Published online in Wiley Online Library
(wileyonlinelibrary.com) • DOI: 10.1002/aehe.20021

Critical Race Theory

IN THIS CHAPTER, WE PROVIDE a brief overview of critical legal studies (CLS), critical race theory (CRT), and key tenets that have framed critical race theory's application. We conclude by presenting an overview of how the rest of the monograph is organized.

In November 2008, then U.S. Senator Barack H. Obama was elected the 44th President of the United States. Because he was the first Person of Color to be elected president, the national media proclaimed that the United States had entered a "postracial" era, leading many people in U.S. society to surmise that racism no longer existed at an institutional level but was enacted exclusively at the individual level. This is reminiscent of what scholars refer to as a color-blind ideology, one that rationalizes contemporary racial inequality as the result of nonracial dynamics (Bonilla-Silva, 2010). However, since President Obama's election and subsequent reelection, there have been a number of incidents illuminating race and racism's continued presence and role in U.S. society and education. Three notable examples sparking national debate are the deaths of two unarmed Black teenagers, Trayvon Martin and Michael Brown, and 43-year-old Eric Garner.[2] In February 2012, Trayvon Martin, an unarmed Black adolescent male, was shot and killed by a neighborhood watch coordinator in Sanford, Florida. The shooter was later acquitted of all charges. More recently, in August 2014, college-bound Michael Brown, another unarmed, Black adolescent male, was shot and killed by a White male police officer in Ferguson, Missouri, setting off months of confrontation between community members, state and local police, and the National Guard.

In November 2014, a grand jury issued a non-indictment. In July 2014, a White male New York City police officer placed Eric Garner in a chokehold (a move that is banned by the New York City Police Department) because he resisted New York City police officers' claims that he was illegally selling cigarettes. Mr. Garner died during the incident, with the coroner's office ruling his death a homicide. The grand jury for this incident also failed to issue an indictment.

Likewise, higher education has also experienced its share of racial incidents during the past 6 years, with numerous incidents taking place. Within the past 2 years, the University of Alabama fraternity and sorority community has made national headlines. At the beginning of the fall 2013 semester, the university's sororities gained national media attention when several sororities denied membership to prospective members because they did not identify as White. The institution's response (by facilitating Women of Color's membership in the historically White sororities) was ineffective and not only failed to disrupt institutionalized racist practices, but also could be perceived as a matter of interest convergence. By more effectively facilitating the sororities' integration, the institution could have demonstrated its "commitment" to creating an inclusive environment for Women of Color in the sororities. It would have also potentially eliminated additional negative broadcast and social media coverage of the sorority system and the university. However, at the beginning of the fall 2014 semester, the university once again gained national attention when a sorority member posted a photo to social media with the caption "Chi O got No n- - - as!!!!!!" These incidents illustrate the systemic and pervasive nature of racism within the University of Alabama's fraternity/sorority system. The institution's response fell short of meaningful intervention in the incident's impact on Students of Color.

Similarly within academe, race and racism take on a more nuanced manifestation. The University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign recently rescinded its offer of an accepted tenure position in American Indian Studies made to Palestinian American Steven Salaita for his perceived anti-Semitic Twitter commentary on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. This incident, one of many, illustrates the complexity of power and (vested) interests that *potentially*

implicates an institutional leadership complicit in perpetuating race and racism within higher education.

As the topic of this monograph, critical race theory asserts these incidents are neither random nor recent in their onset. Further, we argue that these are not isolated incidents manifesting solely at an individual level. In fact, these incidents, and others like them, are symptomatic of a society that remains entrenched in racist ideologies. Critical race theory provides a way to understand and disrupt this system of structural racial inequality.

Critical Race Theory in Higher Education

Critical race theory (CRT) emerged in response to perceived delays in civil rights advancements (Matsuda, Lawrence, Delgado, & Crenshaw, 1993; Stanley, 2006; Taylor, 2009). After significant legal advances for People of Color during the U.S. Civil Rights Era, the 1970s saw a reemergence of hostility toward legal policy, such as affirmative action (Taylor, 2009). By the 1980s, a noted group of legal scholars, including Derrick A. Bell, Jr., Charles Lawrence, Richard Delgado, Lani Guinier, Mari Matsuda, Patricia Williams, and Kimberlé Crenshaw, began to question the role of law in maintaining and further constructing racially based social and economic oppression (Lynn & Adams, 2002; Taylor, 1998, 2009). In addition to focusing on the stalled advancement of civil rights legislation, these early critical race scholars sought to challenge prevailing racial injustices while committing themselves to interrogating racism's continued presence in U.S. jurisprudence (Manning & Muñoz, 2011; Stanley, 2006; Yosso, 2002). Thus, before turning our attention to how the theory has been applied in higher education, we provide a brief overview of critical legal studies, critical race theory, and key tenets that have framed its application.

Critical Legal Studies

After significant civil rights advancements during the 1960s, critical legal studies (CLS) emerged in response to the perceived stalling of the

aforementioned rights during the 1970s. Critical legal scholars argued "that the reasoning and logic of the law was in fact based on arbitrary categorizations and decisions that both reflected and advanced established power relationships in society by covering injustices with a mask of legitimacy" (Taylor, 2009, p. 2). Critical legal studies' primary goal was to expose and challenge the idea that legal reasoning was "neutral, value-free, and unaffected by social and economic relations, political forces or cultural phenomena" (Brown & Jackson, 2013, p. 12).

Critical legal studies questioned the U.S. legal system's role in legitimizing oppressive social structures (Yosso, 2005). Prominent CLS scholars included Roberto Unger, Duncan Kennedy, and Catherine Mackinnon (Taylor, 2009). However, other legal scholars including Derrick A. Bell, Jr. and Alan Freeman argued one of critical legal studies' shortcomings was that it did not offer strategies for social transformation because it did not incorporate race and racism into its analysis (Ladson-Billings, 1998; Yosso, 2005). A second criticism of critical legal studies was that it failed to listen to the lived experiences and histories of oppressed people (Yosso, 2005). Brian McKinley Jones Brayboy (2005) contended, and we concur, that as "left-leaning legal scholarship" (p. 428), critical legal studies argue that the law must be studied through the lens of its contextual impact on different groups of people. These critiques paved the way for what has become known as critical race theory.

The Origins of Critical Race Theory

Critical race theory is grounded in the Civil Rights Movement and from its beginning has focused on social justice, liberation, and economic empowerment (Tate, 1997). Its origins can be traced to the critical legal studies movement of the 1970s (Brayboy, 2005; Lynn, Yosso, Solórzano, & Parker, 2002). Critical race theory emerged from critical legal studies because of the latter's inability to address People of Color's struggles (Brown & Jackson, 2013; Solórzano & Yosso, 2001; Stanley, 2006; Taylor, 2009; Yosso, 2005). Kevin Brown and Darrell Jackson (2013) expressed how critical race theory emerged from the convergence of historical developments and the need to respond to those developments. Dissatisfied with critical legal studies' lack of focus on race and

racism in the legal process, a group of legal scholars convened to name and plan a legal research agenda that focused on the effects of race and racism (Brayboy, 2005; Lynn & Adams, 2002; Lynn et al., 2002; Taylor, 1998, 2009). These scholars recognized the need for new methods for addressing the various ways racism manifests (Delgado & Stefancic, 2013; Museus, 2013). Thus, critical race theory emerged as a form of legal scholarship that sought to understand how White supremacy and its oppression of People of Color had been established and perpetuated. In doing so, race and racism was placed at the center of scholarship and analysis by focusing on such issues as affirmative action, racial districting, campus speech codes, and the disproportionate sentencing of People of Color in the U.S. criminal justice system (Lynn & Adams, 2002; Taylor, 1998).

Critical Race Theory

Critical race theory is a form of race-based oppositional scholarship (Bartlett & Brayboy, 2005; Brayboy, 2005; Calmore, 1992; Liu, 2009; Love, 2004) and challenges Eurocentric values, such as White being normalized in the United States. As a theoretical framework, critical race theory examines the "unequal and unjust distribution of power and resources along political, economic, racial, and gendered lines" (Taylor, 2009, p. 1). It is a movement comprising scholars committed to challenging and disrupting racism and its associated social, legal, political, and educational consequences (Patton, Ranero, & Everett, 2011). Critical race theory is an outcome of a racist legal system and was established as a means for challenging dominant systems of racial oppression (Museus, 2013). The theory has been called an "eclectic and dynamic" (Taylor, 1998, p. 122) form of legal and educational scholarship.

Key Tenets of Critical Race Theory

Critical race theory continues to emerge and expand as a theoretical framework and analytical tool for interrupting racism and other forms of oppression. Its tenets have been defined (see glossary for definitions of key critical

race terminology and concepts included in this monograph) and framed in a number of ways (see Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Solórzano & Yosso, 2002; Taylor, 2009). In this monograph, we specifically focus on the following critical race tenets: (a) the permanence of racism; (b) experiential knowledge (and counterstorytelling); (c) interest convergence theory; (d) intersectionality; (e) Whiteness as property; (f) critique of liberalism; and (g) commitment to social justice.

The Permanence of Racism

Critical race theorists openly acknowledge that racism is an endemic and permanent aspect of People of Color's experiences, influencing political, economic, and social aspects of U.S. society (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004; Ford & Airhihenbuwa, 2010; Ladson-Billings, 2013; Lynn & Adams, 2002; Taylor, 2009). Daniel Solórzano and Tara Yosso (2002) contended that the Eurocentric versions of U.S. history expose race as a socially constructed concept, established to distinguish racial groups and to show the superiority of one group over another. For example, some scholarship in education (*The Bell Curve: Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life,* Hernstein & Murray, 1994) has claimed that White students possess superior intellect when the research could be considered questionable at best. Given that race is a socially constructed concept, we use Carmelita Castañeda and Ximena Zúñiga's (2013) definition of racism:

> *[T]he set of institutional, cultural and interpersonal patterns and practices that create advantages for people legally defined and socially constructed as "white," and the corollary disadvantages for people defined as belonging to racial groups that were not considered Whites by the dominant power structure in the United States. (p. 58)*

Daniel Solórzano, Miguel Ceja, and Tara Yosso (2000) succinctly stated "racism is about institutional power, a form of power, [P]eople of [C]olor—that is non-Whites—have never possessed" (p. 61). For example, the Jim Crow laws of the Deep South institutionally marginalized Black people.

Critical race scholars recognize that racism is not a random isolated act (Ladson-Billings, 2013). It is so engrained in U.S. society that it seems natural and is often unrecognizable or invisible to most individuals (Ladson-Billings, 1998; Taylor, 1998, 2009). When racism is invisible, individuals believe it no longer exists or that it is connected to a specific "isolated" incident (Lopez, 2003). Edward Taylor (2009) surmised that when oppression (such as racism) no longer seems like oppression to the perpetrator, racial incidents become isolated horrific encounters and events.

In their articulation of the permanence of racism, Jessica DeCuir and Adrienne Dixson (2004) stated, "Racist hierarchical structures govern all political, economic, and social domains. Such structures allocate the privileging of Whites and the subsequent Othering of [P]eople of [C]olor in all arenas, including education" (p. 27). Taylor (2009) described racism as a normal component of daily life for People of Color. The aforementioned *Bell Curve* research (Hernstein & Murray, 1994) is one such example of Students of Color being *othered* and deemed inferior when there is no reasonable "scientific evidence" to support the claim. Thus, critical race scholars are more surprised by racism's absence than by its presence and believe the theory's first task is to expose, disrupt, and eliminate racism (Lynn & Parker, 2002). Gerardo Lopez (2003) concluded how racism has been condensed to broad generalizations based on a group's phenotype. For many White people, racism's presence often means unearned advantages based solely on their race and their inability to understand the culture they have created (Taylor, 2009). For example, White people do not have to be concerned about driving in the "wrong neighborhood" and being stopped by the police. For People of Color, and Black people in particular, this is known as being charged with "driving while Black." (See also Peggy McIntosh's [2012] "White Privilege: Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack" and Zeus Leonardo's [2002] "Souls of White Folk" for a more detailed discussion of White privilege.)

Experiential Knowledge (and Counterstorytelling)

The knowledge that People of Color and other subordinated identities possess has often been excluded from higher education (Solórzano & Yosso, 2001). Thus, critical race scholars recognize People of Color's lived experiences

(experiential knowledge) as valued, legitimate, appropriate, and critical to understanding, analyzing, and teaching about racial subordination in education (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004; Solórzano & Yosso, 2001). Lynn and Adams (2002) surmised that experiential knowledge is essential for "the theorizing of race within the context" (p. 88) of People of Color's daily experiences with racism. Contesting traditional methods of scholarship, People of Color's experiences are shared through storytelling, family histories, biographies, chronicles, narratives, metaphorical tales, and testimonies (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004; Jones, Torres, & Arminio, 2014; Lynn & Adams, 2002; Solórzano & Yosso, 2001). Storytelling is fundamental to critical race theory and in using a critical race methodology in educational research. The primary reason stories and counterstories are used in critical race theory is that they add context to the "objectivity" of positivist perspectives (Ladson-Billings, 1998, p. 11). For instance, drawing from the author's (McCoy) own narrative, the Essex Town School District is arguably the best in the State of Vermont; however, this fails to consider the experience that was real for his child elucidating larger questions: Although it might be seen as the best school district, it is the interests of White students that are primarily served. What is it like for the student who is the only Student of Color in his or her grade level? In what ways does this student experience marginalization, isolation, and othering? In what ways must that particular family unit negotiate and navigate these isolating dynamics? It is these alternative narratives that are central to critical race theory.

These "alternative" stories are lived and experienced *counter* (thus the name counterstories) to the prevailing master narrative or majoritarian story (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002; Stanley, 2007). A counterstory is defined as "a tool for exposing, analyzing, and challenging the majoritarian stories of racial privilege" (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002, p. 32). Accordingly, counterstorytelling provides voice to historically marginalized people and serves to illuminate and critique "normalized dialogues that perpetuate racial stereotypes" (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004, p. 27). Counterstories seek to cast doubt on the validity of accepted premises or myths, especially those held by the majority (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004; Delgado & Stefancic, 2001). The use of these methods can be traced to the Black literary traditions of the Harlem Renaissance and other Communities of Color that have been openly critical of the United States'

racist past (Lynn & Adams, 2002). Counterstories occur in three primary forms: personal stories/narratives, other peoples' stories/narratives, and composite stories/narratives (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004; Solórzano & Yosso, 2002).

Interest Convergence Theory

Derrick A. Bell, Jr., considered the "Father of Critical Race Theory" (Ladson-Billings, 2013), first presented the theory of interest convergence. Interest convergence is grounded on the premise that People of Color's interest in achieving racial equality advances only when those interests "converge" with the interests of those in power (typically White, heterosexual, Christian, able-bodied males; Bell, 1980; Brown & Jackson, 2013; Taylor, 2009). Thus, People of Color in the United States make significant social, political, and economic progress when their interests align with those in power and those interests serve to benefit both groups. Even the diversity argument (diversity is a compelling educational interest) in the landmark *Grutter v. Bollinger* should be viewed as a matter of interest convergence. The diversity argument implies that White students benefit from compositional diversity in higher education.

In his seminal work, "*Brown v. Board of Education* and the Interest Convergence Dilemma," Bell (1980) contended that the U.S. Supreme Court's decision to overturn *Plessy v. Ferguson* could not be fully understood without considering how the decision benefited White people, particularly White people with the power to influence policy, economics, and political advancement within the United States and abroad. He argued there were three significant benefits for White people in positions of power. First, the court's decision provided credibility to the United States as it emerged as a world leader and in its fight against communism's spread. Second, the *Brown* decision, which called for racial integration in primary and secondary schooling, reassured Blacks that equality and freedom were valued. Third, Whites realized the South could not fully transition from a rural agrarian society into a more industrialized society until state-sponsored segregation ended.

Interest convergence is grounded in Marxist theory—that the bourgeoisie (middle to upper class) tolerate the proletariat's (working class) advances when those advances also benefit the bourgeoisie (Taylor, 2009). Bell's (1980) theory of interest convergence posits that Black people and other People of Color

advance when their interests converge with the interests of powerful White people, whereas Gloria Ladson-Billings (2013) suggested that interest convergence is about "alignment, not altruism" (p. 38). In higher education, an example of visible interest convergence would be an institution that admits Students of Color in an effort to meet specific diversity goals, even though the campus climate may not be inclusive and the resources necessary to support Students of Color's persistence at that institution may be limited. Historically, White people in the United States have been willing to sacrifice People of Color's well-being for economic self-interests and the continued subordination of People of Color (Taylor, 1998). Considering this, critical scholars recognize critical race as a form of oppositional theory and maintain that conflict is inevitable and that progress is made through resistance[3] (Taylor, 2009).

Intersectionality

Although critical race theory centers on race and racism, critical race scholars recognize that racial identity and this form of oppression (racism) intersect with other subordinated identities (such as gender, class, religion, ability/disability, sexual orientation, etc.) and forms of oppression (for example, sexism, homophobia, ableism, etc.) to influence People of Color's lived experiences (Bartlett & Brayboy, 2005; Brayboy, 2005; Jones et al., 2014; Kumasi, 2011; Lynn & Adams, 2002; McCabe, 2009; Solórzano & Yosso, 2001). Kimberlé Williams Crenshaw (1991) introduced intersectionality in her work exploring how Women of Color experienced oppression based not only on their raced experiences but also through their gendered and classed experiences. Crenshaw's work illustrated that the aforementioned identities "intersected" to influence the women's lives. Kafi Kumasi (2011) defined intersectionality as "the belief that individuals often have overlapping interests and traits based not only on their racial identity but also their class position, gender, and so forth" (pp. 216–217). Ladson-Billings (2013) surmised that it is often difficult for individuals to grasp the concept of intersectionality because U.S. society is organized along binaries. Because of these binaries, we see issues as black or white, right or wrong, yes or no. However, Ladson-Billings (2013) stated that when we "move into the complexities of real life" (p. 39), we as individuals represent multiple identities. Critical race theory is strengthened

because of its intersectionality with other oppressed identities such as gender, sexual orientation, or class in its analysis (Yosso, 2005). In fact, critical race scholars are critical of any analysis that focuses solely on race and fails to consider other marginalized and oppressed identities (Kumasi, 2011).

Whiteness as Property

Cheryl Harris (1993) introduced the concept of Whiteness as property when sharing the story of her grandmother passing for White after leaving the Deep South for the Midwest. Harris (1993) articulated that her grandmother's story secured Whiteness as prized property even while drawing social lines based on racial categories. Her premise is that the "assumptions, privileges, and benefits" (p. 1713) associated with identifying as White are valuable assets that White people seek to protect. She further argued that those benefits have been protected legally.

Property includes the rights of possession, use, transfer, disposition, and exclusion (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004; Harris, 1993). These rights allowed White people to establish an "exclusive club whose membership was closely and grudgingly guarded" (Harris, 1993, p. 1736). In higher education, those individuals (such as White people) who have historically accessed higher education through admissions policies is an example of Whiteness as property. Kathleen Manning (2013), in her discussion of organizational theory in higher education, described how Whiteness could be bartered and exchanged for other forms of property and capital. In her articulation of this concept, she discussed how Whiteness (as a privilege) could be exchanged for access to high-paying careers, better neighborhoods (such as majority White suburban neighborhoods), and higher quality schools. The curriculum in higher education is considered a form of "Whiteness as property" because it has historically focused on White, Western perspectives and its acquisition may offer real tangible benefits in the form of capital to the individual (Patton, McEwen, Rendón, & Howard-Hamilton, 2007).

Whiteness as a concept is based on power relations (Harris, 1993). More specifically, Whiteness is based on White dominance and the subordination of People of Color. In describing the meaning and value associated with Whiteness, Ladson-Billings (1998) positioned critical race theory as an important

intellectual and social tool for "deconstruction, reconstruction, and construction: deconstruction of oppressive structures and discourses, reconstruction of human agency, and construction of equitable and socially just relations of power" (p. 9). Critical race scholars have claimed that the concept of Whiteness can be considered a property interest because those individuals allowed to self-identify as White have social advantages (DeCuir & Dixson, 2005; Harris, 1993).

Harris (1993) argued that the intersectionality of race and property have contributed to establishing and sustaining racial and economic subordination. Two prominent examples in U.S. history are the enslavement of Africans, with Africans (and Blacks) being viewed as property based on their race, and the "conquest, removal, and extermination" (Harris, 1993, p. 1716) of Native American/Indigenous Peoples[4] from their lands. These periods in U.S. history led to Whiteness as a racial identity serving as validation for property rights and ownership. Harris (1993) articulated that "White identity and whiteness were sources of privilege and protection; their absence meant being the object of property" (p. 1721), preventing White people from being considered as property and keeping them free from enslavement.

Critique of Liberalism

Critical race scholars are critical of and challenge the concepts of objectivity, meritocracy, color blindness, race neutrality, equal opportunity, and incremental change (Bartlett & Brayboy, 2005; DeCuir & Dixson, 2004; Ford & Airhihenbuwa, 2010; Lynn & Adams, 2002; Museus, 2013; Solórzano & Yosso, 2001; Taylor, 1998). Solórzano and Yosso (2001) asserted that the aforementioned concepts act as "camouflage for the self-interest, power, and privilege of dominant groups in U.S. society" (p. 473). DeCuir and Dixson (2004) suggested that "at face-value" (p. 29) these concepts appear to be desirable goals; however, they argue given the history of racism in the United States, this is not possible.

Color blindness, the belief that race does not matter (Worthington, Navarro, Loewy, & Hart, 2008), fails to consider the permanence of racism. Manning (2009) suggested it is the misguided belief in the equality of people because they are human. DeCuir and Dixson (2004) suggested that

embracing color blindness ignores "that inequity, inopportunity, and oppression are historical artifacts that will not easily be remedied by ignoring race in the contemporary society" (p. 29). Whereas, Ford and Airhihenbuwa (2010) surmised that critical race theory challenges the erroneous belief that color blindness is synonymous with the absence of racism. Individuals committed to social justice must consistently challenge the ways that racial advancements are promoted through White self-interest and a color-blind ideology (Patton et al., 2007).

Incremental change is the concept where change for People of Color and other marginalized groups occur in an acceptable manner to those currently empowered (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004). Those individuals already in positions of power are not adversely affected by the inequity that results from racism and other forms of oppression. An example of this is the South's slow response to the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision. Many people in the South not only opposed integration, but argued that if it was to happen, it had to occur in a slow methodical manner acceptable to White people. Despite being ordered to integrate "with all deliberate speed," most southern school systems did not integrate until the beginning of the 1970–1971 school year, 14 years after the *Brown* decision.

Commitment to Social Justice

Critical race scholars are committed to the establishment of a socially just U.S. society and educational system and maintain a praxis of activism as a component of their scholarship (Bartlett & Brayboy, 2005). Lee Anne Bell (2013) articulated that social justice is both a process and goal. She described social justice as:

> *full and equal participation of all groups in a society that is mutually shaped to meet their needs. Social justice includes a vision of society in which the distribution of resources is equitable and all members are physically and psychologically safe and secure. (p. 21)*

With its emphasis on social justice, critical race theory accounts for race and racism's role in education and works toward the eradication of racism as

part of a larger goal of opposing or eliminating other forms of subordination based on gender, class, sexual orientation, language, religion, and national origin (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002). Potentially emancipatory in nature, critical race theory is grounded in a consistent commitment to resist the racialized and gendered inequality and injustice marking access to social, political, economic, and cultural resources. It seeks to facilitate change *toward* social justice for People of Color (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004; Love, 2004; Solórzano & Yosso, 2002). Ladson-Billings (1998) contended that racism "requires sweeping changes" (p. 12), but liberalism offers neither instrument nor structure for enacting that change. Therefore, critical race scholars work toward the elimination of racism and the empowerment of groups that are oppressed and marginalized (Jones et al., 2014).

In this chapter we have discussed critical race theory's emergence from the legal field and critical legal studies. In addition, we provided an overview of the theory's higher education origins and seven tenets: (a) the permanence of racism; (b) experiential knowledge (and counterstorytelling); (c) interest convergence theory; (d) intersectionality; (e) Whiteness as property; (f) critique of liberalism; and (g) commitment to social justice. We believe this foundational introduction is essential to developing an enhanced understanding of the theory and its application to higher education.

Critical Race Theory in Higher Education: 20 Years of Theoretical and Research Innovations

In the second chapter, we review selected works that informed the critical race movement in education and connect the extant literature using the tenets presented within the context of People of Color's experiences in the academy. Using the history and tenets as our foundation, in the third chapter we examine critical race theory as a research methodology. We review the key elements (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002) of a critical race methodology as well as its utility. Also in this chapter, we focus on counterstorytelling and discuss its functions. In addition, we review critical race's descendent theories and discuss the tension and possibility of "growing" the counterstory beyond qualitative

methodologies (incorporating quantitative and mixed methodologies). In the fourth chapter, we connect critical race theory with student development theories as a means for understanding Students of Color's racialized experiences in higher education. More specifically, we explore how critical race theory and the intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1991) of students' multiple identities affect their holistic development and experiences in higher education. In the fifth chapter, we examine a more subtle form of racism, racial microaggressive behavior. We discuss the types of microaggressions and how they have replaced covert forms of racism in higher education. We conclude by discussing critical race theory's potential for growth during the next 20 years and its emphasis on social justice, and we offer provocations for how scholars and practitioner–educators can extend or initiate their critical race praxis.

Critical Race Theory in Higher Education

IN THIS CHAPTER, WE REVIEW selected literature to illustrate how critical race tenets intersect to illuminate the effects of race and racism on People of Color's experiences in the academy. Beginning with a discussion of the extant literature on the experiences of Students of Color, we then move to a consideration of the experiences of Faculty of Color. We conclude this chapter with a discussion that connects critical race theory with higher education policy and the law.

Tensions and Possibilities

Well into the 21st century, racism remains a problem in higher education. Since critical race theory's introduction to education, a broad body of literature has emerged. The theory has been used to examine the numerous issues that affect People of Color and their lived experiences in U.S. higher education. The theory's expansion into education is significant because it further illuminated race and racism's role in U.S. society (Dixson & Lynn, 2013). As a theoretical construct, critical race explains how traditional aspects of education and the structures supporting educational systems perpetuate racism and maintain subordinate and dominant racial positions on college and university campuses (Patton et al., 2007; Solórzano, Villalpando, & Oseguera, 2005).

Critical race has emerged as a powerful theoretical framework and methodology, extending into educational theory, research, policy, and practice (Taylor, 2009), while at the same time serving as an analytical tool for examining a myriad of educational issues. Taylor (2009) described critical race theory's potential for extending to educational theory, "challenging Eurocentric epistemology and questioning dominant notions of meritocracy, objectivity, and knowledge" (p. 10). He surmised that critical race theory is applicable to education and that the theory offers "a liberatory pedagogy that encourages inquiry, dialogue, and participation" (p. 10).

Critical race theory is interdisciplinary, transcending epistemological and disciplinary boundaries (Lynn & Adams, 2002). Accordingly, the theory has established a community of scholars from various disciplinary backgrounds. These scholars are dedicated to exposing, critiquing, and transforming racism and other forms of oppression (Kumasi, 2011). Critical race theory is grounded in the scholar–activist traditions found in ethnic and women's studies and is informed by multiple critical theories, including Marxist and feminist theories (Yosso, Parker, Solórzano, & Lynn, 2004). While simultaneously extending the broad literature base of critical theory, critical race borrows from sociology, history, ethnic studies, and women's studies (Lynn & Adams, 2002; Solórzano & Yosso, 2001; Yosso, 2005). Critical race scholars believe that racial analysis can be used to enhance scholars' and practitioners' understandings of the educational barriers that affect People of Color (Taylor, 2009). The theory centers race and racism by placing them in both historical and contemporary contexts (Solórzano & Yosso, 2001). Yosso (2005) defined critical race theory in education as "a theoretical and analytical framework that challenges the ways race and racism impact educational structures, practices, and discourses. [It] is conceived as a social justice project that works toward the liberatory potential of schooling" (p. 74).

Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995) first introduced critical race theory to education with their pathbreaking work "Toward a Critical Race Theory of Education." In their article, they argued for a critical race perspective in education based on three propositions: (a) race remains a significant aspect of U.S. society; (b) U.S. society is based on property rights and not human rights; and

(c) the intersectionality of race and property establishes an analytical tool for understanding both social and educational inequity (p. 47). First, because race had not seriously been interrogated and theorized by educational researchers, Ladson-Billings and Tate suggested that critical race theory could serve as an analytical framework for examining educational issues related to racism and oppression. They were not suggesting that race had not been studied, "but that the intellectual salience of this theorizing [had] not been systematically employed in the analysis of educational inequality" (p. 50). Furthermore, they contended a race-based analysis was important because class- and gender-based explanations were insufficient in describing the variance in Students of Color's educational experiences and performance when compared to their White peers (Tate, 1997). Thus, by centering race and racism in analysis, critical race scholars challenge the commonly held beliefs that culture and poverty are the primary reasons that People of Color experience educational inequality.

Second, Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995) surmised "the ability to define, possess, and own property" (p. 53) is an essential component of power in the United States. They acknowledged that property relates to education in "explicit and implicit" ways, articulating that affluent communities resent funding public school districts that serve primarily Students of Color and poor students. In addition, Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995) identified the curriculum as a form of property, albeit intellectual property. Finally, they discussed the intersection of race and property as central to understanding critical race in education. In doing so, Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995) discussed the property functions of Whiteness—(a) rights of disposition; (b) rights to use and enjoyment; (c) reputation and status property; and (d) the absolute right to exclude (see Harris [1993] for a more detailed discussion of Whiteness as property)—and their applicability to education.

Race and Racism on the U.S. University Campus

Critical race theory in education challenges the experiences of Whites as the norm (Calmore, 1992; Taylor, 2009). Recognizing the permanence of racism in U.S. society and education, critical race scholars contend that racial analysis

can be used to deepen the understanding of the educational barriers that People of Color encounter (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004; Ford & Airhihenbuwa, 2010; Ladson-Billings, 1998, 2013; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Lynn & Adams, 2002; Taylor, 2009). However, to understand racism, it is essential to recognize race as a socially constructed concept (Castañeda & Zúñiga, 2013; Patton et al., 2007; Solórzano & Yosso, 2002). Given its social constructiveness, conceptual notions of Whiteness and Blackness emerged (Ladson-Billings, 1998). Contemporary examples of Whiteness include "school achievement, middle classness, and intelligence," whereas examples of Blackness include "gangs, welfare recipients, and basketball players" (Ladson-Billings, 1998, p. 9). She explained that the aforementioned categories were "not designed to reify a binary but rather to suggest how, in a racialized society where Whiteness is positioned as the normative, *everyone* is ranked and categorized in relation to these points of opposition" (Ladson-Billings, 1998, p. 9; italics in original).

Conceptually grounded in the unique experiences of People of Color, critical race theory has been used to examine Students of Color's (both undergraduate and graduate) experiences (Harper, 2009a, 2009b; Solórzano & Yosso, 2001), the experiences of Faculty of Color teaching in predominantly White institutions (Stanley, 2006, 2007), racial microaggressions (Solórzano et al., 2000; Sue et al., 2007), and educational policy and the legal jurisprudence affecting higher education (Yosso et al., 2004). Given the broad body of scholarship that has emerged in the past 20 years, we review selected works that informed the critical race movement. We selected not only works that discussed critical race theory's emergence and applicability to higher education, but also works that we believed would enhance the audience's understanding of critical race theory and that illuminated the theory's depth and broadness. Our review of the literature illustrates how the critical race tenets presented in the first chapter intersect to illuminate the effects of race and racism on People of Color's experiences in the academy. We begin by discussing the extant literature that engages with Students of Color's experiences before moving to a consideration of Faculty of Color's experiences. Although centered on race and racism, the works reviewed illustrate the importance of confronting the majoritarian narrative in higher education, while simultaneously working

toward socially just educational environments. We conclude with a discussion that connects critical race theory with higher education policy and the law.

Engaging with Students of Color's Experiences

Critical race theory serves as a framework and analytical tool for understanding how race and racism affects Students of Color's experiences. Tara Yosso, Laurence Parker, Daniel Solórzano, and Marvin Lynn (2004) acknowledged that to fully understand how race and racism affect higher education and perpetuate various forms of oppression, Students of Color's lived experiences in academia must be viewed as "valid, appropriate, and necessary forms of data" (p. 15). In this section, we review literature that centers on both undergraduate and graduate Students of Color's experiences.

Solórzano et al. (2000) employed a critical race methodology to enhance scholars and practitioners understanding of undergraduate African American[5] students' experiences at three elite predominantly White institutions. They employed a case study approach and conducted focus groups to better understand how microaggressions and the campus climate affected African American students' experiences. More specifically, Solórzano and colleagues sought to connect racial stereotypes, cumulative racial microaggressions, campus racial climate, and academic performance. The participants' counterstories highlighted the effects of microaggressions on their undergraduate experiences. Their stories revealed "tense" (p. 65) racial climates both in and out of the classroom, struggles with self-doubt, frustration, and isolation. Solórzano et al. (2000) concluded that even at elite undergraduate institutions, inequality and discrimination still exist.

Shaun Harper (2009b) employed a phenomenological approach, conducting interviews with 143 Black male undergraduate students at 30 predominantly White institutions, to disrupt the master narrative and deficit perspectives of Black males in higher education. Harper (2009a) reviewed the etymology of "nigger" in his work, describing it as an "actionable term" (p. 698) and used the term "niggering" (p. 697) to explain how White people marginalize Black males in higher education. The findings revealed the study's participants were academic achievers and student leaders who excelled

in and out of the classroom. Despite their academic, cocurricular, and athletic successes, the participants experienced racism and strategically navigated their respective institutions by engaging with same-race peers and publicizing their educational achievements to White people who possessed deficit perspectives. They resisted being "niggered" through positive self-representation on campus and confronting racist stereotypes. Their response to being "niggered" was a form of resistance and oppositional action.

Similar to Harper, Dorian McCoy (2014) combined critical race theory with a phenomenological approach. McCoy (2014) explored the intersectionality of the participants' identities as Students of Color and as first-generation college students at an "extreme" predominantly White institution (EPWI). He defined an EPWI as a predominantly White institution where Students, Faculty, and Administrators of Color are grossly underrepresented, the institution possesses a history of racism and exclusionary policies and practices, the local community is overwhelmingly White and offers limited resources and/or services for People of Color, and there are no "visible" Communities of Color. McCoy used counterstorytelling to learn about Students of Color's experiences transitioning from racially and ethnically diverse communities to a community where they experienced culture shock in a "Sea of Whiteness" (p. 163). The study's participants described family members' high educational expectations, a difficult admission process (due to the absence of mentoring and a lack of knowledge about the process), overcoming challenging transitions (socially and culturally), and culture shock. McCoy (2014) concluded the EPWI in this study needed to create an inclusive campus community for Students of Color and identify ways to ease their transition as first-generation students to higher education. He emphasized the importance of the multicultural student center and staff, orientation programs, and the presence of racially and ethnically diverse faculty in assisting first-generation Students of Color's transition to an EPWI.

Octavio Villalpando (2004) pulled from both critical race theory and Latino critical theory (see the third chapter for more discussion of Latino Critical Theory or LatCrit) to suggest how the theoretical frameworks offer student affairs practitioner–educators a method to more fully understand and respond to Latina/o students' needs. By using critical race theory and LatCrit

in combination, Villalpando demonstrates the theoretical frames' potential for improving practitioner–educators' understanding of Latina/o students' experiences. Villalpando (2004) concluded that student affairs practitioner–educators can use critical race theory and LatCrit to assess policy and practice for "inequality, contradictions, and inconsistences" (p. 48), potentially leading to greater satisfaction and success for all historically oppressed student populations. We believe critical race theory and all of its descendant theories should be used to enhance our understanding of Students of Color's experiences in academia.

In another work combining critical race theory and Latino Critical Theory, Daniel Solórzano and Dolores Delgado Bernal (2001) examined Chicana/o student resistance. They used the 1968 East Los Angeles school walkouts and the 1993 UCLA student protests for Chicana/o studies as examples of resistance. The 1968 school walkout protested the inferior quality of education Chicana/o students received; the UCLA students protested the chancellor's decision to not support expansion of the Chicano Studies Program to departmental status. Solórzano and Delgado Bernal (2001) suggested Chicana/o student resistance has been ignored and understudied and that current resistance models have yet to offer a framework to explain their efforts. They used both historical and contemporary contexts to examine Chicana/o students' transitional resistance. Transformational resistance critiques oppression, promotes social justice, and offers the greatest possibility for social change (Solórzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001). They created two composite characters (a faculty member and an undergraduate student) to illustrate the complexity of Chicana/o student resistance (see third chapter for types of counterstories). Their work provided context for Chicana/o students' internal and external transformational resistance. Thus, critical race theory and its descendant theories (see the third chapter) are appropriate for identifying the ways Students of Color engage in resistance and seek to disrupt deficit perspectives.

Harper (2009b), in a conceptual piece, considered the educational outcomes that might result when the interests of Black male student–athletes' converge with the interests of community college administrators, faculty, and coaches. Harper (2009b) suggested Black male student–athletes transferring

from a community college to a 4-year institution is a common or shared interest for both the student–athletes and the community college. He explained how both parties benefit, a matter of interest convergence. However, it is appropriate to conclude that the institution and coaches experience greater benefits. Harper (2009b) acknowledged that it is a goal and function of community colleges to have students transfer to 4-year institutions. He identified four ways community colleges could potentially benefit by Black male student–athletes transferring to 4-year institutions. First, the overall transfer rate for Black male student–athletes increases and the overall transfer rate for the institution would also increase. Second, the community college's reputation is enhanced as a result of the increase in graduation and transfer rates. Third, coaches employed at community colleges benefit, particularly if their job retention correlates with the graduation rate. Finally, community colleges might reap the benefits of a former student–athlete who transfers to a 4-year institution and is eventually drafted by a professional sports team. This alum could potentially be a future donor in an era of constrained budgets.

There is considerably less literature framed in critical race theory that specifically focuses on Students of Color's experiences in graduate education. These works have primarily focused on students at the master's level. Here we review several works that focus specifically on Students of Color's graduate experiences.

Solórzano and Yosso (2001) combined critical race theory and Latino critical theory in their study of Chicana and Chicano graduate students' experiences. They specifically focused on the racial and gender discrimination experienced by the study's participants. Solórzano and Yosso (2001) sought to understand how graduate education reinforces racial, gender, and class inequality for Chicano students. Drawing from the existing literature, the data collected, and their personal and professional experiences, Solórzano and Yosso (2001) created two composite characters, a Chicana faculty member and a Chicana graduate student. The composite characters' counterstories underscored the participants' feelings of self-doubt, survivor guilt, imposter syndrome, and invisibility. Their work highlights the nuanced ways Chicano graduate students' experiences differ from those of other Students of Color. They specifically asked, "What is their story?" By doing so, Solórzano and

Yosso (2001) illuminated the experiences of Chicano students, a group often at the margins of graduate education.

Carolann Daniel (2007) employed critical race theory to analyze the experiences of 15 graduate Students of Color enrolled in a social work program at a public predominantly White institution. She identified factors that influence the students' professional development and socialization to social work. Daniel's (2007) work revealed the various ways the participants are ignored and experience cultural and racial isolation as well as invisibility within the program. Her work further highlighted the importance of having mentors given Students of Color underrepresentation in social work graduate programs. Daniel (2007) concluded that much of the literature on professional socialization ignores the "realities of inequality and persistent discrimination" (p. 39) that Students of Color's experience in graduate education programs. Consistent with other studies highlighted in this review, Daniel (2007) revealed Students of Color in social work programs experience numerous racialized challenges while enrolled in their academic program.

Understanding Faculty of Color's Experiences

Critical race theory has been used to develop a more nuanced understanding of Faculty of Color's experiences in academia where they remain underrepresented. Despite our[6] continued underrepresentation, we are frequently concentrated in the humanities, social sciences, and education because of our sense of responsibility and obligation to our communities (Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002). In addition to our underrepresentation in higher education, this subgroup of the professoriate, until recently, has been understudied. Christine Stanley (2006) offered four possible rationales for why this is potentially the case: (a) Faculty of Color are underrepresented; (b) Faculty of Color choose to not participate in studies because we are easily identifiable (due to our underrepresentation); (c) prior to the 1960s, Faculty of Color were not viewed as an important research focus; and (d) studies on Faculty of Color are often conducted by Faculty of Color and numerous White faculty do not believe Faculty of Color are objective in their scholarship and the scholarship lacks rigor. In addition, there are those who believe "this research can be

validated only with a comparison group of White faculty" (Stanley, 2006, p. 703). Critical race theory has been used to illuminate Faculty of Color's experiences, often providing evidence of the institution's unwelcoming and hostile climate.

In her work, "Coloring the Academic Landscape: Faculty of Color Breaking the Silence in Predominantly White Colleges and Universities," Stanley (2006) employed a critical race framework to "present and break the often silenced narratives of [F]aculty of [C]olor in a way that positions them as authentic and understood for what they are" (p. 703). She used an autoethnographic (narrative) approach to illuminate the participants' experiences. Participants included 27 Faculty of Color (including African Americans, American Indians/Indigenous Peoples, Asians/Asian Americans, Latinas/os, and South Africans). Six prominent themes emerged from the participants' narrative: teaching, mentoring, collegiality, identity, service, and racism. First, the participants shared how they often encountered behavioral or conduct issues in the classroom and had their authority and credibility questioned. Despite these challenges, they expressed how teaching brought them joy and was one of the primary reasons they entered academia. Second, they discussed mentoring experiences, describing how other faculty mentors shaped their teaching and research. The participants shared how both formal and informal mentoring contributed to their professional development. Stanley (2006) suggested mentoring was one key aspect for the successful recruitment and retention of Faculty of Color at predominantly White institutions.

Third, Faculty of Color wrote about collegiality. They revealed how relationships with White faculty were critical to their success or a significant factor in their decisions to leave their previous institution(s) (Stanley, 2006). Fourth, the participants described how others perceived them based on their multiple intersecting identities (such as gender, race, ethnicity, nationality, sexual orientation, religion, culture, and socioeconomic status). Fifth, Faculty of Color described heavy service commitments. These commitments typically included mentoring Students of Color, serving on committees that focused on recruiting diverse individuals to their respective institutions, assisting local communities with their educational endeavors, mentoring other Faculty of Color, and educating White people in the university community about

diversity (Stanley, 2006). Finally, the participants shared their racialized experiences, describing their experiences of both institutional and individual racism. Stanley (2006) concluded by offering a number of suggestions specific to each theme for Faculty of Color and for administrators employed at predominantly White institutions. One significant implication of Stanley's work is that Faculty of Color are often recruited to diversify the faculty and the institution's diversity agenda, yet when they engage in these efforts they are told they are of little value.

Using the concept of apartheid, Delgado Bernal and Villalpando (2002) employed a critical race analysis to describe an apartheid (or separation) of knowledge that exists in U.S. higher education. They articulated how an "apartheid of knowledge" (p. 169) is maintained through epistemological racism—a racism that seeks to limit the "epistemologies considered legitimate within the mainstream research community" (p. 169). Delgado Bernal and Villalpando argued an epistemology grounded in the history and culture of the dominant race has produced scholarship that portrays People of Color as deficient and renders Faculty of Color scholarship as "biased and nonrigorous" (p. 169).

Likewise, Faculty of Color employed at predominantly White institutions frequently experience racial microaggressions. Chavella Pittman (2012) employed a case study methodology to examine African American faculty members' experiences at one Midwestern doctoral-granting predominantly White institution. Pittman (2012) sought to further illustrate how African American faculty experience interpersonal racial oppression or microaggressive behavior in academia. She concluded that the study's participants experienced both microinvalidations and microinsults (see the fifth chapter for a more detailed discussion of microaggressions and the various types of microaggressive behavior). Consistent with previous research (Stanley, 2006), Pittman shared how African American faculty members were more likely to have their experiences questioned or dismissed (microinvalidations) by their White colleagues, whereas engagement with White students often resulted in microinsults, with students frequently challenging faculty members' intelligence. The participants in this study revealed that experiencing racial microaggressions often led to additional service commitments, particularly race-related service, on

their campus. However, they considered this additional work as an opportunity to improve the campus climate and to provide support to Students of Color. Pittman's (2012) work provided further evidence that African American faculty continue to experience "chilly" campus climates.

Frank Tuitt, Michelle Hanna, Lisa Martinez, María del Carmen Salazar, and Rachel Griffin (2009) used a critical race methodology to share their collective experiences at one institution. After presenting their work at a national conference, the dean of the college asked if they would share their experience with the faculty. To do so, they created a composite character and used counternarrative to "deconstruct and challenge the ways that race and racism play a role in our pedagogical interactions" (p. 66). Tuitt and his colleagues' goal was to underscore the impact of their racial identities on their classroom experiences. Further highlighting how race and racism continues to affect People of Color in higher education, their composite character "ensure[d] that no one voice remained isolated or exposed" (p. 67) and protected each author from "unnecessary scrutiny" (p. 67). Consistent with prior research, their work further revealed how institutional and classroom climates and Faculty of Color's racial identities contribute to less than positive experiences in academia.

In another study, Lori Patton and Christopher Catching (2009) focused specifically on the experiences of African American faculty teaching in student affairs preparation programs. They used counterstorytelling to highlight the "racial profiling" (p. 713) African American faculty experience in the classroom. More specifically, Patton and Catching (2009) used the metaphor of "teaching while Black," a reference to the racial profiling African Americans often experience while driving, known as "driving while Black" or "being charged with DWB." They also developed composite stories that specifically capture the participants' counterstories to elucidate the 13 African American faculty members' experiences. The counterstories further revealed the participants' experiences with oppression in the classroom, such as having to prove their credibility and White students being disrespectful. Patton and Catching's (2009) research revealed how cross-cultural communication is often misinterpreted resulting in the White students adhering to stereotypes that African American faculty are aggressive and threatening to White people. Their work also further illuminated the shortage of mentors available to

Faculty of Color and the energy African American faculty expend learning the "rules of the game" (p. 722) in academia. Patton and Catching (2009) accentuated African American faculty members' experiences with racial microaggressions, including confronting microaggressions committed by both students and colleagues. The counterstories also highlighted the racialized gendered differences African American faculty experience. Danielle (a composite character) shared how she was objectified by a White male colleague because he considered her "a young, attractive, African American woman" (p. 723).

Finally, Patton and Catching (2009) questioned just how nice is the field of student affairs, a higher education profession that is often deemed welcoming and inclusive. The participants in Patton and Catching's (2009) study experienced racial battle fatigue: "the constant physiological, psychological, cultural, and emotional coping with racial microaggressions in less-than-ideal and racially hostile or unsupportive environments (campus or otherwise)" (Smith, Allen, & Danley, 2007, as cited in Patton & Catching, 2009, p. 724). A significant implication of this scholarship is the need for student affairs preparation programs to create an inclusive environment for African American faculty. These programs should not only focus on the recruitment of African American faculty (or other Faculty of Color) but also their retention and positive mentoring from White allies.

Gregory Diggs, Dorothy Garrison-Wade, Diane Estrada, and Rene Galindo (2009) identified several barriers Faculty of Color encounter in their pursuit of tenure. In this work, the authors identified and discussed barriers to the recruitment and retention of Faculty of Color. Three tenure-seeking faculty members, informally mentored by a senior colleague, discussed navigating the tenure process at a predominantly White institution in the western United States. Consistent with a critical race methodology, the authors include their lived experiences (experiential knowledge) in their data collection and analysis. The four participants, two females and two males, participated in a focus group, with eight themes emerging from the data analysis: Academic Identity, Opportunity Costs, Mentoring, Safe Spaces, Frustrations, Confronting Diversity, Coping Strategies, and Systems Change. In this article they focused on the first four themes. Diggs and colleagues (2009) used

the metaphor of "The Party and The After Party" to describe their experiences. When People of Color socialize with White People at work-related social events, People of Color often have to maintain their "public face" (p. 328) adhering to workplace norms. In the latter half of the 20th century, People of Color often organized an "After Party" as a smaller more intimate, relaxed environment where they could be "real" (p. 328) after the party. The authors emphasized the importance of mentoring and note that mentoring often took place in a "colored space" (p. 328)—the after party. They defined a colored space as a place where Faculty of Color can relate to each other beyond the scrutiny of the dominant culture and White norms and expectations. Diggs et al. (2009) acknowledged that establishing their academic identities and challenging diversity issues was not always satisfying. They suggested that senior-level administrators at the institutional and department/college level need to directly engage in greater dialogue with Faculty of Color to fully understand the faculty members' experiences. Doing so might enhance the administrators' understanding of how Faculty of Color experiences differ from the experiences of their White colleagues. Diggs and his colleagues (2009) argued that without intentional efforts by empowered senior-level administrators, Faculty of Color frustrations might go unnoticed.

In addition to highlighting Faculty of Color institutional and classroom experiences, critical race theory has been used to illustrate Faculty of Color experiences with the publication process. Stanley (2007) focused on the editorial review process and how that process is often grounded in the master narrative. In her work, she described the use and call for quantitative research as an example of the master narrative. Stanley (2007) further emphasized her point by stating how quantitative research is often used to shape higher education policy and decision making. She opined, "It is assumed that these kinds of data are more reliable, serve to answer most research hypotheses, can cure society's ills, and are easier for decision-making bodies to consume" (p. 15). In addition, she described how Faculty of Color engaged in qualitative research centered on race consistently have their scholarship critiqued as subjective and unscholarly. To illuminate how the publication and review process is grounded in the master narrative, Stanley (2007) analyzed the feedback of six reviewers for a work she and colleagues submitted for publication.

Her analysis revealed an "adherence to the master narrative" (p. 16) from almost all of the reviewers. The language of the reviews exposed an editorial process steeped in White privilege and research that was deemed valid only with a comparison group of White faculty members. (See Stanley [2006] for a detailed discussion of the recommendations to journal editors.)

Critical Race Theory, Higher Education Policy, and the Law

Critical race theory allows for a thorough and robust analysis of higher education policy and legal jurisprudence affecting higher education. Yosso et al. (2004) argued that scholars and social justice advocates "must challenge the presence of racism in policies intended to remedy racism" (p. 19). They framed their analysis of higher education policy and several landmark legal cases in critical race theory, suggesting the theory provides a "proactive framework" (p. 18) for the continued pursuit of equal educational access and opportunity for historically underrepresented populations. Next we review works that analyze and critique higher education policy, specifically affirmative action, and three landmark legal cases significant to higher education, admission policy, and student diversity.

Affirmative Action

Since the mid-1990s there has been a surge in attacks on affirmative action. Opponents of affirmative action assert that accounting for race in higher education discriminates against White people (Yosso et al., 2004). Yosso and colleagues (2004) argued the "ahistorical reversal of civil rights progress" (p. 2) adversely affects Students of Color and is framed under the pretense of a color-blind ideology and race-neutral meritocracy. Given this, critical race theory offers a framework for the continuing debate on affirmative action and the effort to provide equal educational access to historically underrepresented populations (Harper, Patton, & Wooden, 2009; Taylor, 2000; Yosso et al. 2004). In fact, Yosso et al. (2004) suggested that some anti-affirmative action opponents will use a color-blind rationale and language to diminish the

attention on policies such as legacy admissions or residential preferences that unfairly advantage White students. (See Yosso et al. [2004] for a more detailed discussion of the strategies employed by affirmative action opponents.)

Brown v. Board of Education *(1954)*

The U.S. Supreme Court ruled in *Brown v. Board of Education* that the "separate but equal" doctrine was no longer legal and that public schools in the United States must desegregate (Dixson & Rousseau, 2005). Critical race theorists openly question the effects of the *Brown* decision on African American students and other Students of Color. In their review of landmark legal cases using a critical race lens, Dixson and Rousseau (2005) argued critical race theorists prefer to examine the factors influencing the decision and the "structures of racial inequity that *Brown* served to reconfigure rather than dismantle" (p. 18). For example, more than 50 years after the U.S. Supreme Court's ruling, Students of Color in "urban" communities continue to enroll in schools that are majority Students of Color. Instead of viewing the decision as one that sought to establish racial equality and greater racial justice, Bell (1980) argued the *Brown* decision served to improve the United States' image in its quest to become a global power during the Cold War Era. The *Brown* decision may have legally ended "apartheid" (Dixson & Rousseau, 2005, p. 19) in the United States, but separate and unequal educational spaces continued to exist. Some states and local school districts (such as the Little Rock, Arkansas public schools) continued the fight against integration by closing schools instead of integrating (Yosso et al., 2004).

Bakke v. Regents of the University of California *(1978)*

Bakke was the first significant challenge to affirmative action in higher education. In this case, Allen Bakke, a White male applicant, argued that he was denied admission to the University of California at Davis Medical School because the institution had "set aside" 16 of 100 slots for historically underrepresented students (Yosso et al., 2004). Bakke filed a class action suit against the university on the premise that he was denied admission because of the university's race-based admissions policy. The U.S. Supreme Court ruled that preferential quotas violated the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibited

discrimination based on race, color, or national origin. However, in a compromise the court decided that the consideration of race was legal to meet the remedial objectives of Title VI (Yosso et al., 2004). Critical race scholars (Harper et al., 2009) have asserted that recent legal decisions are resulting in a "gradual abortion" (p. 409) of affirmative action in higher education. Harper and colleagues (2009) contended this dismantling further reveals racism's presence in higher education and that White people support the efforts of African Americans (and other People of Color) when their interests are not threatened.

Grutter v. Bollinger *(2003)*

Grutter v. Bollinger continued the challenge to affirmative action in higher education (Harper et al., 2009; Yosso et al., 2004). In the *Grutter* case, a White female law school applicant, Barbara Grutter, claimed the University of Michigan's race-based admission policy discriminated against more qualified White applicants. Ultimately, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled the university's law school admissions policy was constitutional based on the diversity rationale (that racial diversity serves as a compelling educational interest). Yosso et al. (2004) asserted the need to extend *Grutter's* legacy not only to provide equal educational opportunity in college admissions, but in retention, financial aid, and faculty hiring programs. They referenced the absence of equal educational opportunities that resulted from past and current discriminatory policies and practices (p. 16).

Conclusion

How often have we heard that change is slow to come in higher education? That question, often posed rhetorically, is almost never interrogated further. DeCuir and Dixson's (2004) concept of incremental change still characterizes much of how institutions operate. We believe critical race theory offers much utility for determining the "why" to the question of change. Much of the literature underscores the pervasiveness of how White superiority and its performative discourse of Whiteness is very much the cornerstone of higher education delivery. It shapes People of Color's experiences, no matter their role. In organizing this chapter, we chose to elucidate the tenets of critical

race theory through key readings that informed the movement in higher education. In doing so, we illustrated how the counterstory is central not only to critical race as a theoretical framework but also as a methodology (reviewed in more detail in the third chapter). Our approach also elucidates in depth the complex power differentials that exist within higher education institutions and critiques notions of color blindness, meritocracy, and neutrality. This power is systemically framed by law and supported by institutional programs and policies that demonstrate an interest convergence. Yet, we do not wish to conclude at a point of pessimism. Although the future may seem bleak with no real systemic escape from the status quo, the many ways in which critical race theory has been employed to frame, analyze, and discuss issues of access, persistence, and achievement of both Students and Faculty of Color offers much promise. It is this sense of both tension and possibility that frames the next two chapters where critical race theory's usefulness as a methodology and student development theory is discussed.

Critical Race as a Methodology

IN THIS CHAPTER WE DISCUSS critical race theory as a research method (critical race methodology) and its use as an analytical tool. More specifically, we examine critical race as a form of critical theory and as a methodology for affecting and disrupting existing power structures and promoting social change in higher education. We explore the theory's evolution as a research methodology, the role of experiential knowledge (and storytelling), and the functions and types of counterstories/counter narratives used in data collection and presentation. We also discuss those theories (Latino Critical Theory [LatCrit], Asian Critical Theory [AsianCrit], and Tribal Critical Theory [TribalCrit]) that are descendants of critical race theory. We explore the potential for growing the counterstory beyond qualitative research, by extending critical race to quantitative and mixed methodology research. Conversely, we discuss how extending a critical race methodology beyond qualitative research is in many ways counter to its foundation as a critical research methodology, and yet, as a theoretical framework, might offer the necessary impetus to fundamentally alter the scientific method as the standard for the study of higher education. Furthermore, although there are critics and criticisms of critical race as a research methodology, we counter these criticisms by discussing the theory's benefits as a methodological approach. Finally, we conclude by discussing the importance of engaging in reflexivity as critical race methodologists.

A Critical Race Methodology

Solórzano and Yosso (2002) defined a critical race methodology as a theoretically grounded research approach that seeks to accomplish the following: (a) center race and racism in all aspects of the research process; (b) challenge traditional research paradigms, texts, and theories that have been used to explain Students of Color's experiences; (c) provide a liberatory or transformative response to oppression and subordination (racism, genderism, classism); (d) focus on Students of Color's racialized, gendered, and classed experiences; and (e) apply an interdisciplinary knowledge base, drawing from ethnic studies, women's studies, sociology, history, humanities, and law to develop an enhanced understanding of Students of Color's experiences in higher education (p. 24).

Elements of a Critical Race Methodology

In their articulation of a critical race methodology, Solórzano and Yosso (2002) identified five key elements that are foundational to critical race as a research methodology: (a) intercentricity of race and racism with other forms of oppression/subordination; (b) challenge to dominant ideology; (c) commitment to social justice; (d) centrality of experiential knowledge; and (e) transdisciplinary perspective. A critical race methodology is founded on the premise that race and racism are normal (Brayboy, 2005; Jones et al., 2014; Ladson-Billings, 1998; Lynn & Adams, 2002; Solórzano & Yosso, 2001). Although race and racism are at the center of a critical race analysis, scholars using a critical race methodology recognize the intercentricity of race and racism with other forms of oppression/subordination (classism, sexism, religious oppression) to affect People of Color's lived experiences. Employing a critical race methodology in educational research challenges the dominant ideology, White privilege, and the concept of neutrality and objectivity in research, and illuminates deficit-based research approaches. Critical race scholars are committed to social justice and engage in a research agenda that empowers minoritized and subordinated peoples and contests issues of racial inequality, oppression and exclusionary practices (Liu, 2009; Taylor, 1998). Penny Pasque,

Rozani Carducci, Aaron Kuntz, and Ryan Gildersleeve (2012) described critical qualitative scholars as being committed to historically marginalized communities in pursuit of social justice and educational equity. Consistent with other critical theories and methodologies, the pursuit of social justice and equity is central to critical race as a research methodology. A critical race methodology challenges traditional research methodologies that have been used to explain People of Color's experiences. Critical race scholars rely on specific methods that are often not considered "traditional or scientific" to learn about and raise awareness of People of Color's lived experiences. They recognize the centrality of experiential knowledge as a strength and means for informing research (Brayboy, 2005) and use a variety of methods including storytelling, family histories, biographies, chronicles, epistolaries, narratives, and testimonies (Bartlett & Brayboy, 2005; Solórzano & Yosso, 2002; Sue et al., 2007). Experiential knowledge is the concept that People of Color's lived experiences provide legitimate and valued tools (data) for analyzing racism and other forms of oppression and subordination (Museus, 2013). A critical race methodology possesses a transdisciplinary perspective, drawing from a number of disciplines, including history, ethnic studies, women's studies, sociology, and law, to inform and guide the research process (Museus, 2013; Solórzano & Yosso, 2002). Employing a critical race methodology involves analyzing race and racism in higher education from both historical and contemporary perspectives (Museus, 2013).

Providing Voice and Legitimizing People of Color's Experiences

Recognizing People of Color's experiential knowledge and counterstories validates them as knowers and situates learning in their racialized experiences (Quaye & Chang, 2012). When scholars and educators focus on personal narratives and experiential knowledge, marginalized people have the opportunity to name their reality or the notion of voice emerges (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Love, 2004; Quaye & Chang, 2012). The power of the counterstory can assist in educating others of the significance of "combining the story

and the current reality into a constructed new world" (Museus, Ravello, & Vega, 2012, p. 35). Therefore, the use of storytelling and counterstories has the potential to ensure that People of Color's lived experiences are "normally shared, culturally valued, and viewed as an asset" (Quaye & Chang, 2012, p. 94). Scholars using a critical race methodology challenge and disrupt the master narrative or majoritarian story by relying on participants' and their own lived experiences. For example, studying achievement disparities has often resulted in work that places emphasis on Students of Color's deficits. The counterstory, which provides voice to People of Color's experiences, is evidence of an educational debt where Students of Color have not been treated equally and this has resulted in unequal outcomes.

Master Narrative/Majoritarian Stories

A critical race methodology confronts the master narrative or majoritarian story in education. Stanley (2007) described the master narrative as one "that act[s] to universalize and cast dialogues in binary, contrasting categories that support the maintenance of dominant groups" (p. 14). She further characterized the master narrative as "a script that specifies and controls" (p. 14) how particular social processes are enacted. Also known as monovocals, standard stories, and majoritarian stories, the master narrative is historically grounded in White superiority. More specifically, Solórzano and Yosso (2002) assert that the majoritarian story continues to privilege, in particular, White people, males, the upper and middle class, and heterosexuals by naming social locations as natural or normative points of reference. Barbara Love (2004) defined majoritarian stories as "the description of events as told by members of dominant/majority groups, accompanied by the values and beliefs that justify the actions taken by dominants to insure their dominant position" (pp. 228–229). She described the "commonly accepted" (p. 229) history of the United States as a majoritarian story.

Love (2004) identified tools specific to the construction of majoritarian stories. They include fostering invisibility, making assumptions about what is normative and universal, and promoting the notion that schools are neutral

and apolitical. These tools are used to mask White privilege and seek to make it appear "normal, natural, and ordinary" (Love, 2004, p. 229). Although primarily told by those individuals with dominant identities, People of Color and other individuals with subordinated or oppressed identities can also tell majoritarian stories (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002). Solórzano and Yosso (2002) identified several noted People of Color (Thomas Sowell, U.S. Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas, and former U.S. Secretary of Education Lauro Cavazos) who have publicly engaged in majoritarian storytelling (p. 28).

Therefore, it is important to *recognize and know* the multiple ways the master narrative (such as achievement disparity) is constructed and perpetuated in order to disrupt and dismantle it. To refute the majoritarian story, People of Color often share their experiences through storytelling or counterstorytelling (Solórzano & Yosso, 2001, 2002; Stanley, 2007).

Storytelling

Storytelling, described as one of the oldest human art forms (Ladson-Billings, 2013), is a valued means of communicating and sharing the histories and experiences of Black People/African Americans, Latinas/os, and Native Americans/Indigenous Peoples (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002). Communities of Color have different histories and experiences with oppression and community members can share their counterstories with White people to bring about an enhanced or greater level of awareness to the majority culture (Museus et al., 2012). Brayboy (2005), when discussing the significance of stories to Native Americans/Indigenous People, stated, "[Students] were not simply telling 'stories'; rather, they had clearly shown me that for many Indigenous people, stories serve as the basis for how our communities work" (p. 427). Storytelling, along with personal stories and counterstorytelling, are used to advance the understanding of People of Color's experiences in education (Liu, 2009). Storytelling is important because this data type offers an additional method for People of Color's voices to be heard and in dismantling the master narrative.

Counterstories

Counterstorytelling is an essential component to educational research employing a critical race framework (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004). The counterstory is central to learning about People of Color's lived experiences. These stories and/or narratives are a way for those whose experiences are not often shared to have them told and heard. Counterstories disagree with and are critical of the master narrative. They deconstruct the master narrative, offering alternatives to dominant discourse in educational research (Stanley, 2007), while providing a means for understanding socially constructed and cultural identities. Thus, within education, counterstories give "voice" to People of Color's lived experiences (Liu, 2009) while offering the potential for creating systemic changes that may lead to positive developments, such as enhanced academic achievement (Love, 2004).

Solórzano and Yosso (2002) defined counterstories as "a tool for exposing, analyzing, and challenging the majoritarian stories of racial privilege" (p. 32), whereas Delgado and Stefancic (2001) defined counterstorytelling "as a method of telling a story that aims to cast doubt on the validity of accepted premises or myths, especially one held by the majority" (p. 144). Counterstories have the potential to "shatter complacency, challenge the dominant discourse on race, and further the struggle for racial reform" (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002, p. 32). These stories uncover and critique normalized discourses that perpetuate racial stereotypes (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004). People of Color (Black People, Latinas/os, and Native Americans/Indigenous Peoples) have a rich history and tradition of using stories and counterstories to share their experiences with racism and other forms of oppression (DeCuir-Gunby & Walker-DeVose, 2013; Solórzano & Yosso, 2002).

Functions of the Counterstory

For critical race scholars, stories and counterstories have salience (Brayboy, 2005). Counterstories serve several important functions in educational research (Museus et al., 2012; Solórzano & Yosso, 2002). First, they can be used in research to further illuminate race and racism's role at the individual,

institutional, system, and societal levels (Museus et al., 2012). Second, counterstories have the potential to build community among those individuals who are at society's margins by putting a "human face" (Museus et al., 2012, p. 35) to educational research, theory, and practice. Third, they contest the perceived wisdom and knowledge of individuals at society's center by offering context that understands and transforms established belief systems (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002). Thus, the counterstory challenges privileged discourses and provides voice to historically marginalized and oppressed people, strengthening the social, political, and cultural survival and traditions of resistance (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004; Museus et al., 2012). Fourth, counterstories may open new windows into the realities of people on society's edge by demonstrating possibilities beyond the ones these individuals are living and revealing that these are not singular experiences (Museus et al., 2012). Finally, counterstories potentially educate others by merging elements from the story and current reality to construct another world that is richer than that portrayed by the story or reality alone (Museus et al., 2012). Adrienne Dixson and Celia Rousseau (2005) suggested it is not enough to simply tell the stories of People of Color, but these stories, which occur in multiple forms, must be subject to deeper analysis using critical race as an analytical lens. In the next section, we discuss the various types of counterstories.

Types of Counterstories

Counterstories in education occur in three primary forms: personal stories/narratives, other peoples' stories/narratives, and composite stories/narratives (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004; DeCuir-Gunby & Walker-DeVose, 2013; Liu, 2009; Museus et al., 2012; Solórzano & Yosso, 2002). Personal stories or narratives are an individual's sharing of their story (autobiographical or reflections) with various forms of racism and oppression. Scholars may compare the individual's lived experiences with a critical race analysis of a particular case within the greater sociopolitical context (Museus et al., 2012; Solórzano & Yosso, 2001, 2002). Other peoples' stories/narratives allow an individual to tell of another person's experiences with racism and are told in third-person voice (DeCuir-Gunby & Walker-DeVose, 2013; Solórzano &

Yosso, 2002). This type of counterstory is biographical and is situated within a sociohistorical context (Museus et al., 2012; Solórzano & Yosso, 2001, 2002). Composite stories/narratives are compilations that draw from multiple sources to share People of Color's experiences. This form of counterstorytelling/storytelling can be biographical or autobiographical. The composite story's author creates a "composite" character who is situated socially, historically, and politically and draws from both autobiographical and biographical events to discuss various forms of oppression (DeCuir-Gunby & Walker-DeVose, 2013; Museus et al., 2012; Solórzano & Yosso, 2002). An example of a composite story in educational research is Museus and colleagues' (2012) characters in their work discussing campus racial climate. They used composite stories in their effort to illuminate how the campus racial climate affects students. They openly acknowledged that some readers may find their methodology "unconventional" (p. 36) and that the composite characters are not real, but the experiences are real, drawing from the participants' interviews, the literature, and their own experiences in academia.

An underused form of storytelling is the epistolary. Solórzano (2013) defined an epistolary as "a form of writing that utilizes a letter or a series of letters to tell a story" (p. 48). Bell (1989) first used an epistolary in his work "An Epistolary Exploration for a Thurgood Marshall Biography." More recently, Solórzano (2013) wrote an epistolary to Derrick Bell discussing his journey as a critical race scholar. Epistolaries offer an additional method for sharing People of Color's lived experiences. Scholars using this type of storytelling could have participants write letters to share and describe their lived experiences.

Descendant Theories of Critical Race Theory

Yosso (2005) described a critical race genealogy that includes Critical Latina/o Theory (LatCrit), Critical Asian Theory (AsianCrit), and Critical Tribal Theory (TribalCrit). (Also included in her genealogy are Feminist Critical Theory and White Critical Theory.) Here, we focus on those theories relevant to specific groups of people who do not identify as Black. These theories emerged from critical race theory because the theory does not address *specific* aspects of Latinas/os, Native American/Indigenous Peoples, and Asian American/Pacific

Islanders' lived experiences in the United States and in education. In addition, the first wave of critical race scholarship was often positioned within a Black/White binary (Brayboy, 2005; Liu, 2009; Yosso, 2005), typically excluding the aforementioned groups of people. Critical race theory's foundational work was framed in the Black/White binary because it emerged from the post-Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s, which focused on the rights of Blacks in the United States. Given this initial focus on a Black/White binary, it is important to recognize how all People of Color, based on their specific racial and ethnic identities, are racialized and experience racism in different ways. Delgado and Stefancic (2001) described this concept as "differential racialization" (p. 144), which is defined as the ways in which People of Color experience racism in the United States based on their specific racial identity.

Although LatCrit, AsianCrit, and TribalCrit contribute as scholarly frameworks and research methodologies and seek to address issues that critical race theory does not, it is important to emphasize that these "branches" in the critical race tree are not in contention and are not mutually exclusive (Delgado Bernal, 2002; Yosso, 2005). Yosso (2005) warned that we (members of the higher education community, critical scholars/activists) should not engage in "some sort of oppression sweepstakes—a competition to measure one form of oppression against another" (p. 73). In this section, we provide a brief overview of LatCrit, AsianCrit, and TribalCrit and ways they have been and can be used in education and educational research. Use of the descendant theories has both theoretical and methodological implications for scholars. Scholars using these theoretical frameworks should consider how the respective theories' tenets influence all aspects of the research process.

Latina/o Critical Theory or LatCrit

Latina/o Critical Theory or LatCrit emerged at a colloquium on Latina/o issues during the mid-1990s (Museus, 2013). This descendant theory advances critical race as a theoretical framework and research methodology by including the "layers of racialized subordination that comprise Chicana/o, Latina/o experiences" (Yosso, 2005, p. 72). Central to LatCrit is an emphasis on Latina/o panethnicity and the influence of European and Spanish colonization (Delgado Bernal, 2002; Jones et al., 2014). LatCrit scholars assert that racism,

sexism, and classism intersect with Latinas/os' sexuality, culture, language, phenotype, accent, immigration, and surname (Brayboy, 2005; Yosso, 2005). Unlike critical race theory, LatCrit emphasizes cultural characteristics such as speaking Spanish and the historical and legal aspects of Latina/o immigration to the United States (Jones et al., 2014).

Solórzano and Yosso's (2001) composite character Esperanza (based on Chicana and Chicano graduate students) defined LatCrit in education as a framework that is used to theorize and examine how race and racism explicitly and implicitly affect the educational structures, processes, and discourses that have an impact on People of Color, but Latinas/os in particular. LatCrit extends critical race discussions that address Latinas/os' racialized subordination (Yosso, 2005). The theory seeks to move research and the discourse on race beyond the Black/White binary that has existed for much of U.S. history. When the racial discourse comprises only a Black/White binary, it continues to limit understanding of the numerous ways that People of Color experience oppression (Yosso, 2005). Thus, critical scholars often employ LatCrit and critical race theory concurrently as a theoretical framework and research methodology (Jones et al., 2014; Solórzano & Yosso, 2002). For example, scholars and student affairs practitioner–educators could employ LatCrit and critical race theory to examine how Latina/o students' immigration and generational status and language affect their experiences at predominantly White institutions.

LatCrit has been employed to examine a number of educational issues that affect Latinas/os. Solórzano and Yosso (2002) combined critical race theory and LatCrit to examine Chicana/o graduate student experiences. In their work, they shared Chicana/o students' experiences through two composite characters. Octavio Villalpando (2004) also used both critical race theory and LatCrit to propose a framework through which student affairs practitioner–educators could better understand and more appropriately respond to Latina/o students' academic and sociocultural needs.

Asian Critical Theory (AsianCrit)

AsianCrit places an emphasis on and critiques nativistic racism framed around the myth of the model minority, immigration/naturalization, language, and

disenfranchisement (Bartlett & Brayboy, 2005; Brayboy, 2005; Chang, 1993; Museus, 2013). Originally developed as a framework for Asian American legal scholarship (Liu, 2009), AsianCrit can be applied to educational research. AsianCrit possesses three stages of deployment—denial, affirmation, and liberation—that translate to research on educational theory and practice (Liu, 2009).

Museus and Iftikar (2013) recently offered an emergent AsianCrit theoretical perspective. They surmised that the AsianCrit perspective could be viewed as an analytical tool for understanding the racialized experiences of Asian Americans and as a lens for interpreting Asian American/Pacific Islander students' experiences in higher education. Similar to LatCrit, AsianCrit does not seek to replace critical race theory but to converge with it as an analytical framework for enhancing scholars' and practitioner–educators' understanding of how racism affects Asian Americans/Pacific Islanders in the United States and in higher education. Museus (2013) theorized that the tenets of AsianCrit are not intended as a permanent or definitive framework but offered a conceptual foundation for the scholarly discourse on Asian Americans and racism. AsianCrit could be employed to examine how Asian American/Pacific Islander females experience sexism and are exoticized in higher education.

AsianCrit comprises seven interconnected tenets, with the first four building upon critical race theory's tenets while incorporating knowledge that is specific to Asian Americans' racialized experiences. The seven tenets include (a) Asianization, (b) transnational contexts, (c) (re)constructive history, (d) strategic (anti)essentialism, (e) intersectionality, (f) story, theory, and praxis, and (g) commitment to social justice. The last three tenets are combinations of critical race tenets that are essential for examination of Asian American issues and experiences (Museus, 2013). Central to AsianCrit is the concept or tenet of Asianization, defined as "the reality that racism and nativistic racism are pervasive aspects of American [U.S.] society, and that society racialized Asian Americans in distinct ways" (Museus, 2013, p. 23). (See Museus [2013] and Museus and Iftikar [2013] for a more detailed discussion of AsianCrit.)

Tribal Critical Theory (TribalCrit)

First introduced by Bryan McKinley Jones Brayboy in 2005 and also emerging from critical race theory, TribalCrit centers on issues confronting Native American/Indigenous People. Brayboy (2005) positioned TribalCrit as a framework to focus on issues related to Native American/Indigenous People and to address their "complicated relationship" (p. 425) with the U.S. federal government. TribalCrit recognizes the unique position of Native American/Indigenous People as both a political and a racial group (Bartlett & Brayboy, 2005; Brayboy, 2005). As a theoretical framework in education, TribalCrit focuses on both historical and contemporary issues that affect Native American/Indigenous People (Bartlett & Brayboy, 2005) and is a forum for Native/Indigenous students' voices and perspectives to emerge (Jones et al., 2014). TribalCrit has been used to examine Native American/Indigenous Peoples' educational experiences including classroom participation, language revitalization, and low graduation rates from both secondary and higher education institutions. (See Shotton [2008] for her phenomenological study exploring the experiences of American Indian women in doctoral programs.) Samuel Museus, Dina Maramba, and Robert Teranishi (2013) also used TribalCrit to examine the experiences of Pacific Islanders as Indigenous peoples by contextualizing their discussion and analysis within both historical and sociopolitical lenses.

Whereas race and racism are at the core of critical race theory, TribalCrit comprises nine central tenets and has colonization at its center (Brayboy, 2005, 2013). Brayboy (2005) described colonization as the "European American thought, knowledge, and power structures" (p. 430) that dominate contemporary U.S. society. TribalCrit's nine tenets are: (a) colonization is endemic to society; (b) U.S. policies toward Indigenous peoples are rooted in imperialism, White supremacy, and a desire for material gain; (c) Indigenous peoples occupy a liminal space that accounts for both the political and racialized natures of their identities; (d) Indigenous peoples have a desire to obtain and forge tribal sovereignty, tribal autonomy, self-determination, and self-identification; (e) the concepts of culture, knowledge, and power take on new meaning when examined through an Indigenous lens; (f) governmental

and educational policies toward Indigenous peoples are intimately linked around the problematic goal of assimilation; (g) tribal philosophies, beliefs, customs, traditions, and visions for the future are central to understanding the lived realities of Indigenous peoples, but they also illustrate the differences and adaptability among individuals and groups; (h) stories are not separate from theory, but they make up theory and are real and legitimate sources of data and ways of being; and (i) theory and practice are connected in deep and explicit ways such that scholars must work toward social change (Brayboy, 2005). He suggested in educational research the "scientific method of inquiry" is an example of "colonization." (For a more robust discussion of TribalCrit, see Brayboy, 2005, 2013.)

Brayboy (2013) acknowledged two specific opportunities for additional research and extension of TribalCrit as a theoretical framework. First is the issue of sovereignty among Native American/Indigenous People. He stated that critics of TribalCrit take issue with how Native American/Indigenous Peoples' relationships with the U.S. federal government are constructed and that the federal government has too much power to define "who belongs where, when and how" (p. 97). A second concern is the dearth of scholarship using TribalCrit to examine gender issues among Indigenous People. Brayboy (2013) has suggested that one opportunity for future research is to explore how gender intersects with sovereignty and self-determination among Native American/Indigenous People. Given Brayboy's assertions, opportunities exist for scholars to use TribalCrit to further examine how colonization, sovereignty, and gender influence Native American/Indigenous Peoples' experiences in higher education.

Growing the Counterstory?

Research employing a critical race methodology in education has primarily been qualitative because of critical race theory's focus on an in-depth understanding of People of Color's lived experiences. Scholars have proposed expanding critical race methodology beyond its qualitative foundation. Despite this call, there is limited research employing a critical race approach with

quantitative or mixed methodologies. One of the most common approaches for combining critical race and quantitative methods is through descriptive statistics (DeCuir-Gunby &Walker-DeVose, 2013). Scholarship employing both critical race and quantitative approaches include Delgado Bernal and Villalpando's (2002) use of descriptive statistics and a composite story to highlight the underrepresentation of Faculty of Color; Teranishi's (2007) use of quantitative methods to disaggregate data based on race and ethnicity to further dispel the myth of the model minority; Enrique Aleman, Jr.'s (2007) study of school systems' funding discrepancies based on race and socioeconomic status (SES); and Uma Jayakumar, Tyrone Howard, Walter Allen, and June Han's (2009) use of regression analysis to examine racial climate, job satisfaction, and retention among Faculty of Color.

Yet it is Dixson and Rousseau's (2005) description of critical race theory as "problem-centered," implying "the problem determined the method, not the other way around" (p. 22), that provokes the (un)conventional use of critical race as a research methodology. They suggested critical race theory is neither inherently qualitative nor quantitative and that inequity in education should be addressed by "any means necessary" (p. 22). Jessica DeCuir-Gunby and Dina Walker-DeVose (2013) argued the benefits of employing critical race theory in mixed methodology research and Alejandro Covarrubias and Veronica Velez's (2013) research introduced Critical Race Quantitative Intersectionality (CRQI) as an extension of critical race theory. DeCuir-Gunby and Walker-Devose (2013) advocated that critical race as a research methodology has the potential to extend into mixed methodology and quantitative research genres. These scholars readily acknowledged that a strength of employing critical race methodology is that it shares marginalized peoples' stories and counterstories/counternarratives. However, they also believe there is potential for aligning the counterstory with a quantitative approach. On the other hand, Covarrubias and Velez (2013) contended critical race theory's qualitative foundation has not resulted in extensive improvement of educational policy. They believe CRQI has the potential to do so. In this section, we review their calls to expand critical race as a research methodology and to grow the counterstory.

Critical Race Theory and Mixed Methodology Research

Both critical scholars and research methodologists have voiced a desire to see scholars employ mixed methodology approaches in their critical scholarship. Charles Teddlie and Abbas Tashakkori (2009) expressed hope that critical scholars would embrace the use of mixed methodologies in their research. Donna Mertens (2003) stated that transformative mixed methodology approaches were in many ways consistent with critical approaches. She indicated the transformative approach centers marginalized individuals' (women, People of Color, the queer community, and those who are differently abled) lives and experiences. Mertens (2003) further articulated that the researcher engages in social inquiry that seeks to analyze power relationships, and question social inequity, connecting the results/findings to social justice issues. John Creswell and Vicki Plano Clark (2011) stated transformative mixed methodology employs an emancipatory theory, with the specific purpose of being change oriented and advancing social justice causes. Creswell and Plano Clark (2011) suggested the reason for mixing methods when using a transformative approach is for "value-based and ideological reasons" (p. 96) and not for reasons related to the research methods and design. This is an important consideration given critical scholars emphasis on change and their commitment to social justice.

Some scholars believe that the potential to align critical race with mixed methodology research is through a transformative-emancipatory mixed methodology design. DeCuir-Gunby and Walker-DeVose (2013) posited that there is a growing movement in mixed methods research to place greater emphasis on theoretical perspectives and their influence on all aspects of the research design process. In addition, they intimated that there is a movement for additional focus on inquiry related to issues of power and social justice. They presented three specific mixed methodology designs appropriate for combining with a critical race approach. (See Teddlie & Tashakkori [2009] for greater discussion on the various mixed methodology designs.) First, they recommended the use of a qualitative dominant design (such as a QUAL → quan). In mixed methodology research, the method noted first is conducted initially, followed by the method noted second. However, the design that is capitalized is the design emphasized in the study. This type of mixed methodology

design is exploratory (qualitative phase first) and also places emphasis on the qualitative phase (the counterstory) with the quantitative phase "supporting" the qualitative phase. The QUAL → quan design could be used in a study exploring Students of Color's experiences with microaggressive behavior in the classroom. A sample of students could be interviewed (QUAL) about their experiences, then a larger sample surveyed (quan). DeCuir-Gunby and Walker-Devose (2013) favored this approach as more appropriate for educational research.

Second, DeCuir-Gunby and Walker-Devose (2013) suggested the use of an explanatory approach (quan → QUAL) with the quantitative phase conducted first and the qualitative phase conducted second. In this design, although the quantitative phase is conducted first, methodological emphasis remains on the qualitative phase, again centering the counterstory. The quan → QUAL design could be employed in a study of Faculty of Color experiences in higher education. Given the underrepresentation of Faculty of Color, they could be surveyed (quan) and then selected participants interviewed (QUAL) to center the counterstory and critical race approach. Finally, they believed a multiphase mixed methodology (longitudinal) design also has the potential for connecting to critical race theory and a critical race methodology. In a multiphase design, both data types (qualitative and quantitative) are collected in multiple phases (QUAL → QUAL → QUAL → quan) with each phase informing the next. The scholars recommend this type of mixed methodology for long-term projects framed in critical race.

Critical Race Quantitative Intersectionality (CRQI)

Covarrubias and Velez (2013) propose critical race quantitative intersectionality (CRQI) as a critically informed model of quantitative research in education. They assert that CRQI is a framework that guides quantitative scholarship and challenges scholars to explore the material impact of intersectionality. CRQI "challenges the lasting legacy of an erroneous, and arguably racist, application of statistical methods in the social sciences and expands the utility and transformative potential of critical race theory" (p. 270). Positioned as an initial point for advancing quantitative research guided by critical race theory,

CRQI is not theory but a framework grounded in critical race theory that is in its developmental stages and defined as:

> *an explanatory framework and methodological approach that utilizes quantitative methods to account for the material impact of race and racism at its intersection with other forms of subordination and works toward identifying and challenging oppression at this intersection in hopes of achieving social justice for [S]tudents of [C]olor, their families and their communities. (p. 276)*

CRQI, consistent with a critical race methodology, draws from and extends an interdisciplinary approach. As such, CRQI guides the development of the research questions, data sources, analysis, and the dissemination and applicability of the scholarship. It is grounded in the following principles: (a) quantifying the material impact of racism at its intersections—intersectional data mining; (b) challenging the neutrality of quantitative data—numbers do not "speak for themselves"; (c) originating from the experiential and material experiences of People of Color; (d) being intentionally committed to addressing injustice and seeking transformation; and (e) taking a transdisciplinary perspective and methods for revealing elusive and hidden patterns (Covarrubias & Velez, 2013).

The first principle, quantifying the material impact of racism at its intersections—intersectional data mining, suggests that no data, including quantitative data, alone can explain anything; thus, the numbers "cannot speak for themselves" (Covarrubias & Velez, 2013, p. 277). Their first assumption is that the intersection is not an ideological and discursive idea, but rather one that is "shaped by and shapes the material conditions for those who exist within it, be it temporarily or permanently" (p. 277). They contended, "CRQI seeks a multidimensional analysis of power-based relationships by [contesting] the practice of singular analytical lenses that reduce people to essentialized and homogenizing units of larger ambiguous, political, social and often legal categories used to distribute power" (p. 277).

In the second principle, challenging the neutrality of quantitative data, Covarrubias and Velez (2013) argued statistical data are framed by the

researcher who uses them in a manner that further protects those already in positions of power. They believe a critical theoretical framework, such as CRQI, has the potential to deconstruct traditional use and claims of neutrality and objectivity, contextualizing the quantitative data.

The third principle, originating from the experiential and material experience of People of Color, is consistent with a critical race methodology, as it is grounded in experiential knowledge. Covarrubias and Velez (2013) acknowledged that starting with People of Color's lived experiences or at the bottom of the well (Bell, 1992) are valid; however, they believe the bottom is a "mobile and relative position" (p. 279) that is shaped by time and space. Thus, they seek an intersectional analysis rather than one based on a singular socially constructed identity. This approach is also informed by the scholars' personal and professional experiences.

The fourth principle, being intentionally committed to addressing injustice and seeking transformation, is guided by a commitment to social justice that seeks to transform educational policy and practice. Covarrubias and Velez (2013) posited that by grounding quantitative analysis in a critical race lens, CRQI offers a "more appropriate and more authentic" (p. 280) portrayal of the material intersections affecting Students of Color. They suggested such analysis leads to greater change in educational policy.

The fifth principle, taking a transdisciplinary perspective and methods for revealing elusive and hidden patterns, draws from many of the disciplines that inform critical race theory, such as ethnic studies, women's studies, queer studies, and sociology. A descendent methodology of CRQI is critical race spatial analysis (CRSA), a quantitative methodology heavily grounded in geography, urban planning, and visual sociology (Covarrubias & Velez, 2013). CRSA highlights the ways specific spatial features or markers, such as streets and highways, attain racial meaning with consequences for the schools that are within close proximity to the spatial feature. As an additional form of scholarship grounded in critical race theory, CRSA can be used to examine space and the sociospatial dimensions of race and racism (Covarrubias & Velez, 2013).

We believe the scholarly discourse on expanding critical race methodology beyond its qualitative foundation is still in its infancy. We acknowledge that there is considerable tension when the discussion (see Pasque et al., 2012)

turns to incorporating the "scientific method" into a methodology grounded in criticality. This debate could be reminiscent of the "paradigm debate" (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011, p. 25) between quantitative and qualitative methodologies during the latter half of the 20th century.

Many scholars urge caution or criticize the idea of moving critical research and its associated methodologies beyond its qualitative roots (see Pasque et al., 2012). However, we recognize that incorporating quantitative methodologies presents an additional method for scholars to extend their critical race praxis and their efforts for transformative scholarship, and to create socially just educational environments. We do not believe it is within the scope of this monograph to position ourselves "for or against" the inclusion of quantitative methods. However, we agree with DeCuir-Gunby and Walker-DeVose (2013) that there needs to be greater dialogue on this topic as scholars across the research methodology spectrum continue to advance critical race methodology.

Positionality

Engaging in reflexivity from a critical race perspective can assist scholars in interrogating their own racial conceptualizations and how those conceptualizations frame our research as critical scholars (Duncan, 2002). Scholars engaging in a critical race approach recognize that their race and other identities inform the research process. Critical race scholars often incorporate their lived experiences into the research process. Given this, it is essential for critical race scholars to position themselves. The scholar's position indicates the influences of the scholar's social identities on the research process and aids the audience in understanding how the scholar's position and identities influenced the research process (Jones et al., 2014).

H. Richard Milner, IV (2007) developed the "Framework of Researcher Racial and Cultural Positionality" to guide researchers in a process of racial and cultural consciousness in their scholarship. Milner (2007) emphasized that his framework rejects practices in which scholars remove themselves from the research process, particularly when they reject their "racialized and cultural

positionality" (p. 388). Using a critical race underpinning, Milner (2007) posits "dangers" emerge in the research process when the researcher does not engage in "processes that can circumvent misinterpretations, misinformation, and misrepresentation of individuals, communities, institutions, and systems" (p. 388). His framework seeks to guide scholars working through the "seen, unseen, and unforeseen dangers" (p. 394) in their scholarship. Milner's (2007) framework comprises three interrelated features: (a) researching the self; (b) researching the self in relation to others; and (c) engaged reflection and representation.

The first feature, researching the self, involves scholars engaging in evolving and emergent critical race and cultural self-reflection (Milner, 2007). This entails the scholars posing racially and culturally grounded questions about themselves prior to and during the research. Milner (2007) believes his framework will assist researchers in working through the tensions of race and culture associated with their scholarship. The second feature, researching the self in relation to others, requires scholars to reflect about themselves in relation to the people and communities involved in their studies and to recognize the various roles, identities, and positions that both the researcher(s) and participants bring to the research process. Finally, both scholars and participants should participate in engaged reflection and representation, a collaborative process of reflection (with race and culture centered). Milner (2007) explained the final feature is essential because scholars and their research participants may interpret an experience or interaction differently based on each individual's lived experiences. He offers a series of questions relative to each feature to aid scholars (and participants) in working through "dangers seen, unseen, and unforeseen." Milner asserted it is the scholar's responsibility to "listen to the voices and perspectives" (p. 396) of the study participants and to present both the narrative and counternarrative. Doing so is essential in studies involving People of Color and Communities of Color because it prevents the scholar's "voice from overshadowing the voice of the researched, and vice versa" (p. 396). This is similar to what William Rawlins (2003) calls a "committed, active passivity" that allows "the other person's voice and stories to reach you, to change you" (p. 122).

Initially positioned (and obviously so) as a qualitative methodology giving voice to historically marginalized communities, critical race as a research methodology offers the potential to bridge the historical divide between qualitative and quantitative methodologies in educational research. We contend that efforts to integrate critical race as a theoretical framework and analytical tool in both quantitative methodologies and mixed methods research strengthens the foundational objective of critical race theory itself: to centralize race and racism and expose majoritarian interests and motivations by honing in on the voice and story of People of Color. We argue that such methodological innovations provide greater benefit to the core values of the theory than do the some of the critiques that using critical race in nonqualitative methodologies capitulates to the scientific method. It is here that critical race theory straddles both tension and possibility and elucidates the complex racialized world in which both scholars and practitioner–educators are called to live, work, and learn.

An Ethics of Critical Race

In their work defining a critical race methodology and counterstorytelling/storytelling, Solórzano and Yosso (2002) asked whose stories are privileged in educational contexts and whose stories are distorted and silenced. More than a decade later, this question remains salient when examining whose voice(s) continue to be heard in academia and whose voices continue to be dismissed and/or silenced. They also asked what the experiences and responses are of those whose stories are often distorted and silenced. Although this question has been answered, we believe that the answer is still being qualified.

Kathleen Gallagher (2008b), in her book *The Methodological Dilemma: Creative, Critical, and Collaborative Approaches to Qualitative Research,* broadly called for a two-pronged approach to research design and methodology—*risking* "our comfortable norms and truths claims each time we seek understanding" (p. 2) and *resisting* the "political and educational context that so clearly privileges the 'scientific,' presumed to be the 'objective' and the 'distanced'" (p. 67). Gallagher (2008b) also challenged researchers to reflect and interrogate their methods and practices "that were not and could not be asked

of it at the time" (p. 68). If we fail to trouble our readings and experiences of the conceptualization and process of research, we risk missing out on learning about how we engage with research more than anything else, the opportunity cost of which is a *diminishing* research experience and, in the worst cases, a *systematic dismantling* of "inventiveness and curiosity" (p. 2) necessary of critical social research. There are times researchers allow "questions of theory and knowledge production to drive their research design; other times their design is driven by research participants . . . who bring their own social and political agendas to the study" (Goldstein, 2008, p. 92). Critical race theory facilitates an interplay between both of these by serving as a theoretical and analytical framework and by guiding and being shaped by the data collected in a research study.

Despite the United States and higher education being more diverse than ever, People of Color continue to experience oppression in the academy. Their experiences and their stories are dismissed. Experiences with racism and other forms of oppression are rejected as isolated incidents that are not symptoms of systemic issues in higher education. Alison Cook-Sather (2007) reflected on the practice of hearing the "voice" in educational research: "How hard it is to learn from voices we do not want to hear (Bragg, 2001; Johnston & Nicholls, 1995) and to learn to hear the voices we do not know how to hear" (as cited in Gallagher, 2008a, p. 72). Critical race theory challenges us to move toward a constant unlearning and relearning that facilitates a practice of critique that is "racially marked and generative of research approaches that are responsible to the struggle of voice, the possibilities and limits of connecting across difference, and the productivity of simultaneous tension and reparation in solidarity efforts" (Lather, 2008, p. 228) with the other.

Conclusion

We believe critical race as a research methodology is an appropriate method for exploring and understanding People of Color's experiences in higher education. A critical race methodology provides voice to people who have been historically marginalized in U.S. higher education and illuminates their experiences as the "other." In this chapter, we illustrated how critical race and

its descendent theories are appropriate research methodologies for disrupting the master narrative and illuminating People of Color's lived experiences. In addition, we identified possibilities for expanding the counterstory beyond its qualitative origins through mixed methods research and CRQI. Finally, we concluded by discussing the importance of critical race scholars positioning their work and engaging in reflexivity.

Critical Race Theory as a (Student) Development Theory

IN THIS CHAPTER, WE APPLY critical race theory to understand Students of Color's racial identity development. We further examine the significance of intersectionality with other social identities and its effects on student development. Next, we explore an emerging body of work that positions critical race as leadership theory. Finally, we offer provocations for the campus environment—how counterstories and counterspaces facilitate Students of Color's holistic development.

Race matters (West, 1994). Twenty years since Cornel West's collection of essays, we are not postracial. Access to and success in higher education in the United States are still at the very least raced, gendered, and classed. It is at and between these margins that critical race theory straddles not only the historical contextual impact but also the contemporary implications of college student development. The tragic events of 9/11 exacerbated Islamophobia and xenophobia in communities and campuses across the United States and increased misdirected racist-cloaked rhetoric toward Communities of Color (Cole & Ahmadi, 2010). The Great Recession of 2009 emboldened critics of a racial discourse to return to arguments of class sans the intersections of race and gender. Amid these sociocultural developments, critical race theory's role as a framework through which one may understand the student experience (and by extension identity development) is more relevant than ever. As outlined in previous chapters, critical race theory hones in on the counterstory centralizing race and racism while accounting for the intercentricities of other forms of oppression. Furthermore, the emergence of several branches of the theory

(see the third chapter) converges its tenets with the unique needs, histories, and experiences of historically "othered" communities. The higher education landscape, marked by dynamic movements of students from matriculation to graduation and everything in between, such as attrition, necessitates a framework that is equally dynamic in its response to the student experience.

According to Erik Erikson (1959/1994), a sense of self (identity) is a relationship between one's (choice of) experiences within a specific environment. As an institutional space, the U.S. university campus unites without interruption, the systemic oppression and individual interactions between different social identities contributing to reproduction in larger society (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977/2000). As such, both the classroom and the campus in general become loci of performance where knowledge about social norms and racial power is both constructed and reinforced. For Daria Roithmayr (1999), the classroom is central to the construction, organization, production, and distribution of knowledge. Vasti Torres, Susan Jones, and Kris Renn (2009) posited that:

> *Social construction of identity occurs in different contexts on campus such as in how student organizations are created and which students are drawn to them, or in the social identities among those in leadership positions and those not, as well as in issues of institutional fit within access and retention. (p. 577)*

For contemporary Students of Color, the college and university experience is a product of one's sense of self, their (social) group memberships, and interactions across the length and breadth of the higher education industrial complex marked by a "Sea of Whiteness" (McCoy, 2014, p. 163). It is a delicate navigation and negotiation of the needs of self with the needs of others (Torres et al., 2009). By connecting historical and contemporary contexts while centering the counterstory, critical race theory meets that threshold.

Centering Race in Student Development

We argue that critical race theory is well positioned as a critical paradigm to understand college students' racial identity development. Although the

etymology of the word "paradigm" has its roots in Latin and Greek and means example, here we use the word in its contemporary context to reflect a cogent structure of beliefs and assumptions through which the world is viewed, constructed, and analyzed. Therefore, a *critical* paradigm is one where an examination of power and politics of difference is central to knowledge construction and production. A critical paradigm uses historicity to explain why the contemporary context exists. For historically marginalized Students of Color, this value is central to their access, agency, and success.

Students of Color's experiences in higher education are well documented in educational scholarship and research as a result of their underrepresentation (Harper & Hurtado, 2007), lack of support and resources (Stewart, 2011), and experiences through racial microaggressions (Solórzano et al., 2000; Sue et al., 2007). Lori Patton, Marylu McEwen, Laura Rendón, and Mary Howard-Hamilton (2007) argued that although retention, student success, organizational development, learning, and campus environment theories guide professional practice on campuses, discourses around the influence and impact of race and racism in student engagement, development, and learning remain scarce. According to Nancy Evans, Deanna Forney, Florence Guido, Lori Patton, and Kris Renn (2010), much of the foundational theories in student development literature "fit contextually within the positivist paradigm" (p. 361), assuming an unbiased status quo transcending time, place, and circumstance while claiming this epistemological influence as necessary for credibility and rigor. This has occurred in a variety of ways: the absence of racial diversity in research study samples, psychology-based research design centralizing internal developmental process as opposed to an interplay of the process with the contextual environment, and the intentional separation of researcher positionality from that of the participants (Evans et al., 2010; Patton et al., 2007; Schuh, Jones, & Harper, 2011). In knowledge production, it is seen through choice of research methods that fail to capture contextual complexity and the development of linear stage models that prescribe a "one size fits all approach."

Research through a constructivist paradigm has added to student development's body of knowledge and practice over the last decade (see Abes, Jones, & McEwen, 2007; Baxter Magolda, 2008). The constructivist

approach focuses on the human experience through multiple, socially constructed realities (Kincheloe, 2005). Here, researchers examine the meaning behind a phenomenon by centralizing voice and narrative within specific contextualized experiences (Guido, Chávez, & Lincoln, 2010). A critical paradigm takes social constructivism and positions it within the larger system interrogating the power structures that facilitate and perpetuate a politics of difference at various levels including the intrapersonal and interpersonal standpoints. For example, Elisa Abes (2009) in her research combining paradigms refers to this as "theoretical borderlands" (p. 142) honing in on the complex navigation and negotiation of (self) identity that historically marginalized students may experience within a larger system. In fact, critical race theory was developed to "expose and dismantle the social and legal status quo from an explicitly race-conscious and critical 'outsider' perspective" (Valdes, Culp, & Harris, 2002, p. 1). As a strengths-based discourse, critical race theory bridges any disconnect between the past experiences of historically marginalized communities and their current contexts (Bell, 1992). To this end, Patton and colleagues (2007) contend that the theory "moves beyond an individualistic focus, is respectful of the sociopolitical realities of marginalized groups, and does not reinforce the power structures in society" (p. 48).

Susan Jones, Elisa Abes, and Stephen Quaye (2013) revisited and examined their Model of Multiple Dimensions of Identity (MMDI; Abes et al., 2007; Jones & McEwen, 2000) through a critical lens. This Critical Race Theory Model of Multiple Dimensions of Identity (CRT-MMDI) integrated the core tenets by "centralizing race . . . yet interacting with other elements of the model" (p. 188). The authors ground their theorization by noting that although "race is always present and central, the individual may not always perceive it as such, and this, too, may shift depending on the context in which the individual is situated" (p. 188). Here, the authors elucidate the complex juxtaposition between critical race theory's centrality of race and racism and the importance of the individual's sense of identity salience. For example, if a student phenotypically presents as a Person of Color and is perceived as such, based on their contextualized narrative, they still might not place salience on

race. Yet, as Jones, Abes, and Quaye (2013) assert, and we concur, critical race theory acknowledges both these realities as appropriate.

One of the most relevant ways that critical race theory offers a different perspective to view student development is through the growing number of students who do not identify with a racial binary. For those occupying a space *between* the binary, the primacy of racial order and its principal performance of Whiteness frames the conflict between cultures marking their positionality. Here, according to Gloria Anzaldúa (2010), an individual's reality emerges from the messages culture communicates. Research on the experiences of such individuals continues to grow in student development literature. (See Renn [2012] for her work on bi/multiracial student identity development.) Moving away from a racial binary toward an understanding of how race and racism is intrinsically connected to White supremacy, capitalism, heteropatriarchy, and the ongoing colonial project does not weaken critical race theory; rather it underscores it (Brayboy, 2005, 2013; Smith, 2010).

Critical race theory's starting point of the permanence of race and racism in the United States is necessary due to the historical impact and contemporary manifestations that play themselves out in terms of ongoing structural domination. The framework of U.S. society is premised on White supremacy and the ongoing oppression of People of Color through differential racialization and various forms of racism affecting their access, agency, and success with education (Chapman, 2013; Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Museus, 2013). Therefore, with a critical race paradigm, White supremacy is a given. It is not about whether it is identifiable but rather where, how, and why it is performed.

White supremacy maintains "the construction of Whiteness as the ultimate property" (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995, p. 58). Universities are constructions of White property that privilege White/Eurocentric norms. This manifests itself in the everyday reality for many Students of Color. Patton and colleagues (2007) expounded on how Whiteness as property is performed in higher education. The lack of People of Color in leadership and teaching positions and consequently the overwhelming "Whiteness" of the curriculum as well as construction of teaching, learning, and social spaces are examples

that "being White carries more status and power than being of color" (Patton et al., 2007, p. 47).

Centering race underscores the amorphous, pervasive, yet undeniable impact of White supremacy and how it pervades not only institutional policy and practice but also the everyday educational experiences of everyone involved in the educational function (Cook, 2013). Thus, critical race theory hones in on race and racism as the focus of analysis while recognizing that other systems of oppression, such as genderism, sexism, heterosexism, homophobia, transphobia, ableism, etc., converge to frame the systemic conditions within which one exists.

Critical Race Theory and Intersectionality

> *Identity is never fixed; it continually evolves. But something in it stays constant; even when we change, we are recognizably who we have always been. Identity links the past, the present, and the social world into a narrative that makes sense. It embodies both change and continuity. (Josselson, 1996, p. 29)*

Critical race theory embodies a critical consciousness that is attentive to the historical and contemporary realities of the cultural performance of race. Yet, as a critical paradigm, critical race theory does not stop there. Critical race theory recognizes that race and racism work with and through other social identity categories such as gender, class, sexuality, religion, and citizenship as interlocking and mutually reinforcing systems of power, rather than as isolated and individual. Crenshaw (1989) referenced this intersectionality in her multidimensional research of Black women's experiences, acknowledging that many modes of oppression exist and shape an individual's sense of self and that its salience is mutually reinforcing. The focus on intersectionality emerged from the challenge to account for the complexity constituting the lived experiences of people who claim or who are ascribed specific identity categorizations and labels (Collins, 2000).

McCall's (2005) work on interlocking oppressions advanced the concept of intersectionality by specifically naming the mechanisms of social

construction and allowing for a more thorough analysis of "the relationships among multiple dimensions and modalities of social relations and subject formations" (p. 1771). Simply stated, an individual's points of privilege or marginalization can shape another's subjectivity and influence their agency and access to capital formation. With race and access to capital historically connected, different structures (capitalism, patriarchy, hegemony) converge with law and policy to exclude individuals and communities within a specific nation state. Thus, one can never be sure what factors draw out the salience of specific identities in a given context. To problematize this further, there is never any certainty with which one can predict how the performance of this salience will be received by those one may encounter. Because U.S. society is organized primarily along binaries (see the third chapter), intersectionality is a difficult concept to research and operationalize. With a critical race paradigm, one must engage with lived realities in all of their complexity, rather than attempt to generalize and essentialize at will. Thus, although race should continue to remain central, it becomes important to acknowledge and include other social identities that affect a certain lived experience.

Ladson-Billings (2013) explained, "the other side of intersectionality is essentialism" (p. 40). Critical race scholarship is antiessentialist; it is predicated on the belief that there is no singular experience or attribute that is ascribed to or may define any group of people (Harris, 1990; Museus & Iftikar, 2013). For example, there is no single fixed Latina/o experience in the United States. The consequences of such practices lead to stereotyping and marginalization at both a systemic and individual level (Ladson-Billings, 2013). However, being singularly antiessentialist presents a conundrum. For example, People of Color often solidarize based on shared characteristics or experiences as a means to cultivate agency and gain greater access against their ongoing marginalization by those in power. Such efforts, while worthy, still silence and erase the unique experiences of specific communities under the People of Color umbrella. In their theorization of AsianCrit, Museus and Iftikar (2013) argued against this cursory dismissal or perfunctory concretization of the social construct of race in favor of a "strategic (anti)essentialism" (p. 26). Such a purposeful approach accounts for the complex differential racialization

that affects Communities of Color and allows for the opportunity to (re)construct histories and narratives by centering voice (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Museus, 2013).

Critical Race Theory and Campus Environments

Paulo Freire (1970) suggests that oppression is best understood through the voices of those who experience it. Thus, a cornerstone of critical race theory is its commitment to counternarrative and counterstorytelling, defined as "a method of telling the stories of those people whose experiences are often not told" (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002, p. 32). Such counterstories serve to better understand how race and racism affect People of Color's lives. Within a higher education context, the value of the counterstory for historically marginalized Students of Color is more relevant than ever. Using a representative sample of 1.5 million first-time baccalaureate graduates in 2007–2008, an American Council of Education (2013) report noted that despite the growth in enrollment of underrepresented racial/ethnic populations in predominantly White institutions, the subsequent graduation rates revealed a largely homogenous picture—graduates were predominantly single (and without children), White, young adults in their early 20s who were largely supported financially by their parents and as a result effortlessly transitioned from matriculation to graduation. The undeniable fact that emerges from this U.S. Department of Education data: Even with "diversity as a compelling interest" (*Grutter v. Bollinger*, 2003), higher education institutions have struggled to "validate" Students of Color's experiences and retain them through graduation.

In an age of cost-cutting, student programs and services are often the first to be eliminated (Varlotta & Jones, 2011). This raises the critical question of environment. In the absence of programmatic intervention and support, how might the quality of the teaching and learning environment impact student engagement and success? Given a plethora of statistics on Students of Color's persistence, the criticality of this environment is heightened for these historically marginalized communities who must confront the daily assault of racial microaggressions (see the fifth chapter) that threaten their engagement in and outside the classroom. How do you foster an environment that is inclusive of

these counterstories? What might such a counterspace look like? Why do we need them?

It is here that we are drawn to and employ Michel de Certeau's (1984) critical geography distinction between place and space. According to this framework, place is associated with those who have the power to own, manage, control, and police space using "strategies," whereas space is connected to the oppressed who have no option but to adopt "tactics" to make some "space" in a "place" owned and controlled by the dominant group (pp. 36–37). Such a space within a place correlates to Richard Delgado and Jean Stefancic's (2001) understanding of a counterspace where such locations can serve as forums for both verbal and nonverbal interactions among Communities of Color. Such spaces are critical as they afford opportunities for historically marginalized and traditionally underrepresented individuals to share, interpret, and validate their experiences with others in similar situations. According to Solórzano et al. (2000), "Counter-spaces serve as sites where deficit notions of [P]eople of [C]olor can be challenged and where a positive collegiate racial climate can be established and maintained" (p. 70). This translates well to higher education where university administrators often use the multiculturalism discourse of food, festival, and "fancy" (ethnic) dress as the face of diversity efforts that tend to serve and benefit White students (Banks & McGee Banks, 2001). According to Yosso and Lopez (2010), such a "diversity of convenience" (p. 89) actually contributes to further marginalization of and a more hostile racial campus for these communities. This is yet another example of Bell's (1980) example of interest convergence, where Students of Color benefit from their institution only at the convenience of those with dominant identities, in this case, White people. It is against this context that we suggest the need for counterspaces as a necessary step to engaging Students of Color and as a result build inclusive campus communities (see Harper, 2008; Museus & Jayakumar, 2012).

The Ecological Perspective of Campus Space

According to ecology theory, "environments select and favor some behaviors and personal characteristics over others, sustaining 'ecological niches' that

promote or inhibit certain kinds of development" (Renn & Patton, 2010, p. 252). Kris Renn and Lori Patton further posit that cultivating an environment where each student may find their ecological niche is a responsibility for educators within educational institutions. The value of designing and maintaining aesthetically pleasing and physically attractive campuses is not new to the higher education landscape. James Banning (1978) called for a campus ecology defined as a "relationship between the student and the campus environment" (p. 5) and honed in on the impact of the campus and its inhabitants and vice versa to facilitate optimum outcomes. C. Carney Strange and James Banning (2001) sought to build on this ecological perspective and presented an educational framework positioning spatial analysis as responsive to the campus environment and its constituents. (Also see Uri Bronfenbrenner [1979] for his seminal work *The Ecology of Human Development.*) They focused on the design of educational environments that "promoted *inclusion* and *safety,* encouraged *involvement,* and built *community*" (Renn & Patton, 2010, p. 244; italics in original). Frank Michael Muñoz (2009) analyzed the ecological perspective using a critical race lens but not before critiquing Strange and Banning for discussing inclusivity and diversity at a perfunctory level instead of elaborating on issues such as institutionalized racism that affects students in college and university environments.

This critique of the ecological perspective of space is not without precedent. Critical theorists, such as Michel Foucault (1977), have examined how both architectural practices and constructed buildings reflect dominant political, social, and cultural discourses. Foucault (1977) argued that power operates in educational spaces through architectural choices of spatial organization (such as corridors, locker bays, and hallways) and viewed these as mechanisms of power in a spatial form that is meant to control and reproduce the existing dominant social order. Other emergent fields such as critical geography and cultural studies of architecture support this assertion. Gallagher (2007) in her ethnographic research of urban schools cited how "architecture is experienced, appropriated, perceived, and occupied" thus playing "a significant role in the processes involved in coming to know oneself as a subject" (p. 27). This complex interplay of spatiality with lived experience is also witnessed in higher education.

Higher education institutions have attempted to meet the growing needs of historically marginalized student communities on campus through the establishment of culture centers (Patton, 2010) as such counterspaces. The establishment of race-specific culture centers (RSCCs) and multicultural centers (MCCs) on many campuses (Benitez, 2010) has historically afforded their respective constituents an opportunity to position their "marginality as a site for resistance" (hooks, 1990, p. 153) rather than one in need of emancipation. What is critical here is how the effectiveness of this space is measured and how it could relate to student outcomes. What role can critical race theory play in understanding this correlation between spatial practices and student experience outcomes? It is also important to understand the student experience in spatial terms and how this reflects and reinforces relations of power both at a macro and micro level. This is currently understudied within higher education research and offers a key area of potential growth for critical race theory.

Impact to Student Development

The inclusion of race in the design of spatial-educational environments can have many benefits to Students of Color. As "sites of resistance" (hooks, 1990, p. 153), counterspaces provide agency directly to the marginalized rather than position them in need of emancipation. Often, counterspaces assist Students of Color in their transitions from their homes and communities to the predominantly White landscape of the university campus. Reflecting community cultural wealth (Yosso, 2005), these spaces provide formal and informal opportunities for mentorship, networking, and the ability to exchange effective "tactics" (de Certeau, 1984), such as contextualized study techniques and employment/career advice, necessary for them to make space in a "sea of Whiteness" (McCoy, 2014, p. 163).

Yosso and Lopez (2010) argued that such counterspaces allow for critical exchange of counterstories within and between historically marginalized communities. Here it is important to understand that we see counterspaces in three ways: physical, programmatic, and virtual. Declining institutional resources render physical counterspaces (most often in the form of free-standing

cultural centers) at risk for consolidation, merger, and/or acquisition by another (often larger) department. Smaller institutions, where physical space is often at a premium, use programmatic interventions to support and cultivate a sense of belonging among Students of Color. The growth of social media as a way to "connect" with others poses an interesting challenge for social justice education. For example, some cultural programs/centers offer online chat services through their official webpages for prospective and current students with questions and/or concerns. The mobilization of social media such as Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, etc. necessitates attention as to how these social networking tools can enhance the "virtual" counterspace and support Students of Color on the go, wherever they might be. Yet, it is in this virtual realm that the value of counterspaces remains underused and underresearched. What might these look like? What does the impact of virtual counterspace interventions look like?

By whatever format (race based or multicultural) or medium (physical, programmatic, or virtual), campus counterspaces are essentially positioned to engage, support, and celebrate the narratives of historically marginalized staff and students. But as Michael Benitez, Jr. (2010) cautioned, there is a need for balance in sustaining such spaces. A critical race lens necessitates that although such spaces centralize the needs of marginalized students and celebrate these narratives, they must also simultaneously address the manifestations of power and privilege rooted in hegemonic discourse (Rothenberg, 2007). Furthermore, drawing from Museus's (2013) tenet of strategic (anti)essentialism, the delicate balance between individual social identities, their salience and needs vis-à-vis the group or community consciousness, needs to be addressed.

Toward a Critical Race Theory of (Student) Leadership

We have previously discussed the theory's potential in racial identity development and examined its focus on intersectionality. We have also explored the value of campus environments and how critical race theory

can shape counterspaces as sites for storytelling. Between this sense of self and this site for counterstories lies the potential for leadership. What could critical race theory afford the practice of leadership as it relates to student development?

A recent study by Lorri Santamaría and Gaëtane Jean-Marie (2014) applied critical theory, and specifically critical race theory, to study the leadership practices of nine women Educators of Color. Drawing from extant literature on transformative leadership, critical multiculturalism, and critical race theory, Santamaría and Jean-Marie (2014) argued that these women constructed and practiced a specific style of shared leadership through "attributes . . . drawn directly from the ethnic or cultural aspects of their identities" (p. 338). The research challenges majoritarian discourse on educational leadership—who these leaders are, what they do, and how they do it. It moves leadership away from positivist ideas of measurability, assessment, and meritocracy toward a contextualized practice of shared responsibilities and sustainable development of diverse and complex communities. How might this research influence how we view Students of Color in leadership roles? What might this say about our leadership development programs for diverse communities?

Work by Beverly Daniel Tatum (1997) and others have long since argued for the value of collectivity among People of Color for solidarity and support to counter the dominant discourses affecting their educational experiences. Specifically, here, Patton's (2010) and others' research on counterspaces (discussed previously) is critical to facilitating not only racial identity development but also shaping leadership practice. As discussed here, critical race theory has been applied to studies on educational leadership across race and gender (Santamaría, 2013; Santamaría & Santamaría, 2012; Stovall, 2004) but there are few studies, if any, that directly explore the theory's application to Students of Color's leadership development. We contend that this is an emerging area for critical race theory where the theory may be applied as a leadership framework to examine understandings and engagement of student leadership practices.

Critical race theory is predicated on the belief that race and racism is pervasive (see the first chapter). Mitigating such a flawed system requires a comprehensive response that not only attends to change at the individual level but

also at systemic and structural levels. Within higher education and the U.S. university campus, we believe that such change must focus on "process"—how and why we as educators and practitioners do what we do. Critical race theory challenges us to interrogate the multiple ways in which we cultivate this educational space and to go beyond simplistic understandings of student identity and leadership development.

Conclusion: The Educator as Architect

Within the campus context and in ways physical, mental, emotional, and virtual, scholars and practitioner–educators are positioned to be "architects" of inclusive and engaging spaces especially in support of historically marginalized communities. Yet, Craig Wilkins (2007) in his book *The Aesthetics of Equity* converges a theoretical analysis with activist practice and calls for an "activist architecture" (p. 207) to mitigate the permanence of racism inherent to making space within the higher education landscape. Wilkins (2007) warns that in the absence of criticality, educators as architects will be complicit in ongoing racialization through the environment they construct by failing to effectively shape space where it is needed most. We contend that we need to reimagine the concepts of architecture and space. Today, learning takes place in various formats and through various media. Each of these necessitates an intentional form of, to borrow from Wilkins, "activist architecture" that makes these spaces more inclusive. Examples of this include a diversification of the curriculum or pedagogical practice, spatial arrangements of classrooms as well as student centers and college unions, and virtual design of online teaching tools such as Blackboard and Adobe Connect. Critical race theory, with its focus on the pervasiveness of race and racism in society, and by extension power relations, compels us to negotiate how these learning media sustain these hegemonic systems. How might we be privileging particular forms of teaching and learning in these spaces? Midterm evaluations can allow for the operationalizing of critical race theory's focus on counterstorytelling by allowing for questions that facilitate such narratives to come forward and alter teaching and learning methods. This can also be true for student engagement and leadership development, where intentional actions on the part of the

educator can help transform these spaces and position them as more inclusive, especially for historically marginalized communities. Such a theoretical positioning of critical race theory that informs student development practices may help reinforce subsequent theoretical developments and shape future research.

Critical race theory is framed upon the interplay between systemic structures and their impact on the individual and community. As such, the individual is always positioned within a context bound by the historical past and the contemporary lived experience. For Students of Color, much of their development during their time in higher education is shaped by the various spheres of influence within which they operate. With race being a visible marker of difference, their development is frequently marked by racial microaggressions that underscore a deeply rooted power and privilege that is often unexamined and uncontested. Institutional oppression manifested through and by White privilege and rooted in White superiority is typically unrecognizable by White people (Taylor, 2009). Within the heteropatriarchal institution of higher education, a critical race paradigm asserts that race as the center of analysis emboldens the urgency to identify White privilege and dismantle the subsequent enactments of Whiteness, of which People of Color are not exempt. To that end, irrespective of the social identities one may hold, educators are called to be architects and create different kinds of counterspaces that not only cultivate a tenacious resilience but also foster a "critical" resistance to interrupt hegemonic discourse within student development work.

Racial Microaggressions

THIS CHAPTER EXPLORES CURRENT literature on racial microaggressions and examines how microaggressive behavior and White privilege combine to create campus climates that are not inclusive. We discuss how microaggressions can converge with critical race theory to explicate the changing nature of oppression and conclude by offering a few thoughts on decolonization.

In March 2014, the "I, Too, Am Harvard" campaign became the latest illustration of Black students' marginalized experiences in higher education, this time at the Ivy League institution, Harvard University. Using the popular social media microblogging platform and website Tumblr, the campaign took the form of a collection of photographs drawn from interviews with over 60 Harvard undergraduate students holding signs elucidating the experiences of Black students at the institution. The result of an independent study project conducted by Harvard undergraduate student, Kimiko Matsuda-Lawrence, this project underscores the isolating impact of interactions with administrators, faculty, and students on a U.S. university campus. Many of the statements used in the project reflected daily conversations that implied racist motivations. Existing literature refers to such passive forms of oppression as racial microaggressions. This chapter examines racial microaggressions in their multiple forms—microassaults, microinsults, and microinvalidations (Sue et al., 2007). We discuss how microaggressive behavior and White privilege combine to create campus climates that are not inclusive, promote

racial hostility, and lead to People of Color experiencing psychosocial stress (Stanley, 2006).

Racial Microaggressions in Scholarship

Chester Pierce (1969), a psychiatrist, first put forward the term "racial microaggressions" to describe "offensive mechanisms which are designed to reduce, dilute, atomize, and encase the hapless into his [*sic*] 'place'" (p. 303). He further elucidated that these constant yet "subtle, stunning, often automatic, and non-verbal exchanges" and "put downs" (Pierce, Carew, Pierce-Gonzalez, & Willis, 1978, p. 66) were designed and delivered in a way that conveys a message of insignificance and irrelevance to the recipient. Sue et al. (2007) defined microaggressions as "brief and commonplace daily verbal, behavioral, or environmental indignities, whether intentional or unintentional, that communicate hostile, derogatory, or negative racial slights and insults to the target person or group" (p. 273). Microaggressions are subtle forms of racism that dramatically affect People of Color's lives (Solórzano et al., 2000). Solórzano and colleagues (2000) defined microaggressions as "subtle insults (verbal, non-verbal, and/or visual) directed toward People of Color often automatically or unconsciously" (p. 60). They noted that while overt forms of racism may not typically be tolerated, this does not preclude racism manifesting in insidious and covert ways, such as snubs, dismissive looks, gestures, and tones (see also Sue et al., 2007). In fact, Eduardo Bonilla-Silva (2006) calls this the "New Racism" (p. 3); one that views racism as soft "othering" with an individual impact, rather than a product of social mechanisms that sustain a dominant social order. Thus, individuals who commit microaggressions are often unaware they engage in microaggressive behavior or communication. It is important to understand that no one is immune from engaging in microaggressive behavior but the most negative impact occurs when such behavior occurs between those who occupy power and those subordinated by it (Sue, Capodilupo, Nadal, & Torino, 2008). Thus, microaggressions adversely affect People of Color because they "impair performance in a multitude of settings by sapping the psychic and spiritual energy of recipients and create inequities" (Sue et al., 2007, p. 273).

Contextualizing Microaggressions

Critical race theory contends that race and racism is endemic to society (see the first chapter) and therefore all racialized individuals are subjected to racial microaggressions, whether consciously or in a "maladaptive state of denial" (Smith, Hung, & Franklin, 2011, p. 67). To begin to understand the effects of microaggressions, it is critical to first understand Claude Steele and Joshua Aronson's (1995) phenomenon of "stereotype threat," which examines how racial stereotypes can interfere and negatively affect outcomes. Specifically, their research found that when African American candidates for the Graduate Record Examination (GRE) were prompted for their race prior to taking the test, their scores were significantly lower than those who were not prompted to indicate their race. Steele and Aronson (1995) described "stereotype threat" as:

> *A social-psychological predicament that can arise from widely known negative stereotypes about one's group. The existence of such a stereotype means that anything one does or any of one's features that conform to it make the stereotypes more plausible as a self-characterization in the eyes of others, and perhaps even in one's own eyes. We call this predicament* stereotype threat *and argue that it is experienced, essentially, as a self-evaluative threat. (p. 797; italics in original)*

What is significant about this research is that Steele and Aronson (1995) examined the "immediate situational threat" and not the "internalization" (p. 798) resulting from the cumulative negative stereotypes about one's group. This is important because it underscores the distinction between threat perceived by the recipient (stereotype threat) and the aggression performed by the perpetrator (microaggressions). When these converge, the impact for Communities of Color is heightened and, consequently, the pervasiveness of race and racism in U.S. society is exacerbated. Steele and Aronson (1995) posit that the impact of stereotype threat includes distraction, anxiety, self-consciousness, decreased attention, and a lack of application. This

psychosocial stress directly emanates from the momentary perceived "threat of possibly being judged and treated stereotypically, or of possibly self-fulfilling such a stereotype" (p. 798). However, Tara Yosso, William Smith, Miguel Ceja, and Daniel Solórzano (2009) are quick to remind us that "the pervasiveness of racial microaggressions reaches beyond the 'immediate situational threat' and causes an ongoing environmental stereotype threat" (p. 675). Such a sustained destructive environmental stress can cause mental, emotional, and physical strain identified by William Smith (2004) as "racial battle fatigue" (p. 180) in his research on Black faculty and then further examined with colleagues Walter Allen and Lynette Danley (Smith et al., 2007) in their research on African American college students. Smith's research not only elucidated the importance of People of Color's voices as they share their everyday experiences with microaggressions, but also that the daily fight to be a *counter* to the majoritarian narrative necessitates critical coping mechanisms in the struggle to survive. He viewed racial battle fatigue as a natural physiological response to daily threats and hostilities that have the potential to not only be debilitating but also life threatening.

It is important to understand that racial microaggressions do not occur in a vacuum. The marginalization contained therein is the result of a systemic framework that perpetuates a "master narrative" (Stanley, 2007, p. 14). Smith, Allen, and Danley (2007) referred to these systemic manifestations as "large-scale, systems-related stressors that are widespread, sometimes becoming highly publicized, race-related, traumatic events" (p. 554). Furthermore, it is fundamental that we contextualize these *macroaggressions* as privileging majoritarian liberalism concepts, such as meritocracy, color blindness, race neutrality, and equal opportunity, at a systemic level that then consequently is performed at an individual level through microaggressions. For example, we often hear the phrase "cream of the crop" to refer to high-performing individuals in everyday life without ever realizing that the color of the cream usually means "White." This can be seen performed at an individual level through microaggressions especially in conversations around achievement or even affirmative action where the arguments of meritocracy and statements that suggest you "pull yourself up by your bootstraps" are veiled attempts to mask the macro assumption of White privilege.

Types of Microaggressions

All microaggressions are not created equally. The convergence of their intent and impact distinguishes one from another. Sue and colleagues (2007) established a "taxonomy" of microaggressions outlining nine themes in three categories. The nine themes include: (a) alien in one's own land, (b) ascription of intelligence, (c) color blindness, (d) criminality/assumption of criminal status, (e) denial of individual racism, (f) myth of meritocracy, (g) pathologizing cultural values/communication styles, (h) second-class status, and (i) environmental invalidation. These appear to occur in three forms: microassaults, microinsults, and microinvalidations. A microassault is defined as "an explicit racial derogation characterized by a verbal or nonverbal attack meant to hurt the intended victim through name-calling, avoidant behavior, or purposeful discriminatory actions" (Sue et al., 2007, p. 274). Microassaults are conducted on an individual level and are likely to be deliberate, while allowing the individual to maintain a level of anonymity (Sue et al., 2007). Examples of microassaults include the conscious use of racial epithets against specific racialized communities or the deliberate use of historical symbols rooted in genocide and slavery as a means to dehumanize and discriminate.

According to Sue et al. (2007) a microinsult is "characterized by communications that convey rudeness and insensitivity and demean a person's racial heritage or identity. [They] represent subtle snubs, frequently unknown to the perpetrator, but clearly convey a hidden message to the recipient of color" (p. 274). An example of a microinsult in higher education is when a White student comments to a Black student, "You must be from Booker T. Washington High School, because all of the Black students at State U. are from Booker T." The implication is that the student was admitted because of affirmative action or an articulation agreement between the high school and the university. Microinsults can also occur nonverbally when a White faculty members fails to acknowledge a Student of Color in the classroom.

Microinvalidations are "characterized by communications that exclude, negate, or nullify the psychological thoughts, feelings, or experiential reality of a [P]erson of [C]olor" (Sue et al., 2007, p. 274). A microinvalidation occurs

when a faculty member of color complains to the department chair that she/he feels the White male students in the class are disrespecting her because of her race and the department chair responds, "You are being overly sensitive. They are 'testing' you because you are a new junior faculty member."

Yosso, Smith, Ceja, and Solórzano (2009), using a critical race methodology, also outlined three types of racial microaggressions in their research on racial assaults on Latina/o undergraduates: interpersonal microaggressions, racial jokes, and institutional microaggressions. Specific to their research, interpersonal microaggressions refer to the "verbal and nonverbal racial affronts directed at Latinas/os from students, faculty, teaching assistants, or other individuals in academic and social spaces" (p. 667) where their mere presence is seen as unsettling the normative functioning of the academic enterprise. Many of the examples cited elucidate the themes in Sue et al.'s (2007) research, especially the ascription of intelligence or in this case the lack thereof. Yosso et al. (2009) focused on racial jokes as microaggressions and argued that their "undeniable intentionality" (p. 669) distinguishes them from interpersonal microaggressions. They posited that the perpetrator in this case unconsciously internalized racist beliefs and "coded them as humor" through performance of a racially charged joke. They also did not absolve the audience in their responsibility of the reception of the microaggressive joke. Finally, in their elucidation of the third type of racial microaggresion called "institutional microaggressions," Yosso and colleagues (2009) drew on Kenneth González's (2002) concept of "cultural starvation" (p. 210). The social, physical, and epistemological isolation underscores the sense of rejection and erasure experienced by Students of Color and encourages the dangerous interplay of both stereotype threat and racial battle fatigue through their college careers. Thus, institutional microaggressions are those "racially marginalizing actions and inertia of the university evidenced in structures, practices, and discourses that endorse a campus racial climate hostile to People of Color" (Yosso et al., 2009, p. 673).

Microaggressions adversely affect the recipient because the individual often experiences anger, resentment, irritation, and frustration (psychosocial stressors; Stanley, 2006; Sue et al., 2007). On the other hand, the perpetrator (individual or institution) typically rationalizes their response, if and when

questioned about their verbal or nonverbal communication. In fact, the perpetrator may even offer a perfectly logical explanation for their actions. The relentless exertion of power and privilege by the perpetrator causes the recipient to not only question whether the microaggression really happened (Crocker & Major, 1989) but also exacts energy and resources away from more positive life fulfilling desires (Smith, Hung, & Franklin, 2011).

We caution that not all acts of oppression constitute microaggressions. Oppressive acts with overt racist intent must be named as such whether individual or systemic. We also suggest that positioning microaggressions as an elite, academic umbrella term is a dangerous proposition. Microaggressions underscore the pervasiveness of Whiteness and White superiority in everyday life and generally there is an ambivalence with respect to how both the perpetrator and the recipient view the impact. It becomes critical to name and explain, rather than label and dismiss at the point of incident. Julie Minikel-Lacocque (2013) analyzed the existing framework of racial microaggressions using a multiple case study of six Latina/o students and argued that microaggressions, as a term, is moving toward being dangerously "misused" (p. 432) within academia. She cautioned that microaggression is becoming an umbrella term to include acts that are very clearly microassaults and contended that doing so minimizes the destructive nature of the act and lessens the recipient's response to the aggression with the act potentially remaining uncontested and the perpetrator still unaware of their action. Thus, she argued that the intentional and overt racist acts be called "racialized aggressions" (p. 459).

Research on Microaggressions

We briefly discussed the concepts of stereotype threat and racial battle fatigue to contextualize microaggressions. We noted that the accumulation of microaggressive behavior operationalizes both the aforementioned concepts into lived experiences for People of Color. To date, there is a paucity of research completed that has explored the effects of microaggressions on Students of Color within the higher education landscape. Current empirical research on racial microaggressions has mostly focused on the experiences of Black (Donovan, Galban, Grace, Bennett, & Felicié, 2013; Solórzano, Ceja, &

Yosso, 2000; Watkins, LaBarrie, & Appio, 2010), Latina/o (Rivera, Forquer, & Rangel, 2010; Yosso et al., 2009), and Asian American (Lin, 2010) communities. Specifically, Solórzano et al.'s (2000) research on African American college students elucidated effects of stereotype threat (Steele & Aronson, 1995), tokenism (similar to Steele and Aronson's concept of "spokesperson pressure"), and struggles with self-doubt, frustration, and isolation with impacts on academic performance, such as withdrawing from a course or changing majors. William Smith, Man Hung, and Jeremy Franklin (2011) examined how racial microaggressions among Black college men contributed toward what Grace Carroll (1998) originally described as "mundane, extreme, environmental stress (MEES)" (Carroll as cited in Smith, Hung, & Franklin, 2011, p. 63). (See Carroll [1998] for a comprehensive analysis of her conceptualization of MEES on African Americans.) Solórzano and Yosso (2001) used a critical race framework to examine Latina/o students' relationships between racial stereotypes, cumulative racial microaggressions, campus racial climate, and academic performance. Yosso and colleagues (2009) expanded on this work by exploring tactics used by Latinas/os to respond to racial microaggressions on their respective campuses. These include "*building communities* that represent and reflect the cultural wealth of their home communities" and cultivating "skills of *critical navigation between* [their] *multiple* worlds of home and school, academia, and community" (p. 680; italics in original).

Microaggressions and Critical Race Theory

The recent Paris massacre of Charlie Hebdo cartoonists by radical Islamists elicited widespread support for the organization and the victims. Although we condemn such violence, we continue to be intrigued by mainstream discourse that frames the consistently racist, Islamophobic, and xenophobic work of Charlie Hebdo as "freedom of expression" through the genre of "satire," and as a result, somehow protected from critique. This willful exemption sends a message that all racist communication can be positioned as "satirical" and is a dangerous precedent with the potential to devastate the lived experiences for Communities of Color. Another striking example closer to home is the ongoing vilification of the *Black Lives Matter* movement by some, supposedly

as an act of solidarity, arguing instead, "all lives matter." At first glance, this kind of solidarity might be applauded, but in actuality such appropriation of one group's cause typifies the erasure and marginalization that constitutes the impact of microaggressions.

What role can critical race theory play in this regard? hooks (1990) challenges such marginality as "sites of resistance" (p. 153) and critical race theory, through its emphasis on the counterstory, can highlight the diverse narratives that underscore People of Color's everyday strength as they resist majoritarian discourse. The ongoing *Black Lives Matter* movement, formed in response to the killing of Black male youth at the hands of law enforcement, is demonstrative of the critical activist work being done to continually expose the structural and systemic racism that disproportionately affects the lives of Black people (and all People of Color) in very concrete and measurable ways. At an individual level, these incidents reveal an urgent need to move beyond theoretical conceptualizations of racial microaggression frameworks and toward empirical research that hones in on lived experience at and between the margins. In higher education, those identifying as Mixed or Bi/Multiracial (see Johnston & Nadal [2010] for their research on microaggressions within the clinical counseling setting) are underresearched as are the effects of microaggressions on Indigenous communities (for empirical research, see Clark, Spanierman, Reed, Soble, & Cabana, 2011; for theorization, see Hill, Kim, & Williams, 2010). Furthermore, more research is needed to study the effects of specific kinds of microaggressions (Yosso et al., 2009) and even particular themes, such as environmental microaggressions (Sue et al., 2007). Minikel-Lacocque (2013) argued that there is a need to focus on studying what happens after the microaggression has occurred and calls for further research on "contested microaggressions" defined as "as the process by which the target of a microaggression names and contests the perceived racist act" (p. 458).

Centralizing the response of recipients of microaggressions toward the perpetrators advances the strengths-based discourse of critical race theory. Finally, longitudinal multi-institutional studies offer the potential to explore how the effects of microaggressions influence Students of Color's success over time within the context of the academic and social environment of higher education. We contend that doing so advances the theory's focus on the

counterstory by realizing Robert Teranishi, Laurie Behringer, Emily Grey, and Tara Parker's (2009) notion of "thick descriptions" (p. 59) of Students of Color's narratives relative to campus environments and their experiences. From a methodological standpoint, it is essential to develop clear and specific protocols that specifically explore and examine the use and experience of microaggressions in the aforementioned contexts (Yosso et al., 2009). The methodology chapter in this monograph outlines the ways in which critical race theory might assist in this process.

Decolonizing Microaggressions: A Concluding Thought

As we have written, it is necessary to contextualize microaggressions within the framework of the United States as a settler colonial state where typically People of Color do not all constitute the same kind of "Other" (Rodricks & McCoy, in press). This is consistent with critical race theory's tenet of differential racialization (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001) and in this case, for non-Indigenous People of Color to understand themselves within an active process of colonial settlement. Decolonizing microaggressions requires People of Color to avoid "moves to innocence," a term defined by Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang (2012) as "strategies or positionings that attempt to relieve the settler of feelings of guilt or responsibility without giving up land or power or privilege" (p. 10).

Bonita Lawrence and Enakshi Dua (2005) theorized a decolonization of antiracism and outlined the need for an "explicit awareness and articulation of the intersection of specific settlement policies with policies controlling 'Indians'" (p. 136). According to Tuck and Yang (2012), "settler colonialism is built upon an entangled triad structure of settler-native-slave" and thus "the decolonial desires of [W]hite, non-[W]hite, immigrant, postcolonial, and oppressed people, can similarly be entangled in resettlement, reoccupation, and reinhabitation that actually further settler colonialism" (p. 1).

How might microaggressions reflect this commitment to decolonization? Gaztambide-Fernández (2012) argued that the "post-9/11 black/brown

'Other' constitutes the strangeness of imminent danger and the prospect of terror" (p. 60), whereas the Indigenous "other" is often constituted as historical artifacts (Writer, 2008). What is illustrated here is that certain essentialist notions of specific "Others" (Black and Brown bodies marked as "terrorist" or "foreign") have taken root, whereas others (such as Indigenous Peoples) have simply been erased. This is largely evidenced in a spectrum of research where Indigenous Peoples, their histories, and complex narratives have been largely swept under the umbrella category of People of Color. Here, Museus and Iftikar's (2013) concept of strategic (anti)essentialism is particularly important because it describes the complicity of Communities of Color to potentially take advantage of the processes of differential racialization and obtain political power and influence within a racist system. Given the inextricable meld of racism and colonialism, People of Color are themselves sometimes willing perpetrators of microaggressive behaviors, either by buying into the master narrative, hegemonic Whiteness, or as a self-preservation technique. We are reminded of the 1940s Woody Guthrie folk song, "This Land Is Your Land," and use that as a context to underscore the gravity of how microaggressive behavior can be perpetuated even among Communities of Color. The fact remains that the land belongs to the Indigenous Peoples and was not "made for you or me." Either way, decolonizing microaggressions requires, at the very least, a movement toward building critical consciousness around the needs of differential racialization and how this affects the lived experiences of the varied, yet distinct, Communities of Color on our college and university campuses and specifically of Native American/Indigenous Peoples and their communities. Future conceptualizations and empirical research involving racial microaggressions in higher education would be well served to take this consciousness into account.

From a praxis standpoint, it is critical that new faculty orientations and ongoing faculty professional development (re)center race and racism in their curriculum design and delivery. Student leadership programs and training modules for student employees, such as residential life staff, should move away from posturing race and racism through a single time-constrained social justice module and instead move toward integrating race and racism with and through its intersections with other identities into every aspect of the

program. Such intentionality is key. Harper (2011) defined intentionality as "reflectively and deliberately employing a set of strategies to produce desired educational outcomes" (p. 288). Scholars and practitioner–educators must create not just intentional programs but also environments that can support such reflective and deliberate choices. Doing so not only (re)centers but also advances critical race theory's focus on White superiority and Whiteness, just as the founders intended.

Critical Race Theory and the Next 20 Years

IN THIS CONCLUDING CHAPTER, WE DISCUSS how critical race theory might take up emergent scholarship and provoke more effective and relevant engagement on the part of critical race scholars and practitioner–educators through a renewed focus on reflexivity and listening. We conclude by offering a call to praxis.

During the past 20 years, critical race theory has served as a tool for exposing and analyzing race and racism in higher education. Since it was introduced to education by Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995), scholars have used the theory to examine educational policy and practice. It has provided a forum for People of Color to share their lived experiences. Through the telling of their stories, People of Color have informed scholars and practitioner–educators of their realities in the academy. Although the increased usage of critical race theory is noteworthy, it is our contention that CRT has not reached its full potential as a theoretical framework, analytical tool, and research methodology.

There are many in higher education whose voices remain silenced and/or their experiences dismissed. David Brunsma, Daniel Delgado, and Kerry Ann Rockquemore's (2013) theoretical and empirical development of their "identity matrix" (p. 482) for multiracial young adults positions the social construction and performance of a racial identity as a self-authoring strategy in several different contexts including but not limited to interactional, political, cultural, physical (embodied), and institutional settings. This is important because the realities of multiracial people and their claims to identities are

contextually bound by time, place, and circumstance. Their realities continue to be questioned or framed as isolated incidents by those who believe the only reality is an "objective" reality. The emergent scholarship in Critical Mixed Race Studies offers the opportunity to critically focus on the multiracial experience. In their inaugural issue of the *Journal of Critical Mixed Race Studies*, G. Reginald Daniel, Laura Kina, Wei Ming Dariotis, and Camilla Fojas (2014) explained that:

> *multiracials become subjects of historical, social, and cultural processes rather than simply objects of analysis. This involves the study of racial consciousness among racially mixed people, the world in which they live, and the ideological, social, economic, and political forces, as well as policies that impact the social location of mixed-race individuals and inform their mixed-race experiences and identities. CMRS also stresses the critical analysis of the institutionalization of social, cultural, and political structures based on dominant conceptions of "race." (p. 8)*

How might critical race theory engage with such emergent scholarship? What can emerging and experienced critical race scholars and practitioner–educators do to make any engagement effective and relevant? We contend that the effectiveness of any review of extant literature on a subject, as this monograph proposes to do, lies in its ease and usefulness in practical application. For instance, we have proposed elsewhere, through a convergence of critical race theory with servant leadership, a critical student affairs servant pedagogy that informs student affairs practice (see Rodricks & McCoy, in press).

As previously articulated, one of critical legal studies' shortcomings was the failure to listen to People of Color's stories (Yosso, 2005). At its core, critical race theory offers the potential to facilitate praxis-directed models of reflexivity and listening and to integrate this into educational research design and practice. Such models would realize Freire's (1970) concept of dialogical teaching and learning by inverting authoritarian ways across disciplines. We contend that doing so adds a new quality of depth to professional practice as

well as educational research design, and believe this to be the next challenge for critical race theory in the next 20 years.

Reflexivity and Listening

The sharing of stories, particularly counterstories and counternarratives, is central to critical race theory. We appeal to faculty and student affairs practitioner–educators to *hear* the stories that Students and Faculty of Color share about their experiences in the academy. These stories are not *just* stories but a way that People of Color share their lived experiences in higher education. According to Rawlins (2003):

> *Hearing others is not a passive enactment of being-in-conversation. Hearing* voices*, it says something about you that is critical. It identifies you as someone who has postponed speaking, someone who is reserving and respecting the space of talk for (an)other. It announces you as someone potentially open to the other's voice, at least in this moment when he/she [*sic*] is speaking. Listening in this way is a committed, active passivity. It is an opening in practice, conscientious listening. (p. 122)*

Thus, hearing involves more than "listening" to the counterstories. It encompasses developing an understanding and appreciation of them, recognizing their legitimacy and validity in a place where White Eurocentric norms have historically been the standard, and ensuring these stories are given their due in knowledge mobilization efforts to interrupt the socially constructed normative order of being. Brayboy (2005) emphasized that listening involves the ability to connect traditional community values with larger societal institutions such as schools and the courts (p. 428). He makes a significant and critical distinction between listening and hearing the stories that People of Color share. "Listening is part of going through the motions of acting engaged and allowing individuals to talk. Hearing stories means that value is attributed to them and both the authority and the nuance of stories are understood" (p. 440).

Call to Praxis

Praxis involves scholars using theory to bring about active change in the situation and context being studied (Brayboy, 2005). Yosso et al. (2004) acknowledged the scholarly and activist traditions of education while recognizing critical race theory as a framework that shapes the praxis of individuals committed to social justice. In our forthcoming work (Rodricks & McCoy, in press) we pose a series of questions to the practitioner–educator. Grounded in the aforementioned critical race tenets (see the first chapter), these key questions include a "call to praxis." We believe the questions are appropriate for a broader audience in higher education. We recognize social justice as a journey and not a destination and believe that the socially constructive nature of race and racism (and its pervasiveness) converges the ever-changing composition of the college-bound student marking the U.S. university campus. This perpetual confluence necessitates that *all* in higher education can enhance their praxis no matter our role or the length of time we have devoted to it. Thus we conclude by asking similar questions to the larger higher education community.

- How might I embody Whiteness in my scholarship research and practice? Where and how do I perform the subtle oppression that may emerge from that embodiment?
- What was/is my role in perpetuating the existing norm? How did/does my work (or lack thereof) contribute to the status quo—the dominant social order?
- Why am I here? Whose and what interests are being served? To whom am I accountable?
- How might I use my awareness as privilege to make space in my work to draw out oppressed people's stories/narratives?
- Where and how do I privilege Whiteness as a form of property? Where is the "hidden curriculum" (Apple 1979/2004; Jackson, 1968) in my work?
- How and where am I complicit in "incremental change" especially as it relates to equitably serving the needs of historically marginalized communities in academia? How is this connected or grounded in a color-blind ideology?

Asking, reflecting on, and responding to these questions are a genesis. They are to assist the social justice advocate on their journey.

The Academy Award–winning historical drama film *12 Years a Slave* elicited sharp discourse on the role of a White Brad Pitt in the role of Samuel Bass, a Canadian laborer who ends up being a key figure in the "deliverance" of the film's protagonist, the once-free but now 12 years–enslaved Black man, Solomon Northup, to freedom. Critics contended it was yet another film showcasing a White savior with Pitt (who also produced the film) positioning himself as such. Whatever the rhetoric and reaction, the debate underscores a key point. Working through both the historical and contemporary pervasiveness of White superiority, Whiteness, race, and racism (of which there is no clear and immediate respite) takes both, to borrow from Gallagher's call, *risking* and *resisting* on the part of both those in power and those subjected to and by it. Challenging the master narrative requires such a commitment to praxis. We advocate for openness to vulnerability, that one might name their identities and social locations and be attentive to the differential marginalization that varying subjectivities face.

To that end and without judgment, we contend that critical race theory frames the context within which this juxtaposition occurs and beckons the reader to reflect on who they are and what they do depending on where they might fall on the spectrum. This, we believe, is the theory's moral imperative.

Glossary

Antiessentialism—the belief that there is no singular experience or attribute that is ascribed to or that defines a group of people. [Also see *Strategic (anti)essentialism*.]

Asian Critical Theory (AsianCrit)—an analytical tool for understanding Asian Americans' racialized experiences in the United States and a lens for interpreting Asian American/Pacific Islander students' experiences in higher education; places an emphasis on and critiques nativistic racism framed around the myth of the model minority, immigration/naturalization, language, and disenfranchisement; composed of seven interconnected tenets.

Campus racial climate—"the collective patterns of tacit values, beliefs, assumptions, and norms that evolve from an institution's history and are manifest in its mission, traditions, language, interactions, artifacts, physical structures, and other symbols which differentially shape the experiences of various racial and ethnic groups and can function to oppress racial minority [*sic*] populations within a particular institution" (Museus, Ravello, & Vega, 2012, p. 32).

Color blindness—the ideology that race is not a factor in how people are perceived by others.

Colored spaces—the "unofficial, informal space allows [F]aculty of [C]olor to be 'real'; to express themselves, share experiences and perspectives, and vent and support each other in (cultural) ways that are not necessarily safe in the official, formal workplace" (Diggs, Garrison-Wade, Estrada, & Galindo, 2009, p. 331).

Composite character—a fictitious character who is historically and contemporarily contextualized, whose experience represents the lived experiences of multiple individuals including the researcher and study participants; used when employing a critical race methodology.

Composite story—a type of counterstory that is biographical or autobiographical; the author(s) creates a "composite" character drawn from multiple sources to share People of Color's experiences; the character is situated socially, historically, and politically to discuss various forms of oppression. [Also see *Counterstories/Counternarratives.*]

Contested microaggressions—defined as "as the process by which the target of a microaggression names and contests the perceived racist act" (Minikel-Lacocque, 2013, p. 458). [Also see *Racial microaggressions.*]

Counterspace—a site "where deficit notions of People of Color can be challenged and where a positive racial climate can be established and maintained" (Solórzano et al., 2000, p. 70).

Counterstories/Counternarratives—"a tool for exposing, analyzing, and challenging the majoritarian stories of racial privilege" (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002, p. 32); typically occurs in three forms: stories/narratives, counterstories/counternarratives, and composite stories.

Counterstorytelling—"a method of telling a story that aims to cast doubt on the validity of accepted premises or myths, especially ones held by the majority" (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001, p. 144); a means of exposing and critiquing normalized dialogues that perpetuate racial stereotypes (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004, p. 27); offers a method for People of Color to have their voices heard. [Also see *Counterstories/Counternarratives; Counterspace; Composite story.*]

Critical Legal Studies (CLS)—a form of legal scholarship that questioned the U.S. legal system's role in legitimizing oppressive social structures; its primary goal was to expose and challenge the idea that legal reasoning was "neutral, value-free, and unaffected by social and economic relations, political forces or cultural phenomena" (Brown & Jackson, 2013, p. 12).

Critical race methodology—a theoretically grounded research approach that seeks to accomplish the following: (a) center race and racism in all aspects of the research process; (b) challenge traditional research paradigms, texts,

and theories that have been used to explain Students of Color's experiences; (c) provide a liberatory or transformative solution to oppression and subordination (racism, genderism, classism); (d) focus on Students of Color's racialized, gendered, and classed experiences; and (e) apply an interdisciplinary knowledge base, drawing from ethnic studies, women's studies, sociology, history, humanities, and law to develop an enhanced understanding of Students of Color's experiences in higher education (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002).

Critical Race Quantitative Intersectionality (CRQI)—"an explanatory framework and methodological approach that utilizes quantitative methods to account for the material impact of race and racism at its intersection with other forms of subordination and works toward identifying and challenging oppression at this intersection in hopes of achieving social justice for students of color, their families and their communities" (Covarrubias & Velez, 2013, p. 276).

Critical Race Theory (CRT)—a form of oppositional scholarship that centers race and racism while challenging the Eurocentric values established as the accepted norm in the United States; is used to examine the unequal and unjust distribution of power and resources politically, economically, racially, and socially; a movement of scholars committed to challenging and disrupting racism and other forms of oppression; composed of the following key tenets: the permanence of racism, experiential knowledge, interest convergence theory, intersectionality, whiteness as property, the critique of liberalism, and commitment to social justice.

Critique of liberalism—a key critical race tenet; challenges the concepts of objectivity, meritocracy, color blindness, race neutrality, equal opportunity, and incremental change.

Differential racism—the concept that racial groups are racialized in varied ways and that the same racial group can be racialized in different ways depending on the context (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001).

Epistemological racism—a racism that seeks to limit the "epistemologies considered legitimate within the mainstream research community" (Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002, p. 169).

Epistolary—a form of writing that uses a letter or a series of letters to tell a story (see Solórzano, 2013).

Experiential knowledge—the knowledge that People of Color possess based on their lived experiences; considered valued, legitimate, appropriate, and critical to understanding, analyzing, and teaching about racial subordination in education; contests traditional methods of scholarship; shared through storytelling, family histories, biographies, chronicles, and narratives.

Extreme Predominantly White Institution (EPWI)—a predominantly White institution where Students, Faculty, and Administrators of Color are grossly underrepresented, the institution possesses a history of racism and exclusionary policies and practices, the local community is overwhelmingly White and offers limited resources and/or services for People of Color, and there are no "visible" Communities of Color.

Hegemony—is the political, economic, and cultural dominance of one social group's (or nation's) values, beliefs, and interests over another. It is an expression of ideology that, even if consented to rather than forced, actually serves the interests of the dominant group.

Heteropatriarchy—the systemic dominance and systematic devaluing of women in society by heterosexual males. Heteropatriarchy "ensures male right of access to women. Women's relations—personal, professional, social, economic—are defined by the ideology that woman is for man" (Code, 2000, p. 347). [Also see *Patriarchy.*]

Individual racism—refers to values, attitudes, and practices/behaviors/actions toward another individual or group based on their racial and/or ethnic group membership. The performance of individual racism may be conscious and unconscious and in ways active and passive.

Institutional microaggressions—refers to those "racially marginalizing actions and inertia of the university evidenced in structures, practices, and discourses that endorse a campus racial climate hostile to People of Color" (Yosso et al., 2009, p. 673). [Also see *Racial microaggressions.*]

Institutional racism—"the collective failure of an organization to provide an appropriate and professional service to people because of their color, culture, or ethnic origin. It can be seen or detected in processes, attitudes, and behavior which amount to discrimination through unwitting prejudice, ignorance, thoughtlessness, and racist stereotyping which disadvantage minority [*sic*] ethnic people" (Macpherson, 1999, para. 6.34).

Interest convergence—a key critical race tenet; proposes that historically oppressed people (People of Color) advance socially and politically when their interests converge with the interests of those in power (typically White, heterosexual, Christian, able-bodied males). [Also see *Hegemony; Master narrative.*]

Interpersonal microaggressions—Within the context of their research with Latina/o undergraduates, Yosso et al. (2009) define interpersonal microaggressions as "verbal and nonverbal racial affronts directed to [Students of Color] from students, faculty, teaching assistants, or other individuals in academic and social spaces" (p. 667). [Also see *Racial microaggressions.*]

Intersectionality—key critical race tenet; the theoretical concept that race intersects with other subordinated identities (such as gender, class, religion, ability/disability, and sexual orientation) and forms of oppression (sexism, homophobia, ableism) to influence People of Color's lived experiences.

Latino Critical Theory (LatCrit)—a framework that is used to theorize and examine how race and racism explicitly and implicitly affect the educational structures, processes, and discourses that have an impact on People of Color, but Latinas/os in particular.

Macroaggressions—"large-scale, systems-related stressors that are widespread, sometimes becoming highly publicized, race-related, traumatic events" (Smith, Allen, & Danley, 2007, p. 554).

Majoritarian story (also called monovocals or standard stories)—"one [a story] that privileges Whites, men, the middle and/or upper class, and heterosexuals by naming these social locations as natural or normative points of reference" (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002, p. 28).

Master narrative—a script that specifies and controls how some social processes are carried out (Stanley, 2007, p. 14). Typically used in reference to the dominant standard established by the White, heterosexual, Christian, able-bodied, educated male belonging to the upper-middle/upper socioeconomic class. [Also see *Hegemony; Heteropatriarchy; Interest convergence.*]

Microaggressions—Also see *Microassault*; *Microinsult*; *Microinvalidation*

Microassault—"an explicit racial derogation characterized by a verbal or nonverbal attack meant to hurt the intended victim through name-calling, avoidant behavior, or purposeful discriminatory actions" (Sue et al., 2007, p. 274). [Also see *Macroaggressions; Racial microaggressions.*]

Microinsult—"characterized by communications that convey rudeness and insensitivity and demean a person's racial heritage or identity. [They] represent subtle snubs, frequently unknown to the perpetrator, but clearly convey a hidden message to the recipient of color" (Sue et al., 2007, p. 274). [Also see *Racial microaggressions.*]

Microinvalidation—"characterized by communications that exclude, negate, or nullify the psychological thoughts, feelings, or experiential reality of a [P]erson of [C]olor" (Sue et al., 2007, p. 274). [Also see *Racial microaggressions.*]

Model minority—the misguided and stereotypical concept that students of the Asian/Pacific Islander diaspora succeed in the U.S. educational systems because they have assimilated to the Eurocentric norms.

Moves to Innocence—"strategies or positionings that attempt to relieve the settler of feelings of guilt or responsibility without giving up land or power or privilege" (Tuck & Yang, 2012, p. 10).

Nativistic racism—the ways that people of the Asian/Pacific Islander diaspora are racialized within the United States.

Othering—"a process whereby individuals, groups, and communities are deemed to be less important, less worthwhile, less consequential, less authorized and less human based on historically situated markers of social formation such as race, class, gender, sexuality and nationality" (Yep, 2003, p. 18).

Patriarchy—"A system of social structures, and practices in which men dominate, oppress, and exploit women" (Walby, 1990, p. 214).

Permanence of racism—the primary tenet of critical race theory; the concept that racism is not random and isolated but is an endemic and permanent aspect of People of Color's experiences in the United States; the ideology that racism influences all aspects (political, economic, social, and educational) of U.S. society.

Place—used here in the context of critical geography and is associated with those that have the power to own, manage, control, and police space using "strategies" (de Certeau, 1984, p. 36). [Also see *Space.*]

Praxis—refers to the process of reflection and action by which theory or a theoretical concept is performed, i.e., enacted, embodied, or realized, and in the process transforming the context in which it occurs (Freire, 1970).

Privilege—refers to the unearned benefit or advantage afforded to a particular social group over all others. Within a critical race context, we invoke Leonardo's (2004) elucidation: "Privilege is the daily cognate of structural domination. Without securing the latter, the former is not activated" (p. 148).

Racial battle fatigue—"the constant physiological, psychological, cultural, and emotional coping with racial microaggressions in less-than-ideal and racially hostile or unsupportive environments (campus or otherwise)" (Smith, Allen, & Danley, 2007, as cited in Patton & Catching, 2009, p. 724).

Racial identity—"the degree to which a person feels connected to or shares commonalities with an ethnic or racial group" (Kumasi, 2011, p. 211).

Racial microaggressions—"brief and commonplace daily verbal, behavioral, or environmental indignities, whether intentional or unintentional, that communicate hostile, derogatory, or negative racial slights and insults toward [P]eople of [C]olor" (Sue et al., 2007, p. 271); "subtle insults (verbal, nonverbal, and /or visual) directed toward [P]eople of [C]olor often automatically or unconsciously" (Solórzano et al., 2000, p. 60).

Racial privilege—"the notion that White subjects accrue advantages by virtue of being constructed as Whites" irrespective of whether the subjects have disclaimed their White racial identity (Leonardo, 2004, p. 137). Racial privilege is typically unearned and unrecognizable by the White beneficiary. [Also see *Privilege; White privilege.*]

Racism—"[T]he set of institutional, cultural and interpersonal patterns and practices that create advantages for people legally defined and socially constructed as 'white,' and the corollary disadvantages for people defined as belonging to racial groups that were not considered Whites by the dominant power structure in the United States" (Castañeda & Zúñiga, 2013, p. 58).

Social justice—"full and equal participation of all groups in a society that is mutually shaped to meet their needs . . . includes a vision of society in which the distribution of resources is equitable and all members are physically and psychologically safe and secure" (Bell, 2013, p. 21).

Space—used here in its context of critical geography and is connected to the oppressed where there exists no option but to adopt "tactics" to make some space in a place owned and controlled by the dominant group (de Certeau, 1984, p. 37).

Storytelling—a valued means of communicating used by People of Color to share their histories and experiences. [Also see *Counterstorytelling*.]

Strategic (anti)essentialism—connects the critical race concept of antiessentialism and Spivak's (1987) concept of strategic essentialism. According to Museus and Iftikar (2013), strategic (anti)essentialism refers to the juxtaposition between the economic, political, and social impact of differential racialization (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001) on certain Communities of Color, and their complicity to engage in actions facilitating those same processes to obtain political power and influence within a racialized system.

Structural racism—the legitimization of a hierarchical system of political, social, economic, and cultural inequity disproportionately favoring Whites over People of Color. We posit that this normalization of White supremacy is characterized by an ineradicable cumulative impact and is evidenced in institutional racism through their respective policies and processes.

Transformational resistance—critiques oppression, promotes social justice, and offers the greatest possibility for social change (Solórzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001).

Tribal Critical Theory (TribalCrit)—a theoretical framework that centers the colonization of Native American/Indigenous People and examines both historical and contemporary issues related to their experiences in the United States; focuses on Native American/Indigenous People's "complicated relationship" (Brayboy, 2005, p. 425) with the U.S. federal government; composed of nine central tenets.

Voice—"the assertion and acknowledgement of the importance of the personal and community experiences of [P]eople of [C]olour as sources of knowledge" (Dixson & Rousseau, 2005, p. 10).

White privilege—an invisible package of unearned assets (McIntosh, 2012, p. 121); a system of opportunities and benefits conferred upon people simply because they are White (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002, p. 27).

Whiteness—is a not a culture but a social concept (Leonardo, 2002, p. 31). Leonardo describes it as a "racial discourse" distinct from the socially constructed racial category of White identity (p. 31). Whiteness is a pervasive racialized worldview that is "supported by material practices and institutions"

(p. 32). Harris (1993) described it as the right to identity as enshrined and embraced by the law.

Whiteness as property—a key tenet of critical race theory; the premise that the assumptions, privileges, and benefits of identifying as White are valuable assets that White people seek to protect; includes the rights of possession, use, transfer, disposition, and exclusion (Harris, 1993).

Notes

1. Terms such as "White" or "Black" are often capitalized. For similar reasons, we choose to capitalize such terms as "People of Color," "Students of Color," and "Educators of Color" in our writing to reaffirm the voice, experience, and history of exclusion of those who are represented by these phrases.

2. Trayvon Martin, Michael Brown, and Eric Garner were three Black males killed in separate incidents between 2012 and 2014. Trayvon Martin was unarmed and killed by a neighborhood watch volunteer in Sanford, Florida. The accused was later acquitted of all charges. Michael Brown was also unarmed and gunned down by a police officer. Eric Garner was placed in a chokehold by a New York City Police Department Officer and later died. Neither officer was charged by a grand jury.

3. We understand the term resistance to be a politicized term often used interchangeably with violence by those in power when their dominance and superiority are threatened. We feel strongly about securing this term in critical race discourse and do so consciously and in respect to the various movements that have marked the struggle for voice, legitimacy, and equity.

4. This group of people is referred to by many names including but not limited to Native, Indigenous, and First Nations/Peoples. For the purpose of this monograph we use Native American/Indigenous Peoples. In the works reviewed in the monograph we use the term employed by the scholar(s) who conducted the research (such as American Indian).

5. We use the terms Black and African American interchangeably to refer to people of African descent in the United States. For the works reviewed in the monograph we use the term employed by the scholar(s) who conducted the research.

6. Consistent with previous critical race scholarship, we use "our" to include ourselves among Scholars of Color and those committed to social justice. Consistent with a critical race methodology, scholars often incorporate their lived experiences in their research and scholarship.

References

Abes, E. S. (2009). Theoretical borderlands: Using multiple theoretical perspectives to challenge inequitable power structures in student development theory. *Journal of College Student Development*, *50*, 141–156.

Abes, E. S., Jones, S. R., & McEwen, M. K. (2007). Reconceptualizing the Model of Multiple Dimensions of Identity: The role of meaning-making capacity in the construction of multiple identities. *Journal of College Student Development*, *48*(1), 1–22.

Aleman, E., Jr. (2007). Situating Texas school finance policy in a CRT framework: How "substantially equal" yields racial inequity. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *43*(5), 525–558.

American Council on Education. (2013). *With college degree in hand: Analysis of racial minority graduates and their lives after college*. Washington, DC: Author.

Anzaldúa, G. (2010). La conciencia de la mestiza: Towards a new consciousness. In M. Adams, W. Blumenfeld, C. Castañeda, H. Hackman, M. Peters, & X. Zúñiga (Eds.), *Readings for diversity and social justice* (2nd ed., pp. 94–97). New York, NY: Routledge. (Original work published 1999)

Apple, M. 2004. *Ideology and curriculum*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul. (Original work published in 1979)

Banks, J. A., & McGee Banks, C. A. (2001). *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Wiley.

Banning, J. H. (Ed.). (1978). *Campus ecology: A perspective for student affairs* (NASPA Monograph). Cincinnati, OH: NASPA.

Bartlett, L., & Brayboy, B. M. J. (2005). Race and schooling: Theories and ethnographies. *The Urban Review*, *37*(5), 361–374.

Baxter Magolda, M. B. (2008). Three elements of self-authorship. *Journal of College Student Development*, *49*(4), 269–284.

Bell, D. A., Jr. (1980). *Brown v. Board of Education* and the interest convergence dilemma. *Harvard Law Review*, *93*(3), 518–533.

Bell, D. A., Jr. (1989). An epistolary exploration for a Thurgood Marshall biography. *Harvard Blackletter Journal*, *6*, 51–67.

Bell, D. A., Jr. (1992). *Faces at the bottom of the well*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Bell, L. A. (2013). Theoretical foundations. In M. Adams, W. J. Blumenfield, C. Castañeda, H. Hackman, M. Peters, & X. Zúñiga (Eds.), *Readings for diversity and social justice* (3rd ed.; pp. 21–35). New York, NY: Routledge.

Benitez, M., Jr. (2010). Resituating culture centers within a social justice framework. In L. Patton (Ed.), *Culture centers in higher education: Perspectives on identity, theory, and practice* (pp. 119–134). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2006). *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in the United States*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2010). *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism & racial inequality in contemporary American* (3rd ed.). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (2000). *Reproduction in education, society and culture* (2nd ed., R. Nice, Trans.). London: Sage. (Original work published 1977)

Bragg, S. (2001). Taking a joke: Learning from the voices we don't want to hear. *Forum*, *43*(2), 70–73.

Brayboy, B. M. J. (2005). Toward a tribal critical race theory in Education. *The Urban Review*, *37*(5), 425–446.

Brayboy, B. M. J. (2013). Tribal critical race theory: An origin story and future directions. In M. Lynn & A. D. Dixson (Eds.), *The handbook of critical race theory in education* (pp. 88–100). New York, NY: Routledge.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Brown, K., & Jackson, D. D. (2013). The history and conceptual elements of critical race theory. In M. Lynn & A. D. Dixson (Eds.), *Handbook of critical race theory in education* (pp. 9–22). New York, NY: Routledge.

Brunsma, D., Delgado, D., & Rockquemore, K. A. (2013). Liminality in the multiracial experience: Towards a concept of identity matrix. *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power*, *20*(5), 481–502.

Calmore, J. O. (1992). Critical race theory, Archie Shepp and fire music: Securing an authentic intellectual life in a multicultural world. *Southern California Law Review*, *65*, 2129–2230.

Carroll, G. (1998). *Environmental stress and African Americans: The other side of the moon*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Castañeda, C., & Zúñiga, X. (2013). Race as a sociopolitical construction. In M. Adams, W. Blumenfeld, C. Castañeda, H. Hackman, M. Peters, & X. Zúñiga (Eds.), *Readings for diversity and social justice* (3rd ed.; pp. 58–60). New York, NY: Routledge.

Chang, R. S. (1993). Toward an Asian American legal scholarship: Critical race theory, post-structuralism, and narrative space. *California Law Review*, *19*, 1243–1323.

Chapman, T. K. (2013). Origins of and connections to social justice in critical race theory in education. In M. Lynn & A. Dixson (Eds.), *Handbook of critical race theory in education* (pp. 101–112). New York, NY: Routledge.

Clark, D. A., Spanierman, L. B., Reed, T. D., Soble, J. R., & Cabana, S. (2011). Documenting weblog expressions of racial microaggressions that target American Indians. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *4*, 39–50.

Code, L. (2000). *Encyclopedia of feminist theories*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Cole, D., & Ahmadi, S. (2010). Reconsidering campus diversity: An examination of Muslim students' experiences. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *81*(2), 121–139.

Collins, P. H. (2000). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Cook, D. A. (2013). Blurring the boundaries: The mechanics of creating composite characters. In M. Lynn & A. Dixson (Eds.), *Handbook of critical race theory in education* (pp. 181–194). New York, NY: Routledge.

Cook-Sather, A. (2007). Resisting the impositional potential of student voice work: Lessons for liberatory educational research from poststructuralist feminist critiques of critical pedagogy. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, *28*(3), 389–403.

Covarrubias, A., & Velez, V. (2013). Critical race quantitative intersectionality: An anti-racist research paradigm that refuses to "let the numbers speak for themselves." In M. Lynn & A. D. Dixson (Eds.), *Handbook of critical race theory in education* (pp. 270–285). New York, NY: Routledge.

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory, and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, *140*, 139–168.

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

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Crocker, J., & Major, B. (1989). Social stigma and self-esteem: The self-protective properties of stigma. *Psychological Review*, *96*, 608–630.

Daniel, C. (2007). Outsiders-within: Critical race theory, graduate education and barriers to professionalization. *Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*, *34*(1), 25–42.

Daniel, G. R., Kina, L., Dariotis, W. M., Fojas, C. (2014). Emerging paradigms in critical mixed race studies. *Journal of Critical Mixed Race Studies*, *1*(1), 6–65.

de Certeau, M. (1984). *The practice of everyday life* (S. Rendall, Trans.). Berkeley: University of California Press. (Original work published 1974)

DeCuir, J. T., & Dixson, A. D. (2004). "So when it comes out, they aren't that surprised that it is there": Using critical race theory as a tool of analysis of race and racism in education. *Educational Researcher*, *33*(5), 26–31.

DeCuir-Gunby, J. T., & Walker-DeVose, D. C. (2013). Expanding the counterstory: The potential for critical race mixed methods studies in education. In M. Lynn & A. D. Dixson (Eds.), *The handbook of critical race theory in education* (pp. 248–259). New York, NY: Routledge.

Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2001). *Critical race theory: An introduction*. New York, NY: NYU Press.

Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2013). Discerning critical moments. In M. Lynn & A. D. Dixson (Eds.), *Handbook of critical race theory in education* (pp. 23–33). New York, NY: Routledge.

Delgado Bernal, D. (2002). Critical race theory, Latino critical theory, and critical raced-gendered epistemologies: Recognizing students of color as holders and creators of knowledge. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *8*(1), 105–126.

Delgado Bernal, D., & Villalpando, O. (2002). An apartheid of knowledge in academia: The struggle over the "legitimate" knowledge of faculty of color. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *35*(2), 169–180.

Diggs, G. A., Garrison-Wade, D. F., Estrada, D., & Galindo, R. (2009). Smiling faces and colored spaces: The experiences of faculty of color pursuing tenure in the academy. *Urban Review*, *41*, 312–333.

Dixson, A. D., & Lynn, M. (2013). Introduction. In M. Lynn & A. D. Dixson (Eds.), *Handbook of critical race theory in education* (pp. 1–6). New York, NY: Routledge.

Dixson, A. D., & Rousseau, C. K. (2005). And we are still not saved: Critical race theory in education ten years later. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *8*(1), 7–27.

Donovan, R. A., Galban, D. J., Grace, R. K., Bennett, J. K., & Felicié, S. Z. (2013). Impact of racial macro- and microaggressions in Black women's lives: A preliminary analysis. *Journal of Black Psychology*, *39*(2), 185–196.

Duncan, G. A. (2002). Critical race theory and method: Rendering race in urban ethnographic research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *8*(1), 85–104.

Erikson, E. H. (1994). *Identity and the life cycle*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company. (Original work published 1959)

Evans, N. J., Forney, D. S., Guido, F. M., Patton, L. D., & Renn, K. A. (2010). *Student development in college: Theory, research and practice* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Ford, C. L., & Airhihenbuwa, C. O. (2010). Critical race theory, race equity, and public health: Toward antiracism praxis. *American Journal of Public Health*, *1009*(S1), S30–S35.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). New York, NY: Pantheon Books.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

Gallagher, K. M. (2007). *The theatre of urban: Youth and schooling in dangerous times*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Gallagher, K. M. (2008a). The art of methodology. In K. Gallagher (Ed.), *The methodological dilemma: Creative, critical, and collaborative approaches to qualitative research* (pp. 67–81). New York, NY: Routledge.

Gallagher, K. M. (Ed.). (2008b). *The methodological dilemma: Creative, critical, and collaborative approaches to qualitative research.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Gaztambide-Fernández, R. (2012). Decolonization and the pedagogies of solidarity. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education, & Society*, *1*(1), 41–67.

Goldstein, T. (2008). Performed ethnography: Possibilities, multiple commitments, and the pursuit of rigour. In K. Gallagher (Ed.), *The methodological dilemma: Creative, critical, and collaborative approaches to qualitative research* (pp. 85–102). New York, NY: Routledge.

González, K. (2002). Campus culture and the experiences of Chicano students in a predominantly white university. *Urban Education*, *37*(2), 193−218.

Grutter v. Bollinger, 539 U.S. 306 (2003).

Guido, F. M., Chávez, A. F., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2010). Underlying paradigms in student affairs research and practice. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, *47*(1), 1–22.

Harper, S. R. (Ed.). (2008). *Creating inclusive campus environments: For cross-cultural learning and student engagement*. Washington DC: NASPA Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education.

Harper, S. R. (2009a). Niggers no more: A critical race counternarrative on Black male student achievement at predominantly White colleges and universities. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *22*(6), 697–712.

Harper, S. R. (2009b). Race, interest convergence, and transfer outcomes for Black male student athletes. In L. S. Hagedorn & D. Horton Jr. (Eds.), *New Directions for Community Colleges: No. 147. Student athletes and athletics* (pp. 29–37). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Harper, S. R. (2011). Strategy and intentionality in practice. In J. H. Schuh, S. R. Jones, & S. R. Harper (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (5th ed., pp. 287–302). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Harper, S. R., & Hurtado, S. (2007). Nine themes in campus racial climates and implications for institutional transformation. In S. R. Harper & L. D. Patton (Eds.), *New Directions for Student Services: No. 120. Responding to the realities of race on campus* (pp. 7–24). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Harper, S. R., Patton, L. D., & Wooden, O. S. (2009). Access and equity for African American students in higher education: A critical race historical analysis of policy efforts. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *80*(4), 389–414.

Harris, A. P. (1990). Race and essentialism in feminist legal theory. *Stanford Law Review*, *42*, 581–616.

Harris, C. I. (1993). Whiteness as property. *Harvard Law Review*, *106*(8), 1707–1791.

Hernstein, R. J., & Murray, C. (1994). *The bell curve: Intelligence and class structure in American life*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Hill, J. S., Kim, S., & Williams, C. D. (2010). The context of racial microaggressions against Indigenous peoples: Same old racism or something new? In D. W. Sue (Ed.), *Microaggressions and marginality: Manifestation, dynamics, and impact* (pp. 105–122). New York, NY: Wiley.

hooks, b. (1990). *Yearning*. Boston, MA: South End Press.

Jackson, P. W. (1968). *Life in classrooms*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Jayakumar, U. M., Howard, T. C., Allen, W. R., & Han, J. C. (2009). Racial privilege in the professoriate: An exploration of campus climate, retention, and satisfaction. *Journal of Higher Education*, *80*(5), 538–563.

Johnston, M. P., & Nadal, K. L. (2010). Multiracial microaggressions: Exposing monoracism in everyday life and clinical practice. In D. W. Sue (Ed.), *Microaggressions and marginality: Manifestation, dynamics, and impact* (pp. 123–144). New York, NY: Wiley.

Johnston, P., & Nicholls, J. (1995). Voices we want to hear and voices we don't. *Theory into Practice*, *34*(2), 94–100.

Jones, S. R., Abes, E. S., & Quaye, S. J. (2013). Critical race theory. In S. R. Jones & E. S. Abes (Eds.), *Identity development of college students: Advancing frameworks for multiple dimensions of identity* (pp. 166–190). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Jones, S. R., & McEwen, M. K. (2000). A conceptual model of multiple dimensions of identity. *Journal of College Student Development*, *41*(1), 405–414.

Jones, S. R., Torres, V., & Arminio, J. (2014). *Negotiating the complexities of qualitative research in higher education: Fundamental elements and issues* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Josselson, R. E. (1996). *Revising herself: The story of women's identity from college to midlife*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Kincheloe, J. L. (2005). *Critical constructivism primer*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Kumasi, K. D. (2011). In B. A. U. Levinson (Ed.), *Beyond critique: Critical social theories and education* (pp. 196–219). Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1998). Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a *nice* field like education? *Qualitative Studies in Education*, *11*(1), 7–24.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2013). Critical race theory—what it is not! In M. Lynn & A. D. Dixson (Eds.), *Handbook of critical race theory in education* (pp. 34–47). New York, NY: Routledge.

Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. F., IV. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record*, *97*(1), 47–68.

Lather, P. (2008). Getting lost: Critiquing across difference as a methodological practice. In K. Gallagher (Ed.), *The methodological dilemma: Creative, critical, and collaborative approaches to qualitative research* (pp. 219–231). New York, NY: Routledge.

Lawrence, B., & Dua, E. (2005). Decolonizing antiracism. *Social Justice*, *32*(4), 120–143.

Leonardo, Z. (2002). The souls of White folk: Critical pedagogy, whiteness studies, and globalization discourse. *Race, Ethnicity, and Education*, *5*(1), 29–50.

Leonardo, Z. (2004). The color of supremacy: Beyond the discourse of "white privilege." *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *36*(2), 137–152.

Lin, A. I. (2010). Racial microaggressions directed at Asian Americans: Modern forms of prejudice and discrimination. In D. W. Sue (Ed.), *Microaggressions and marginality: Manifestation, dynamics, and impact* (pp. 85–104). New York, NY: Wiley.

Liu, A. (2009). Critical race theory, Asian Americans, and higher education. *Interactions: UCLA Journal of Education and Information Studies*, *5*(2), 1–12.

Lopez, G. R. (2003). The (racially neutral) politics of education: A critical race perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *39*(1), 68–94.

Love, B. J. (2004). Brown plus 50 counter-storytelling. A critical race theory analysis of the "majoritarian achievement gap" story. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *37*, 227–246.

Lynn, M., & Adams, M. (2002). Introductory overview to the special issue critical race theory and education: Recent developments in the field. *Equity &Excellence in Education*, *35*(2), 87–92.

Lynn, M., & Parker, L. (2002). What's race got to do with it? Critical race theory's conflicts with and connections to qualitative research methodology and epistemology. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *8*(1), 7–22.

Lynn, M., Yosso, T. J., Solórzano, D. G., & Parker, L. (2002). Critical race theory and education: Qualitative research in the new millennium. *Qualitative Inquiry 8*(1), 3–6.

Macpherson, W. (1999). *Stephen Lawrence inquiry*. London, England: HMSO.

Manning, K. (2009). Philosophical underpinnings of student affairs work on difference. *About Campus*, *14*(2), 11–17.

Manning, K. (2013). *Organizational theory in higher education.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Manning, K., & Muñoz, F. M. (2011). Conclusion: Re-visioning the future of multicultural student services. In D. L. Stewart (Ed.), *Multicultural student services on campus: Building bridges, re-visioning community* (pp. 282–299). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Matsuda, M. J., Lawrence, C. R., III, Delgado, R., & Crenshaw, K. W. (1993). *Word that wound: Critical race theory, assaultive speech, and the first amendment*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

McCabe, J. (2009). Racial and gender microaggressions on a predominantly White campus: Experiences of Black, Latina/o and White undergraduates. *Race, Gender, & Class*, *16*(1–2), 133–151.

McCall, L. (2005). The complexity of intersectionality. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, *30*(3), 1771–1800.

McCoy, D. L. (2014). A phenomenological exploration of the experiences of first-generation Students of Color at one "extreme" predominantly White institution. *College Student Affairs Journal*, *32*(1), 155–169.

McIntosh, P. (2012). White privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack. In P. Rothenberg (Ed.), *White privilege: Essential readings on the other side of privilege* (4th ed., pp. 121–125). New York, NY: Worth.

Mertens, D. M. (2003). Mixed methods and the politics of human research: The transformative-emancipatory perspective. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed methods in social behavioral research* (pp. 135–166). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Milner, H. R., IV. (2007). Race, culture, and researcher positionality. Working through dangers, seen, unseen, and unforeseen. *Educational Researcher*, *36*(7), 388–400.

Minikel-Lacocque, J. (2013). Racism, college, and the power of words: Racial microaggressions reconsidered. *American Educational Research Journal*, *50*(3), 432–465.

Muñoz, F. M. (2009). Critical race theory and the landscapes of higher education. *The Vermont Connection*, *30*, 53–62.

Museus, S. D. (2013). *Asian American students in higher education*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Museus, S. D., & Iftikar, J. (2013, April). *AsianCrit: Toward an Asian critical theory in education.* Paper presented at the 2013 Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Museus, S. D., & Jayakumar, U. M. (Eds.). (2012). *Creating campus cultures: Fostering success among racially diverse student populations*. New York, NY: Routledge.

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

Museus, S. D., Ravello, J. N., & Vega, B. E. (2012). The campus racial culture: A critical race counterstory. In S. D. Museus & U. M. Jayakumar (Eds.), *Creating campus cultures: Fostering success among racially diverse student populations* (pp. 28–45). New York, NY: Routledge.

Pasque, P. A., Carducci, R., Kuntz, A. M., & Gildersleeve, R. E. (2012). Qualitative inquiry for equity in higher education: Methodological innovations, implications, and interventions. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, *37*(6). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Patton, L. D. (2010). *Culture centers in higher education: Perspectives on identity, theory, and practice*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Patton, L. D., & Catching, C. (2009). "Teaching while Black": Narratives of African American student affairs faculty. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *22*(6), 713–728.

Patton, L. D., McEwen, M., Rendón, L., & Howard-Hamilton, M. F. (2007). Critical race perspectives on theory in student affairs. In S. R. Harper & L. D. Patton (Eds.), *New Directions for Student Services: No. 120. Responding to the realities of race on campus* (pp. 39–53). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Patton, L. D., Ranero, J., & Everett, K. (2011). Engaging race in multicultural student services. In D. L. Stewart (Ed.), *Multicultural student services on campus: Building bridges, re-visioning community* (pp. 63–80). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Pierce, C. M. (1969). Is bigotry the basis of the medical problems of the ghetto? In J. C. Norman (Ed.), *Medicine in the ghetto* (pp. 301–312). New York, NY: Meredith.

Pierce, C., Carew, J., Pierce-Gonzalez, D., & Wills, D. (1978). An experiment in racism: TV commercials. In C. Pierce (Ed.), *Television and education* (pp. 62–88). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Pittman, C. T. (2012). Racial microaggressions: The narratives of African American faculty at a predominantly White university. *The Journal of Negro Education*, *81*(1), 82–92.

Quaye, S. J., & Chang, S. H. (2012). Fostering cultures of inclusion in the classroom: From marginality to mattering. In S. D. Museus & U. M. Jayakumar (Eds.), *Creating campus cultures: Fostering success among racially diverse student populations* (pp. 88–105). New York, NY: Routledge.

Rawlins, W. K. (2003). Hearing voices/learning questions. In R. P. Clair (Ed.), *Expressions of ethnography: Novel approaches to qualitative methods* (pp. 119–125). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Renn, K. A. (2012). *Mixed race students in college: The ecology of race, identity, and community on campus*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Renn, K. A., & Patton, L. D. (2010). Campus ecology and environments. In J. Schuh, S. R. Jones, & S. R. Harper (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (pp. 242–256). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Rivera, D. P., Forquer, E. E., & Rangel, R. (2010). Microagressions and the life experience of Latina/o Americans. In D. W. Sue (Ed.), *Microaggressions and marginality: Manifestation, dynamics, and impact* (pp. 59–84). New York, NY: Wiley.

Rodricks, D. J., & McCoy, D. L. (in press). Developing a "critical student affairs servant pedagogy": Provocations for the culturally-responsive scholar-practitioner. In J. A. Aiken, L. Flash, W. Heading-Grant, & F. Miller (Eds.), *Theory to practice: Fostering diverse and inclusive campus environments*. Ypsilanti, MI: NCPEA Press.

Roithmayr, D. (1999). Introduction to critical race theory in educational research and praxis. In L. Parker, D. Deyle, & S. Villenas (Eds.), *Race is … race isn't: Critical race theory and qualitative studies in education* (pp. 1–6). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Rothenberg, P. (2007). Half-empty or half-full: "Diversity" in higher education today. *Liberal Education*, *93*(1), 44–49.

Santamaría, L. J. (2013). Critical change for the greater good: Multicultural dimensions of educational leadership toward social justice and educational equity. *Education Administration Quarterly*, *50*(3), 347–391.

Santamaría, L. J., & Jean-Marie, G. (2014). Cross-cultural dimensions of applied, critical, and transformational leadership: Women principals advancing social justice and educational equity. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, *44*(3), 333–360.

Santamaría, L. J., & Santamaría, A. P. (2012). *Applied critical leadership in education: Choosing change*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Schuh, J., Jones, S. R., & Harper, S. R. (Eds.). (2011). *Student services: A handbook for the profession*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Shotton, H. (2008). *Pathway to the Ph.D.: Experiences of high-achieving American Indian females.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma.

Smith, A. (2010). Heteropatriarchy and the three pillars of white supremacy: Rethinking women of color organizing. In M. Adams, W. Blumenfeld, C. Castañeda, H. Hackman, M. Peters, & X. Zúñiga (Eds.), *Readings for diversity and social justice* (2nd ed., pp. 88–93). New York, NY: Routledge. (Original work published 2006)

Smith, W. A. (2004). Black faculty coping with racial battle fatigue: The campus racial climate in a post-civil rights era. In D. Cleveland (Ed.), *A long way to go: Conversations about race by African American faculty and graduate students at predominantly white institutions* (pp. 171–190). New York, NY: Lang.

Smith, W. A., Allen, W. R., & Danley, L. L. (2007). "Assume the position … you fit the description": Psychosocial experiences and racial battle fatigue among African American male college students. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *51*(4), 551–578.

Smith, W. A., Hung, M., & Franklin, J. D. (2011). Racial battle fatigue and the *mis*education of Black men: Racial microaggressions, societal problems, and environmental stress. *Journal of Negro Education*, *80*(1), 63–82.

Solórzano, D. G. (2013). Critical race theory's intellectual roots: My email epistolary with Derrick Bell. In M. Lynn & A. D. Dixson (Eds.), *The handbook of critical race theory in education* (pp. 48–68). New York, NY: Routledge.

Solórzano, D. G., Ceja, M., & Yosso, T. (2000). Critical race theory, racial microaggressions, and campus racial climate: The experiences of African American college students. *The Journal of Negro Education*, *69*(1/2), 60–73.

Solórzano, D. G., & Delgado Bernal, D. (2001). Examining transformational resistance through a critical race and LatCrit theory framework: Chicana and Chicano student in an urban context. *Urban Education*, *36*(3), 308–342.

Solórzano, D. G., Villalpando, O., & Oseguera, L. (2005). Educational inequities and Latina/o undergraduate students in the United States: A critical race analysis of their educational progress. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, *4*(3), 272–294.

Solórzano, D. G., & Yosso, T. J. (2001). Critical race and LatCrit theory and method: Counter-storytelling. Chicana and Chicano graduate school experiences. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, *14*(4), 471–495.

Solórzano, D. G., & Yosso, T. J. (2002). Critical race methodology: Counter storytelling as an analytical framework for educational research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *8*(1), 23–44.

Spivak, G. C. (1987). *In other words: Essays in cultural politics.* New York, NY: Methuen.

Stanley, C. A. (2006). Coloring the academic landscape: Faculty of color breaking the silence in predominantly White colleges and universities. *American Educational Research Journal*, *43*(4), 701–736.

Stanley, C. A. (2007). When counter-narrative meets master narratives in the journal editorial-review process. *Educational Researcher*, *36*(1), 14–24.

Steele, C. M., & Aronson, J. (1995). Stereotype threat and the intellectual test performance of African Americans. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *69*(5), 797–811.

Stewart, D. L. (Ed.). (2011). *Multicultural student services on campus: Building bridges, re-visioning community*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Stovall, D. (2004). School leader as negotiator: Critical race theory, praxis, and the creation of productive space. *Multicultural Education*, *12*(2), 8–12.

Strange, C. C., & Banning, J. H. (2001). *Educating by design: Creating campus learning environments that work*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Sue, D. W., Capodilupo, C. M., Nadal, K. L., & Torino, G. C. (2008). *American Pyschologist*, *63*(4), 277–279.

Sue, D. W., Capodilupo, C. M., Torino, G. C., Bucceri, J. M., Holder, A. M. B., Nadal, K. L., & Esquilin, M. (2007). Racial microaggressions in everyday life: Implications for clinical practice. *American Psychologist*, *62*(4), 271–286.

Tate, W. F., IV. (1997). Critical race theory and education: History, theory, and implications. *Review of Research in Education*, *22*, 195–247.

Tatum, B. D. (1997). *Why are all the Black kids sitting together in the cafeteria? And other conversations about race*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Taylor, E. (1998). A primer on critical race theory: Who are the critical race theorists and what are they saying? *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education*, *19*, 122–124.

Taylor, E. (2000). Critical race theory and interest convergence in the backlash against affirmative action: Washington state and Initiative 200. *Teachers College Record*, *102*(3), 539–560.

Taylor, E. (2009). The foundations of critical race theory in education: An introduction. In E. Taylor, D. Gillborn, & G. Ladson-Billings (Eds.), *Foundations of critical race theory in education* (pp. 1–13). New York, NY: Routledge.

Teddlie, C., & Tashakkori, A. (2009). *Foundations of mixed methods research. Integrating quantitative and qualitative approaches in social and behavioral sciences*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Teranishi, R. T. (2007). Race, ethnicity, and higher education policy: The use of critical quantitative research. In F. K. Stage (Ed.), *New Directions for Institutional Research: No. 133. Using quantitative data to answer critical questions* (pp. 37–49). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Teranishi, R. T., Behringer, L. B., Grey, E. A., & Parker, T. L. (2009). Critical race theory and research on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders in higher education. In S. D. Museus (Ed.), *New Directions for Institutional Research: No. 142. Conducting research on Asian Americans in higher education* (pp. 57–68). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Torres, V., Jones, S. R., & Renn, K. A. (2009). Identity development theories in student affairs: Origins, current status, and new approaches. *Journal of College Student Development*, *50*(6), 577–596.

Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeniety, Education, and Society*, *1*(1), 1–40.

Tuitt, F., Hanna, M., Martinez, L. M., Salazar, M. d. C., & Griffin, R. (2009). Teaching in the line of fire: Faculty of Color in the academy. *Thought & Action*, *25*, 65–74.

Valdes, F., Culp, J. M., & Harris, A. P. (2002). *Crossroads, directions, and a new critical race theory*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Varlotta, L. E., & Jones, B. C. (Eds.). (2011). *New Directions for Student Services: No. 129. Student affairs budgeting and financial management in the midst of fiscal crisis*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Villalpando, O. (2004). Practical considerations of critical race theory and Latino critical theory for Latino college students. In A. M. Ortiz (Ed.), *New Directions for Student Services: No. 105. Addressing the unique needs of Latino American students* (pp. 41–50). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Walby, S. (1990). *Theorizing patriarchy*. Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell.

Watkins, N. L., LaBarrie, T. L., & Appio, L. M. (2010). Black undergraduates experiences with perceived racial microaggressions in predominantly White colleges and universities. In D. W. Sue (Ed.), *Microaggressions and marginality: Manifestation, dynamics, and impact* (pp. 25–54). New York, NY: Wiley.

West, C. (1994). *Race matters*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Wilkins, C. L. (2007). *The aesthetics of equity: Notes on race, space, architecture, and music*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Worthington, R. L., Navarro, R. L., Loewy, M., & Hart, J. (2008). Color-blind racial attitudes, social dominance orientation, racial-ethnic group membership and college students' perceptions of campus climate. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *1*(1), 8–19.

Writer, J. H. (2008). Unmasking, exposing, and confronting: Critical race theory, tribal critical race theory and multicultural education. *International Journal of Multicultural Education*, *10*(2), 1–15.

Yep, G. A. (2003). The violence of heteronormativity in communication studies: Notes on injury, healing, and queer world-making. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *45*(2–4), 11–59.

Yosso, T. J. (2002). Toward a critical race curriculum. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *35*(2), 93–107.

Yosso, T. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race, Ethnicity, and Education*, *8*(1), 71–93.

Yosso, T., & Lopez, C. B. (2010). Counterspaces in a hostile place. In L. Patton (Ed.), *Culture centers in higher education: Perspectives on identity, theory, and practice* (pp. 83–104). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Yosso, T. J., Parker, L., Solórzano, D. G., & Lynn, M. (2004). From Jim Crow to affirmative action and back again: A critical race discussion of racialized rationales and access to higher education. *Review of Research in Higher Education*, *28*, 1–25.

Yosso, T., Smith, W. A., Ceja, M., & Solórzano, D. (2009). Critical race theory, racial microaggressions, and campus racial climate for Latina/o undergraduates. *Harvard Educational Review*, *79*(4), 659–690.

Name Index

T

V

W

Y

Z

Subject Index

About the Authors

Dorian L. McCoy is an assistant professor in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. He received his PhD from Louisiana State University and A&M College in educational leadership and research. His research focuses on the experiences of the historically underrepresented in higher education. His recent work has focused on Students of Color's access and transition to graduate education. He has articles published or forthcoming in *The Journal of College Student Development, College Student Affairs Journal, The Journal of Diversity in Higher Education,* and *The Journal of Higher Education.*

Dirk J. Rodricks is a doctoral student in Critical Studies in Curriculum and Pedagogy at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) of the University of Toronto. His research interests include critical race theory, drama as methodology and intervention, and issues of access to higher education and the relations of schooling *in* and *through* the "third space."