Check for updates

Article

Critical Race Theory in Education: A Review of Past Literature and a Look to the Future

Qualitative Inquiry
2015, Vol. 21(3) 206–222
© The Author(s) 2014
Reprints and permissions:
sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav
DOI: 10.1177/1077800414557825
qix.sagepub.com
SAGE

María C. Ledesma[1] and Dolores Calderón[1]

Abstract

This article examines the development of Critical Race Theory (CRT) in education, paying attention to how researchers use CRT (and its branches) in the study of K-12 and higher education. The article reviews CRT literature with a focus on CRT scholarship that offers tools to engage with and work against racism within education. The authors highlight works that embody the critical origins of CRT in both the law and elsewhere, with a goal of demonstrating that CRT work means more than just pointing to race. It requires an engagement and articulation with the material, structural, and ideological mechanisms of White supremacy.

Keywords

critical race theory, critical pedagogy, narrative

Introduction

Within the span of the last two decades, Critical Race Theory (CRT) has become an increasingly permanent fixture in the toolkit of education researchers seeking to critically examine educational opportunities, school climate, representation, and pedagogy, to name a few. Scholars have looked to CRT, as an epistemological and methodological tool, to help analyze the experiences of historically underrepresented populations across the k-20 educational pipeline. In the law, this research can be traced back to the Critical Legal Studies movement, which gave rise to CRT (Crenshaw, 2011; Tate, 1997). Contemporary critical legal scholarship, therefore, builds upon an already robust literature base (Bell, 1980; Crenshaw, Gotanda, Peller, & Thomas, 1995; Delgado & Stefancic, 2001). In education, critical scholars have often looked to CRT's foundational legal scholarship, ethnic studies, as well as to the pioneering work of Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995) and Solorzano (1998), who introduced the study of CRT to K-12 and higher education, respectively. As previous Critical Race academics (Dixson & Rousseau, 2005; Ladson-Billings, 2005; Parker & Lynn, 2002) have observed, the task of applying a CRT framework to educational scholarship is complex and multifaceted. And as the application of CRT to educational studies continues to grow, vocal reminders persist to honor CRT's legal genesis (Dixson & Rousseau, 2005; Ladson-Billings, 2005; Tate, 2005). The suggestion is that aspiring Critical Race education scholars be more mindful about acknowledging and grounding their own work within CRT's (legal) roots. To ignore this, it is said, is to weaken the potency of CRT's praxis.

In their analysis of CRT in education literature between 1995 and 2003, Dixson and Rousseau (2005) stress the importance of always coupling contemporary work with CRT's founding legal tenets. Indeed, Dixson and Rousseau make a concerted effort to emphasize that it is only when Critical Race education scholars recouple their work with Critical Race legal literature that CRT's commitment to eliminate all forms of oppression can be more fully actualized. They posit that education scholars too often rely on overtheorizing as opposed to linking theory to practice. Echoing this analysis, Ladson-Billings (2005) underscores Dixson and Rousseau's observation, stressing that Critical Race scholarship should always be in conversation with itself. Ladson-Billings suggests that it is only through this dialogical practice that readers will understand how CRT has developed over time.

However, Ladson-Billings (2005) also goes on to caution aspiring Critical Race scholars to be careful with the "lure" of CRT; as an example, she refers to the "uncritical" use of narrative, or storytelling (p. 117). Ladson-Billings laments, "I sometimes worry that scholars who are attracted to CRT focus on storytelling to the exclusion of the central ideas such stories purport to illustrate. Thus I clamour [sic] for richer, more detailed stories that place our stories in more robust and powerful contexts" (p. 117). Ladson-Billings'

[1]University of Utah, Salt Lake City, USA

Corresponding Author:
María C. Ledesma, College of Education, University of Utah, 1721 Campus Center Drive, Salt Lake City, UT 84112, USA.
Email: maria.ledesma@utah.edu

observation is well founded. As CRT legal scholar Kimberlé Crenshaw (2011) has noted, since very early in its inception CRT has been subject to criticism. As early as 1997, mainstream legal scholars, such as Richard Posner, dismissed Critical Race theorists and CRT as the "'lunatic core' of 'radical legal egalitarianism'" (Crenshaw, 2011, p. 1310). Despite these early attacks, 20 years of CRT have proven its staying power and resonance. Critical Race scholars can now be found across an array of academic disciplines and fields, like education, ethnic studies, and sociology, just to name a few (Crenshaw, 2011; Tate, 1997). However, a cross-section of academics continues to offer caution and critique to scholars drawn to CRT (Buenavista, 2013). For instance, social scientists such as Darder and Torres (2004) are among researchers who contest what they perceive to be CRT's hyper-emphasis on race. Darder and Torres (2004) decry CRT's use of race as a "the central category of analysis" (p. 97) in educational debates around racism to the exclusion of "a substantive critique of capitalism" (p. 99), adding "that the use of 'race' has been elevated to a theoretical construct, despite the fact that the concept of 'race' itself has remained under-theorized" (p. 99). Ironically, what CRT critics like Darder and Torres discount is that when approached systemically, CRT can be a means by which to more fully theorize "race."

Furthermore, CRT's commitment to intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1991) also recognizes that oppression and racism are not unidirectional, but rather that oppression and racism can be experienced within and across divergent intersectional planes, such as classism, sexism, ableism, and so on. Although often overlooked, Ethnic Studies has provided CRT scholars with a robust foundation to draw upon the concept of intersectionality and flesh it out in their work. Moreover, as Dixson and Rousseau (2005) previously detailed, CRT scholars in education have long understood the urgency behind the need to theorize race. Referring to Ladson-Billings and Tate's (1995) foundational Critical Race scholarship in education piece, Dixson and Rousseau (2005) commented that race was "under-theorized as a topic of scholarly inquiry in education" (p. 8). As a response, Ladson-Billings and Tate "proposed that Critical Race Theory (CRT), a framework developed by legal scholars, could be employed to examine the role of race and racism in education" (Dixson & Rousseau, 2005, p. 8).

Darder and Torres' critiques serve as useful reminders to aspiring Critical Race scholars that Critical Race scholarship should be rigorous and robust and able to withstand scrutiny. To the contrary, Critical Race scholars and scholarship become liable to fall prey to accusations of simple identity politics and conjecture. A relevant question to ask is, now, a decade after Darder and Torres' (2004) allegations, "Does CRT in education stand on firmer footing?" The answer is "yes." In our review of CRT work in education, we found an abundance of work that takes to heart the dilemmas debated early on in the field. CRT in education scholars understand the critiques of CRT and are explicitly building work that both acknowledges CRTs foundations in law and ethnic studies, as well as offering practical tools for education practitioners. Because CRT has proven to be hyper-scrutinized, it behooves current and aspiring Critical Race scholars to hold each other accountable. For instance, we must confront works that claim to do CRT but do not actually honor this commitment. Therefore, our goal in this review is not to critique these works but instead to highlight those pieces that endeavor to Critical Race Praxis (Leonardo, 2009, 2013; Lynn & Parker, 2006; Stovall, 2013). Thus, to undertake this review, journal articles, books, and book chapters that included education and CRT were examined. We found that CRT in education literature can be divided into two subgenres: K-12 education issues and higher education. While we could not include the universe of texts in this review, we highlight articles post-2005-2006,[1] which we found to be representative of emergent themes we encountered in the literature. In the area of K-12, we found that articles generally address the following themes: (a) curriculum and pedagogy, (b) teaching and learning, (c) schooling, and (d) policy/finance and community engagement. Many times, articles addressed one or more of the themes included above. In higher education, Critical Race scholars have centered their work around three predominant themes, including (a) colorblindness, (b) selective admissions policy, and (c) campus racial climate. As stated, the articles we review here are used as examples of the work being done in these areas, responding to the contemporary crisis facing K-12 and higher education. They offer important guideposts as to where our work as Critical Race scholars in education should go.

Following the review of these two areas, we conclude discussing what the review of the field tells us and where we think we need to go next. Now, we move to our review of CRT in K-12.

CRT and K-12 Education

Here, our discussion highlights works that emphasize what we believe are the important contributions of CRT in K-12 education, keeping in mind the important precautions offered by Ladson-Billings (2005). This discussion is not intended to exclude other work; rather, the work we highlight here can be characterized as a deeply engaged application of CRT. Accordingly, the work we review here demonstrates how CRT is used to locate how race and racism manifest themselves throughout the K-12 pipeline, and more importantly, this work offers us tools that allow us to engage these issues in the classroom, in the context of policy, and in community work. From issues of pedagogy, curriculum, to leadership, policy, and school politics, CRT in education highlights the persistence of racism across education.

This work represents a follow-up to Lynn and Parker's (2006) article, "Critical Race Studies in Education: Examining a Decade of Research on U.S. Schools." In that article, the authors examine how CRT has been used as a tool of analysis, critique and approach in K-12 education. In this article, they lay out what CRT is, its origins, and how it has been theorized in education, outlining the different manifestations of CRT such as LatCrit and AsianCrit. The authors explain as follows:

> Critical Race studies in education could be defined as a critique of racism as a system of oppression and exploitation that explores the historic and contemporary constructions and manifestations of race in our society with particular attention to how these issues are manifested in schools. Critical Race studies in education then—like critical pedagogy—is ultimately concerned with employing multiple methods and borrowing from diverse traditions in the law, sociology, ethnic studies and other fields to formulate a robust analysis of race and racism as a social, political and economic system of advantages and disadvantages accorded to social groups based on their skin color and status in a clearly defined racial hierarchy. (Lynn & Parker, 2006, p. 282)

In conclusion, Lynn and Parker urge we move toward a *Critical Race praxis* in K-12 education. Indeed, the work we highlight in this section is exemplary of this commitment. Undoubtedly, the amount and breadth of work as the publishing of this article has been exponential. For this reason, we use Lynn and Parker's article as a jumping point from which to move the review of what the literature of CRT in K-12 education looks like. What are the trends, ideas, paths set out to us by the literature? In this sense, we conclude much like Lynn and Parker, asking what next?

The depth of this work demonstrates the necessity of CRT in education, illuminating that we cannot truly assess, respond, and promote educational research and praxis devoid of the deep and entrenched nature of White supremacy in U.S. Society. Certainly, the shared themes explored by these texts are the analyses and responses to the continuing inequities (Ladson-Billings, 2009) found in K-12. Furthermore, current educational climate dictates that no matter a democratic or republican agenda, the neoliberalization of education, the increasing onslaught of corporate interests in controlling public education (Au, 2011; Pierce, 2012), we continue to be on a fast track in which education continues to privilege the rich and underserve the poor (Au, 2014; Cook & Dixon, 2013; Giroux, 2004; Pierce, 2012; Stovall, 2013).

Thus, in this section, we focus on how CRT examines issues in K-12 education, organizing our assessment and commentary to fit within well-defined parameters with K-12 education including (a) curriculum and pedagogy, (b) teaching and learning, (c) schooling in general, and (d) policy and community engagement. To begin, we revisit key works in CRT that offer important conceptual tools to frame the discussion henceforth.

K-12: (a) Curriculum and Pedagogy

Here, we examine the practical developments within Critical Race Pedagogy (CRP; Lynn, 1999, 2004; Solorzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001; Solorzano & Yosso, 2001, 2002; Yosso, Parker, Solorzano, & Lynn, 2004). In addition, we acknowledge that much of this pedagogical work is indebted to the pioneering work of Derrick Bell (2008a) whose pedagogical use of *race hypos* in legal education underscores much of this work. However, the role of CRT in pedagogy is not extensively worked out in the capacity that culturally relevant pedagogies, multicultural education pedagogies, or funds of knowledge for that matter have been articulated. Yet, CRT has been useful in allowing scholars to map out the type of work done using CRT in concert with the above named traditions. Moreover, while Critical Race scholars in education have taken time to define CRP (Lynn, 2004; Parker & Stovall, 2004; Yosso et al., 2004), the current trend in CRT in education research related to pedagogy demonstrates that CRT scholars are building, engaging, and enacting Critical Race pedagogical practices that if used appropriately have the potential to empower students of color while dismantling notions of colorblindness, meritocracy, deficit thinking, linguicism, and other forms of subordination (Asimeng-Boahene, 2010; Chapman, 2007; Kohli, 2012; Kohli & Solorzano, 2012). Finally, it is important to note that doing CRT in the classroom, engaging in pedagogy that centers race and racism is not easy work. Quite the contrary, it engenders discomfort and pain. It is challenging to do the work of CRP because ultimately the goal is to unsettle and center highly charged histories and contemporary realities that the majority dismiss with narratives of colorblindness, meritocracy, or postracialism (Choi, 2008; Leonardo & Porter, 2010). Taking a step back, what then is CRP?

Lynn (2004) defines CRP "as an analysis of racial, ethnic, and gender subordination in education that relies mostly upon the perceptions, experiences and counter-hegemonic practices of educators of color" (p. 154). According to Lynn, a CRP "necessarily leads to an articulation and broad interpretation of emancipatory pedagogical strategies and techniques proven to be successful with racially and culturally subordinated students" (Lynn, 2004, p. 154). As we shall see below, the body of literature on CRP spells out what these pedagogical strategies and techniques look like. Important to highlight, in Lynn's work, CRP "is constructed via the reflections of African American practitioners/intellectuals who were strongly committed to the ideals and principles found in 'Critical Race theory' and/or Afrocentricity" (p.154). Together, CRT and Afrocentricity are about liberatory possibilities,

moving toward emancipatory epistemologies that deconstruct and center White supremacy, challenging tropes of postracialism, meritocracy, colorblindness, and the like.

How do educators enact, perform, or use CRP? Following feminists of color work that maintains our insights must be achieved (Calderón, Delgado Bernal, Pérez Huber, Malagón, & Vélez, 2012), CRP must likewise engage experiential knowledge in a critical manner. That is, experiential knowledge cannot be used without a pedagogical framing of the racialized contexts that give rise to experience. This work has developed from teaching in the classroom and a sustained engagement with both the scholarship produced by Critical Race Theorists in education and epistemological engagements in education (Cajete, 1994; Delgado Bernal, 1998; Deloria & Wildcat, 2001). It relies both on case method and Derrick Bell's race hypos to explore the role of race and racism across a spectrum of curriculums to encourage students to reflect on what is in CRT counterstorytelling, mindful of Ladson-Billing's (2005) cautionary words.

As the following works demonstrate, counterstorytelling is a method that has been highlighted as a useful tool to perform CRP (Asimeng-Boahene, 2010; Taliaferro Baszile, 2009), which begins with the lives of students, thus offering critical starting points for counterstorytelling to be relevant to the lives of students (Rodriguez, 2011). Specifically Asimeng-Boahene (2010) discusses the use of counterstorytelling developed in CRT to pursue social justice oriented education that includes "alternative" epistemologies. Asimeng-Boahene argues such "alternative" epistemologies can be included

> in the form of counter-stories that utilize African proverbs to explore the conceptual and pedagogical landscapes of the non-dominant cultures' narratives. In effect, the lived experiences of diverse students who continue to struggle for expression within the mainstream would be acknowledged. (Asimeng-Boahene, 2010, pp. 437-38)

Yet, it is not enough to include Students of Color voices; without critical educators, such work does little to critically engage White supremacist ideology prevalent across pedagogy.

Rodriguez (2011) and Chapman's (2007) work highlight the need for teachers to be conscious of the racialized foundations on which they stand to teach in a liberatory manner. Thus, not only is it important for a CRP to situate the subjectivities of students' lives, but it is also equally important for teachers to engage in such meaning-making. Both student and teacher counternarratives are contextualized within particular experiences that critically examine what it means to bring nondominant voices into classrooms, an essential component of CRT. In a sense, this work echoes James Banks' caution in employing multicultural approaches: It is simply not enough to use diverse counternarratives to disrupt dominant pedagogies. These diverse counternarratives must begin with the lives of the oppressed as these are the voices traditionally excluded from dominant pedagogies.

Alternatively, CRP is also useful for White students. Matias' (2013) work offers us tools as CR educators working with majority White students or students of color that might embody majoritarian narratives regarding their own communities and other communities of color. For Matias, this demands a "process of re-educating Whites via raced curriculum from which they begin a renewed process of identity development" (p. 6). Drawing from Cross' (1971) concept of *Nigrescence*, she proposes "colorscence" of White racial identity [citations omitted] that is predicated on learning raced history and re-centering the once marginalized counter-stories of students of colour as part of canonical curriculum [citations omitted] (p. 6). She recommends that we must teach Whites to understand themselves through the history of the other, in much the same way many communities of color understand themselves in relationship to Whites. Pedagogically, Matias models the lessons by using herself, a woman of color, as a point of inquiry into identity. This is necessary, Matias insists, for Whites "to colour their racial identity" (p. 6) by engaging counterstories as pedagogical tools that disrupt Whiteness in the classroom and begin to dismantle ahistorical and acontextual (Ledesma, 2013) narratives that predominate pedagogy and curriculum. However, it is important to highlight that with this work comes resistance (Evans-Winters & Twyman Hoff, 2011; Ladson-Billings, 1996) that demands we rearticulate what it means to critically train preservice teachers in the manner described above. For this reason, the work of CR educators must always work to identify and explore racism, while also working through what racial hierarchies mean in K-12.

A related question, particularly for those who desire to engage in CRP in K-12, has to do with curriculum: If curriculum is colorblind (Banks & Banks, 2009), how does one enact CRP? This is an important question that leads us to consider pedagogy in relationship to curriculum. Connected to CRP, Tara Yosso (2002) argues for a Critical Race Curriculum (CRC) in education:

> Critical Race curriculum is the approach to understanding curricular structures, processes, and discourses, informed by Critical Race Theory (CRT). According to the five tenets of CRT a Critical Race curriculum would: (1) acknowledge the central and intersecting roles of racism, sexism, classism, and other forms of subordination in maintaining inequality in curricular structures, processes, and discourses; (2) challenge dominant social and cultural assumptions regarding culture and intelligence, language and capability, objectivity and meritocracy; (3) direct the formal curriculum toward goals of social justice and the hidden curriculum toward Freirean goals of critical consciousness; (4) develop counterdiscourses through storytelling, narratives, chronicles, family histories, scenarios, biographies, and parables that draw on the lived

> experiences students of color bring to the classroom; and (5) utilize interdisciplinary methods of historical and contemporary analysis to articulate the linkages between educational and societal inequality. (p. 98)

Yosso's formulation of CRC is characterized both by ideological commitments, social justice goals, and an outline of approaches that can achieve the aforementioned. In response to Yosso's CRC, Carbado (2002) asks what a CRC would "look like" and how it would be "implemented" (p. 183). His query serves as a point of entry to discuss the following works that are motivated by Yosso's (2002) work that argues for a CRC in education.

Many scholars examining curriculum using a CRT lens demonstrate how curriculum is influenced by White supremacy (colorblindness, meritocracy, integrationism, postracialism, etc.) and offer practical means to reconstruct curriculum in liberatory ways. For instance, Crowley (2013) uses CRT to explore how interest convergence[2] shapes the field of curriculum. Crowley shows how specific pieces of legislation, such as the 1965 voting rights act, originally enacted to address racism and segregation, are treated "ahistorically and acontextually" (Ledesma, 2013) in school curriculum that teaches about the civil rights movement. This echoes what many critical curriculum theorists have found regarding Civil Rights content in K-12 (Calderón, 2008; Martinez, 1998; Sleeter, 2005). Crowley uses CRT to show how the voting rights act continues to be "an unsettled issue by outlining the ongoing debates that surround the legislation and detailing the continuing vulnerability of the voting franchise for many people of color" (p. 2). To demonstrate how the historical goals of the Voting Rights act are maintained, the author specifically draws from three main approaches from CRT: (a) critique of liberalism (Crenshaw, 1988), (b) interest convergence (Bell, 1980), and (c) historical revisionism (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001). Crowley describes how the actual passage of the voting rights act was motivated by interest convergence, arguing that teaching through this historical context provides students with the critical tools to examine how race and racism have been central organizers of key aspects of our history. CRT in education, specifically in curriculum, allows us to both historicize and contextualize (Ledesma, 2013) key pieces of history in social studies (see also Daniels, 2011; Ladson-Billings, 2003) and other related curricular fields that would provide students a real understanding of U.S. history and thus maybe have a more concrete grasp of race and racism today.

Returning to Carbado's query, the following works answer this question offering different aspects of actual curriculum practices and content. Considering that CRT in education centers the experiential knowledge of communities of color through forms such as storytelling, many of the curricular and pedagogical research (taken up in the previous section) examine what exactly this means and how we must be mindful that counterstorytelling be used critically. Denise Taliaferro Baszile (2009) argues Hip Hop should be incorporated as a key component of school curriculum because as curriculum stands, it serves to alienate students of color, acknowledging that the incorporation of Hip Hop culture in school curriculum might be problematic as many see Hip Hop as "the cause of students disassociation with school" (p. 8). She argues for the opposite, demonstrating that it is not Hip Hop that alienates students from school; rather, it is the highly racialized curriculums, policies, practices of schooling that push students out (physically and intellectually). Hip Hop, Taliaferro Baszile insists, is a counternarrative, using CRT's notion of counterstorytelling to help frame Hip Hop as a counterstory to majoritarian narratives that predominate school curriculum reifying White supremacy. She relies on both CRT and curriculum theory,

> to argue that efforts to re-imagine the relationships among education, social justice, and hip hop culture must take into consideration the nature of the existing relationship between the official school curriculum and its representation of acceptable identities and the counter-representations reflected in hip hop culture. (Taliaferro Baszile, 2009, p. 8)

She envisions Hip Hop as an alternative epistemology to the ways the official curriculum has alienated youth of color, particularly within urban contexts through a variety of mechanisms including official knowledge not reflective of youth experience, disciplinary policies, and general disinvestment in public schooling.

Both Crowley (2013) and Taliaferro Baszile's (2009) work demonstrate that the ability of CRT to center the ways in which race and racism continue to impact education today offer us meaningful ways to imagine engaging and working with curriculums that increasingly alienate students of color. Moreover, the pedagogical and curricular implications of applying CRT to K-12 indicate that counterstorytelling is a useful tool if it is built on critical foundations. That is, it is not enough to simply introduce students of color experiences without coupling these experiences with critical insights such as African proverbs (Asimeng-Boahene, 2010), colorscence (Matias, 2013), hip hop pedagogy (Taliaferro Baszile, 2009), and the critical insights that CRT offers us in understanding the dominant ways we have been taught to understand Civil Rights history, for instance (Crowley, 2013). In other words, counterstorytelling is a tool for students to achieve a critical understanding of the role of race and racism in society that is dependent on a thoughtful pedagogical practice. This leads us to related areas of inquiry as both pedagogy and curriculum are tied to teaching and learning. Next, we highlight work that offers "take aways" that can be used by both preservice teachers and teachers in the field. It bears repeating that the importance of the work

we review and highlight here is about Critical Race praxis in K-12 education.

K-12: (b) Teaching and Learning

Another important issue explored by researchers utilizing CRT in education is in regard to teaching. This area is broad as the research examines teacher attitudes, behaviors, and practices. In addition, Critical Race Theorists examining teaching deal with the added layer of teacher subjectivity—how do teacher subjectivities motivate them to engage issues important to both Critical Race curricular and pedagogical approaches?

As a whole, research that utilizes CRT to examine teaching finds that a key aspect of teacher attitudes mimic larger problematic ideologies such as colorblindness, meritocracy, liberal attitudes that see race as an individualized issue, and postracialism. Thus, the composition of who teachers are is an important question addressed by Critical Race scholars. Research shows that there is a need for teachers of color (Kohli, 2009, 2012; Ladson-Billings, 2001; Villegas & Irvine, 2010). Research also tells us that teachers are most effective when they teach in ways that are culturally relevant to students of color (Chapman, 2007; Ladson-Billings, 2009; Yazzie-Mintz, 2007). Being culturally relevant is about more than knowing a student's culture (Ladson-Billings, 2009); it extends to understand that students' cultures operate in a historical and contemporary context in which White supremacy institutionalizes a hierarchy in which Whites are at the top and people of color are at the bottom (Chapman, 2007). The work we highlight here shows how CRT helps expose this reality examining teacher attitudes and practices, while simultaneously offering mechanisms to move such limiting attitudes and practices toward more liberatory ends (Matias & Liou, 2014; Kohli & Solorzano, 2012).

Vaught and Castagno's (2008) work reveals how key concepts developed in CRT help explain and contextualize problematic teacher attitudes vis-à-vis White privilege using CRT legal scholar Harris' (1993) concept of *Whiteness as property*: "Whiteness as property is a concept that reflects the conflation of Whiteness with the exclusive rights to freedom, to the enjoyment of certain privileges, and to the ability to draw advantage from these rights" (Vaught & Castagno, 2008, p. 96), findings reproduced in later CRT K-12 work (Young, 2011). Vaught and Castagno interviewed teachers to assess their reactions to diversity trainings in which notions of White privilege were interrogated. The attitudes they documented were organized around the following thematic findings: White privilege and individualism, Whiteness as the right to determine meaning, individualism in relation to equality, the challenges of being aware of White privilege but not linking it to structure (Vaught & Castagno, 2008). Not surprisingly, the majority of White teachers minimized the impact of racism. For example, Vaught and Castagno describe that White teachers in their study enacted Whiteness as property by minimizing racism to individual acts; "One component of Whiteness as property that is critical to our understanding of teacher constructions of White privilege and race power is 'the continued right to determine meaning'" (Harris, 1993, p. 1762; Vaught & Castagno, 2008). The researchers also found that the privilege White teachers voiced cannot be divorced from racism; yet teachers insisted that racism is an "exclusively individual issue" (p. 101). This finding, according to Vaught and Castagno, is a common trope of White supremacy that individualizes racism as "an individual pathology" (p. 101), rather than understanding it as a structural and ideological manifestation (Vaught & Castagno, 2008).

Finally, the authors offer the idea of distributive justice (Harris, 1993) as a mechanism to engage these problematic teacher attitudes. Distributive justice is a conceptual frame that shifts the emphasis from one of guilt to one of fairness (Harris, 1993), paralleling Matias' (2013) pedagogical model of *colorscence* that requires an understanding of structural racism and both "individual and collective accountability towards equity" (p. 110). On the flip side, Matias and Liou (2014) also caution that social justice oriented White teachers should endeavor to move away from White liberal tendencies of savior and missionary mentalities toward a Critical Race teacher activism that begins with the epistemological foundations of communities of color. These works insist that the context of where teachers are located cannot be divorced from schooling at large.

Critical Race research in K-12 demonstrates that teaching and teacher subjectivities are crucial to student learning. As the above research shows, if teachers maintain uncritical subjectivities, then they run the chance of promoting majoritarian narratives that isolate students of color (Chapman, 2007; Ladson-Billings, 2001; Matias & Liou, 2014; Marx & Pennington, 2003). Reminding our reader of Ladson-Billings introductory words of caution, we reflect upon the need for teacher educator programs to, in some cases, continue to do the social justice, equity-oriented work they are committed to. However, for the majority of teacher education programs, this work must begin. Without such an endeavor, we leave untouched dominant ideologies of White supremacy (Choi, 2008; Evans-Winters & Twyman Hoff, 2011; Howard, 2003; Kohli, 2012; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Solorzano & Yosso, 2001; Young, 2011). The work above reminds us that this critical work with teachers and administrators needs to be maintained once teachers and administrators are at their school sites. Consequentially, questions of school culture must also be addressed.

K-12: (c) Schooling

Hence, in this subsection, we examine how broader issues of ideology, discourse, and other issues are dealt with in

relationship to the more expansive notion of schooling, characterized by how race and racism inform school culture (K-12) and how school cultures manifest broader social ideological forms of White supremacy such as linguicism (Liou, Anthrop Gonzales, & Cooper, 2009; Pérez Huber, 2011). Importantly, CRT is used to examine the ways White supremacy impacts school culture and climate, echoing some of the work CRT scholars have engaged in the area of higher education

In particular, CRT has been utilized to examine the ways that White supremacy shapes the discursive practices predominant in schools. Specifically, Mitchell's (2013) "study is a cross-cutting analysis of over 100 empirical and conceptual studies regarding the education of secondary multilingual learners and their teachers" that repeat "four common majoritarian stories . . . : there is no story about race, difference is deficit, meritocracy is appropriate, and English-is-all-that-matters" (p. 3). This research describes the manner in which racialized ideologies not only manifest in schools but also how traditional educational research reifies these racialized ideologies that disempower communities of color. Pérez Huber's (2011) work specifically addresses how the above realities impact Latino/a K-12 students in California, using LatCrit and CRT to examine discursive practices around language.

Pérez Huber (2011) identifies how racist nativism—"the institutionalized ways people perceive, understand and make sense of contemporary US immigration, that justifies native (White) dominance, and reinforces hegemonic power" (p. 380)—frames undocumented students in deficit ways, promoting what she calls racist nativist microaggressions in schools. She explains that majoritarian discourses in school "portray Latina/o undocumented immigrants as 'criminals' and a burden on government resources, justifying a perceived 'nonnative' status of this group [citations omitted]" (p. 380). Her research, testimonios collected from 20 undocumented students, also finds that undocumented students encounter linguistic hegemony, which she characterizes as English dominance, throughout the K-12 pipeline, especially in elementary and middle school. This type of English language dominance, highlighted by Pérez Huber, frames the speaker of Spanish as having an "impairment" or intellectual deficit. Specifically, the students in her study describe, "how language became symbolic of the perceived inferiority of the Spanish language and of the students who spoke it" (Huber, 2011, p. 394). Pérez Huber's work shows how dominant ideologies of White supremacy, in this case English dominance, shape school culture, illuminating how dominant ideologies maintain school climates that are unfriendly to communities of color.

Structures within schools also maintain and create hostile climates. CRT scholars have turned their attention to spatial/structural issues in schools that include understanding how discursive or ideological manifestations of White supremacy organize space within schools. In this regard, Kumasi (2012) offers a necessary intervention into rethinking libraries through a Critical Race lens to offer us ways to reconceptualize spaces that traditionally serve to alienate youth of color and instead empower them though what Kumasi refers to as *critical inquiry* within libraries. This critical inquiry, she insists, begins by starting with the lives of students as well as with the very folks who "run" libraries. Interrogating and thinking about how these subjectivities engender counterstories and majoritarian narratives is crucial in restructuring these spaces so they are welcoming of all students.

In addition, we know that policy is central to shaping school climate. In this next subsection, we explore how CRT is used to examine the impact of policies on the K-12 pipeline.

K-12: (d) Policy, School Finance, and Community Engagement

The role of public policy in relationship to education is multifaceted as the following research demonstrates. CRT in this area of research posits that public policy does not operate in a vacuum: It is responsive to inherently racist and White supremacist ideologies (Parker, 2003). In addition, research that utilizes CRT to examine policy issues in K-12 demonstrates that policy and school finance impact communities of color in disparate ways. Likewise, communities of color are not passive actors in mobilizing for and against policies that are detrimental to students of color. Finally, this research demonstrates that using CRT to highlight challenges is not enough: We must go beyond rhetoric to advance praxis, a politics of action.

Stovall (2013) illustrates how CRT is useful in examining urban educational policy, emphasizing that to do this work we must attend to the structural nature of race and racism. Specifically he charts, through CRT's counterstorytelling and interest convergence, how one can chart communities of color, in this case Chicago, reactions to top–down policy intended to divest and disinvest working class people of color from the city in favor of a gentrification process that preferences Whites. For example, policies are put in place that "redesign" urban schools in ways that make it harder for the intended residents to attend and make these schools more attractive to White residents. The strategies used to "redevelop poorly performing 'inner-city' schools and the poor neighborhoods where they are usually located have real potential to do more harm than good for the families the policy is supposed to benefit" (Stovall, 2013, p. 40). Communities of color understand the need to reform schools that are not serving them (see Velez's, 2008, work on Latino/a Immigrant parent organizing). As a result, some families embrace what Stovall calls a "politics of desperation," which he defines "as the complex assemblage of

thoughts and actions that guide educational decisions in periods of housing and schooling uncertainty, especially when available choices have not been defined by affected communities" (p. 40). He cautions that the politics of desperation "are based on an understanding of the peculiar realities around [limited] educational options in the city [of Chicago]" (Stovall, 2013). In particular the public school choices left to parents, Stovall explains, "come in the form of charter, contract, or a renamed neighborhood school with a supposedly new curricular focus" (Stovall, 2013). Yet, once parents enroll their children in these schools they are hard-pressed to keep their children in these schools due to a variety of mechanisms put in place that push out working class students of color, including fines for disciplinary behavior (Stovall, 2013).

Similarly, Alemán (2006, 2007a, 2007b, 2013) outlines how financing for public schools is inexorably linked with the structural inequalities of schooling that are intimately tied to race in the United States. Using CRT to study school financing, Alemán (2007b) argues, "A CRT perspective situates school funding inequity as a political, social, and historical process in which the normalization of inequity, subjugation of marginalized groups, and oppression of communities of color exists via the institution of a racist school finance system" (p. 527). Specifically, CRT buttressed by LatCrit, Aleman continues, "complicates terms like 'equity' and 'adequacy' and encourages problematizing the effects of funding formulas" (p. 527) and is useful in understanding the racial hierarchies prevalent in Texas school financing as institutional manifestations of racism vis-à-vis Whites and Mexican Americans in Texas (Alemán, 2013). Alemán's trajectory of work illustrates that CRT spotlights the structural origins of racism that impact policy and school finance tied to property rights (Alemán, 2013). Like Stovall, Alemán points to the historical and contemporary organizing by Latino/a communities as starting points for action, indicating they are the central stakeholders within the current debates on school finance.

Thus, it is important to contextualize communities of color struggles within the structural realities in which they live (Smith & Stovall, 2008; Stovall, 2013). Stovall's (2013) call for Critical Race Praxis, echoing Lynn and Parker's earlier call to praxis—"spend less time with abstract theorizing and more time with on-the-ground issues concerning historically marginalized communities of color . . . toward[s] transformative education and equity" (p. 41)—reflects the work we review here. This work reveals that the concepts developed by CRT in the law such as Whiteness as property, interest convergence, counterstories, majoritarian narratives, among others, offer educators tools with which to both critique and build our work in K-12. Education, like law, is an explicit manifestation of institutionalized White supremacy, which demands specialized tools that can expose, highlight, and challenge these realities. Indeed, the articles reviewed in this section highlight the salience and necessity to use CRT in educational work, debunking colorblind, meritocratic, postracial narratives that predominate. More importantly, these works demonstrate a commitment to Critical Race Praxis that offers both tools and approaches that demand constant critical reflection and engagement.

In the section that follows, we explore similar trajectories in the area of higher education, examining how CRT has been used to explore issues of equity in higher education.

CRT in Higher Education

In this section, we examine the application of CRT to the study of higher education. We discuss the formative concepts drawn from CRT and highlight the evolution and growth of CRT scholarship in the study of postsecondary education. In concert with our analysis of Critical Race scholarship in K-12, in this section, we examine the deeply engaged application of CRT in higher education.

Our discussion here highlights works that we believe uncover and problematize the majoritarian policies that have historically framed and shaped higher education. As in the previous section, the discussion in this section is not intended to exclude other works. Nonetheless, the literature we highlight here can be characterized as exemplifying emerging scholarship in the critical study of high education. Accordingly, the work we review herein demonstrates how CRT is used to challenge claims of race-neutrality and objectivity in the application of higher education. This work represents some of the newest contributions to CRT research in higher education.

Just as in our K-12 section, the depth of this work demonstrates the necessity of CRT in higher education, again illuminating that we cannot truly assess, respond, and promote educational praxis when policy discussions and decision making are debated within an ahistorical and acontextual framework. Devoid of this nation's critical but "unlovely" (Loury) history, CR theorists stipulate that majoritarian frames, which privilege Whiteness and White supremacy, succeed in remaining the norm. In the last decade, Critical Race postsecondary scholars have sought to disrupt such majoritarian frames by interrogating the following emergent themes: (a) colorblindness, (b) selective admissions policy, and (c) campus racial climate.

Twelve years ago, Parker and Lynn (2002) set out to help explain CRT's conflicts with and connections to qualitative research methodology and epistemology. In 2005 Dixson and Rousseau followed suit with a synthesis of 10 years of CRT work in education. Both of these pieces build off of the influential work of scholars Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995) and Solorzano (1998), who pioneered the application of CRT to the study of K-12 and higher education, respectively. In the decade plus since *Qualitative Inquiry's*

special issue (Lynn, Yosso, Solorzano, & Parker, 2002), titled, "Critical Race Theory and Qualitative Research," the reliance upon CRT as a methodological and epistemological framework has grown steadily. Both within and beyond the field of law, scholars continue to be drawn to CRT to help study and explain lingering social and educational challenges. In higher education, students and researchers alike have been drawn to CRT to examine the persistence of disparate educational opportunities for historically marginalized communities from the baccalaureate through the professoriate.

Perhaps heeding Professor Ladson-Billings' (2005) call for a more robust application of CRT, in the last decade, Critical Race postsecondary scholars have moved toward producing richer, more nuanced research, including narratives that place "our stories" in more powerful contexts. Within the field of higher education, Critical Race scholars have centered their work around addressing three predominant themes, including (a) colorblindness, (b) selective admissions policy, and (c) campus racial climate. To follow, we address these themes in detail.

Higher Education: (a) Colorblindness

As reflected in its original tenets, core functions of CRT, and Critical Race scholarship, include challenging notions of race-neutrality, objectivity, and ahistoricism. One important way this task is accomplished is by adhering to another central CRT principle—recognizing the centrality of race and racism in shaping the everyday life experiences of all people, but especially for people of color. The belief that racism is normal, not aberrant, behavior provides necessary context to understanding persistent patterns of racial inequity in higher education. CRT founding father Derrick Bell (1991) coined the term *racial realism* to describe the permanence of the subordinate status for Black Americans, and by extension the persistence of White supremacy, in establishing law and other social policy. As Crenshaw (2011) has reflected, "Bell's entire body of work encouraged an emerging cohort of critical thinkers to place race at the center of scholarly inquiry, a license that had not yet been granted by the legal academy" (p. 1282). Critical thinkers beyond of the legal academy have also followed suit, placing race and racism at the center of critical scholarship that analyzes educational opportunities and outcomes.

Critical Race scholarship in higher education has helped expose how majoritarian structures have historically shaped and framed educational access and opportunity for historically underrepresented populations. Despite the lure of race-neutrality and colorblindness, and more recently proclamations of postracialism, historically grounded Critical Race scholarship in higher education maintains that race matters, and by extension, racism matters. Critical Race postsecondary scholars have also set out to expose how the prevalence of Whiteness and White supremacy, frequently in the guise of colorblindness, covertly and overtly shapes the culture of higher education.

Ironically, even when aiming to produce critical scholarship, racism and White supremacy often prevail. For instance, Harper (2012) uncovered how too often even those academics who set out to produce race centered scholarship retreat to majoritarian norms that ignore, if not dismiss, accounts of racism to explain the experiences of historically marginalized communities. In such cases, authors treat the notion of racism as "taboo" rather than accept that racism is a likely contributor to disparate outcomes.

In his study, Harper (2012) undertook a systemic analysis of 255 articles across seven leading peer-reviewed journals that regularly publish empirical studies on the experiences of postsecondary constituencies, including students, faculty, administrators, trustees, and so on. Although Harper targeted articles that employed CRT and that explicitly used the terms *race* and *racism* either in their "Discussion" and "Implications" sections, he discovered that even in cases where researchers applied a Critical Race lens to their analyses, many authors were reluctant to explicitly name racism as complicit in creating and/or maintaining inequitable educational opportunities and experiences for "minoritized" (Harper, 2012) populations. Instead, as his analysis uncovers, authors explained away racism by focusing on other possible reasons that could cause and/or contribute to disparate experiences and outcomes. For example, Harper (2012) tells us that several of the studies he reviewed found that students of color "experienced campus racial climates differently than their White counterparts" (p. 17). Few of these authors considered "structural/institutional racism as a logical explanation for such differences" (Harper, 2012, p. 17). For example, in one of the studies Harper reviewed, racial climate was never questioned as a way to explain the differences between the residential experiences of students of color and White students. Instead, Harper (2012) suggests that authors relied upon "assorted explanations" or "anything but racism" to characterize and explain "racial phenomena in postsecondary contexts" (p. 16). Furthermore, even across articles that more explicitly used the terms *racism* and *racist*, Harper (2012) found that there were differences in the extent by which authors challenged and/or named racist practices. Overall, Harper (2012) explains that the goals of "narrowing racial gaps, diversifying college and university campuses, and doing research that informs the creation of environments that no longer marginalize persons of color" (p. 25) are compromised when authors do not name or confront racism head-on. Harper (2012) cautions that the application of "[Un]Critical Race Theory" does nothing to promote educational equity and racial justice. We would add that such practices, unwittingly or not, also work to sustain White supremacist notions of colorblindness and race-neutrality.

As with CRT K-12 scholarship, CR scholarship in higher education can also be used to enact praxis. While colleges and universities are very good at crafting inclusive mission statements and diversity action plans, realizing such ends often prove to be more difficult, if not impossible. Iverson (2007) speaks directly to this point. Iverson employs a CRT informed policy discourse analysis to examine diversity action plans from 20 land-grant institutions. She reveals how such plans, even when well-intentioned, work to reinforce positivist-oriented frameworks of people of color as "outsiders, at-risk-victims, and commodities" (Iverson, 2007, p. 586). In so doing, postsecondary institutions perpetuate Whiteness by reifying discourses that privilege normative conceptions of who students are and what successful students look like. To demonstrate the "discursive representation of diversity in educational policy" Iverson cites four discourse tropes commonly relied upon by universities to address diversity. These tropes include the discourses of "access, disadvantage, marketplace, and democracy" (p. 593), which work to "(re)produce a relative subordination of people of color and reinscribe a racially neutral conception of education policies" (Iverson, 2007). For example, Iverson explains how the discourse of disadvantage, as presented in institutional action plans, characterize people of color as "at risk before entering institutions of higher education and remaining at risk once a member of the university—at risk for educational failure, for being victims of hate crime, discrimination, harassment, nonpromotion, no advancement, no tenure, among other things" (Iverson, 2007, p. 596). Indeed, as Iverson further illustrates, the reliance on words like "disadvantaged" and "unprepared" to describe people of color entering academe serves to cast people of color as defective. Iverson (2007) explains, "Looking through a CRT lens enables a critique of this discursive framing of diversity as disadvantaged and deficient" (p. 597). Iverson's piece helps illustrate how a CRT informed approach to higher education policy can help individuals working on postsecondary policy to "be more aware of the discursive effects of their efforts to inform change and achieve equity in U.S. higher education" (p. 603). In addition, CRT helps account for the systemic factors that produce disparate educational access and opportunities in the first place.

In 2008, an infirmed John O. Calmore asked his friend and fellow Critical Race legal scholar, Derrick Bell, to stand in his place and deliver a lecture to be given in Professor Calmore's honor. Professor Bell agreed. In preparation to deliver the talk, Bell read from his friend's robust body of work. During the speech, Bell included passages written by his friend and colleague, including an excerpt from Calmore's 1999 article titled, "A Call to Context: The Professional Challenges of Cause Lawyering at the Intersection of Race, Space, and Poverty." Citing Calmore's work, Bell (2008b) stated,

> Race and racism are always concepts in formation. Our notion of race and our experience with racism do not represent fixed, static phenomena. Racism is more than the intentional behavior of the occasional bad actor. Racism mutates and multiplies, creating a range of racisms. We must be able to bring up issues of race and racism without the terms always leading to fear, alienation, and off-point debate. (p. 624)

Bell's citation is an important reminder for Critical Race scholars seeking to advance educational equity and social justice in higher education research. Precisely because racism is not a fixed or static phenomenon, history and context are critically important to understanding racism's nuances and permutations. Professor Calmore's (1999) insights that "one simply cannot seek economic justice and equal treatment for the poor by separating the quest from considerations of the raced aspects of context, history, social organization, institutional arrangements, and culture" (pp. 1939-1940) may also be applied to the plight of the educationally disadvantaged. Aspiring Critical Race scholars should keep in mind that the quest for educational justice and equitable treatment within postsecondary institutions should not be decoupled from the context, history, and sociocultural realities that produced the inequities and disparities in the first place. Furthermore, as Harper's (2012) study illustrates, Critical Race scholarship should not shun the "R" words. Race and racism are what gave rise to the need for CRT and Critical Race scholarship, and they need to be called out in all of their contemporary forms.

More recently, Bonilla-Silva (2003) and Haney-López (2014) echo the Bell and Calmore's works by reminding us that racism has evolved. Although overt displays of racism are generally not tolerated, racism and racists persist. However, claims of colorblindness and race-neutrality camouflage White supremacy and produce what Bonilla-Silva (2003) has called "racism without racists." Haney-López (2014) explains the lure of colorblindness this way:

> Today the dominant etiquette around race is colorblindness. It has a strong moral appeal, for it laudably envisions an ideal world in which race is no longer relevant to how we perceive and treat each other. It also has an intuitive practical appeal: to get beyond race, colorblindness urges, the best strategy is to immediately stop recognizing and talking about race. (pp. 77-78)

Critical race scholars in higher education have mobilized to confront this fallacy head-on and to remind us that DuBois (1903), Myrdal (1962), and Bell's (1987) works remain prescient. The American dilemma in the new century continues to be the problem of the color line; and higher education is not exempt to this fact. What CR scholarship does is help expose how race and racism are infused into the higher education culture.

Higher Education: (b) Selective Admissions Policy

In their 2002 review of CRT in qualitative research, Parker and Lynn remarked,

> Given the conservative nature of the federal court rulings on questions of race, as exemplified in the bevy of anti-affirmative action decisions and laws that have sprung up around the country in recent years, CRT in education will come under the same attack it is facing in the legal arena. Therefore, the future of CRT and its place in qualitative research will partially depend on the efforts made by researchers and scholars to explore its possible connections to life in schools and communities of color. For example, the emerging broader theoretical framework related to race and the widening of the lens to take into account other perspectives besides the Black-White paradigm would be very useful in terms of developing a more multilayered research discussion about life in racially diverse schools with different populations of students. (p. 18)

Parker and Lynn's (2002) observations, made on the cusp of the University of Michigan's 2003 affirmative action Supreme Court cases, *Grutter v. Bollinger* and *Gratz v. Bollinger*, continue to ring true. Since its inception, at the center of Critical Race scholarship has been the task of interrogating majoritarian frames that have historically shaped and informed race-conscious admissions policies in higher education.

As with the study of K-12 education, postsecondary education scholars have applied CRT's core tenets to contextualize and historicize higher educational access and opportunities. What is revealed in this process is that claims of objectivity and meritocracy, which fuel anti-affirmative action movements, are illusory. Supposed race-neutrality simply camouflages the continuance of White privilege and the social construction of merit.

Perhaps more than in any other subgenre in higher education, the study and analysis of higher education policy and practice as related to affirmative action admissions most closely bridges the work of Critical Race legal and social science scholars. In fact, in many ways, the study of affirmative action is incomplete without a grounding in Critical Race legal scholarship (Bell, 2004; Carbado & Harris, 2008; Onwuachi-Willig, Houh, & Campbell, 2008). After all, the seminal work of Critical Race legal scholars, such as Derrick Bell and Richard Delgado, among others, helped lay the foundation by which higher education scholars can continue to interrogate affirmative action policies. For example, Bell's (1980, 1992, 2004, 2008a) formative work on "interest convergence" has not only helped contextualize the history of affirmative action but also helps explain why, even now, under constant scrutiny and surveillance, as well as threats of legal action by anti-affirmative action pundits, postsecondary institutions continue to defend the policy, albeit in lukewarm fashion. Bell's interest convergence principle, which posits that Whites will only support race-conscious remedies when perceived costs are outweighed by the perceived benefits to be gained by the majority, implies that the reason that predominantly White institutions (PWIs) continue to defend affirmative action is because it is in their interest to do so. Indeed, with the falling away of all but the diversity rationale to legally defend affirmative action policies, PWIs seem to recognize that student body diversity has become an important "commodity" by which to market their institutions (Leong, 2013).

The persistent attack on affirmative action has also helped usher in a new era of critical research, one that has helped widen the scope of CR scholarship beyond the Black–White binary. Teranishi, Behringer, Grey, and Parker (2009) and Park and Liu (2014) are just a few of the authors that have contributed to the affirmative action debate by speaking to the Asian American experience with affirmative action. Their scholarship is especially valuable as critics of affirmative action policy have long depended on the "model minority" myth to position Asian Americans as victims of affirmative action. As Teranishi et al. (2009) tell us,

> Asian American and Pacific Islander students, within higher education access and admissions debates, are either misrepresented or used by the opposing factions within the debate to further their own interests of maintaining or dismantling affirmative action. In both cases, AAPIs' authentic stories and voices have largely been silenced. (p. 60)

Not only have the voices and stories of Asian American and Pacific Islander students been silenced, often these have been manipulated by politics beyond the academy. For example, arguments in favor of normative conceptions of merit, such as standardized test scores, are relied upon to disprove the need for affirmative action policy. However, as Park and Liu (2014) explain, the reliance upon such measures shifts depending on who is expected to benefit. For instance (Kang, 1996, as cited in Park & Liu, 2014) posit,

> Kang (1996) pioneered the term [negative action] to explain how Asian Americans are often displaced by Whites, and not other ethnic minorities, in college admissions. Negative action occurs when White students are more likely to gain admission than Asian Americans with equivalent standardized academic records. In other words, negative action "is in force if a university denies admission to an Asian American who would have been admitted had that person been White." (pp. 39-40, citations omitted)

With the ongoing debate on the future of affirmative action and with the increasing reliance on state initiatives to curtail and/or overturn affirmative action policy, CR scholarship has become invaluable. Through a CRT lens, researchers are helping expose the social construction of

merit, as well as to complicate and expose how arguments against race-conscious policies are used to maintain the status quo.

Higher Education: (c) Campus Racial Climate

As evidenced by a sampling of the CRT-infused postsecondary literature produced in the last decade (Buenavista, 2012; Gildersleeve, Croom, & Vasquez, 2011; Gusa, 2010; Harper, 2012; Jain, Herrera, Bernal, & Solorzano, 2011; Jayakumar, Howard, Allen, & Han, 2009; Museus & Iftikar, 2013; Yosso, Smith, Ceja, & Solorzano, 2009), Critical Race scholars continue to rely upon CRT to capture the unique and continuously, overlooked and/or dismissed, experiences of those historically marginalized in higher education spaces. Chief among the goals of many Critical Race scholars has been to accurately situate the presence and life stories of historically underrepresented groups. Whereas deficit frameworks have often been used to speak to the experiences of students and faculty of color in postsecondary education (Herrnstein & Murray, 1994; Thernstrom & Thernstrom, 1997). CRT provides a means by which to highlight both macro and micro sociopolitical and institutional structures impacting postsecondary access and success. For example, through their examination of racial microaggressions at three selective institutions, Yosso et al. (2009) utilize CRT to explore how racism continues to permeate postsecondary institutions and the collegiate interactions for students of color, including Latin@ students. As Yosso et al. (2009) posit, "The ways race, racism, and racial ideologies influence . . . collegiate interactions remain underresearched" (p. 660). Through a CRT lens, coupled with Dr. Chester Pierce's seminal work on racial microaggressions, Yosso et al. set out to contribute to the literature on Latin@ undergraduates by shedding light on the experiences of Latin@ students with racial microaggressions. Yosso et al.'s work contextualizes the lived experiences of historically minoritized students, but in so doing, they also challenge higher education scholars, leaders, and practitioners, to think about how historically underrepresented students are represented and supported on campuses. One way they do this is by pressing postsecondary institutions to be more explicit about their "diversity" goals. For instance, they differentiate between a "diversity of convenience," the form most often endorsed by universities, and genuine diversity, or "pluralism" (p. 664), which the authors admit is challenging to fulfill in the current political racial climate. A diversity of convenience, according to Yosso et al. (2009), actually works to maintain a "hostile campus racial climate" (p. 664) while simultaneously limiting "equal access and opportunities for Students of Color" (p. 664). For Yosso et al. (2009), "Genuine racial diversity or pluralism refers to underrepresented racial and ethnic groups being physically present and treated as equals on the college campus" (p. 664). Thus, CRT provides a framework through which Critical Race scholars, leaders, and practitioners, among others, can press their institutions to enact truly inclusive and equitable policies and practices.

CRT recognizes and embraces the experiential knowledge of historically marginalized people. In postsecondary scholarship, this means acknowledging the power of narratives that give testimony to the experiences of historically underrepresented students, faculty, staff, administrators, etcetera. Narratives that center the voice of *minoritized* communities help honor and validate the experiences of those too often silenced or cast to the margins, while also interrogating presumed pedagogical canons. This amplification of usually silenced voices has made the tenet of honoring experiential knowledge one of the most popular CRT tenets for postsecondary Critical Race scholarship.

In their synthesis of CRT in education literature, Dixson and Rousseau (2005) address the power and importance of narrative, or as they term it *voice* in Critical Race scholarship. They summarize as follows:

> One of the important functions of voice and stories in CRT scholarship is to counteract the stories of the dominant group (Delgado, 1989). The dominant group tells stories that are designed to "remind it of its identity in relation to outgroups and provide a form of shared reality in which its own superior position is seen as natural" (Delgado, 1989, p. 240). One of the functions of voice scholarship is to subvert that reality. According to Lawrence (1995), "we must learn to trust our own senses, feelings and experiences, to give them authority, even (or especially) in the face of dominant accounts of social reality that claim universality" (p. 338). Thus, one of the functions of voice scholarship is to provide a "counterstory"—a means to counteract or challenge the dominant story. (Dixson & Rousseau, 2005, p.11)

As Dixson and Rousseau (2005) illustrate, a focus on voice/narrative/counterstorytelling has been a main function of Critical Race scholarship. The aim to subvert the majoritarian reality is only one half of the reason why Critical Race scholars are drawn to the use of narrative. The other half is that through narrative, Critical Race scholars give voice and agency to those historically dispossessed of power.

In legal studies, Critical Race legal scholar Richard Delgado (1989) explained the use of narratives as follows, "Stories, parables, chronicles, and narratives are powerful means for destroying mindset—the bundle of presuppositions, received wisdoms, and shared understandings against a background of which legal and political discourse takes place" (p. 2413). Calmore (1992) further clarified,

> Critical Race theory attempts to construct a social reality and direct operation within it. It is a way of finding meaning within

> legal scholarship through combining language, thought, and experience. Voice is important: how voice is expressed, how voice is informed, how our voice differs from dominant voice. (p. 2167)

In the study of higher education the power of narrative has been "instrumental in providing a voice for students who are otherwise not heard, thus allowing students to provide their own perspectives on their educational experiences" (Teranishi, 2002 as cited in Dixson & Rousseau, 2005, p. 11).

Critical Race scholarship examining the lived experiences of individuals of color in higher education has flourished in the last decade. Through qualitative and quantitative approaches, Critical Race researchers in higher education have set out to analyze "educational inequities, academic tracking, college admissions, critical pedagogy, racial microaggressions, and best practices," among other postsecondary topics (Espino, 2012, p. 32). In so doing, researchers have provided an opportunity for marginalized communities to speak their own truths.

Indeed, CRT's emphasis on narrative has allowed researchers to tell the "richer, more detailed stories" clamored for in educational research (Ladson-Billings, 2005). For example, in response to the common practice to aggregate student groups, Buenavista, Jayakumar, and Misa-Escalante (2009) disentangle the unique college experiences that U.S. Pilipino students encounter in comparison with their Asian American peers. They posit,

> While Asian Americans have been included in debates about racial and ethnic minority representation in American colleges and universities since the 1980s, they have mostly been used to legitimate or devalue the experiences of other racial and ethnic groups. Rarely have Asian American experiences and perspectives been given attention in and of themselves. (Buenavista et al., 2009, pp. 68-69)

As Buenavista and her coauthors (2009) recount, "A CRT examination of the factors influencing Pilipino American college students reveals that they continue to be constructed as liminal students of color, while their experiences are similar to those of underrepresented students of color" (p. 77). Contrary to fulfilling the popular "Model Minority" myth cast upon Asian American students, Buenavista et al. posit, "Pilipino American college students face similar retention issues as other students of color, but their experiences remain obscure, and postsecondary institutions consequently fail to provide the recognition and invest the resources to address their concerns" (p. 77). The use of narrative therefore allows Buenavista et al. to honor voices too often excluded from dominant discourses.

By utilizing CRT's narrative process, Critical Race scholars who study postsecondary related topics are also able to produce more robust studies that transcend the Black–White binary (Parker & Lynn, 2002). Contemporary Critical Race scholarship challenges the homogenization of racial/ethnic groups (Museus & Iftikar, 2013), while adding richness and texture to the study of all groups in higher education (Annamma, Connor, & Ferri, 2012; Espino, 2012; Yosso, 2006).

Conclusion

In the January 2012 issue of *Diverse Issues in Higher Education*, Robin Hughes posed a provocative blog post centered on CRT. Here, Hughes (2012) implied that CRT has become the newest "sexy" theoretical framework, the "new little black dress, fishnet, black panty hose, smoking jacket" (para. 2). Hughes suggests that is it "CRTitilicious" to present yourself as a Critical Race Theorist. She implies that scholars, in education and elsewhere, have been drawn to CRT's radical past and rabble-rousing present, and to the presumption that describing yourself as a "CRiT" scholar guarantees a secure, albeit bumpy, road toward publication. Among the tongue and cheek critique, Hughes offers sobering advice to both wannabe CRiTs and practicing Crits alike. Like others before her, Hughes reminds us that it is not enough to sprinkle CRT here and there in your work. Though Hughes jests,

> Being "Crit" has become so cool that you only have to be a little vested in the framework. For instance, write 25 pages of text and use one paragraph of CRT—that's good enough. It's called a teaser. Simply add a paragraph that explains the four tenets lifted directly from Bell or Delgado and Stefancic. Sprinkle in some of the "names" (we all know them) and you are really sexy. (para. 6)

By now, we should know better.

The use of CRT in education is no longer in its infancy. To the contrary, CRT has evolved into a type of revolutionary project. Such a project unapologetically centers race and examines how this key sociohistorical construct affects all facets of daily life. CRT also problematizes objectivity and exposes how colorblind and postracial ideologies, that envelope daily discourse, work to maintain privilege and protect White supremacy. Indeed, CRT has proven to be invaluable in helping us name and challenge the White supremacist patriarchy (bell) that has historically framed and shaped educational opportunity for all throughout the k-20 pipeline. As such, we owe it to ourselves, and others, to help safeguard CRT. While we should by all means challenge one another to apply CRT in the most robust and rigorous fashion possible, we hurt ourselves by leaving CRT susceptible to preventable criticism. This means that whenever possible, as we aim to achieve a Critical Race Praxis, we work to recouple CRT to *all* of its historical roots. This means acknowledging not just critical legal studies but also ethnic studies, women's studies, history, sociology, and so on. These are the historical roots

that are the backbone of CRT and that inform the richness and power of intersectionality.

We acknowledge the critiques of CRT in education (and elsewhere), specifically that while CRT offers us a strong lens to identify institutional racism it does not offer remedies (Su, 2005) and instead promotes bleak and pessimistic views of potential change (Rosen, 1996 in Su, 2005). The work here we identify above offer particular tools to use to engage enduring racism. Importantly, CRT centers the need of community engagement in doing this work. In K-12 research, the role of communities of color in shaping the direction and driving the work of Critical Race work remains paramount (Su, 2005; Tate, Ladson-Billings, & Grant, 1993).

However, as CRT continues to evolve so does its potential potency. In recent years, Critical Race researchers have expanded the application and scope CR scholarship. New literature now exists that confronts the important and racialized components of heretofore unexamined educational experiences through as CRT lens, such as the community college transfer function (Jain et al., 2011), career readiness (Castro, 2013), and even the enactment of the federal Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors (DREAM) Act DREAM ACT (Buenavista, 2012), just to name a few.

If we return to our opening question, "Does CRT in education stand on firmer footing?" The answer is an unequivocal "yes." However, important work remains to be done. We believe that when aiming toward a CRT-inspired revolutionary praxis in education, paying more attention to the institutional, not just individual, structures and relationships would help facilitate larger scaled change (Carbado & Gulati, 2003). We applaud all the CR-inspired work done to date but are reminded that claims of colorblindness and postracialism, aided by the advent of a new type of "dog whistle racism" (Haney-López, 2014) and rampant neoliberalism, complicate CRT's task of challenging White supremacy in education and elsewhere. After all, how do we call out racism when others deny that race continues to matter? In the classroom, in the boardroom, in the courtroom, and in the court of public opinion, race and racism remain taboo subjects. Still, we are encouraged that at the core of so much Critical Race work is the task of advancing social justice. And we join the ranks to continue the work ahead.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Notes

1. We arrive on 2005-2006 as a marker for this project because we build upon previous literature reviews, including Dixson and Rousseau (2005) and Parker and Lynn (2006), which synthesized Critical Race in education scholarship between 1995 and 2005.
2. Derrick Bell (1980) coined the term *interest convergence* to describe how advances for people of color are promoted only when they serve to promote White interests as well.

References

Alemán, E. Jr. (2006). Is Robin Hood the "prince of thieves" or a pathway to equity? Applying critical race theory to school finance political discourse. *Educational Policy*, *20*, 113-142.

Alemán, E. Jr. (2007a). Critical race theory and human capital theory: Framing the discourse on the nexus between social justice and education finance. In G. M. Rodriguez & R. A. Rolle (Eds.), *To what ends and by what means: The social justice implications of contemporary school finance theory and policy* (pp. 35-57). New York, NY: Routledge.

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

Alemán, E. Jr. (2013). Intersecting educational finance, politics and the law with racism: A critical race case analysis. In L. C. Tillman & J. J. Scheurich (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational leadership for equity and diversity* (pp. 552-578). New York: Routledge.

Annamma, S. A., Connor, D., & Ferri, B. (2012). Dis/ability critical race studied (DisCrit): Theorizing at the intersections of race and dis/ability. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *16*, 1-31.

Asimeng-Boahene, L. (2010). Counter-storytelling with African proverbs: A vehicle for teaching social justice and global understanding in urban, U.S. schools. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *43*, 434-445.

Au, W. (2011). Teaching under the new Taylorism: High-stakes testing and the standardization of the 21st century curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *43*, 25-45.

Au, W. (2014). Hiding behind high-stakes testing: Meritocracy, objectivity and inequality in US education. *International Education Journal: Comparative Perspectives*, *12*(2), 7-19.

Banks, J. A., & Banks, C. A. M. (Eds.). (2009). *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.

Bell, D. (1980). Brown vs. Board of Education and the interest-convergence principle. *Harvard Law Review*, *93*, 518-533.

Bell, D. (1987). *And we are not saved: The elusive quest for racial justice*. New York, NY: BasicBooks.

Bell, D. (1991). Racism is here to stay: Now what? *Howard Law Journal*, *35*, 79-93.

Bell, D. (1992). Racial realism. *Connecticut Law Review*, *24*, 363-379.

Bell, D. (2004). *Silent covenants: Brown v. Board of Education and the unfulfilled hopes for racial reform*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Bell, D. (2008a). *Race, racism, and American law*. New York, NY: Aspen.

Bell, D. (2008b). Racism the ultimate deception. *North Carolina Law Review*, *86*, 621-634.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2003). *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in the United States*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Buenavista, T. L. (2012). Citizenship at a cost: Undocumented Asian youth perceptions and the militarization of immigration. *AAPI Nexus*, *10*, 101-124.

Buenavista, T. L. (2013, April). *(Color) blind review: The commodification of critical race theory in the academic publishing process*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Buenavista, T. L., Jayakumar, U. M., & Misa-Escalante, K. (2009). Contextualizing Asian American education through Critical Race Theory: An example of U.S. Pilipino college student experiences. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, *142*, 69-81.

Cajete, G. (1994). *Look to the mountain: An ecology of indigenous education*. Durango, CO: Kivaki Press.

Calderón, D. (2008). *Indigenous metaphysics: Challenging western knowledge organization in social studies curriculum*. Ann Arbor, MI: ProQuest.

Calderón, D., Delgado Bernal, D., Pérez Huber, L., Malagón, M. C., & Vélez, V. N. (2012). A Chicana feminist epistemology revisited: Cultivating ideas a generation later. *Harvard Educational Review*, *82*, 513-539.

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

Calmore, J. O. (1999). A call to context: The professional challenges of cause lawyering at the intersection of race, space, and poverty. *Fordham Law Review*, *67*, 1927-1957.

Carbado, D. W. (2002). Afterword: (E)Racing education. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *35*, 181-194.

Carbado, D. W., & Gulati, M. (2003). What exactly is racial diversity? (Review of *Silence at Boalt Hall* by Andrea Guerrero). *California Law Review*, *91*, 1149-1165.

Carbado, D. W., & Harris, C. I. (2008). The new racial preferences. *California Law Review*, *96*, 1139-1214.

Castro, E. L. (2013). Racialized readiness for college and career toward an equity-grounded social science of intervention programming. *Community College Review*, *41*, 292-310.

Chapman, T. (2007). Interrogating classroom relationships and events: Using portraiture and Critical Race Theory in education research. *Educational Researcher*, *36*, 156-162.

Choi, J. (2008). Unlearning colorblind ideologies in education class. *Educational Foundations*, *22*, 52-71.

Cook, D. A., & Dixson, A. D. (2013). Writing critical race theory and method: A composite counterstory on the experiences of black teachers in New Orleans post-Katrina. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *26*, 1238-1258.

Crenshaw, K. W. (1988). Race, reform, and retrenchment: Transformation and legitimation in antidiscrimination law. *Harvard Law Review*, *101*(7), 1331-1387.

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

Crenshaw, K. W. (2011). Twenty years of Critical Race theory: Looking back to move forward. *Connecticut Law Review*, *43*, 1253-1353.

Crenshaw, K. W., Gotanda, N., Peller, G., & Thomas, K. (Eds.). (1995). *Critical Race Theory: The key writings that formed the movement*. New York, NY: The New Press.

Cross, W. Jr. (1971). The Negro to Black conversion experience. *Black World*, *20*(9), 13-27.

Crowley, R. M. (2013). "The goddamndest, toughest voting rights bill": Critical Race Theory and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *16*, 696-724.

Daniels, E. A. (2011). Racial silences: Exploring and incorporating critical frameworks in the social studies. *The Social Studies*, *102*, 211-220.

Darder, A., & Torres, R. D. (2004). *After race: Racism after multiculturalism*. New York: New York University Press.

Delgado, R. (1989). Storytelling for oppositionists and others: A plea for narrative. *Michigan Law Review*, *87*, 2411-2441.

Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2001). *Critical Race Theory: An introduction*. New York: New York University Press.

Delgado Bernal, D. (1998). Using a Chicana feminist epistemology in educational research. *Harvard Educational Review*, *68*, 555-583.

Deloria, V., & Wildcat, D. (2001). *Power and place: Indian education in America*. Golden, CO: Fulcrum.

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*, 7-27.

DuBois, W. E. B. (1903). *The souls of black folk*. Chicago, IL: A.C. McClurg.

Espino, M. M. (2012). Seeking the "truth" in the stories we tell: The role of Critical Race epistemology in higher education research. *The Review of Higher Education*, *36*, 31-67.

Evans-Winters, V., & Twyman Hoff, P. (2011). The aesthetics of White racism in pre-service teacher education: A Critical Race Theory perspective. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *14*, 461-479.

Gildersleeve, R. E., Croom, N. N., & Vasquez, P. L. (2011). "Am I going crazy?!" A Critical Race analysis of doctoral education. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *44*, 93-114.

Giroux, H. (2004). *The terror of neoliberalism: Authoritarianism and the eclipse of democracy*. Herndon, VA: Paradigm.

Gusa, D. L. (2010). White institutional presence: The impact of Whiteness on campus climate. *Harvard Educational Review*, *80*, 464-489.

Haney-López, I. (2014). *Dog whistle politics: How coded racial appeals have wrecked the middle class*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Harper, S. R. (2012). Race without racism: How higher education researchers minimize racist institutional norms. *The Review of Higher Education*, *36*, 9-29.

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

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

Howard, T. C. (2003). Culturally relevant pedagogy: Ingredients for critical teacher reflection. *Theory Into Practice*, *42*, 195-202.

Hughes, R. L. (2012). *Bringing sexy back: The "critilicious" and theoretical framing* [Web log post]. Retrieved from http://diverseeducation.com/article/31371/#

Iverson, S. V. (2007). Camouflaging power and privilege: A critical race analysis of university diversity policies. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *43*, 586-611.

Jain, D., Herrera, A., Bernal, S., & Solorzano, D. G. (2011). Critical Race theory and the transfer function: Introducing a transfer receptive culture. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, *35*, 252-266.

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

Kang, J. (1996). Negative action against Asian Americans: The internal instability of Dworkin's defense of affirmative action. *Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review (CR_CL), 31*. Retrieved from http://ssrn.com/abstract=707624

Kohli, R. (2009). Critical race reflections: Valuing the experiences of teachers of color in teacher education. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *12*, 235-251.

Kohli, R. (2012). Racial pedagogy of the oppressed: Critical interracial dialogue for teachers of color. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *45*, 181-196.

Kohli, R., & Solorzano, D. G. (2012). Teachers please learn our names! Racial microaggressions and the K-12 classroom. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *15*, 441-462.

Kumasi, K. (2012). Roses in the concrete: A critical race perspective on urban youth and school libraries. *Knowledge Quest*, *40*(5), 32-37.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). Who will teach our children: Preparing teachers to successfully teach African American students. In E. R. Hollins, J. E. King, & W. C. Hayman (Eds.), *Teaching diverse populations: Formulating a knowledge base* (pp. 129-142). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1996). Silences as weapons: Challenges of a Black professor teaching White students. *Theory Into Practice*, *35*, 79-85.

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

Ladson-Billings, G. (2001). *Crossing over to Canaan: The journey of new teachers in diverse classrooms* (The Jossey-Bass Education Series). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Ladson-Billings, G. (Ed.). (2003). *Critical race theory perspectives on the social studies: The profession, policies, and curriculum*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2005). The evolving role of Critical Race theory in educational scholarship. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *8*, 115-119.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2009). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.

Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. F. (1995). Toward a Critical Race Theory of education. *Teachers College Record*, *97*, 47-68.

Ledesma, M. C. (2013). Revisiting *Grutter* in the wake of *Fisher*: Looking back to move forward. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *46*, 220-235.

Leonardo, Z. (2009). *Race, Whiteness, and education*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Leonardo, Z. (2013). *Race frameworks: A multidimensional theory of racism and education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Leonardo, Z., & Porter, R. K. (2010). Pedagogy of fear: Toward a Fanonian theory of "safety" in race dialogue. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *13*, 139-157.

Leong, N. (2013). Racial capitalism. *Harvard Law Review*, *126*, 2151-2226.

Lynn, M. (1999). Toward a critical race pedagogy a research note. *Urban Education*, *33*, 606-626.

Lynn, M. (2004). Inserting the "race" into critical pedagogy: An analysis of "race based epistemologies." *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *36*, 153-165.

Lynn, M., & Parker, L. (2006). Critical race studies in education: Examining a decade of research on US schools. *The Urban Review*, *38*, 257-290.

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

Martinez, E. S. (1998). *De colores means all of us: Latina views for a multi-colored century*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

Marx, S., & Pennington, J. (2003). Pedagogies of Critical Race Theory: Experimentations with White preservice teachers. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, *16*, 91-110.

Matias, C. E. (2013). Who you callin' White?! A critical counter-story on colouring White identity. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *16*, 291-315.

Matias, C. E., & Liou, D. D. (2014). Tending to the heart of communities of color: Toward critical race Teacher activism. *Urban Education*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1177/0042085913519338

Mitchell, K. (2013). Race, difference, meritocracy, and English: Majoritarian stories in the education of secondary multilingual learners. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *16*, 339-364.

Museus, S. D. & Iftikar, J. (2013). An Asian critical race theory (AsianCrit) framework. In M.Y. Danico & J.G. Golson (Eds.), *Asian American Students in Higher Education* (pp. 18-29). New York: Routledge.

Myrdal, G. (1962). *An American dilemma: The Negro problem and modern democracy*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Onwuachi-Willig, A., Houh, E., & Campbell, M. (2008). Cracking the egg: Which came first—Stigma or affirmative action? *California Law Review*, *96*, 1299-1352.

Park, J. J., & Liu, A. (2014). Interest convergence or divergence? A critical race analysis of Asian Americans, meritocracy, and critical mass in the affirmative action debate. *Journal of Higher Education*, *85*, 36-64.

Parker, L. (2003). Critical race theory and its implications for methodology and policy analysis in higher education desegregation. In G. R. López & L. Parker (Eds.), *Interrogating racism in qualitative research methodology* (pp. 145-180). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Parker, L., & Lynn, M. (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*, 7-22.

Parker, L., & Lynn, M. (2006). Critical Race studies in education: Examining a decade of research on U.S. Schools. *The Urban Review*, *38*, 257-290.

Parker, L., & Stovall, D. O. (2004). Actions following words: Critical race theory connects to critical pedagogy. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *36*, 167-182.

Pierce, C. (2012). *Education in the age of biocapitalism: Optimizing educational life for a flat world*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pérez Huber, L. (2011). Discourses of racist nativism in California public education: English dominance as racist nativist micro-aggressions. *Educational Studies*, *47*, 379-401.

Rodriguez, T. L. (2011). Stories of self, stories of practice: Enacting a vision of socially just pedagogy for Latino youth. *Teaching Education*, *22*, 239-254.

Rosen, J. (1996). The bloods and the crits: O.J. Simpson, critical race theory, the law, and the triumph of color in America. *The New Republic*, *215*(24), 27-42.

Sleeter, C. E. (2005). *Un-standardizing curriculum: Multicultural teaching in the standards-based classroom*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Smith, J. J., & Stovall, D. (2008). "Coming home" to new homes and new schools: Critical race theory and the new politics of containment. *Journal of Education Policy*, *23*, 135-152.

Solorzano, D. G. (1998). Critical Race Theory, racial and gender microaggressions, and the experiences of Chicana and Chicano scholars. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *11*, 121-136.

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

Solorzano, D. G., & Yosso, T. J. (2001). Critical race and LatCrit theory and method: Counter-storytelling. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *14*, 471-495.

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

Stovall, D. (2013). Against the politics of desperation: Educational justice, critical race theory, and Chicago school reform. *Critical Studies in Education*, *54*, 33-43.

Su, C. (2005). Cracking silent codes: Critical race theory and education organizing. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, *28*, 531-548.

Taliaferro Baszile, D. (2009). Deal with it we must: Education, social justice, and the curriculum of hip hop culture. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *42*, 6-19.

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

Tate, W. F. (2005). Ethics, engineering and the challenge of racial reform in education. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *8*, 121-127.

Tate, W. F., Ladson-Billings, G., & Grant, C. A. (1993). The Brown decision revisited: Mathematizing social problems. *Educational Policy*, *7*, 255-275.

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. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, *2009*, 57-68.

Thernstrom, S. & Thernstrom, A. (1997). *America in Black and White: One nation, indivisible*. New York: Touchstone.

Vaught, S. E., & Castagno, A. E. (2008). "I don't think I'm a racist": Critical Race Theory, teacher attitudes, and structural racism. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *11*, 95-113.

Velez, V. N. (2008). Challenging lies LatCrit style: A critical race reflection of an ally to Latina/o immigrant parent leaders. *FIU Law Review*, *4*, Article 119.

Villegas, A. M., & Irvine, J. J. (2010). Diversifying the teaching force: An examination of major arguments. *The Urban Review*, *42*, 175-192.

Yazzie-Mintz, T. (2007). From a place deep inside: Culturally appropriate curriculum as the embodiment of Navajo-ness in classroom pedagogy. *Journal of American Indian Education*, *46*(3), 72-93.

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

Yosso, T. J. (2006). *Critical Race counterstories along the Chicana/Chicano educational pipeline*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Yosso, T. J., Parker, L., Solorzano, 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 Education*, *28*, 1-25.

Yosso, T. J., Smith, W. A., Ceja, M., & Solorzano, D. G. (2009). Critical Race theory, racial microaggressions, and campus racial climate, for Latina/o undergraduates. *Harvard Educational Review*, *79*, 659-690.

Young, E. (2011). The four personae of racism: Educators' (mis) understanding of individual vs. systemic racism. *Urban Education*, *46*, 1433-1460.

Author Biographies

María C. Ledesma, PhD, is an assistant professor in the Educational Leadership and Policy Department at the University of Utah's College of Education. Dr. Ledesma's research interests include historicizing and contextualizing race-conscious social policy in higher education, narrative framing and discourse analysis, and critical race theory in education.

Dolores Calderon, JD, PhD , is an assistant professor in the Department of Education, Culture and Society and the Ethnic Studies Program at the University of Utah. Her research focuses on indigenous education, culturally relevant/multicultural education, Chicana(o)/indigenous student success, and settler colonial/critical race theories.