Using critical race theory and Latina/Latino critical race theory as a framework, this article utilizes the methods of qualitative inquiry and counterstorytelling to examine the construct of student resistance. The authors use two events in Chicana/Chicano student history—the 1968 East Los Angeles school walkouts and the 1993 UCLA student strike for Chicana and Chicano studies. Using these two methods and events, the authors extend the concept of resistance to focus on its transformative potential and its internal and external dimensions. The authors describe and analyze a series of individual and focus group interviews with women who participated in the 1968 East Los Angeles high school walkouts. The article then introduces a counterstory that briefly listens in on a dialogue between two data-driven composite characters, the Professor and an undergraduate student named Gloria. These characters’ experiences further illuminate the concepts of internal and external transformational resistance.

East Los Angeles School walkouts: In 1968, people witnessed a worldwide rise in student movements in countries such as France, Italy, Mexico, and the United States. In March of that year, more than 10,000 students walked out of the predominately Chicana and...
Chicano high schools in East Los Angeles to protest the inferior quality of their education. For many years prior to the walkouts, East Los Angeles community members made unsuccessful attempts to create change and to improve the educational system through mainstream accepted channels. These formal requests went unanswered. As a result of the poor educational conditions and the fact that numerous attempts to voice community concerns were ignored, students boycotted classes and presented an official list of grievances to the Los Angeles School District’s Board of Education. The list consisted of 36 demands, including smaller class sizes, bilingual education, and more emphasis on Chicano history. The students received national attention and earned support from numerous people and organizations both inside and outside of the East Los Angeles communities.

UCLA Chicana and Chicano studies protests: Twenty-five years later, in 1993, a multiethnic group of students occupied the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) Faculty Center to protest the chancellor’s decision to not support the expansion of the Chicano Studies Program to departmental status. Indeed, his lack of support was viewed by many students, faculty members, and community organizations as a precursor to dismantling the Chicano Studies Program. The occupation of the Faculty Center ended when more than 100 students were arrested and taken to jail. In the aftermath of the arrests, a second protest was planned. Students organized a hunger strike at the center of the UCLA campus. For about 2 weeks, there were numerous daily demonstrations and marches both on and off the UCLA campus. Other colleges, universities, and high schools also held demonstrations in support of the eight students and one professor who participated in a hunger strike for the expansion of the Chicano Studies Program into a Chicana and Chicano Studies Department.

We open this article with these two historical examples to emphasize the varied yet consistent forms of Chicana and Chicano student resistance that have been overlooked and understudied in sociology of education research. Chicana and Chicano students have engaged and indeed do engage in resistance that is motivated by a desire to create more just and equitable learning environments. However, this resistance is almost entirely ignored by social scientists. Specifically, the small but growing body of work on the
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phenomenon of school resistance tends to focus primarily on working-class males and their self-defeating resistance. In contrast to the forms of resistance we offer as examples in the opening of this article, self-defeating resistance helps to recreate the oppressive conditions from which it originated (Foley, 1990; MacLeod, 1987; McLaren, 1993, 1994; Willis, 1977). We assert that for too long, researchers have focused on the self-defeating resistance of working-class students without acknowledging and studying other forms of resistance that may lead to social transformation. Thus far, the goal of analysis for most resistance studies has been to better understand the role individuals play in the process of social reproduction rather than investigate the possibilities for social transformation. In other words, the majority of resistance studies provide information about how youth participate in oppositional behavior that reinforces social inequality instead of offering examples of how oppositional behavior may be an impetus toward social justice.

We argue that the current resistance literature is marred by its own theoretical and conceptual limitations. Furthermore, current resistance models have yet to provide a framework to accurately explain the school resistance of Chicana and Chicano students. Using critical race theory (CRT) and Latina/Latino critical race theory (LatCrit), we build on the school resistance literature to further develop a race- and gender-conscious framework that examines and explains Chicana and Chicano student resistance in an urban context. This is particularly important in the current anti-Latino and anti-affirmative-action climate that threatens the education of Chicana and Chicano students. Chicana and Chicano students have a rich historical legacy that includes active struggles to gain equal access to quality education, and today, students remain active in the pursuit of quality education through different forms of resistance (see Acuna, 1996). It is crucial that educators, policy makers, and community workers better understand how students engage in resistance strategies that attempt to counteract the conditions and results of ineffective educational practices (Solorzano & Solorzano, 1995).
To advance our knowledge of the concept of resistance, we begin by presenting the CRT and LatCrit literature and providing five themes that form their basic assumptions, perspectives, research methods, and pedagogy in education. Second, we explore school resistance within a critical race and LatCrit framework and define the theoretical construct of *transformational resistance*. Third, to better understand the awareness and motivation of students who engage in urban school resistance, we draw historical and contemporary examples from 1968 and 1993. Specifically, we present these examples through oral history data and a CRT and LatCrit counterstory. Finally, we reflect on how a CRT and LatCrit framework challenges us to identify, acknowledge, and give empirical examples of both internal and external forms of transformative resistance, which distinguishes our work from most social scientists who study and write about school resistance.

**CRITICAL RACE THEORY AND LATINA/LATINO CRITICAL RACE THEORY**

CRT and LatCrit theory draw from and extend a broad literature base that is often termed *critical theory*. In paraphrasing Brian Fay (1987), William Tierney (1993) defined critical theory as “an attempt to understand the oppressive aspects of society in order to generate societal and individual transformation” (p. 4). Similarly, Mari Matsuda (1991) viewed critical race theory as the work of progressive legal scholars of color who are attempting to develop a jurisprudence that accounts for the role of racism in American law and that work toward the elimination of racism as part of a larger goal of eliminating all forms of subordination. (p. 1331)

LatCrit theory is similar to CRT. However, LatCrit is concerned with a progressive sense of a coalitional Latina/Latino pan-ethnicity and addresses issues often ignored by critical race theorists such as language, immigration, ethnicity, culture, identity, phenotype, and sexuality (Espinoza, 1990; Garcia, 1995; Hernandez-Truyol, 1997;
LatCrit is a theory that elucidates Latinas/Latinos’ multidimensional identities and can address the intersectionality of racism, sexism, classism, and other forms of oppression. It is a theory that has already developed a tradition of offering a strong gender analysis so that it “can address the concerns of Latinas in light of both our internal and external relationships in and with the worlds that have marginalized us” (Hernandez-Truyol, 1997, p. 885). Indeed, this tradition and its necessary intersectionality offer an important lens from which to talk about transformational resistance, especially for Chicanas. LatCrit theory is conceived as an antisubordination and antiessentialist project that attempts to link theory with practice, scholarship with teaching, and the academy with the community (“Fact Sheet: LatCrit,” 2000). However, LatCrit is not incompatible or competitive with CRT. For instance, Francisco Valdes (1996) stated, “Instead, LatCrit theory is supplementary, complementary, to critical race theory. LatCrit theory at its best should operate as a close cousin—related to critical race theory in real and lasting ways, but not necessarily living under the same roof” (pp. 26-27).

Borrowing from the law, we argue that CRT and LatCrit theory challenge the dominant discourse on race and racism as they relate to education by examining how educational theory and practice are used to subordinate and marginalize Chicana and Chicano students (R. Barnes, 1990; Bell, 1992, 1995; Calmore, 1992; Crenshaw, Gotanda, Peller, & Thomas, 1995; “Critical Race Theory in Education,” 1998; Delgado, 1989, 1995a, 1995b, 1996; Espinoza, 1990; Harris, 1994; Lawson, 1995; Matsuda, 1989; Matsuda, Lawrence, Delgado, & Crenshaw, 1993; Montoya, 1994; Olivas, 1990; P. Williams, 1991). As follows, we posit at least five themes that form the basic perspectives, research methods, and pedagogy of a CRT and LatCrit framework in education.

1. The centrality of race and racism and intersectionality with other forms of subordination. Race and racism are endemic, permanent, and in the words of Margaret Russell (1992), “a central rather than marginal factor in defining and explaining individual experiences of the law” (pp. 762-763). Although race and racism are at the
center of a critical race and LatCrit analysis, we also view them at their intersection with other forms of subordination such as gender and class discrimination (Crenshaw, 1989, 1993). As Robin Barnes (1990) stated, “Critical race scholars have refused to ignore the differences between class and race as basis for oppression. . . . Critical race scholars know that class oppression alone cannot account for racial oppression” (p. 1868). Similar to LatCrit scholars, we argue further that class and racial oppression cannot account for oppression based on gender, language, or immigration status. It is at this intersection of race, class, gender, language, and immigration status that some answers to theoretical, conceptual, and methodological questions related to Chicana and Chicano student resistance might be found.

2. The challenge to dominant ideology. A CRT and LatCrit framework in education challenges the traditional claims of the educational system to objectivity, meritocracy, color-blindness, race neutrality, and equal opportunity. Critical race and LatCrit theorists also challenge the predominant deficit frameworks used to explain Chicana and Chicano educational inequality. Critical race and LatCrit theorists argue that these traditional paradigms act as a camouflage for the self-interest, power, and privilege of dominant groups in U.S. society (Calmore, 1992). In this article, we demonstrate that student transformational resistance questions this camouflage and pushes the educational system to seriously address the education of Chicanas and Chicanos.

3. The commitment to social justice. A critical race and LatCrit framework is committed to social justice and offers a liberatory or transformative response to racial, gender, and class oppression (Matsuda, 1991). We envision a social justice research agenda that leads toward (a) the elimination of racism, sexism, and poverty and (b) the empowering of underrepresented minority groups. Critical race researchers acknowledge that educational institutions operate in contradictory ways with their potential to oppress and marginalize coexisting with their potential to emancipate and empower. Likewise, a critical race methodology in education rec-
recognizes that multiple layers of oppression and discrimination are met with multiple forms of resistance. Furthermore, we argue that one of the defining characteristics of transformational resistance is a strong commitment to social justice.

4. The centrality of experiential knowledge. A CRT and LatCrit framework recognizes that the experiential knowledge of Students of Color are legitimate, appropriate, and critical to understanding, analyzing, and teaching about racial subordination in the field of education. In fact, CRT and LatCrit educational studies view this knowledge as a strength and draw explicitly on the lived experiences of the students of color by including such methods as storytelling, family history, biographies, scenarios, parables, testimonios, cuentos, consejos, chronicles, and narratives (Bell, 1987; Carrasco, 1996; Olivas, 1990; Solorzano & Villalpando, 1998; Solorzano & Yosso, 2000; Villalpando & Delgado Bernal, in press; Villenas & Deyhle, 1999). In our analysis of Chicana and Chicano school resistance, we incorporate the experiential knowledge of students by drawing from oral history data and counterstorytelling (Delgado, 1989, 1995a, 1995b, 1996).

5. The interdisciplinary perspective. A CRT and LatCrit framework in education challenges ahistoricism and the unidisciplinary focus of most analyses and insists on analyzing race and racism in education by placing them in both an historical and contemporary context using interdisciplinary methods (Delgado, 1984, 1992; Garcia, 1995; Harris, 1994; Olivas, 1990). To empirically ground our discussion of school resistance within a CRT and LatCrit framework, we draw on data from an historical and a contemporary example of Chicana and Chicano school resistance in Los Angeles: the 1968 East Los Angeles school walkouts and the 1993 struggle for a Chicana and Chicano Studies Department at UCLA.

In this article, we take each of these five themes and where applicable apply them to the school resistance of Chicana and Chicano students. Each of these themes is not new in and of itself, but collectively, they represent a challenge to the existing modes of scholarship. In fact, borrowing and adapting the work of critical race and LatCrits scholars, we define a critical race theory of education as a
framework that can be used in theorizing about the ways in which educational structures, processes, and discourses support and promote racial subordination. CRT and LatCrit theorists acknowledge that educational structures, processes, and discourses operate in contradictory ways with their potential to oppress and marginalize coexisting with their potential to emancipate and empower. A CRT and LatCrit framework is transdisciplinary and draws on many other schools of progressive scholarship.

Indeed, a CRT and LatCrit theory of resistance is critical and different from other resistance frameworks because it (a) challenges the traditional paradigms, texts, and separate discourse on race, class, gender, language, and immigration status by showing how at least these five elements intersect to affect our understanding of Chicana and Chicano school resistance; (b) helps us focus on the racialized and gendered experiences of Chicana and Chicano high school and college students; (c) offers a liberatory or transformative response to racial, gender, and class oppression; and (d) utilizes the interdisciplinary knowledge base of ethnic studies, women's studies, sociology, history, and the law to better understand the various forms of oppression. It should be noted that a CRT and LatCrit framework is anything but uniform and static, and we use as many of the five themes as possible to examine the resistance of Chicana and Chicano students.

**TRANSFORMATIONAL RESISTANCE AS A THEORETICAL CONSTRUCT**

Theories of resistance draw on an understanding of the complexities of culture to explain the relationship between schools and the dominant society (McLaren, 1994). Resistance theories are different than social and cultural reproduction theories because the concept of resistance emphasizes that individuals are not simply acted on by structures. In contrast, resistance theories demonstrate how individuals negotiate and struggle with structures and create meanings of their own from these interactions. These theories represent a significant advance over more deterministic reproduction models of schooling by acknowledging human agency—the confidence
and skills to act on one’s behalf (Solorzano & Solorzano, 1995). Nevertheless, although resistance theories help explain Student of Color responses to social and cultural reproduction, they share a failure of these reproduction theories by not emphasizing the importance of working toward social justice.

Most resistance research focuses on a self-defeating resistance in which students’ behavior implicates them even further in their own domination (Fine, 1991; Foley, 1990; MacLeod, 1987; McLaren, 1993, 1994; Willis, 1977). A very small number of studies address female school resistance, and most of those examine aggressive sexuality as the only manifestation of resistance (McRobbie, 1978; Ohron, 1993; Thomas, 1980). The few studies that examine more positive forms of female school resistance in which students are motivated by social justice concerns focus on overt forms of resistance and do not explicitly examine more subtle forms of resistance (Delgado Bernal, 1997; Fuller, 1980, 1983; Robinson & Ward, 1991; Ward, 1996).

Within this body of literature, student resistance has been conceptualized in many different ways. Most often, it has been defined and used to include a narrow range of students who at one end are simply acting out in class without any critique of the social conditions that may contribute to their disruptive behavior. At the other end of the spectrum are students who have a strong critique of their oppressive social conditions but who ultimately help re-create these conditions through their own self-defeating resistant behavior. To expand on this narrow range of so-called resistant behavior, we draw from a study of Chicana school resistance that provides a framework to better understand different types of Chicana and Chicano school resistance (Delgado Bernal, 1997). The study provides a distinction between the following four different types of student oppositional behavior: (a) reactionary behavior, (b) self-defeating resistance, (c) conformist resistance, and (d) transformational resistance. These different types of oppositional behavior are depicted in Figure 1 and are based on an adaptation of Henry Giroux’s (1983a, 1983b) notion that resistance has the following two intersecting dimensions: (a) Students must have a critique of social oppression, and (b) students must be motivated by an interest...
in social justice. The distinction between the four behaviors is not static or rigid, and neither are these behaviors inclusive of all types of oppositional behavior. In addition, the quadrants should not be seen as discrete and static entities, but rather, within each quadrant is a range of a student’s critique of social oppression and motivation for social justice. We also acknowledge that the manifestations of these four categories may be different among females and males. Following, we provide a brief description of the four oppositional forms of behavior and then discuss a more detailed understanding of transformational resistance.

Reactionary behavior. The first type of oppositional behavior is not a form of resistance because the student lacks both a critique of her or his oppressive conditions and is not motivated by social justice. An example of reactionary behavior is the student who acts out or behaves poorly in class, the schoolyard, or the community and has no critique of the social conditions that may contribute to her or his disruptive behavior. In addition, the student is not motivated by an interest in social justice and may challenge the teacher or other authority figures “just for kicks” or “to see the teacher sweat.”

Self-defeating resistance. This is the traditional notion of school resistance. Self-defeating resistance refers to students who may have some critique of their oppressive social conditions but are not motivated by an interest in social justice. These students engage in behavior that is not transformational and in fact helps to re-create the oppressive conditions from which it originated. An example of self-defeating resistance is the high school dropout who may have a compelling critique of the schooling system but then engages in behavior (dropping out of school) that is self-defeating and does not help transform her or his oppressive status (at least not in the long run) (see Fine, 1991). Although the construct of self-defeating resistance acknowledges human agency, one might argue that it does so in a limited way by only considering a partial understanding of the systems of oppression and demonstrating behaviors that can be destructive to oneself or others.
Conformist resistance. The third type of resistance refers to the oppositional behavior of students who are motivated by a need for social justice yet hold no critique of the systems of oppression. These students are motivated by a desire to struggle for social justice yet engage in activities and behavior within a more liberal tradition. They want life chances to get better for themselves and others but are likely to blame themselves, their families, or their culture for the negative personal and social conditions. They offer “Band-Aids” to take care of symptoms of the problem rather than deal with the structural causes of the problem. In other words, these students choose to strive toward social justice within the existing social systems and social conventions. However, based on this classification scheme, this behavior is resistant because the student
exhibits one of Giroux’s (1983a, 1983b) criteria—being motivated by the goal of social justice. An example is the student who thinks the best way to change the high drop-out rate at her or his school would be to offer tutoring and counseling so that the dropouts can adapt to the ways of the school. The student would probably not challenge institutional practices, question the relevancy of the pedagogy and curriculum, or examine the effect of socioeconomic factors. Although some social change is possible through conformist resistance, without a critique of the social, cultural, or economic forms of oppression, it does not offer the greatest possibility for social justice.

Transformational resistance. The fourth form of resistance refers to student behavior that illustrates both a critique of oppression and a desire for social justice. In other words, the student holds some level of awareness and critique of her or his oppressive conditions and structures of domination and must be at least somewhat motivated by a sense of social justice. With a deeper level of understanding and a social justice orientation, transformational resistance offers the greatest possibility for social change. This type of resistance differs from the self-defeating resistance of Michelle Fine’s (1991) dropouts because it does not serve to strengthen the oppression and domination of the person. The manifestations of transformational resistance can take on many forms but will look very different than the “street-corner” behavior that often implicates students even further in their own oppression (McLaren, 1993).

In her work on critical media literacy, Tara Yosso (2000) built on this model of resistance and examined some of the many manifestations of Chicana and Chicano students’ transformational resistance, including their attempt to “prove others wrong.” Proving them wrong seems to be a process in which students “(a) confront the negative portrayals and ideas about Chicanas/os, (b) are motivated by these negative images and ideas, and (c) are driven to navigate through the educational system for themselves and other Chicanas/os” (p. 109). She elaborated on the arsenal of subtle strategies that students engage in during the process of resistance and
extended transformational resistance to include resilient resistance. She defined resilient resistance as "surviving and/or succeeding through the educational pipeline as a strategic response to visual microaggressions" (p. 180). Resilient resistance is at the intersection between conformist and transformational resistance where the strategies students use “leave the structures of domination intact, yet help the students survive and/or succeed” (p. 181).

In related work, Tracy Robinson and Janie Ward (1991) identified and examined the following two kinds of resistance when speaking of African American adolescent females: (a) resistance for survival and (b) resistance for liberation (also see Ward, 1996). They defined resistance for liberation as “resistance in which Black girls and women are encouraged to acknowledge the problems of, and to demand change in, an environment that oppresses them” (p. 89). Indeed, our construct of transformational resistance is similar to Robinson and Ward’s (1991) resistance for liberation, and similar to Yosso’s (2000) resilient resistance. These theoretical constructs counter what seem to be the common assumptions among those who have studied and written about the self-defeating school resistance of working-class students. Peter McLaren (1993) stated, “Resistance among working-class students rarely occurs through legitimate channels of checks and balances that exist in educational organizations. Rather, resistance among the disaffected and disenfranchised are often tacit, informal, unwitting and unconscious” (p. 147).

We argue that transformational resistance framed within the tenets of a CRT and LatCrit framework allows one to look at resistance among Students of Color that is political, collective, conscious, and motivated by a sense that individual and social change is possible. Because researchers tend to focus on the self-defeating resistance of working-class students without acknowledging and studying the more positive forms of school resistance, we provide examples of Chicana and Chicano student resistance that are based on an awareness and critique of social oppression and are motivated by an interest in social justice.
UNDERSTANDING TRANSFORMATIONAL RESISTANCE: AWARENESS AND MOTIVATION IN THE 1968 EAST LOS ANGELES STUDENT WALKOUTS

We acknowledge that transformational resistance is not self-explanatory and that the awareness and motivation of the student is crucial to its identification and analysis. Therefore, it is nearly impossible for a researcher or educator to accurately assess a behavior as resistance without communicating with and learning from the student’s perspective and delving deeply into the historical and sociopolitical context that formed the behavior. To demonstrate that the students we write about were aware of and had a critique of social oppression and were motivated by a need to struggle for social justice, we provide their voices that speak to how and why they became involved in school resistance.

In the case of Chicanas who participated in the 1968 school walkouts, the oral history data show that personal and family background and mentors and role models greatly contributed to their awareness and motivation toward social justice (Delgado Bernal, 1997). It was often through their parents’ community involvement, political action, or compassion for others that these women first began to develop a critical consciousness that explored the inequalities of society. One woman describes how her mother’s community involvement was early training for her participation in the school blowouts.

God, my mother was always active in the community, and in the schools. She formed the mother’s club and she was in the PTA. And as I got older, she used to drag me along, that was her way of keeping me busy and out of trouble, given the neighborhood that we lived in cause we lived in the housing projects, federal housing projects. She used to drive me along to meetings and I would help her . . . so I had that early training. (Crisostomo, 1995, p. 5)

Another woman remembers how various factors came together with her father’s influence to help her develop a greater awareness of the resource discrepancies in her working-class neighborhood.
Well my father is a long-term labor leader in the community, from the 40s and even through the zoot stuff. So he comes from a life, a lifelong struggle. So it was through him and working-class values, working-class neighborhood, and then going to these meetings, these were instrumental in formulating, crystallizing for me the discrepancies in our communities. (Cuaron, 1996, p. 5)

Still another woman explains that she did not grow up in a politically active family, and neither did anyone spell out issues of social or economic oppression to her. However, her mother, a devoted Catholic, was influential in instilling a strong sense of compassion for others and an identification with the poor and oppressed. She said,

You know, we were poor in Texas, but compared to the people in Mexico that were poor, we were well off, okay? And, I remember that every time we’d go across the border, my mother always, always had money to give to the poor. So I remember learning from my mother compassion for people who were suffering and for people who were poor. (Mendez Gonzalez, 1995, p. 13)

What becomes clear from the oral history data is that the social justice values that motivated these students and their awareness and critique of oppression, both of which are fundamental to their transformational resistance in school, stems from their roots and their own family and personal histories.

An additional factor that inspired these women to be concerned with social justice issues and be involved in school-related issues were mentors and role models (Delgado Bernal, 1997). In the context of this study, transformational role models are visible members of one’s own racial/ethnic and/or gender group who actively demonstrate a commitment to social justice, whereas transformational mentors use the aforementioned traits and their own experiences and expertise to help guide the development of others (Blackwell, 1988; Solorzano, 1998b). Thus, a mentor is involved in a more complex relation-ship than a role model in that she or he is someone who participates in one’s socialization and development (Solorzano, 1998b). Most of the women identify and discuss
individuals other than their parents who inspired them and gave them the support to enact their human agency—confidence and skills to act on their own behalf. These mentors were female and male adults and peers who helped them to transcend prescribed gender roles. One woman recalls how she was able to interact with a teacher who was a motivator and supporter and how he raised her awareness of poor school conditions and encouraged her to realize her potential as an individual and as part of a community.

I would listen to him and the class. And in that guidance class was where he would talk to his students about . . . [the] lack of quality education and so on and so forth. . . . A guidance class was basically where you started to plan your future. And they would give you these little tests to see what you seem to be, what your preference was. Was it clerical, was it business, was it going into science, or whatever. And, then after the test he’d say, “See, this is a bunch of bullshit. They’re trying to track you into these different things.” So you know, I was listening to him also. And he’s a very dynamic person. As a teacher he was fantastic. (Baca, 1995, p. 11)

An illustration of another type of transformational mentorship is the leadership style, personality, and behavior of individuals who were involved in the students’ extracurricular activities. Specific extracurricular experiences prior to the walkouts exposed students to a number of supportive and influential adults who began to raise their social, cultural, and/or class consciousness. One woman recalls a type of mentorship she found in the leadership style, personality, and behavior of the African American woman who was the director of the Upward Bound program.

I remember how she opened our minds too. I mean she was so outspoken. And she wasn’t afraid of anybody, White administrators, anybody. She wouldn’t tuck and hush. . . . I mean she would just say openly what she thought and she fought for it. She was such a marvelous, marvelous, courageous, outspoken woman and so intelligent, and so capable, and ready to stand up and fight for what she believed in and express it openly. So she was a marvelous role model. And when I went to Occidental [College] later on, I turned to her for a lot of mentoring. (Mendez Gonzalez, 1995, pp. 52-53)
Similar to these women, Chicana and Chicano students today often identify transformational role models and mentors as influential people who inspire and socialize them to be concerned with and struggle for social justice issues in their school and community. It is clear from the data that as young students, these women gained a social consciousness and to differing degrees embraced a critique of the educational system. They not only held an acute level of awareness and critique of oppression, but the data indicate they were also motivated by an interest in social justice and transforming the inequitable and unjust schooling system that was failing to educate them. Thus, based on their level of awareness and their motivation, their participation in the school walkouts was indeed an act of transformational resistance. Having identified students’ awareness and motivation, we now turn to two ways in which students might engage in transformational resistance.

**TWO CATEGORIES OF TRANSFORMATIONAL RESISTANCE**

Transformational resistance can be divided into two different types, internal and external (Delgado Bernal, 1997). External transformational resistance is often easier to identify and analyze than internal transformational resistance, yet both have been widely ignored in school resistance studies. Although we outline these as two separate concepts, there is an overlap between the two. In fact, they are fluid, and individuals can engage in both simultaneously or at different points in time.

*Internal resistance.* The behavior of internal transformational resistance appears to conform to institutional or cultural norms and expectations, however individuals are consciously engaged in a critique of oppression. Students maintain both criteria of transformational resistance, yet their behavior is subtle or even silent and might go unnamed as transformational resistance. One example is the Student of Color who holds a critique of cultural and economic oppression and is motivated to go to graduate school by a desire to engage in a social justice struggle against this oppression.
This student might hope to give back to her or his community through a service profession in the teaching, medical, social work, or legal fields. The student maintains both criteria of transformational resistance, but on the surface, her or his behavior appears to conform to societal and maybe parental expectations. That is, they are doing well in school, pursuing a higher education, and their outward behavior may not overtly indicate any semblance of social justice. This is not conformist resistance because on further and deeper analysis, the student does in fact have a social justice agenda to “give back” to her community in the form of education and social service.

Another, somewhat different example of internal transformational resistance can be seen through the experiences of a Chicana who participated in the 1968 walkouts by using her “goody-two-shoes” image and light-colored skin to gain access to the principal of Lincoln High School. At the high school, her key role was to set up a meeting with the principal and detain him while other college students came on campus to encourage high school students to participate in the walkouts. This student recalls the strategy at Lincoln High School and how her somewhat “passive” role allowed other students to engage in a more overt or active form of resistance.

I remember we had a whole strategy planned for Lincoln, how we were going to do it. And who was going to be in the halls to yell “Walkouts” at the various buildings. And my role was to make an appointment with the principal to meet him, to talk to him about either employment or something. I’m in his office and my job is trying to delay him. He kept saying, “I’ll be right with you, I’ll be right with you.” So I was to just keep him distracted a little bit. (Castro, 1995, p. 5)

External resistance. Individuals who engage in external transformational resistance also hold both criteria of transformational resistance. In addition, external transformational resistance involves a more conspicuous and overt type of behavior, and the behavior does not conform to institutional or cultural norms and expectations. A good example is the civil rights worker who participated in boycotts and demonstrations in the hopes of securing the integration of public facilities. This type of resistance differs from
internal transformational resistance because it is openly visible and overtly operates outside the traditional system. Another example is the writings of many Chicana scholar activists such as Mary Pardo (1990, 1991, 1998), Gloria Anzaldúa (1987), and Adaljiza Sosa-Riddell (1974, 1993) or Chicana law professors Leslie Espinoza (1990) and Margaret Montoya (1994). Through their scholarship, these women challenge the institutionalized notions of knowledge from within the academy. Although the act of political writing can be a form of internal transformational resistance, once it is published or made public, it can be a very powerful form of external transformational resistance.

Students can participate in multiple forms of transformational resistance. For instance, the student who participated in a form of internal resistance by using her “goody-two-shoes” image to distract the principal at Lincoln High School also had other roles and responsibilities during the walkouts that exhibited a form of an external resistance. For example, it was her responsibility to use her Mazda automobile to pull down the chain link fence that had been locked to prevent high school students from leaving the campus grounds. “I remember having to back my car, put on the chains, and pull the gates off” (Castro, 1995, p. 5).

Finally, it is important to note that we employ the constructs of internal and external resistance because they allow us to look at different types of resistance among Chicana and Chicano students. This resistance may be political, collective, conscious, and motivated by a sense that social justice is possible through resistant behavior. It is also important to distinguish between these two types of resistance because too often, external resistance is romanticized by liberal and progressive scholars while internal resistance is not identified, misidentified, or even ignored. Because the traditional school resistance literature does not fully explain the experiences and needs of Chicana and Chicano students, it is important to employ the theoretical constructs that more accurately interpret the realities of Chicana and Chicano students. As we have presented this framework to Chicana and Chicano undergraduate and graduate students, scholars, and activists, the feedback has overwhelmingly been related to the importance of identifying and examining
the various forms of internal and external transformative resistance. Indeed, we have found that many successful Chicana and Chicano students engage in many forms of internal resistance that are more subtle and inconspicuous than external resistance. Yet these students and others see them as equally important to identify, analyze, and affirm. Defined by the aforementioned terms, internal and external transformational resistance can provide helpful analytical concepts for looking at the lives of Chicana and Chicano students. Another method borrowed from CRT and LatCrit theory to illustrate these forms of transformative resistance is counterstorytelling (Delgado, 1989).

COUNTERSTORYTELLING:⁴ THE UCLA CHICANA AND CHICANO STUDIES PROTESTS

“The funny thing about stories is that everyone has one. My grandfather had them, with plenty to spare. When I was very young, he would regale me with stories, usually about politics, baseball, and honor. These were his themes, the subject matter he carved out for himself and his grandchildren.” (Olivas, 1990, p. 425)

“Oppressed groups have known instinctively that stories are an essential tool to their own survival and liberation.” (Delgado, 1989, p. 2436)

To integrate critical race theory with internal and external resistance, we also use a procedure that has a tradition in the social sciences, humanities, and the law—storytelling. Richard Delgado (1989) used a methodology called counterstorytelling and argued that it is both a technique of telling the story of those experiences that are not often told (i.e., those on the margins of society) and a tool for analyzing and challenging the stories of those in power and whose story is a natural part of the dominant discourse—the majoritarian story.⁷ These counterstories can serve several theoretical, methodological, and pedagogical functions, including the following: (a) They can build community among those at the margins of society by putting a human and familiar face to educational theory and practice; (b) they can challenge the perceived wisdom of those at society’s center; (c) they can open new windows into the
reality of those at the margins of society by showing the possibilities beyond the ones they live and to show that they are not alone in their position; (d) they can teach others that by combining elements from both the story and the current reality, one can construct another world that is richer than either the story or the reality alone; and (e) they can provide a context to understand and transform established belief systems (Delgado, 1989; Lawson, 1995). Storytelling has a rich and continuing tradition in African American (Bell, 1987, 1992, 1996, 1998; Berkeley Art Center, 1982; Lawrence, 1992), Chicana/Chicano (Delgado, 1989, 1995b, 1996; Olivas, 1990; Paredes, 1977), and American Indian (Deloria, 1969; Marmon, 1996; R. Williams, 1997) communities.

We want to add to this tradition by illuminating internal and external forms of resistance that many Chicana and Chicano students engage in as part of their educational experience. As another vehicle for identifying and examining transformational resistance, we draw on the 1993 UCLA Chicana and Chicano studies protests. We offer the following counterstory, which briefly allows us to listen in on a dialogue between two composite characters who are engaged in a dialogue. The Professor is a senior faculty member at UCLA, and Gloria Martinez is a third-year undergraduate student at the same university. Using the five elements of critical race theory and our definitions of internal and external transformational resistance, we ask you to suspend judgment, listen for the story’s points, test them against your own version of reality (however conceived), and use the counterstory as a theoretical, conceptual, and pedagogical case study of student resistance (see L. Barnes, Christensen, & Hansen, 1994). The Professor and Gloria meet in the Professor’s office. Their story begins here.

**AT THE PROFESSOR’S OFFICE**

It was about 5:30 in the afternoon and Gloria peeked her head through the door of my office. As she looked inside, I could see that she was visibly upset and it was a look that I haven’t seen before. She asked, “Professor, can I please talk to you in private?” I was just finishing up a meeting with a doctoral research group. “Let’s set up our next meeting date and time to continue this discussion and in the mean-
time continue with your library and fieldwork,” I said. The students left and Gloria apologized to each of them as she made her way into my office.

Gloria started right away, “Professor, you may have heard that yesterday, a group of students were staging a sit-in at the faculty center and the situation got a bit ugly.” I replied, “Yes, I was out of town yesterday, but I saw some of the clips on the news and I made a few phone calls last night to try to keep updated as to what was happening and to make sure the arrested students were okay.” Still very upset she replied, “Well, my roommate, Libertad, was arrested, so I was up all night trying to update her parents and then I picked her up from the police station a few hours ago.” Realizing she was not going to sit down in the chair I had offered, I interjected, “Gloria, let’s get a cup of coffee and continue talking about this.” As we began to walk toward the coffee shop, she seemed to begin to calm down a bit. Yet, as she began to speak I still noted a little panic in her voice. “As you may be aware Professor, this whole thing really got rolling in the last couple of weeks, when rumors started spreading around campus that the chancellor, with support of some faculty, were going to dismantle both the Chicano Studies Program [an interdisciplinary academic program that examines the experiences of Chicanas and Chicanos in the United States] and Academic Advancement Program [AAP; a minority student recruitment and retention program]. I nodded my head in agreement. Gloria went on: “When the chancellor finally made a statement that he would not support a Chicana and Chicano Studies Department, the students went into the faculty club and started a demonstration that ended in a sit-in.” Gloria continued, “I support them and their cause, but I didn’t feel right about sitting in. I stood out front and talked and argued with other students and faculty who were in opposition to the sit-in. I was trying to explain why we need Chicano Studies and AAP. I was there all afternoon. But I didn’t go in. I watched the police take Libertad and the other students away in handcuffs and then I rushed home to make sure the first way her parents heard about this wouldn’t be from the evening news. I then spent hours trying to explain to Libertad’s family the importance of this struggle. Yet, I had a hard time justifying the way in which she went about getting her point across. I mean, as ‘involved’ students, we’ve known that this was coming and many of us were trying to pick a time, method, and place to make our points. I think it was the time, but I’m not so sure about the method and place.”

As I held open the door to the coffee shop, I replied, “Gloria, you have to feel and believe strongly about these issues, especially about the tactics. If you don’t feel strongly, then you should probably think
twice. Are there other ways you can participate?” Gloria paused as we ordered and waited for our drinks. When we sat down, she took a quick sip of her steaming coffee and then began to speak even more rapidly than before, “Professor, I know this sounds like a copout, but I feel really uncomfortable about this tactic. Since I’ve been at UCLA and taken Chicano studies classes, I believe in the program even more. In fact, I often challenge other people’s misgivings about the program by sharing with non-Chicano studies faculty and students some of the research and publications of my Chicana and Chicano studies professors. I also discuss with them the importance of Chicano studies here at UCLA as well as in elementary and high schools throughout the country. I’ve tried to show my professors the importance of Chicana and Chicano studies by my own work in their classes.” Gloria stopped and made a motion with her hands as if to say, “time-out.” She stood up and went to grab a few more creamers for her coffee. She returned and continued, “By the way Professor, all my hard work is beginning to pay off. Did I tell you I made the Dean’s list and I’m doing pretty well academically?” Gloria took my class 2 years ago and I learned firsthand just how strong a student she is. As I watched her pour creamer after creamer into her cup, I commented, “It doesn’t surprise me and I’m waiting to hear about the National Association for Chicana and Chicano Studies Student Premio Award you are going to receive at the next national meeting.” Gloria got red as a beet and said, “I figured I’d get to that after I told you about the faculty center incident.”

She was right, we were getting off the track so I asked, “Gloria, how else have you advocated for Chicana and Chicano studies?” She responded, “Well, in my sociology and psychology classes, I’ve tried to focus my term papers on Chicana and Chicano topics. Some TAs and professors have been resistant to my work, but I’ve taken the time to go to their office hours to talk to them about what I’m doing and argue for Chicana and Chicano studies topics. I don’t know if I changed their attitudes, it probably didn’t, but I laid out my arguments for doing work on the lived experiences of service workers at L.A. airport hotels, the Justice for Janitors Movement in the high-rise buildings not far from UCLA, day laborers throughout Los Angeles, or our elders in senior citizen centers [see Valenzuela, 1999]. I tried to convince them with the quality of my arguments and work.” I added, “Are you saying that you’re struggling for Chicana and Chicano studies in the background and it’s the outward manifestation, the foreground, the overt resistance, that you won’t or can’t do?” Again, she paused for a moment and continued, “No, Professor, I guess I could do it, but I feel more comfortable behind the scenes. Taking a less conspicuous role.”
I knew this was hard for her and she was uncomfortable so I commented, “Gloria, you have to play the role that fits you best. It’s something many of us have had to struggle with. People say that if you don’t do things ‘this way,’ then you’re not ‘Chicana or Chicano enough.’ There have always been some arbitrary standards that so-called ‘leaders’ have set for others. At times it can become a bit ridiculous. You know Benito Juarez, the former president of Mexico once said, and I know I’ll butcher this quote, ‘Among nations, as among individuals, respect for the rights of others is peace.’ I think we have to learn to truly respect the different ways in which people struggle for social justice.”

After we finished our coffee, we started walking back to the office. Gloria continued speaking but at a more calm pace than before, “Professor, some day I may feel more comfortable in a more visible role, but for now, I feel this is how I can best help Chicana and Chicano studies. I have a friend who feels the same way but for a different reason.” I was caught off guard for a second and replied, “What do you mean?” Gloria replied, “I have this friend, Lupe, who wants to get involved but can’t. She is a permanent resident from Mexico but thinks that if she gets involved in any political activity at school or in her community the Immigration and Naturalization Service will revoke her green card and send her back to Mexico. She has such a brilliant and analytical mind, and she’s dying to show others how she feels, thinks, and can act. In class, she just sits there and has a lot to say but remains silent. Maybe it’s a form of strategic silence but it’s like she just simmers. Then after class, we sit and talk, and it all comes out.”

When we arrived at the office, there was a line of students waiting. I made a sort of general announcement, “Can you all hold on for a couple of minutes? I have a few things to talk about with this student.” The students apologized for the intrusion and waited patiently in the outer office. I returned to the conversation. “Gloria, did you know that many working people feel the same way as you and Lupe. At their job, they remain silent when their bosses say or do things to them that are wrong. In some cases, they remain silent because they’re afraid. They’re afraid because they’re not sure if their bosses will fire them if they speak out. Or many won’t speak out because speaking and acting out are new behaviors for them and things that are new take time to get used to. After a while, they may feel more comfortable. And many times, it’s when they talk to others who are going through the same thing that they begin to speak out and take action, sometimes individually and sometimes with others. You probably know that from your study of the Justice for Janitors Movement.” I thought for a moment and then continued, “I have an-
other quote that might be helpful to you, especially in these next few weeks, and it comes from the scientist Sir Isaac Newton. He said, ‘If I have seen farther, it is because I’ve stood on the shoulders of giants.’ Gloria, those students who were arrested and you and me, who are involved in the struggle in less conspicuous ways, we all owe a lot to and must acknowledge the people who have worked and struggled before us. Those who have actively demonstrated and those who worked in near solitude by themselves and never asked for or received credit. We need to acknowledge and respect those different roles that people play in the struggle for social justice.”

Gloria just stared at me and replied, “Professor, I hear what you’re saying, and I need to think this out some more. There are parts of me that want to be in both places and I’m really confused.”

Trying to help her understand the confusion, I rolled my chair toward the computer and pulled up a bibliography called “Critical Race Theory and LatCrit Theory Readings.” I scrolled through the bibliography and continued, “Gloria, here are a couple of articles I’d like you to read by Lani Guinier [1990-1991] and Regina Austin [1986] where they talk about feeling silenced in the classroom. I think they might help you and Lupe in your own struggles with these issues both inside and outside the classroom. So that you can also know that others may have been in similar situations and dealt with these issues in similar and different ways.” I walked a few steps to the file cabinet and pulled the Guinier article I was referring to. I continued, “Guinier had a similar experience when she was a law student at the Yale Law School. She wrote: ‘I had no personal anecdotes for the profound senses of alienation and isolation caught in my throat every time I opened my mouth. [. . . ] In law school I resisted through silence. Only later did I learn to question out loud’ [p. 94].”

Retrieving the Austin [1986] article, I proceeded, “Professor Austin’s comments on resistance are telling and speak to the varieties of resistance one can participate in. She found that ‘ranting and raving, while useful, has its limits and varying one’s tactics keeps the enemy off guard. Thus, the best form of resistance is often covert, unsuspected and guerrilla-like. What I have in mind is the token’s equivalent of poisoning the master’s coffee’ [p. 53].”

In my attempt to piece together Professors Guinier and Austin with Gloria’s experiences I suggested, “Although you haven’t been silenced in the same way that Lupe has, Professor Guinier’s sense of alienation and isolation and her initial resistance through silence are important insights. Also, Professor Austin’s acknowledgment of covert resistance and the less open and obvious tactics sound like parts of your and Lupe’s experience.” I went back to the computer
and typed in a “Find Command” for Audre Lorde. One of her poems came up and I asked, “Have you read Audre Lorde’s [1978] ‘Litany of Survival’? She is actually responding to those of us who struggle with silence and has something to say about resistance through poetry.” I read her poem aloud:

and when we speak we are afraid/
our words will not be heard/
nor welcomed/
but when we are silent/
we are still afraid/
So it is better to speak/
remembering/
we were never meant to survive. [pp. 31-32]

I watched a smile come over Gloria’s face and I said, “As you know, you are not alone in struggling with these issues. It is an important part of our own growth and political development.” I proceeded, “If you feel comfortable, tell your friend Lupe to come and see me and we can talk about these issues and maybe we can send her to talk to others about her rights as an immigrant student.” I remembered the students in the hallway and tried to bring closure to the conversation by stating, “I hope I was able to help?” Gloria, struggling with her backpack, replied, “Thanks Professor, you’ve given me a lot to think about.” As she got up and reached across the desk to shake my hand she responded, “I’ve got to go to work. You know I took your advice and got a work-study job in the library. I think I’ll track down some of the articles in your ‘Critical Race Theory and LatCrit Theory Bibliography.’ Thanks for the consejos and for listening to me. I’ll come and see you after my midterms next week.” “Anytime Gloria. Give my best to Libertad and please let me know how things are going.”

When Gloria left, I sat there for a minute and remembered when I was a college student in the 1960s and 1970s. I too had struggled with many of the same issues. Who was a Chicano? Who decides who is a Chicano? How do we prove we are Chicanos? How do we give back to our communities and engage in social justice? These were and continue to be personal and collective questions. It is the struggle to answer these questions that in part keeps this entity called the Chicana and Chicano Movement moving forward. Gloria’s struggle for social justice brings to light issues of internal and external forms of resistance. How do we define covert or less visible forms of resistance? And how do we begin to identify and acknowledge the less visible forms of resistance? I continued to look out the window and...
again remembered the students waiting in the hallway. I went to the
door and greeted the next group of students from MEChA [a 
Chicana and Chicano student organization] who were there to talk
about inviting the community to participate in the candlelight vigil
supporting Chicano studies that was planned for later in the week
and the possibility of my sponsoring a class on Chicana and Chi-
cano student retention at the university next quarter. Over the years,
I keep being reminded that each of us defines and struggles for so-
cial justice in our own way.

SUMMARY/CONCLUSION

“To fully understand Chicanas'[os'] resistance, it is necessary to view
their strategies within the context of their oppression—resistance
under this frame gains its full significance and non-resistance also
becomes much more understandable.” (Hurtado, 1996, p. 48)

“Resistance can take the form of momentous acts of organized, planned,
and disciplined protests, or it may consist of small, everyday ac-
tions, seeming insignificant that can nevertheless validate the ac-
tor’s sense of dignity and worth.” (Caldwell, 1995, p. 276)

These epigraphs are a challenge for researchers who hope to
better understand resistance. That is, Aida Hurtado and Paulette
Caldwell push us to go beyond the traditional conceptions of resis-
tance and study multiple strategies of student resistance, some of
which are subtle and silent and others that are conspicuous and
overt. To meet that challenge, we turn to critical race theory and
Latina/Latino critical theory as the basis of a conceptual frame-
work that allows us to offer insight into the internal and external
transformational resistance of Chicana and Chicano students in an
urban context. We extend the resistance literature by moving away
from an examination of resistance that implicates students even fur-
ther in their own domination or focusing solely on overt forms of
resistance. Instead, we distinguish between different types of resis-
tance, all of which are fluid and multifaceted. In doing so, we have
grounded our work in empirical data that emerge from students’
voices and have tried not to romanticize any form of resistance. Our
work also takes another step toward filling a void in the resistance
literature by demonstrating that the resistance of female students in particular does not always center on their sexuality.

One of the five themes of critical race theory and LatCrit theory is the centrality of race and racism and the intersectionality with other forms of subordination. Our critical race and LatCrit framework has allowed us to move beyond the intersection of race, class, and gender to a more complex intersection. That is, Chicana and Chicano students live between and within layers of subordination based on race, class, gender, language, immigration status, accent, and phenotype (Johnson, 1998) so that “these students do not ‘fit’ neatly into a single category of consciousness and/or forms of resistance” (Yosso, 2000, p. 162). This means that their resistance must be examined at an intersection that includes language rights, cultural rights, and the influence of immigration status. For example, the students who demonstrated multiple forms of resistance during the 1968 East Los Angeles walkouts did so as they struggled to obtain bilingual education and a curriculum that included Chicano history and culture. Certainly Gloria’s friend Lupe and her status as a permanent resident from Mexico can help us to better understand the kind of resistance undocumented students may engage in.

Another theme of critical race theory and LatCrit theory is the centrality of experiential knowledge. A CRT and LatCrit framework recognizes that oral histories and counterstorytelling are legitimate and appropriate methodologies to analyze the educational experiences of Students of Color. These methodologies can provide an essential tool for the survival and struggles for social justice in Communities of Color (Delgado, 1989). These methodologies that we draw from are also recognized as critical pedagogical techniques because they place the lived experiences of Students of Color at the center of the teaching and research enterprise. Using oral histories and counterstorytelling, we place Chicanas and Chicanos at the center of analysis and demonstrate how they engage in internal and external forms of transformational resistance. Drawing from the experiential knowledge of Students of Color allows educators and community workers to identify, acknowledge, and view as strengths the transformational resistance strategies that students use to navigate through the university and the community.
Indeed, we need to listen more closely and more often to the voices and experiences of resistance as we also develop critical educational studies and related stories from a strength- or asset-based perspective (Delgado Bernal, 2000; Kretzman & McKnight, 1993).

A third theme of critical race theory and LatCrit theory is the challenge to dominant ideology. Our CRT and LatCrit framework challenges the ideology of a “race- and gender-neutral curriculum,” “objective standardized testing,” “meritocratic tracking systems,” and other “color- and gender-blind educational policies” that Students of Color regularly encounter and often combat through internal and external transformational strategies. Similar to the way the Professor nurtured the transformational resistance of Gloria, urban educators and community workers must also cultivate their students’ transformational resistance strategies to challenge anti-affirmative-action, anti-bilingual-education, anti-immigrant, and heterosexist legislation and policies. Indeed, this is crucial to counteracting the results of ineffective, inappropriate, and often racist and sexist educational practices and polices that continue to fail many Students of Color in an urban context.

Finally, bell hooks (1990) argued that People of Color are often in the margin and that we know more about the margin as a site of deprivation or domination and less as a site of resistance and empowerment. She stated that “I am located in the margin. I make a definite distinction between the marginality which is imposed by oppressive structures and that marginality one chooses as site of resistance—as location of radical openness and possibility” (p. 153). Stephan Haymes (1995) argued further that Black public spaces are counterspaces with their role as a place of comfort and nurturance and as a place of building communities of resistance. Through a CRT and LatCrit framework, we have demonstrated that the students represented in the 1968 walkouts and the 1993 student sit-in and hunger strike have shown by their examples of transformational resistance that they chose the margin as a site of resistance and empowerment. We feel that through the stories of these students and other Students of Color, researchers and educa-
tors can add to the understanding of resistance as a site of possibility and of human agency.

NOTES

1. *Chicanas and Chicanos* are defined as female and male persons of Mexican ancestry living in the United States irrespective of immigration or generation status. It should be noted that each of these terms has a political dimension that this article does not discuss.

2. *Social transformation*, for our purpose here, can be defined as the process of eliminating various forms of subordination such as racism, sexism, classism, and homophobia and thereby creating the conditions for social justice.

3. In 1994, the voters of the state of California passed an anti-immigrant proposition (Proposition 187). In 1996, voters in California also passed an anti-affirmative-action proposition (Proposition 209). In 1998, they passed an anti-bilingual-education proposition (Proposition 227).


5. In this article, the term *Students of Color* is defined as persons of African American, Latina/Latino, Asian American, and American Indian ancestry.

6. Given our definition of *counterstorytelling* as putting a human and familiar face to educational theory and practice, we want to emphasize that Gloria and the other characters in this counterstory represent very real experiences based on numerous interviews, focus groups, biographical narratives in the humanities and social science literature, and our own personal experiences. We express our deep gratitude to those who shared their stories with us. We dedicate this to those Chicanas and Chicanos who continue to resist in the midst of inequities and struggle toward social justice.

7. Richard Delgado and Jean Stefancic (1993) defined the majoritarian mindset as “the bundle of presuppositions, perceived wisdoms, and shared cultural understandings persons in the dominant race bring to the discussion of race” (p. 462).

8. Gloria and the Professor are composite characters that emerged from the experiences and research of the authors (see Footnote 6). The development of these characters is influenced by Geneva Crenshaw and Rodrigo Crenshaw, the primary characters in the works of Derrick Bell (1987, 1992, 1996, 1998) and Richard Delgado (1995b, 1996).

9. Throughout the country, there are many high school students who have overcome tremendous odds to succeed in school but whose immigration status does not allow them to qualify for in-state tuition at a local university or for federal financial aid (Johnston, 2000). Their immigration status may not only influence their resistance, but it also “may bar them from the final stepping stone to the American Dream: a college education” (Johnston, 2000, p. 1).
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