
- Markee, N. (2013). Emic and etic in qualitative research. *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*, 1-4. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0366>
- Marraccini, M. E., Weyandt, L. L., & Rossi, J. S. (2015). College students' perceptions of professor/instructor bullying: questionnaire development and psychometric properties. *Journal of American College Health*, 63(8), 563-572. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07448481.2015.1060596>
- Martin, M. M., Goodboy, A. K., & Johnson, Z. D. (2015). When professors bully graduate students: Effects on student interest, instructional dissent, and

- intentions to leave graduate education. *Communication Education*, 64(4), 438-454. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2015.1041995>
- Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2015). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. Wiley & Sons.
- Morris, S. E. (2011). Doctoral students' experiences of supervisory bullying. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 19(2), 547-555. [http://psasir.upm.edu.my/id/eprint/57736/1/JSSH%20Vol.%2019%20\(2\)%20Sep.%202011%20\(View%20Full%20Journal\).pdf#page=284](http://psasir.upm.edu.my/id/eprint/57736/1/JSSH%20Vol.%2019%20(2)%20Sep.%202011%20(View%20Full%20Journal).pdf#page=284)
- Moss, S. E., Täuber, S., Sharifi, S., & Mahmoudi, M. (2022). The need for the development of discipline-specific approaches to address academic bullying. *EclinicalMedicine*, 50, 101598. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2022.101598>
- Moss, S. E., & Mahmoudi, M. (2021). STEM the bullying: An empirical investigation of abusive supervision in academic science. *EclinicalMedicine*, 40, 101121. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2021.101121>
- Motulsky, S. L. (2021). Is member checking the gold standard of quality in qualitative research? *Qualitative Psychology*, 8(3), 389. <https://doi.org/10.1037/qup0000215>
- Museus, S. D., & Iftikar, J. (2013). Asian critical theory (AsianCrit). In M.Y. Danico (Ed.), *Asian American society: An encyclopedia* (pp. 95–98). Sage.
- Museus, S. D., & Kiang, P. N. (2009). Deconstructing the model minority myth and how it contributes to the invisible minority reality in higher education research. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 2009 (142), 5-15. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ir.292>
- National Association for Foreign Student Affairs. (2022). International Student Economic Value Statistics. <https://www.nafsa.org/sites/default/files/media/document/EconValue-2022.pdf>
- National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics. (2020). Graduate students in science, engineering, and health broad fields, by degree program, citizenship, ethnicity, and race. <https://ncesdata.nsf.gov/explorer/datatables?survey=GSS&page=1&superTopic=Demographics&topic=Race%20and%20Ethnicity>
- Roche, M., Diers, D., Duffield, C., Catling-Paull, C., (2009). Violence towards nurses, the work environment, and patient outcomes. *J. Nurs. Sch.* 42(1), 13e22. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1547-5069.2009.01321.x>
- Roksa, J., Jeong, S., Feldon, D., & Maher, M. (2018). Socialization experiences and research productivity of Asians and Pacific Islanders: “Model minority” stereotype and domestic vs. international comparison. In *Research in the Sociology of Education* (pp. 155-179). Emerald Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S1479-353920180000020007>
- Rose-Redwood, C., & Rose-Redwood, R. (2017). Rethinking the politics of the international student experience in the age of Trump. *Journal of International Students*, 7(3), I-IX. <https://doi.org/10.32674/jis.v7i3.201>
- Saldaña, J. (2021). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Sage.

- Saito, L. E., & Li, J. (2022). Applying an AsianCrit Lens on Chinese international students: History, intersections, and Asianization during COVID-19. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Leadership Studies*, 3(1), 122-140. <https://doi.org/10.52547/johepal.3.1.122>
- Smith, J. A., Flowers, P., & Larkin, M. (2022). *Interpretative phenomenological analysis: Theory, method and research* (2nd edition). Sage.
- Spring, J. (2022). *Deculturalization and the struggle for equality: A brief history of the education of dominated cultures in the United States* (9th edition). Routledge.
- Twale, D., & De Luca, B. (2008). *Faculty incivility: The rise of the academic bully culture and what to do about it*. Jossey-Bass.
- Wang, P., Gu, X., & Morales, A. (2022). "It was just my name!": A CRT/CRF analysis of international female graduate students' perception and experiences regarding their ethnic name. *Journal of International Students*, 13(2), 172-188. <https://doi.org/10.32674/jis.v13i2.4716>
- Yamada, S., Cappadocia, M. C., & Pepler, D. (2014). Workplace bullying in Canadian graduate psychology programs: Student perspectives of student-supervisor relationships. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, 8(1), 58. <https://doi.org/10.1037/tep0000015>
- Yao, C. W., George Mwangi, C. A., & Malaney Brown, V. K. (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>
- Yoo, H. C., Gabriel, A. K., & Okazaki, S. (2022). Advancing research within Asian American psychology using Asian critical race theory and an Asian Americanist perspective. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 62(4), 563-590. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00221678211062721>
- Yosso, T. J., & Solórzano, D. G. (2005). Conceptualizing a critical race theory in sociology. In Romero, M., & Margolis, E. (Eds.) *The Blackwell companion to social inequalities* (pp.117-146). NY: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Yuan, X., Yang, Y., & McGill, C. (2023). The impact of academic advising activities on international students' sense of belonging. *Journal of International Students*, 14(1), 424-448. <https://doi.org/10.32674/jis.v14i3.5227>
- Zawadzki, M., & Jensen, T. (2020). Bullying and the neoliberal university: A co-authored autoethnography. *Management Learning*, 51(4), 398-413. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350507620920532>
- Zhang, Q., Xiong, Y., Rose Prasath, P., & Byun, S. (2023). The relationship between international students' perceived discrimination and self-reported overall health during COVID-19: Indirect associations through positive emotions and perceived social support. *Journal of International Students*, 14(1), 119-133. <https://doi.org/10.32674/jis.v14i1.5368>

Author bio

PEIWEN WANG, PhD, is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Curriculum and Learning at Southern Connecticut State University, USA. Her major research interests lie in the areas of international higher education, teacher education that advances equity, and critical discourse studies. Email: peiwenwang71@hotmail.com
