

VOLUME 42

NUMBER

6

Whiteness in Higher Education: The Invisible Missing Link in Diversity and Racial Analyses

NOLAN L. CABRERA
JEREMY D. FRANKLIN
JESSE S. WATSON

ASHE Higher Education Report

Available online at wileyonlinelibrary.com

ASHE Higher Education Report: Volume 42, Number 6
Kelly Ward, Lisa E. Wolf-Wendel, Series Editors

Whiteness in Higher Education: The Invisible Missing Link in Diversity and Racial Analyses

Nolan L. Cabrera, Jeremy D. Franklin,
Jesse S. Watson

Whiteness in Higher Education: The Invisible Missing Link in Diversity and Racial Analyses

Nolan L. Cabrera, Jeremy D. Franklin, Jesse S. Watson

ASHE Higher Education Report: Volume 42, Number 6

Series Editors: Kelly Ward, Lisa E. Wolf-Wendel

ASHE HIGHER EDUCATION REPORT, (Print ISSN: 1551-6970; Online ISSN: 1554-6306), is published quarterly by Wiley Subscription Services, Inc., a Wiley Company, 111 River St., Hoboken, NJ 07030-5774 USA.

Postmaster: Send all address changes to *ASHE HIGHER EDUCATION REPORT*, John Wiley & Sons Inc., C/O The Sheridan Press, PO Box 465, Hanover, PA 17331 USA.

Copyright and Copying (in any format)

Copyright © 2017 Wiley Periodicals, Inc., a Wiley Company. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored or transmitted in any form or by any means without the prior permission in writing from the copyright holder. Authorization to copy items for internal and personal use is granted by the copyright holder for libraries and other users registered with their local Reproduction Rights Organisation (RRO), e.g. Copyright Clearance Center (CCC), 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, USA (www.copyright.com), provided the appropriate fee is paid directly to the RRO. This consent does not extend to other kinds of copying such as copying for general distribution, for advertising or promotional purposes, for republication, for creating new collective works or for resale. Permissions for such reuse can be obtained using the RightsLink "Request Permissions" link on Wiley Online Library. Special requests should be addressed to: permissions@wiley.com

Information for subscribers

ASHE HIGHER EDUCATION REPORT is published in 6 issues per year. Institutional subscription prices for 2017 are:

Print & Online: US\$477 (US), US\$557 (Canada & Mexico), US\$626 (Rest of World), €406 (Europe), £323 (UK). Prices are exclusive of tax. Asia-Pacific GST, Canadian GST/HST and European VAT will be applied at the appropriate rates. For more information on current tax rates, please go to www.wileyonlinelibrary.com/tax-vat. The price includes online access to the current and all online back-files to January 1st 2013, where available. For other pricing options, including access information and terms and conditions, please visit www.wileyonlinelibrary.com/access.

Delivery Terms and Legal Title

Where the subscription price includes print issues and delivery is to the recipient's address, delivery terms are **Delivered at Place (DAP)**; the recipient is responsible for paying any import duty or taxes. Title to all issues transfers FOB our shipping point, freight prepaid. We will endeavor to fulfill claims for missing or damaged copies within six months of publication, within our reasonable discretion and subject to availability.

Back issues: Single issues from current and recent volumes are available at the current single issue price from cs-journals@wiley.com.

Disclaimer

The Publisher and Editors cannot be held responsible for errors or any consequences arising from the use of information contained in this journal; the views and opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect those of the Publisher and Editors, neither does the publication of advertisements constitute any endorsement by the Publisher and Editors of the products advertised.

Publisher: ASHE HIGHER EDUCATION REPORT is published by Wiley Periodicals, Inc., 350 Main St., Malden, MA 02148-5020.

Journal Customer Services: For ordering information, claims and any enquiry concerning your journal subscription please go to www.wileycustomerhelp.com/ask or contact your nearest office.

Americas: Email: cs-journals@wiley.com; Tel: +1 781 388 8598 or +1 800 835 6770 (toll free in the USA & Canada).

Europe, Middle East and Africa: Email: cs-journals@wiley.com; Tel: +44 (0) 1865 778315.

Asia Pacific: Email: cs-journals@wiley.com; Tel: +65 6511 8000.

Japan: For Japanese speaking support, Email: cs-japan@wiley.com.

Visit our Online Customer Help available in 7 languages at www.wileycustomerhelp.com/ask

Production Editor: Poornita Jugran (email: pjugran@wiley.com).

Wiley's Corporate Citizenship initiative seeks to address the environmental, social, economic, and ethical challenges faced in our business and which are important to our diverse stakeholder groups. Since launching the initiative, we have focused on sharing our content with those in need, enhancing community philanthropy, reducing our carbon impact, creating global guidelines and best practices for paper use, establishing a vendor code of ethics, and engaging our colleagues and other stakeholders in our efforts. Follow our progress at www.wiley.com/go/citizenship

View this journal online at wileyonlinelibrary.com/journal/aehc

Wiley is a founding member of the UN-backed HINARI, AGORA, and OARE initiatives. They are now collectively known as Research4Life, making online scientific content available free or at nominal cost to researchers in developing countries. Please visit Wiley's Content Access - Corporate Citizenship site: <http://www.wiley.com/WileyCDA/Section/id-390082.html>

Printed in the USA by The Sheridan Group.

Address for Editorial Correspondence: Coeditors-in -chief, Kelly Ward, Lisa E. Wolf-Wendel, ASHE HIGHER EDUCATION REPORT, Email: lwolf@ku.edu and kaward@wsu.edu

Abstracting and Indexing Services

The Journal is indexed by Academic Search Alumni Edition (EBSCO Publishing); Education Index/Abstracts (EBSCO Publishing); ERIC: Educational Resources Information Center (CSC); Higher Education Abstracts (Claremont Graduate University); IBR & IBZ: International Bibliographies of Periodical Literature (KG Saur).

Cover design: Wiley

Cover Images: ©

For submission instructions, subscription and all other information visit: wileyonlinelibrary.com/journal/aehc

Advisory Board



The ASHE Higher Education Report Series is sponsored by the Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE), which provides an editorial advisory board of ASHE members.

Amy Bergerson
University of Utah

Bryan Brayboy
Arizona State University

Ryan Gildersleeve
University of Denver

Michael Harris
Southern Methodist University

Elizabeth Jones
Holy Family University

Adrianna Kezar
University of Southern California

Kevin Kinser
SUNY – Albany

Peter Magolda
Miami University of Ohio

Dina C. Maramba
SUNY – Binghamton

Susan Marine
Merrimack College

Christopher Morphew
University of Iowa

Robert Palmer
SUNY – Binghamton

Michael Paulsen
University of Iowa

Todd Ream
Taylor University

Barbara Tobolowsky
University of Texas at Arlington

Carolyn Thompson
University of Missouri, Kansas City

Diane Wright
Florida Atlantic University

Contents

Executive Summary	7
Foreword	11
Prelude	14
Whiteness in Higher Education: Core Concepts and Overview	16
Whiteness as a Racial Discourse	18
Overview of Monograph	27
Interpersonal Whiteness and Higher Education	29
White on White: Invisibility and Structured Ignorance	30
Microaggressions and the Missing Perspective of Whiteness	35
Whiteness and College Students: The Empirical Scholarship	37
Conclusion	48
Institutional Whiteness and Higher Education	50
Space, Race, and College Campuses: Three Perspectives	52
Whiteness Informing Culture, Climate, and Ecology	58
How Whiteness Affects Students of Color	67
Conclusion	75
Developing Racial Justice Allies	76
Ally Development: Context, Challenges, and Concepts	77
Conclusion	93

Implications and Futuring Whiteness Studies in Higher Education	95
The Future of Whiteness Studies in Higher Educations	97
A Concluding, Cautionary, and Challenging Note	108
References	111
Name Index	127
Subject Index	133
About the Authors	135

Executive Summary

THE FIELD OF higher education is severely lacking in a critical, race-based analysis of Whiteness literature in higher education. This monograph presents the scholarship and research on Whiteness and applies it to higher education to address the following questions:

1. Why and how are Critical Whiteness Studies important to higher education?
2. How does the hegemony of Whiteness inform the college campus racial dynamics?
3. What can higher education institutions do programmatically, structurally, and interpersonally to disrupt and transform normative Whiteness?
4. How can higher education researchers incorporate and account for Whiteness in their research?
5. How can an interrogation of Whiteness inform and shape higher education policy, practice, and research?

The monograph is intended for higher education scholars, practitioners, and students. Higher education scholars and practitioners find Whiteness difficult because it is often unclear how it is applicable to higher education policy and programs. Diversity and Critical Race Theory (CRT) scholars will find value in this monograph as it will provide the “missing link” in their analyses (i.e., one cannot understand the marginalization of Students of Color if there is no one doing the marginalizing). Second, and similar to the first audience, practitioners working at predominantly White campuses will find value in this

monograph as it will help reframe diversity and inclusion to include White responsibility. Third, higher education students are increasingly interested in the study of race to make sense of an increasingly multicultural society, and this monograph will provide a novel approach to this subject.

The first chapter introduces the reader to Whiteness studies in general and more specifically how it is ingrained in higher education. We focus on the various theoretical frameworks that are used in Whiteness studies in higher education including Whiteness as:

1. colorblindness
2. epistemologies of ignorance
3. ontological expansiveness
4. property
5. assumed racial comfort

Within each of these sections it is explained how Whiteness is intertwined in the concept. The chapter reviews some of the key readings and concepts that are within these frameworks. The very high-level review is useful for the reader and especially students or newcomers to Critical Whiteness Studies who want to understand how Whiteness relates to related concepts such as colorblindness. Thus, the first chapter prepares the reader to better understand the theoretical framing of later chapters that delve into specific topics in Whiteness studies such as interpersonal Whiteness, institutional Whiteness, and how to develop racial justice allies.

The monograph is intended to help the reader understand how Whiteness is situated in every aspect of higher education from the people, the policies, and even the early vestiges of the institution up to today. In the vein of Bronfenbrenner's ecology system's theory, we begin the second chapter at the individual level and then branch out to look at Whiteness beyond the individual in later chapters. The second chapter focuses on interpersonal Whiteness in higher education. This chapter describes how socialization processes construct Whiteness and the ways in which White college students ignore race and racism and recreate Whiteness everyday through their action and inaction. Using literature from higher education, the chapter interrogates the

intersection of Whiteness and microaggressions, colorblindness, racial segregation, emotional responses, teacher education, and White privilege pedagogy. The documentation of behaviors, emotions, and ideologies that perpetuate systemic racism and Whiteness enables the reader to better understand how Whiteness is embedded in the culture of higher education institutions.

In the third chapter, the authors highlight the historical and contemporary structural characteristics of higher education institutions that maintain Whiteness. The chapter complicates the issue of space and race on college campuses with a discussion of the distinctions between campus climate and culture. In doing so, the historical framing of meritocracy is described and demonstrates how it contributes to Whiteness in higher education. The chapter moves on to addressing how Whiteness informs our understanding of campus culture, climate, and ecology through a brief discussion of the history of higher education. No discussion of space in higher education would be complete without discussion of traditional Greek life and the myth of safe spaces, which can be hostile, precarious places for minoritized groups. The chapter discusses how structural Whiteness negatively affect Students of Color, but the chapter would not be complete without a discussion of how Whiteness benefits White students. Overall, this chapter delves into the higher education literature that investigates the role of higher education institutions in sustaining and eventually disrupting whiteness.

The fourth chapter specifically focuses on the development of, need for, and role of racial justice allies to combat and transform Whiteness in higher education settings. This chapter begins with a discussion of ally development and the challenges that come with such a process. Numerous studies provide definitions of what it means to be an ally and part of the chapter attempts to untangle the definitions. In the chapter, recommendations and next steps are outlined that discuss how allyship can be developed. We admit there is no easy way to become a racial justice ally, but rather a number of considerations and processes must be taken into account. Regarding any discussion of being an ally, it is not necessarily a personally chosen identity, but rather one that is recognized by people who have been marginalized. Institutions of higher education can admit and hire more People of Color, but they also need to resocialize Whites to be racial justice allies. The development of allies

will not only contribute to the betterment of campus racial climates but also change the culture of higher education institutions that have been dominated by Whiteness and White privilege.

The fifth and final chapter looks at the future of Whiteness studies in higher education. The chapter argues that to make progress in the field, researchers need to look into the gray areas of Whiteness research and look beyond the “Good White/Bad White” dichotomy. Whiteness scholars need to look beyond undergraduate student populations and include an examination of administrators, faculty, and graduate students. Future research should better understand what it means to be an ally through developing more and better antiracism studies. Although there has been some research on higher education spaces and Whiteness, not much research has investigated resource allocation. Who receives the majority of resources and for what purpose? Do resources (e.g., financial or staff) help deconstruct or reaffirm Whiteness? Unfortunately, one of the biggest gaps in Whiteness studies is how it pertains to higher education policy. Higher education policy is in need of incorporating critical Whiteness perspectives and we hope that this chapter and monograph can assist policymakers. The chapter concludes with a discussion of methodological considerations when conducting Whiteness research.

Foreword

IN A RECENT article in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* (Brown, 2016), Shaun Harper and other higher education scholars noted that the overt and covert racist incidents happening daily on today's college and university campuses will be reduced only if attention is paid to educating people who identify as White. The article goes on to suggest that White students, faculty, and staff need to engage in bystander intervention when they see examples of overt racism on campus. To achieve this goal, however, White people on campuses have to understand the role they play in perpetuating existing racist systems. The *Whiteness in Higher Education* monograph by Nolan Cabrera, Jeremy Franklin, and Jesse Watson, suggests ways to help make awareness of Whiteness a reality.

As a White, middle-aged, upper middle class, highly educated, heterosexual, cis-gender woman, I am the embodiment of privilege. As a higher education scholar who focuses on diversity and equity, I believe I understand what it means to hold these privileged identities. Through reading, watching, and listening, I try to continually educate myself about my own privileges and about the many people who do not have the luxury of my positionality. To be honest, I enter into this work sometimes with defensiveness, sometimes with tears, sometimes with fragility—but mostly with a willingness to dig in and learn. It is from this vantage point that I encourage you to read and learn from this monograph. Everyone has more to learn about race, privilege, and power and the monograph is a great guide.

Cabrera, Franklin, and Watson have something to offer anyone who works in institutions of higher education. The monograph clearly articulates

ideas about race and Whiteness that aren't often brought to table. The monograph introduces readers to new theories, new perspectives, new readings, and new approaches. Using an ecological framework, the authors look at Whiteness from an individual or interpersonal perspective as well as from a structural perspectives (i.e., looking at issues of space, culture, and climate).

The chapter on allies has a particular impact as it pushes the reader to reflect on the ways that one thinks about Whiteness and privilege and offers new perspectives. For example, the book may show the reader that some of the common ways that scholars and practitioners currently engage in diversity pedagogy in the classrooms, or with students outside of class, may be more counterproductive than helpful. The monograph will educate readers about what it means to be a White ally—and how, despite good intentions, allies may be falling short. If you are White, like me, filled with good intentions to educate, call out, upend and move institutions of higher education toward being more inclusive and less oppressive, then this book is for you. The book is particularly helpful in revealing ways that even well-meaning attempts can perpetuate racist ways of being and acting.

The final chapter, which illuminates the need for more and better research, frames the role of Whiteness in perpetuating systems of oppression. The chapter provides scholars of higher education a theoretical lens and methodological guidance to move our scholarship forward in ways that could influence higher education policy and practice. The conclusion of the monograph may provoke the reader, raising questions and sometimes emotions. But, it will also make you think and hopefully help the higher education community engage in research and practice in new ways.

Clearly, the monograph fills an important void in our collective understanding and offers scholars and practitioners new insights into what is happening on our campuses. For regular readers of the series, we note that this monograph fits with other recently published volumes including *Rethinking Cultural Competence* by Chun and Evans (2016), *Racism and Racial Equity in Higher Education* by Museus, Ledesma, and Parker (2016), and *Critical Race Theory* by McCoy and Rodricks (2015). These monographs are so important today as higher education struggles to respond to overt and covert forms of racism. The present monograph provides researchers and practitioners with a

well-rounded understanding of racism, Whiteness, and pathways forward to broaden research agendas and increase awareness in practice to make colleges and universities more open and functional places in which to work and study.

Lisa E. Wolf-Wendel
Series Editors

Prelude

WHILE EDITING THE proofs of this monograph, demophobia (Chang, 2014) – or the irrational fear of demographic population shifts – reared its ugly head and Trump was elected President of the United States. Trump won overwhelmingly with White people, and his triumph demonstrates the pressing importance of colleges and universities taking seriously the issue of Whiteness. In many respects, Trump won because the persistent *Dog Whistle Politics* on the right that continually frames White people are the “true victims” of contemporary racism (Lopez, 2014). The racist and xenophobic post-election climate makes the work more difficult, but also makes it all the more necessary. Many will be afraid to speak, but we the authors are reminded of the words of Lupe Fiasco:

*I think that all the silence is worse than all the violence
Fear is such a weak emotion that's why I despise it
We scared of almost everything, afraid to even tell the truth
So scared of what you think of me, I'm scared of even telling you
Sometimes I'm like the only person I feel safe to tell it to
I'm locked inside a cell in me, I know that there's a jail in you
Consider this your bailing out, so take a breath, inhale a few
My screams is finally getting free, my thoughts is finally yelling
through*

-Words I Never Said

It is time to let those “screams free” and fight racism within and without institutions of higher education. We feel the theorizing and empiricism collected for this monograph are critically important, but they are insufficient if not coupled with critical, collective, anti-racist action.

Whiteness in Higher Education: Core Concepts and Overview

W. E. B. DUBOIS wrote that as a Black man, when racial issues arise, he was continually asked, “How does it feel to be a problem?” Over a century after DuBois’ insightful comment, higher education scholarship and practice still suffer this method of racial framing. When “diversity” initiatives are created or a racist issue occurs on college campuses, the focus tends to be on racially minoritized campus populations. Implicitly, this means ignoring the cause of the racial issue. Only listening to the grievances of Students of Color but ignoring Whiteness will not make substantive progress on fostering racially inclusive campuses.

This issue is incredibly difficult to tackle, in large part, because of the fragility of Whiteness.¹ Black professor Saida Grundy Tweeted, “Why is White America so reluctant to identify White college males as a problem population?”² Instead of using this as an opportunity to critically engage the issue of Whiteness and masculinity on college campuses, the media instead tended to focus on irrelevant and distracting questions such as:

- Why is it acceptable for her to be racist against White people?
- How can *she* teach White men?
- Would this Tweet be acceptable if it was a White professor making a similar statement about Black students?

These questions avoid the central critique she was lodging and serve, again, to make the Black person the source of the problem (DuBois) as opposed to Whiteness being the problem.

A large part of this issue is the tendency to individualize issues of race when the subject is Whiteness. A simple contemporary example is the University of Oklahoma's (OU) Sigma Alpha Epsilon (SAE) fraternity who were videoed on a bus singing, "There will never be a nigger in SAE." They were immediately condemned and expelled from campus, and the OU president made the public statement that his university has a zero tolerance policy for campus racism. Cabrera (2015) took issue with this statement given how rampant and systemic contemporary racism is, arguing:

[N]o institution of higher education in the country has a zero-tolerance policy for racism. Racial bias—much of it unconscious—is so ingrained in American society that any institution that actually enforced zero tolerance would have to expel half its freshman class before winter break. What Boren actually means is that OU has zero tolerance for overtly racist actions that are caught on camera, are posted to YouTube and embarrass the institution in the national news.

It may make individual White people feel good to condemn the OU SAE fraternity as it makes them appear to be not racist, but it ignores and downplays how racism is systemically engrained in the fabric of contemporary higher education (Cabrera, 2009). Within this context, we offer this monograph to more accurately identify, assess, critique, engage, and transform a central problem of race in higher education: Whiteness. We begin from the position that systemic racism continues to inequitably structure society: marginalizing People of Color and privileging Whites (Leonardo, 2009). These privileges are frequently invisible to the beneficiaries of the system, so our intention is to make them visible to our audience. To begin, we offer some of the core conceptual frameworks within Whiteness studies that guide this monograph.

Whiteness as a Racial Discourse

At the core of this monograph is the central question: What is Whiteness and how does it structure society? The problem with this question is that scholars of race and racism are not entirely sure. Whiteness is a normative structure in society that marginalizes People of Color and privileges White people (Feagin, 2006, 2010); Omi & Winant, 1994). White people receive material benefits from this normative Whiteness and People of Color lose (Bonilla-Silva, 2006; Kincheloe, Steinberg, Rodriguez, & Chennault, 1998). But the nature of Whiteness continues to change as it moves from a totalitarian form of social stratification to a hegemonic one (Omi & Winant, 1994). This malleable nature of contemporary Whiteness poses the following tension: Whiteness is real in that it has material impacts on people in U.S. society but it also escapes precise definition. Some argue this ambiguous and concurrently powerful nature is precisely why it is so effective at structuring society (Omi & Winant, 1994).

This monograph is contextualized within Critical Whiteness Studies (CWS). A foundational distinction within CWS research is that Whiteness \neq White people. As Leonardo (2009) noted, “‘Whiteness’ is a racial discourse, whereas the category ‘white people’ represents a socially constructed identity, usually based on skin color . . . Whiteness is not a culture but a social concept” (pp. 169–170). Within this context, there are three central components of the discourse of Whiteness: (a) an unwillingness to name the contours of systemic racism, (b) the avoidance of identifying with a racial experience or minority group, and (c) the minimization of the U.S. history of racism. As the dynamics of the larger society play out on the college campus (Cabrera, 2009), Whiteness also informs the racial climate and culture of colleges and universities (Gusa, 2010).

Although White people tangibly benefit from the discourse of racism in the aggregate (Feagin, 2010; Leonardo, 2009), understanding Whiteness as a discourse means that it is possible for People of Color to engage in the very discourse that serves to marginalize them. This disputes the frequently accepted notion that due to power differentials, racial minorities cannot be racist (Feagin, Vera, & Imani, 1996). Rather, they can be if they are engaging in a

discourse of Whiteness. For example, Michelle Malkin is an Asian American woman who wrote the text *In Defense of Internment* (2004), where she defends the overtly racist practice of the U.S. internment of Japanese Americans during World War II. Thus, she engages in a discourse of Whiteness despite being a Woman of Color. As Leonardo (2004b) argued, “Just as Ebert (1996) makes it possible to call Camille Paglia a ‘patriarchal feminist’, it is also possible to say that the *actions* of people of color are racist when they participate in the maintenance of a racist system” (italics original, p. 489). Therefore, CWS seeks to identify the contours of Whiteness as a discourse while critically examining the material, psychological, emotional, and physical effects Whiteness has on People of Color.

Within this context, we find it necessary to orient the intellectual lineage of CWS. There is frequently a mistaken notion that CWS is a subsection of Critical Race Theory (CRT). For example, Yosso (2005) provided a schema that documents the lineage of CRT from Critical Legal Studies through the race-specific manifestations (e.g., LatCrit). One of these subsections is White-Crit (Yosso, 2005, p. 71), and it is a common misinterpretation that CWS is simply a branch of CRT. Historically, W. E. B. DuBois (1920) is frequently credited with conducting the first CWS analysis in his essay “The Souls of White Folk,” more than 50 years before the creation of CRT. Additionally, James Baldwin wrote many pieces in the 1960s through 80s that are in the canon of CWS (e.g., “White Guilt” and “On Being White and Other Lies”). Therefore, CWS is its own standalone area of critical inquiry, separate from CRT; however, these lines become blurred contemporarily.

Despite these separate intellectual lineages, there are numerous examples of CRT being applied to the study of Whiteness (e.g., Cabrera, 2014d; Gillborn, 2008), and this creates occasional overlap between CWS and CRT. That said, it is very important that each maintain its distinctiveness. A key reason is that CRT was developed to provide an intellectual space for Scholars of Color to critically interrogate issues of racism (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001). Critical examinations of Whiteness in this context can have the unintended, but predictable, effect of recentering Whiteness in scholarly discussions (Apple, 1998; Cabrera, 2014b)—a common phenomenon that CRT was meant to subvert.

To further elaborate the contours of CWS as it relates to higher education scholarship, we offer some of its core theoretical components: (a) Whiteness as colorblindness, (b) Whiteness as epistemologies of ignorance, (c) Whiteness as ontological expansiveness, (d) Whiteness as property, and (e) Whiteness as assumed racial comfort (or racial “safety”). There is a great deal of conceptual overlap among these five concepts, but for clarity we have separated them into distinct categories.

Whiteness as Colorblindness

A core component of Whiteness is colorblindness, or an ideology that finds virtue in being “colorblind.” In practice, this means framing racial inequality in terms of anything but racism (Bonilla-Silva & Forman, 2000). Bonilla-Silva argued that colorblindness is more than a racial attitude; rather, it was a racial ideology. The importance of this distinction is that, “the central components of any dominant racial ideology is it frames or *sets pathways for interpreting information*” (Bonilla-Silva, 2006, p. 26, emphasis in original). That is, regardless of information provided about the realities of contemporary racism, the evidence will always be interpreted in ways that find the root cause as anything but racism.

Bonilla-Silva (2006) took this theorizing one step further and defined the four frames of colorblind racial ideologies: (a) abstract liberalism, (b) naturalization, (c) cultural racism, and (d) minimization of racism. Abstract liberalism refers to a contradictory belief system where one is “all for racial equity” but then adamantly opposes race-conscious policies that address inequality (e.g., affirmative action). Naturalization means that when interpreting racial inequality, the rationale centers on “it’s just natural.” For example, when explaining persistent racial segregation, a naturalization frame sees it as a function of personal preference (i.e., *not* from racism). Cultural racism refers to the movement away from biological racism (e.g., Blacks are a genetically inferior people) to using cultural differences as a way to interpret racial inequality (e.g., Hispanics culturally don’t value education). Finally, the minimization of racism frame downplays the role that racism plays in contemporary society. Together, these four frames, according to Bonilla-Silva (2006), collectively form the ideology that leaves contemporary, systemic racism uninterrogated,

which allows White people to maintain their structural advantages over People of Color.

As it pertains to higher education, colorblindness informs a great deal of interpersonal interactions, policy, and even the way scholars conduct research. For example, Rankin and Reason (2005) empirically demonstrated that White students are significantly more likely than Students of Color to see that the campus environment as welcoming and equitable along racial lines. A large part of this stems from White students entering higher education in rooted in a racial ideology of colorblindness (Bonilla-Silva & Forman, 2000; Reasons & Evans, 2007). On a policy level, much of the opposition to race-conscious access programs such as affirmative action is rooted in colorblind racism (Harper, Patton, & Wooden, 2009). Additionally, Harper (2012) demonstrated that although higher education scholars frequently describe racial differences in their work, they frequently take a colorblind approach to their interpretations as they rarely attribute the cause of these differences to racism. Harper described higher education as a field of “race without racism,” and he highlighted how colorblindness is embedded in the very method of conducting research. These are only a few of the many means by which colorblind racism affects higher education research and practice. Another mechanism that allows White people to avoid the realities of systemic racism is epistemologies of ignorance.

Whiteness as Epistemologies of Ignorance

Philosopher Charles Mills (1997) made the bold argument that Whiteness represented an inverted epistemology or an *epistemology of ignorance*. This type of ignorance was markedly different than colloquial usage of the term. Rather, he argues that epistemologies of ignorance represented a willful aversion to the human suffering caused by systemic White supremacy, which has a twofold effect. First, if ignorance is bliss, then racial ignorance allows White people to remain racially blissful (or at least not complicit in racial oppression). Second, it allows the contours of contemporary systemic racism to remain uninterrogated and therefore remain in place.

Over the last almost 20 years, scholars have continued to engage this issue. For example, Applebaum (2010) elaborates, “One of the significant

features of White ignorance is that it involves not just ‘not knowing’ but also ‘not knowing what one does not know and believing that one knows’” (p. 39). That is, White epistemologies of ignorance do not simply involve not knowing but also insisting that one *does* know. Taking epistemologies of ignorance one step further Malewski and Jaramillo (2011) argue, “The idea is not merely ‘to reflect on where ignorance has transpired’ but to ‘change the damaging consequences of ignorance’” (p. 17). Therefore, the point is not to simply identify epistemologies of ignorance but rather to eliminate this ignorance and its material consequences.

On college campuses, this ignorance is manifest in a number of ways that are elaborated in the subsequent chapters. A simple example is that White people now believe that racial discrimination against Whites (i.e., “reverse discrimination”) is more prevalent than racism against Blacks (Norton & Sommers, 2011). It does not matter to White students that there is no empirical foundation for this assertion (Bonilla-Silva, 2006). Rather, the point is that White students frequently believe this, which causes discussions to shift from how to address actual issues of campus racism to the myth of “reverse racism” (Cabrera, 2014d). Closely related to the issue of epistemologies of ignorance is ontological expansiveness.

Whiteness as Ontological Expansiveness

Whereas the vast majority of race-based analyses in higher education focus on interpersonal interactions as the center of analysis, Whiteness also informs issues of campus space (Cabrera, Watson, & Franklin, 2016). Lipsitz (2011) described this dynamic in his often misinterpreted title *How Racism Takes Place*. Many have misread this title to mean “how racism operates,” but instead it is a critical examination of the intersection between race and space. That is, Lipsitz is specifically concerned with systemic racism (“race”) confers ownership (“takes”) over physical space (“place”) to White people. A large part of this dynamic is what Sullivan (2006) refers to as *ontological expansiveness*, which she defines as “white people tend to act and think as if all spaces—whether geographical, psychical, linguistic, economic, or otherwise—are or should be available to them to move in and out as they wish” (p. 10). Essentially, ontological expansiveness means

White entitlement—the privilege of access to both physical and metaphorical space.

This intersection of race and space is further explored in the third chapter (*Institutional Whiteness*), but we briefly foreground it here. Frequently, People of Color are aware of the reality that not all space (physical, cultural, linguistic, etc.) is open to them (Cabrera et al., 2016). With respect to college campuses, various scholars have theorized the normalization of Whiteness in this physical space. Gusa (2010) refers to the normalization of Whiteness on college campuses as *White Institutional Presence* (WIP). Harper and Hurtado (2007) identified a similar dynamic but referred to it as *White Space*. Both refer to the means by which Whiteness becomes the social and environmental norm within institutions of higher education.

Analyses specifically focusing on the physical geography of college campuses are relatively rare contemporarily but were a lot more common in the early 1990s with the work on the campus ecology. Largely centering on the work of Jim Banning (1992, 1993, 1997), these analyses focused on the marginalizing messages that campus environments can send to minority students on campus. These analyses tended to be more overt in nature and did not directly address the ways that Whiteness as a norm can be and is embedded in the everyday functioning of college campuses. This normativity serves to send the message that White students are afforded access to all components of the college environment even though Students of Color have their access restricted—either overtly or covertly (Cabrera et al., 2016). Part of the power of this relationship between race and space is predicated upon the relationship between race and property.

Whiteness as Property

In one of the seminal works of both Whiteness and Critical Race Theory scholarship, Harris (1993) provided a powerful and provocative thesis. She argues that the United States is predicated upon property rights and that Whiteness evolved into a form of property protected by and enshrined in U.S. law. Harris (1993) elaborates, “The law has accorded ‘holders’ of whiteness the same privileges and benefits accorded holders of other types of property” (p. 1731). These property rights included (a) the rights of disposition, (b) the

right to use and enjoyment, (c) reputation and status property, and (d) the absolute right to exclude (Harris, 1993).

Harris (1993) describes the right to disposition as follows: “Property rights are traditionally viewed as fully alienable” (p. 1731). That is, for something to be alienable, it must be salable, transferable, or marketable. However, she takes issue with this narrow view of property, because there are a number of inalienable assets that have been legally treated as property. For example, “professional degrees or licenses held by one party and financed by the labor of the other is marital property” (p. 1733). Even though a PhD cannot be transferred from one person to another, Harris still considers this a form of property. Therefore, Harris problematizes this first tenet of property as it is not simply an alienability/inalienability dichotomy, and she further postulates that the scarcity of Whiteness based upon its inalienability (i.e., one cannot give another Whiteness) helps make Whiteness a valuable commodity.

The right to use and enjoyment is somewhat self-explanatory. If individuals own something, they are allowed to use and enjoy it as they please. Transferring this concept to Whiteness is tricky because how can one enjoy Whiteness? Harris (1993) argues that whenever White persons are using White privilege, they are using and enjoying their Whiteness. As she elaborates, “Whiteness as the embodiment of white privilege transcended mere belief or preference; it became usable property, the subject of the law’s regard and protection” (Harris, 1993, p. 1734).

The right to reputation and status property begins with the first object that people own: their own person (Harris, 1993). Within this framework, if one’s reputation is demeaned, it can lower the value placed on this form of property. Returning to racial analysis, White people historically have sued for defamation over being labeled Black (Harris, 1993, p. 1735). That is, the court held that their reputation was lessened via being ascribed the identifier “Black”; however, this dynamic does not go both ways. Blacks could not sue for defamation by being labeled “White” because this is seen as elevating their status, and therefore, no harm to their property occurred.

Finally, the absolute right to exclude means that to have property is a twofold process. It allows the owner to do with it as they please. It also allows the owner to prevent others from using their property. This tenet of

Whiteness as property fits especially well given the historical development of Whiteness. That is, in early colonial history, the concept of Whiteness did not exist (Allen, 1997; MacMullan, 2009). Instead, the identifier was developed as a series of laws, especially in a post-Bacon's Rebellion era, were enacted limiting the rights of those identified as non-White (Allen, 1997). As Harris (1993) elaborated:

The possessors of whiteness were granted the legal right to exclude others from the privileges inherent in whiteness; whiteness became an exclusive club whose membership was closely and grudgingly guarded. The courts played an active role in enforcing this right to exclude—determining who was or was not white enough to enjoy the privileges accompanying whiteness. (p. 1736)

Thus, a core component of Whiteness was determining who was not White and excluding them from the privileges of Whiteness. This exclusionary history creates White as the default racial category against which all other groups are judged (Allen, 1997; Leonardo, 2009). This makes White socially constructed as “normal,” and for the beneficiaries of this normality, it frequently renders Whiteness invisible (Cabrera, 2009). Part of this invisibility and accompanying privilege means being able to ignore issues of race. When there are challenges lodged against Whiteness in higher education institutions, it can provoke a defensive reaction, even leading some to cry “reverse racism” (Cabrera, 2014a, 2014c). Instead of challenging the normativity of Whiteness in higher education, institutional practices frequently reify Whiteness as property. Bondi (2012) demonstrated not only how Whiteness was embedded in student affairs training but also that leaving the hegemony of Whiteness unchallenged created an institutionally-sanctioned protection of Whiteness as property. Returning to Harris’ (1993) description of property, ownership entails the right to exclude. The state-specific elimination of affirmative action in higher education serves to restrict higher education access for Students of Color (Pierce, 2012; Santos, Cabrera, & Fosnacht, 2010), and these attacks reify Whiteness as property through the exclusionary mechanism. These are only a few of the numerous ways Whiteness as property is manifest within

institutions of higher education. An additional core contour of CWS is the assumption of racial comfort in social situations.

Whiteness as Assumed Racial Comfort

Frequently, multicultural higher education entails dialogue across difference, and a frequently used ground rule in these dialogues is establishing the space as “safe.” Leonardo and Porter (2010) problematize this notion by returning to the work of Frantz Fanon. Within the Fanonian framework, the linguistic violence of the colonizer can serve as a form of dehumanization to the colonized. Applying this theorizing to the college campus, in particular cross-racial dialogues, Leonardo and Porter (2010) argue that the normal form of cross-racial dialogues in a contemporary U.S. context serves as a site of linguistic violence against Students of Color, in particular in the form of microaggressions.

Microaggressions are “the brief and common place daily verbal, behavioral, and environmental indignities, whether intentional or unintentional, that communicate hostile, derogatory, or negative racial, gender, sexual orientation, and religious slights and insults to the target person or group” (Sue, 2010, p. 5). Despite microaggressions being a form of individual interactions, Pérez Huber and Solórzano (2015) argue that they are better understood as the product of contemporary White supremacist ideologies. That is, despite microaggressions being a form of interpersonal interactions, they are better understood as the result of systemic racism (Pérez Huber & Solórzano, 2015). This form of linguistic violence can have a devastating impact on the academic, social, psychological, physiological, and behavioral well-being of Students of Color (Franklin, Smith, & Hung, 2014; Johnson, Wasserman, Yildirim, & Yonai, 2014; Smith, Allen, & Danley, 2007). That is, their impact is cumulative—building up over time leading to what some refer to as *racial battle fatigue* (Smith, Yosso, & Solórzano, 2007).

Part of what makes microaggressions so prevalent is that they are frequently offered without the conscious consideration of the microaggressor (Sue, 2010). Additionally, the creation of “safe space” on campus can, counterintuitively, create a breeding ground for microaggressions because it is frequently misinterpreted to mean a *lack* of social discomfort. Prioritizing racial comfort, in practice and according to Leonardo and Porter (2010), serves to

reinscribe racial privilege. When people are challenged for committing a microaggression, they are frequently uncomfortable (Cabrera et al., 2016; DiAngelo, 2011). However, the avoidance of this discomfort, according to Cabrera et al. (2016) has a twofold effect. First, it leaves White students in a state of racial arrested development because they are insufficiently challenged regarding the development of their racial selves. Second, and more important, it normalizes the linguistic violence that Students of Color experience in these environments because of White entitlement to racial comfort. Essentially, White people have been sold a false bill of goods where they have been promised racial progress in the absence of racial discomfort, not realizing that this is simply not possible.

Although we described each of these concepts within CWS (i.e., colorblindness, epistemology of ignorance, ontological expansiveness, Whiteness as property, and assumed racial comfort) in isolation, in reality, they are mutually reinforcing. For example, assumed racial comfort for White people (DiAngelo, 2011) primarily exists to the extent that they are unaware of the realities of contemporary racism (i.e., an epistemology of ignorance; Mills, 1997). Both assumed racial comfort and epistemology of ignorance exist only within a broader context of colorblind racial ideology (Bonilla-Silva, 2006), and thus, all three of these CWS concepts become mutually reinforcing.

Overview of Monograph

This monograph provides an overview of the higher education scholarship on the subject of Whiteness. Because there are a number of holes in this field, we frequently have to go outside of higher education to fill in some gaps (e.g., Harris, 1993, “Whiteness as Property”). Regardless, the central focus is on Whiteness and its relationship to institutions of higher education. This is important for several reasons. First, the dynamics of the larger society frequently play out on the college campus (Cabrera, 2009). Second, the democratic promise of higher education is greater social inclusion and equity (Gutmann, 1999). To the extent that Whiteness is engrained in and normalized within institutions of higher education, colleges and universities move

farther and farther from their democratic purposes. Within this context, we offer the following overview of the current monograph.

In the second chapter, we provide a critical review the interpersonal scholarship on Whiteness in higher education. As students are the most common unit of analysis in higher education scholarship (Astin, 1993; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005), this is the area with the strongest empirical foundation in higher education scholarship. Even within this context, we demonstrate that unacknowledged Whiteness is still undertheorized and underexplored.

In the third chapter, we offer a relatively novel method of exploring race and higher education: the intersection of race and space. That is, the physical infrastructure of college campuses can send implicit (and sometimes explicit) messages about racial exclusion. In addition, there can be spaces that are ostensibly White in their membership (e.g., traditionally housed Greek life; Cabrera et al., 2016). Although relatively scant, we demonstrate that the scholarship that examines the intersection of campus space and race forces us to think more holistically about how the privileges of Whiteness are reinforced through the college experience.

In the fourth chapter, we explore the scholarship on the development of racial justice allies, or how White people use their racial privileges to challenge the system of racism that gave them White privilege in the first place. We highlight that even though Whiteness is severely understudied within higher education scholarship, allyship development is an area where higher education as a field is a leader in CWS. Even within this context, the area of allyship development is still understudied, and as we will demonstrate, ripe for future investigation.

In Chapter 5, we provide summative overviews of the preceding chapters and then offer some thoughts on new directions for studying Whiteness in higher education as well as some cautionary notes about the pitfalls of engaging in this type of scholarship.

Interpersonal Whiteness and Higher Education

Therefore, a vast amount of the energy that goes into what we call the Negro problem is produced by the white man's profound desire not to be judged by those who are not white, not to be seen as he is, and at the same time a vast amount of the white anguish is rooted in the white man's equally profound need to be seen as he is, to be released from the tyranny of his mirror.

(Baldwin, 1963, p. 109)

AS THE BALDWIN quotation demonstrates, a core component of CWS scholarship stems from an issue of misidentification of the problem. That is, there is no “Negro problem” if White people are not racially marginalizing Black people in the first place. In higher education, there is a similar dynamic. There are no “underrepresented minorities” unless White students are concurrently overrepresented; however, this overrepresentation is not part of diversity discussions. Harper (2012) observed that higher education scholars analyze “race without racism,” or racial inequality without a root cause. These incomplete analyses continue to fall within the frame of Baldwin’s quotation. White people are reticent to frame racial inequality as White privilege because that would implicate them in the process (Unzueta & Lowery, 2008). Instead, it is psychologically more tenable to describe minority underrepresentation in

the absence of personal responsibility, thereby releasing White people “from the tyranny of his mirror.”

These complicated racial dynamics make exploring interpersonal Whiteness in higher education incredibly difficult for a number of reasons—the most pressing is the persistent denial by many White people that they are racist (Bonilla-Silva, 2006). As the quote by James Baldwin illustrates, White people invest a great deal of time and energy trying *not* to see their true racial selves or understand the racial experiences of minoritized people. By interpersonal Whiteness, we mean the ways in which Whiteness on a systemic level informs and contextualizes individual interactions locally on college campuses. This chapter details the numerous methods by which White people in general, and White college students in particular, ignore issues of race while unintentionally recreate the existing racial paradigm. The bulk of empirical scholarship on Whiteness explores issues outside of higher education (Cabrera, 2009). Therefore, we provide a mixture of scholarship inside and outside of the field of higher education, centering the work in higher education, as a means of exploring interpersonal Whiteness on college campuses. Additionally, this chapter centers the CWS notions of colorblind racism (Bonilla-Silva, 2006), epistemologies of ignorance (Mills, 1997), and entitlement to racial comfort (Cabrera et al., 2016; Leonardo & Porter, 2010). This scholarship and theoretical concepts collectively function in this chapter as the racial mirror Baldwin referenced in the preceding quotation. It may not be a pleasant reflection, but ignoring these racial realities only makes them persist.

White on White: Invisibility and Structured Ignorance

Before we explore the impact of Whiteness on cross-racial, interpersonal interactions on college campuses, we first explore what Whiteness means from the perspective of White students. We begin from the premise that Whiteness is a racial discourse (Leonardo, 2002), and this discourse is related to the structure of contemporary White supremacy (Leonardo, 2009; Mills, 1997). It is this structure that provides Whiteness with its social value. From this

oppressive social force, White people garner the “public and psychological wages of Whiteness” (DuBois, 1935), and this unwarranted cultural asset is so valuable that it led Harris (1993) to argue that Whiteness functions as a form of property. The realities of Whiteness are, however, generally divorced from the way White people see and experience this system of oppression.

From the perspective of White students, Whiteness frequently has no inherent meaning (Lewis, 2004; Macalpine, 2005; Morrison, 1992; Tatum, 2000). For example, Lewis (2004) explored race and racism in an overwhelmingly White school. When she began her ethnography, the school administrators said there are no racial issues at this school because there were no racial minorities. This racial insulation helps White people not have to feel their Whiteness because Whiteness and the unwarranted privileges associated with it are experienced as normal parts of everyday existence (Tatum, 2000). Unlike many Students of Color, White students are often able to exist without having to consider their racial background, and college is a period that often represents the first time in their lives that many White students have meaningful interactions across race (Chesler, Lewis, & Crowfoot, 2005). As Macalpine (2005) highlighted when asking White people what Whiteness means to them, “There’s nothing I can say.” This lack of racial awareness, as Lewis (2004) highlighted, leads to a situation where race/racism becomes *their* (Students of Color) issue. Thus, when issues of race arise, White people frequently express a great deal of apathy (Feagin, 2010; Forman & Lewis, 2015).

This apathy is predicated upon Mills’ (1997) conception that Whiteness represents a structured *epistemology of ignorance*. As the cliché goes, ignorance is bliss. In this instance, structured racial ignorance leads to racial bliss where racism is not the fault or responsibility of White people (Applebaum, 2010). Again, it is a means of making racism “their problem.” An additional feature of this relates to individualizing racism. That is, there are some people who are racists (i.e., bad), and others who are not racists (i.e., good). Individualizing racial issues, instead of framing them as systemic realities, not only functions as a core component of White denial (Applebaum, 2010; Mills, 1997; Tatum, 2000) but also White ego maintenance (Unzueta & Lowery, 2008). By ego maintenance, we mean that White people are able to maintain a positive sense

of self when racism is individualized because they, individually, are able to escape the pejorative label “racist” (Feagin, 2010; Unzueta & Lowery, 2008). Essentially, this means that the lack of racial engagement by White students exists because learning about racism can make White people feel bad about their racial selves (DiAngelo, 2011; Feagin, 2010; Unzueta & Lowery, 2008).

Part of this structured ignorance relates to the continuing legacy and contemporary manifestations of segregation. For example, there are many cities that have levels of educational segregation as high as when *Brown v. Board of Education* was heard in 1954 (Frankenberg, Lee, & Orfield, 2003). Returning to college campuses, White men tend to have the most racially homogenous friendship groups (antonio, 2001). Contrary to the popular book title, it is not *Why are all the Black kids sitting together in the cafeteria?* (Tatum, 2000). Instead, it is, “Why *don't* we notice when all the White kids are sitting together in the cafeteria?” Regardless, these environmental conditions mean that White people are frequently insulated from painful realities of racism experienced by Students of Color (Cabrera, 2014c; DiAngelo, 2011; Feagin & O’Brien, 2003). It is not only that there is structured segregation, but this becomes a method of reinforcing the White epistemology of ignorance (Mills, 1997). Being insulated from the pain of racism frequently leads White students to make an inappropriate logical leap that follows:

1. I do not see racism in my everyday life.
2. Therefore, there must not be racism, except maybe by some fringe groups like the KKK. (Cabrera, 2014d)

This structured ignorance paints a false sense of both contemporary racial progress while allowing White people to strongly hold a positive sense of their racial selves. When these positive views are challenged by the realities of contemporary racism, it can allow *White fragility* to surface (DiAngelo, 2011). White fragility refers to:

[A] state in which even a minimum amount of racial stress becomes intolerable, triggering a range of defensive moves. These moves include the outward display of emotions such as anger, fear, and

guilt, and behaviors such as argumentation, silence, and leaving the stress-inducing situation. (DiAngelo, 2011, p. 57)

Thus, White racial bliss stemming from White racial ignorance leads to a situation where, instead of authentically engaging issues of racism, White students instead enact creative means of avoiding race as a topic.

Some of these methods of avoidance involve semantic moves (Bonilla-Silva, 2006). Semantic moves are methods of making racist statements but offering prefaces that attempt to inoculate them from charges of racism. For example, Bonilla-Silva and Forman (2000) highlighted how White students used the phrase “I’m not a racist, but . . .” as a segue into a racist comment. Similarly, others have documented how White people offer the phrase “Some of my friends are [insert minority group]” again, as a means of discursive means of avoiding charges of racism (Bonilla-Silva, 2006).

In a similar vein, Feagin and O’Brien (2003) offered the concept of *sincere fictions*. Sincere fictions are beliefs espoused by White people regarding the nature of contemporary racism that they both believe (sincere) and are divorced from empirical reality (fictions). For example, Feagin and O’Brien (2003) highlighted a number of participants engaging in the myth of “reverse discrimination” (i.e., racism against White people) even though almost all available indicators continue to point to Whiteness being a social privilege. Essentially, these discourses serve the same functions: downplaying the significance of contemporary racism while framing White people as not responsible for issues of race.

Pierce (2012) refers to this as “racing for innocence.” In her analysis of White discourses around affirmative action, Pierce continually found people individualizing race and claiming “I’ve done nothing wrong, why should I be penalized through affirmative action?” She argues that these views do not simply appear out of thin air. Instead, there was a systematic media strategy throughout the 1980s and 1990s that continually told White people in general, and White men in particular, that they were actually the victims of multiculturalism. This, in Pierce’s (2012) argument, helps foster a collective historical memory that is both very real in terms of everyday beliefs, but also one that is completely divorced from empirical reality (see sincere fictions).

However, it is not simply that White people are painting themselves as individually innocent (i.e., not racist), but also their innocence requires minority aggression (Orozco, 2013). For example, a debate about race arises. In the semantic game of racing for innocence (Pierce, 2012), not only do White people discursively demonstrate their lack of individual accountability in the situation, but they then frame race-conscious policies, curricula, or pedagogies as being oppressive to Whites (Orozco, 2013).

Ultimately, White denial that racism is an issue relates to White people taking issues of racism and ignoring the racial pain of oppression. In turn, they center racial discussions on their lack of individual responsibility as well as how they too feel oppressed racially (Cabrera, 2014c, 2014d; McKinney, 2003). This insistence on making racial issues about White people have led some to argue that expressions of “reverse racism” and narcissism are strongly linked (Bell, 1980; Schneider, 2005). Instead of honestly engaging issues of race and racism, a privilege of Whiteness is centering the discussion on the White racial self (Cabrera, 2014d). As Schneider (2005) argues, “Each seeks to capture the stories of others as, at heart, stories about themselves” (p. 200). Instead of hearing and engaging racial pain on its own terms, some argue that narcissism changes the terms of the discussion to return the focus to the racial privileged (Bell, 1980; Schneider, 2005). A key component that allows White narcissism to dominate racial conversations is a severe lack of racial empathy (Bell, 1980; Feagin, 2010; Schneider, 2005). We return to empathy later when we discuss the development of racial justice allies in the fourth chapter.

Related to White racial narcissism, Richeson and Shelton (2007) explore the dynamics of cross-racial interactions. They are particularly interested in why cross-racial interactions fail or produce counterproductive results. They find, from a psychological perspective, that People of Color tend to invest their psychic energy being racial teachers to their White peers. White people, conversely, spend their psychic energy trying to not appear racist; something that serves to undercut the efforts of racial teachers. When someone is spending all of their time trying not to appear racist, they are not listening and are not able to learn about race or work on their racial selves. Thus, both sides leave the interaction frustrated because the White people tend to make the cross-racial interaction about how they are perceived (not racist) instead of meaningfully

engaging the issue at hand. This section explored how Whiteness becomes constructed as socially invisible and still socially dominant; the next section explores a common consequence of interpersonal, cross-racial interactions in college: microaggressions.

Microaggressions and the Missing Perspective of Whiteness

Microaggressions are one of the most common forms of interpersonal racism that occur on college campuses. As previously discussed, microaggressions are “subtle, innocuous, preconscious, or unconscious degradations, and put-downs, often kinetic but capable of being verbal” (Yosso, Smith, Ceja, & Solórzano, 2009, p. 660). The scholarship in higher education has extensively documented the nature and effects of microaggressions. Scholars have highlighted how microaggressions serve to marginalize, especially at predominantly White institutions (PWIs), Blacks (Donovan, Galban, Grace, Bennet, & Felicie, 2013; Smith, Allen et al., 2007; Solórzano, Ceja, & Yosso, 2000; Watkins, LaBarrie, & Appio, 2010), Latina/os (Franklin et al., 2014; Rivera, Forquer, & Rangel, 2010; Yosso et al., 2009), Asian Americans (Lin, 2010), Native Americans (Clark, Spanierman, Reed, Soble, & Cabana, 2011), and even multiracial students (Museus, Lambe Sariñana, Yee, & Robinson, 2016). These areas of inquiry have even extended to Black faculty (Smith, 2004) and Chicana scholars (Solórzano, 1998). This research all points to some key, core components: that non-White students do not belong in a historically White space, and their White peers, faculty, and staff, remind them of this on a consistent basis via microaggressions.

In the popular discourse, the term “microaggression” is frequently used as a pejorative to frame current undergraduates as being overly sensitive, entitled, and coddled (e.g., Lukianoff & Haidt, 2015). In contrast, scholars studying this issue have demonstrated the disastrous, cumulative effects that microaggressions have on students and scholars of color. For example, Smith (2004) and Smith, Allen et al. (2007) demonstrate that perpetually fighting microaggressions can lead to *racial battle fatigue* (Franklin et al., 2014; Smith, Hung,

& Franklin, 2011). Gildersleeve, Croom, and Vasquez (2011) argue that being a graduate Student of Color among predominantly White peers and the constant target of microaggressions can develop an “Am I going crazy?” syndrome. That is, in ostensibly White environments, the normative pressure can push the targets of microaggressions to think that either they are reading too much into a “nonracial” situation or being overly sensitive in the face of a microaggression (i.e., “Am I going crazy?”). Sue (2010) argues that, from a psychological perspective, persistent microaggressions can decrease academic performance, increase stress, and increase the likelihood of people developing depression and anxiety. Within this context, Minikel-Lacocque (2013) claims that the name microaggressions undercuts the severity of these interactions on the emotional and mental well-being of Students of Color. She, instead, prefers to refer to them as “racialized aggressions” (Minikel-Lacocque, 2013, p. 459).

Pérez Huber and Solórzano (2015) offered a framework for understanding racial microaggressions because these interpersonal interactions can sometimes be removed from the systemic realities of contemporary racism. Instead, they argue that to truly understand microaggressions, one needs to understand the larger contexts. These contexts, according to Pérez Huber and Solórzano, include institutional racism that is, in turn, circumscribed by the White supremacy. In their view, this is what gives microaggressions their power above and beyond being an interaction between individuals. Rather, the microaggressions are the localized manifestation of racial oppression.

All of these analyses start from the perspectives of People of Color, and have been both illuminating and limited. They have been illuminating in the sense of being able to specifically identify and therefore address these modern, commonplace forms of racism. They are limited because these analyses almost always stem from the perspective of those targeted by microaggressions. It leaves several underlying questions unaddressed. Why are White students so frequently microaggressing³ their Peers of Color? If microaggressions are largely unconsciously delivered by the microaggressor, what is the socialization process that allows these racial attitudes and behaviors to develop? How can they be so oblivious to the racial pain they are causing their peers? The

empiricism on the subject of Whiteness in higher education that illuminates the “other side of racism” is small but growing.

Whiteness and College Students: The Empirical Scholarship

There is a strange and counterintuitive dynamic regarding empirical inquiry and Whiteness as it pertains to college students. Whereas some of the most headline-garnering controversies regarding Whiteness involve college students (e.g., OU SAE fraternity), the bulk of Whiteness analyses do not focus on this population. As Cabrera (2009) found:

While reviewing five edited volumes on CWS (Delgado & Stefancic, 1997; Doane & Bonilla-Silva, 2003; Fine et al., 1997; Hill, 1997; Kincheloe et al., 1998; Nakayama & Martin, 1999), eight of the 215 chapters included issues of higher education and only one of these eight examined Whiteness as it pertained to students. (p. 24)

There has recently been a small but growing empirical grounding for understanding Whiteness as it relates to college students.

Whiteness, Colorblindness, and Higher Education

In the empirical scholarship on students, Cabrera (2014d) finds that White men at two college campuses tend to have very limited views of what constituted racism, existing in racially homogenous, White environments in high school and college, and this corresponds to them believing they are racially persecuted for being White. This is similar to the findings of Chesler, Peet, and Sevig (2003) who interviewed White students and argue that they tend to exist in environments physically separated from racial minorities, while viewing racism as an individual defect (as opposed to a systemic reality), and this corresponds to their view of Whites as the victims of “reverse discrimination” (i.e., perceived⁴ racial discrimination against White people).

A colorblind orientation is an important ideological context from which many White male college students operate. By ideology, we are not discussing being politically left wing or right wing. Instead, we use Bonilla-Silva's (2006) conceptualization that "ideologies are about 'meaning in the service of power.' They are expressions at the symbolic level of the fact of dominance. As such, the ideologies of the powerful are central in the production and reinforcement of the status quo" (pp. 25–26). Returning to our previous description, Bonilla-Silva (2006) argues that colorblind ideology is the dominant racial ideology in contemporary society, and it operates by forcefully denying the persistence of systemic racism and blaming minorities for their marginalized social positions. As such, it serves to mask the realities of contemporary White supremacy.

Within the context of colorblind ideology, Cabrera (2011) conducted a mixed methods study of racial ideology development during the first year of college. He finds that White men enter college with the strongest colorblind ideology orientation of any group (White Women, Women of Color, or Men of Color), and they are the group of students who are the least likely to change their ideological orientation during their first year of college. This colorblindness can have some strong, negative impacts on Students of Color. For example, Cabrera (2014a) finds that White men frame their Asian American peers as nonracial beings (i.e., not the targets of racism), and this gives license to express stereotypes about Asian Americans (e.g., being nerdy or bad drivers). Within this analysis, Cabrera (2014a) highlights a number of differences in expressed racial animus that exist across two institutions of higher education. In the university that has the higher concentration of Asian Americans and is more academically competitive, the participants held much stronger anti-Asian American views: blaming them for campus racial segregation and expressing stronger amounts of racial prejudice against this group. At the less competitive university with a lower concentration of Asian Americans, the participants tended to hold very weak beliefs about their Asian American peers.

At both institutions, however, students tended to subscribe to the myth of the model minority whereby Asian Americans are framed as uniformly successful and the "example" other minority groups should follow (Museus,

2008). This leads to a situation of racial triangulation, or blaming Black and Brown educational shortcomings on the communities themselves by using the success of Asian Americans as a barometer (Kim, 1999). What is additionally troubling about these findings is that Cabrera (2014a) highlights how even racially progressive White men still articulate a number of racist views about Asian Americans, and this again, relates to Asian Americans not being viewed as “real minorities.”

Although there have been a number of explorations into White male college student racism (Cabrera, 2009, 2011, 2014a, 2014b, 2014c, 2014d), the empirical explorations of White female college students' is limited. Trepagnier (2006) is one of the few to study this group. In her analysis, she discusses White female racial views among a group of self-proclaimed “nonracist” women. While exploring their experiences and views on race, Trepagnier finds that her participants still hold many negative views of racial minorities and they tended to avoid issues of race when possible. Trepagnier labeled the structured avoidance as “silent racism,” and she argues that it is central to the perpetuation of systemic racism. That is, the perpetual lack of racial engagement by White women, leave the structure of contemporary White supremacy unchallenged, intact, and reproducing racial inequality.

Within educational spaces, there can be implicit Eurocentric cultural norms. For example, O'Brien (2004) argues that White calls for People of Color to “calm down” during racial discussions serves only to reify racial privilege. Essentially, racism is a potentially caustic topic because it is not only dehumanizing but also makes a great deal of racial pain resurface. Demanding “calm” or “rational discussion” before engaging in discussions of racism removes this affective component from the discussion and allows White people to avoid the pain that racism causes (O'Brien, 2004). This makes it extremely difficult to truly engage the effects of racism and it reinscribes a Eurocentric norm in classrooms (O'Brien, 2004). Leonardo and Porter (2010) have a similar argument critiquing intergroup dialogues as we have previously discussed. In summary, they argue that making these “safe spaces”⁵ implicitly means safe for White students to feel comfortable. This, in their argument, then creates an environment where Students of Color are the targets of linguistic violence via persistent microaggressions. This is all predicated upon

creating a dialogue where the space is normed around Whiteness, privileging potential discomfort of White students over the racial marginalization of Students of Color (Leonardo & Porter, 2010).

Applebaum (2008) further explores the complicated dynamics of White people beginning to engage in discussions of racism. She finds that there is a continual insistence of having White perspectives on racial issues carry equal weight in racial discussions, in particular through the challenging question, “Doesn’t my experience count?” This process, Applebaum (2008) argues, had a twofold impact. First, it recenters Whiteness in the classroom discussions that are supposed to be a critical interrogation of racism. Second, it serves to functionally silence the voices of Students of Color in the process.

In many respects, these attitudes, beliefs, ideologies, and actions are strongly related to the racial environments in which the students exist and develop. Within PWIs, there is a troubling trend of White students existing within highly segregated, White environments. We more thoroughly explore studies of Whiteness and space in the third chapter. Here, we briefly turn to how racially segregated campus environments relate to White racism.

Racial Segregation in Higher Education and White Racism

Expressions of White racism on college campuses, especially at PWIs, strongly relate to the ability and psychological desire of White students to racially self-segregate. As Antonio (2001) empirically demonstrated, White people in general and White men in particular, have the most racially homogenous friendship groups among college students. This racial segregation, however, is more than simply fostering separation as it reifies Whiteness as property (Harris, 1993). As Harris argues, for it to be property the owner has the absolute right to exclude, and this instance it is the right to exclude Students of Color from social circles. Campus racial segregation additionally produces some very troubling outcomes.

For example, racially homogenous friendship groups tend to heighten expressions⁶ of racism on campus (Cabrera, 2014b; Picca & Feagin, 2007). Picca and Feagin analyze racial journals of White undergraduates and find a disturbing trend. White students tend to be fairly “politically correct” in mixed race company but among their White peers openly use and hear many

forms of old fashioned racism (e.g., using the n-word and telling overtly racist jokes). Picca and Feagin label these behaviors as *backstage* and *frontstage* performance to highlight how markedly different White students act depending on the racial composition of their peer environment.

Cabrera (2014b) has a similar finding when exploring racial joke telling among White college men. When Cabrera asked White men at two universities where they see racism in their everyday lived environments, the most common answer is racial joke telling. Although they identify racial joke telling, the participants downplay the racism in the jokes because their friends do not *intend* to be racist. Cabrera further explores the social environment in which the jokes are told, and they tended to be among White people; particularly White men. This is closely related to a rationale that Students of Color are “overly sensitive” on issues of race, which provided an ideological justification to continue telling racist jokes and doing it among almost exclusively White peers. Cabrera (2014b) labels this the *cycle of rationalization* whereby White men engage in racist behaviors, do so in ostensibly White environments, and justify it by framing minorities as overly sensitive, which cyclically reproduces these mutually reinforcing ideologies, behaviors, and environments.

These racially segregated, White environments are the sites of White racial bonding (Lensmire, 2008; Sleeter, 1994). By White racial bonding, we mean:

[I]nteractions that have the purpose of affirming a common stance on race-related issues, legitimizing particular interpretations of groups of color, and drawing conspiratorial w/elthey boundaries. These communication patterns take forms such as inserts into conversations, race-related “asides” in conversations, strategic eye-contact, and jokes. (Sleeter, 1994, p. 8)

Lensmire (2008) recounts a time as a child when he performed what he considers a minstrel show minus the blackface. Performing for his homogenous, White, rural home community, he performed stereotypical Blackness as a form to be mutually despised. Through this routine, Lensmire (2008) argues that in this way he became White by “punching de tar baby” (Lensmire,

2008, p. 299). That is, his performance of stereotypical Blackness affirmed the mutual Whiteness of him and his audience.

As previously discussed, a key component to White racial bonding is the telling of racist jokes (Cabrera, 2014b; Lensmire, 2011; Picca & Feagin, 2007). Behind closed doors, in the general absence of racial minorities, it is very common for White students to tell overtly racist jokes to each other (Cabrera, 2014b; Picca & Feagin, 2007). This phenomenon is particularly prevalent among White men and functions as a means of racial bonding by constructing racist images of the racial other (frequently Black people). Essentially, telling the jokes assumes and affirms a common understanding of race between both joke teller and listener/laugher (Cabrera, 2014b).

Ultimately, White racial bonding exists only if there are high degrees of racial segregation (Sleeter, 1994). Within these racially homogenous campus environments, we theoretically argue (Cabrera et al., 2016) the college environment frequently leaves White students in a state of *racial arrested development*. That is, the Whiteness embedded in the ecology of PWIs coupled with White students' entitlement to social comfort (in this case racial comfort) means that they do not have to work on their racial selves.⁷ This dynamic, contextualized within the general invisibility of Whiteness to White people (Macalpine, 2005) serves to heighten the racial arrested development. In particular, it is associated with heightened perceptions of "reverse discrimination" (Cabrera, 2014d; McKinney, 2003; Norton & Sommers, 2011; Sidanius, Levin, Van Laar, & Sears, 2008). Thus, White space frequently functions as a form of racial regression as opposed to development—an environment where White people create an imagined world where they are the true targets of racism (Cabrera, 2014d; Norton & Sommers, 2011).

Although these areas of inquiry are informative, they are limited by their framing. There is a tired liberal mantra that states, "If only they weren't so ignorant, they wouldn't be so racist." However, as Leonardo (2005) argues, "Countering with scientific evidence an ideological mindset that criminalizes people of color becomes an exercise in futility because it does not even touch the crux of the problem, one based upon fear and loathing" (p. 402). In Leonardo's understanding, an ideological orientation of Whiteness insulates White people from understanding and critically examining issues of

systemic racism from which they benefit. Therefore, it is not enough to provide White people with racial facts and expect them to change their long-standing racial views. Or, to borrow from Cabrera's (2012a) pithy observation, "contrary to the maxim, the (racial) truth does not set White people free" (p. 379). This is, in part, because of the emotions of White racism (Spanierman & Cabrera, 2015). Therefore, we turn to the small but growing area regarding the intersection of Whiteness and emotionality.

Whiteness and Emotions

Emotions can and do play a central role in the maintenance of racial inequality (Cabrera, 2014c; Feagin, 2010; Matias, 2015); however, Whiteness and emotions is a very underdeveloped area of inquiry because racial analyses tend to implicitly adopt a cognitive frame. As Cabrera (2014c) argues, "Despite this growing literature in psychology, there are currently few analyses of how White people feel about issues of racism. Most of the literature in racial theory tends to rely on a cognitive framing of race/racism (e.g., Bonilla-Silva, 2006; Leonardo, 2005)" (Cabrera, 2014c, p. 772). We understand that the emotion/logic or affect/cognition is a false dichotomy as emotionality is a form of cognition (Cabrera, 2014c). Instead, we are highlighting how the bulk of analyses that cover Whiteness focus on what White people *think* about issues of racism at the expense of how they *feel*. As Cabrera (2014c) argues, "This is an important development because people are not fully rational beings, and their emotions frequently drive their actions" (p. 772). Essentially, we *might* be inverting analyses of Whiteness. Instead of seeing ideologies driving actions, it could be emotionality and this affective response to racial issues helps form racial ideologies. Within this context, we explore this growing area of study that investigates the relationship between emotions and Whiteness.

In Cabrera's (2014c) cross-site analysis of two institutions of higher education, he finds that White male affective responses to racial issues differed dramatically by context. In the more racially diverse, academically competitive university, the White men were much more likely to articulate feelings of being racially oppressed (i.e., the myth of "reverse racism"). However, and consistent with a lot of masculinity research (e.g., Connell, 2005), these young men do not frame these as emotions (e.g., "I feel oppressed") but rather

“objective” fact (e.g., “I am being oppressed”). These emotional expressions are dramatically different than those of the participants at the less diverse and less competitive school. These White males instead tended to express apathy regarding issues of race. Cabrera (2014c) argued that both responses are different sides of the same (racial) coin in that both deny the realities of contemporary racism and serve to recreate the existing racial paradigm.

Cheryl Matias has dedicated a great deal of time to exploring Whiteness and emotions from both empirical and theoretical perspectives, but primarily focusing on students in teacher training programs. For example, Matias et al. (2014) explores the racial imagination of White teacher education candidates at a single institution. They report troubling findings that many of the candidates have only a surface-level understanding of what constituted racism, and when they start to explore it further, their responses are counterproductive. Instead of critically engaging racism and how their White racial privilege could be used to combat it, they instead regress into White racial guilt. Essentially, the narratives of these preservice teachers served only to recreate rather than challenge hegemonic Whiteness (Matias et al., 2014).

Matias and Zembylas (2014) further explore White racial emotions of preservice teachers. This time, the analysis focuses on one class where the instructor specifically inserts explorations of Whiteness and emotions into the course syllabus. The student reactions demonstrate how their frequent professions of “caring” and “love” for Students of Color are more accurately rooted in disgust and shame, leading to racial distancing (as opposed to engagement). In many respects, these professions are rooted in the strong desire of the preservice teachers to not see themselves as racist (Matias & Zembylas, 2014). In a similar vein, Matias (2015) offers a seething critique, highlighting how attachment to racial minorities for many White preservice teachers becomes a form of racial fetish that insulates them from charges of racism (i.e., “I have a Black friend”). She argues for a more authentic friendship, which requires White teachers to grapple with their racial emotions that cloud the authenticity of cross-racial friendships (Matias, 2015). Within these contexts of teacher education, Matias (2013) argues that culturally responsive pedagogy can be an incredibly effective tool for using education to fight systemic racism. By culturally responsive pedagogy, Matias means an approach to teaching that

centers inequality and cultural difference. That said, she further argues, culturally responsive pedagogy delivered by White teachers that does *not* engage Whiteness can inadvertently recreate the very racial paradigm this pedagogy is supposed to challenge.

Miguel Unzueta has a slightly different perspective on the relationship among Whiteness, racism, and emotions. Although he does not explicitly explore how college influences and contextualizes White student racial development, the bulk of participants in his studies are White college students. In psychologically based studies, he and colleagues continue to find that racial beliefs frequently serve the function of ego maintenance. For example, Unzueta and Lowery (2008) demonstrate that White men framing affirmative action as “quotas” serves to insulate positive views of the self. Essentially, if White men earn a position, they can tell themselves that they were best candidate. If they are turned down, they can tell themselves that it was because an “underserving” or “lesser qualified” minority received the position due to affirmative action quotas. Either way, Unzueta and Lowery (2008) highlight that the positive view of self of White men is not challenged.

For White women, the dynamic is more nuanced. As Unzueta, Gutiérrez, and Ghavami (2010) demonstrate, it depends on whether or not White women believe themselves to be the beneficiaries of affirmative action. If they do not, then beliefs about affirmative action as a quota system serves the same ego-maintenance function that it does for White men. If they believe themselves to be the beneficiaries of affirmative action, the ego-maintenance function disappears (Unzueta et al., 2010).

Finally, Lowery, Knowles, and Unzueta (2007) explore the role that framing issues of racism has on White people’s self-image. When racism was framed as individualized anti-Black discrimination, White people are able to maintain a positive self-image. However, their self-image is threatened when racism is framed as White privilege (implicating them). Even though the two concepts are dialogically related (one cannot have disadvantage without advantage), the latter makes White people feel bad because it threatens their positive, non-racist sense of self. This, again, is a manifestation of White fragility (DiAngelo, 2011), whereby modest challenges to White sense of self becomes viewed as a

threat, leading to frequently hostile reactions by White people toward People of Color (Cabrera, 2014a; Matias et al., 2014).

Boatright-Horowitz, Marraccini, and Harps-Logan (2012) explore college students' emotional responses to learning about White privilege. They find the more students feel racially attacked, the less likely they are to understand White privilege. Additionally, White students learning about White privilege frequently makes them feel uncomfortable—as if they are a “bad guy” in society. Additionally, there is an inverse relationship between beliefs in U.S. mythologies and the ability to learn about White privilege. That is, those who do not believe that U.S. society is a meritocratic are concurrently more likely to learn about White privilege. Overall, the findings suggest that a complex constellation of emotional orientations and responses informs the degree to which White students are willing to actually engage with issues of White privilege (Boatright-Horowitz et al., 2012).

Finally, Spanierman and Cabrera (2015) offer a taxonomy of the emotions of White racism. These emotional responses include White apathy, White fear, White melancholia, White rage, and White guilt/shame. In their critical synthesis of literature on racism and emotions, they make a surprising finding. In most CWS scholarship, racial guilt is counterproductive because it refocuses racial discussions on White emotions instead of challenging racism (e.g., Matias et al., 2014). In the psychology literature, Spanierman and Cabrera (2015) find that a certain amount of White guilt can actually be productive in that it can actually lead to antiracist actions. This is not to say that racial guilt is either good or bad. Rather, that under certain conditions, it can actually be leveraged to challenge racism (Spanierman & Cabrera, 2015). In other situations, racial guilt can serve as a narcissistic method of recentering Whiteness in racial conversations while leading to inaction (Matias et al., 2014). These emotional reactions to frequently unchecked and unacknowledged Whiteness seep into other areas of the college campus. In particular, there are a number of explorations of Whiteness in teacher education.

Teaching, Teacher Education, and Whiteness

We offer this section with some trepidation. The fact that there are a greater number of explorations of Whiteness in teacher education relative to business

schools, for example, should not be construed to mean that preservice teachers have more problems with Whiteness relative to future business leaders. Rather, it is a reflection that Whiteness is a much more common analytical lens in the field of education relative to business, law, or medicine. That said, there are a number of empirical investigations specifically into the experiences, views, and racial resistance of largely White (usually female) preservice teachers beyond those by Matias and colleagues already reviewed.

For example, Evans-Winters and Hoff (2011) two Black, female professors infuse counterhegemonic approaches to their preservice teaching course. Instead of students engaging with the material, they use their teacher/course evaluations (TCEs) as a platform to complain that this approach to teacher education is a form of “reverse racism” via discomfort over racial issues. The authors further argue that White cultural hegemony is reinforced in these interactions because TCEs provide an institutionalized structure by which the students avoid, and ultimately resist, CRT approaches to teacher education (Evans-Winters & Hoff, 2011).⁸

Similarly, Marx (2004) explores race among White, English-speaking preservice teachers. She finds that they tend to view their students in terms of deficits, whether they are culturally, linguistically, familially, or intelligence. Marx is unsatisfied with simply reporting racism and subsequently challenges her participants during interviews when racist views are expressed. This produces mixed results—many students still resist learning about Whiteness and racism—but it does provide an avenue for students to begin unpacking their unconscious racism. In a similar approach, Marx and Pennington (2003) find that their critical interventions, in particular being White women talking to White women, help move preservice teachers to become cognizant of the role their Whiteness plays in their educational practice. They openly acknowledge that to accomplish this, they have to individually overcome much of their individual trepidation to participate in these dialogues about Whiteness with these preservice teachers. In the process, their students eventually become more comfortable acknowledging and engaging with their own engrained racism. Regardless, the authors are able to leverage their participants’ desires to be “good people” (i.e., not racist) as a means of pushing them toward challenging racism. It is not a linear process with a predetermined,

antiracist outcome. However, Marx and Pennington (2003) do find that engaging in this pedagogical and critical approach to teacher education helped increase the likelihood of developing antiracist praxis.

Ladson-Billings (1996) offered a relatively unique take on Whiteness and teacher education, specifically from her perspective as a Black woman teaching White preservice teachers. She critically engaged silence in her classroom. Initially, she, by her own admission, misinterpreted silence to be the same as consent. If students do not say anything, there must not be anything wrong. Through journals, she finds this assumption to be mistaken. In particular, she argues that silence can be a weapon. Ladson-Billings (1996) elaborates, “Rather than feeling unable to use one’s voice in a forceful way to provoke dialogue, silence can be used as a means of resistance that shuts down the dialogic processes in the classroom” (p. 85). In the instance of White students learning about race, silence can be a passive-aggressive form of racial resistance that disrupts the pedagogical flow of the classroom.

Despite the numerous issues documented in this chapter, there are some promising methods meant to disrupt White privilege in higher education. In particular, White privilege pedagogy offers a critical means of systemically challenging White students to unpack the hidden benefits of being White in contemporary society (Kendall, 2006; Ortiz & Rhoads, 2000). We detail the promise and pitfalls of White privilege pedagogy in the fourth chapter.

Conclusion

We take seriously Paulo Freire’s (2000) argument that oppression is dehumanizing to both the oppressed and the oppressor, and that through antioppressive praxis, we collectively become more fully human. Yes, it is the case that individual White people are not all White supremacists. However, they continue to benefit from this system of racial exploitation. With these unwarranted privileges comes responsibility to undercut the very system, which grants these privileges in the first place (Applebaum, 2010). Most agree that racism is a social evil, but few are willing to actually do anything about

it (Bonilla-Silva, 2006; Cabrera, 2009). It is precisely this inaction that helps perpetuate this system of racial oppression (Omi & Winant, 1994; Trepagnier, 2006). Therefore, we have detailed the numerous methods that White people, specifically White college students, engage in to avoid the painful realities of racism and their own culpability in its perpetuation (Applebaum, 2010).

It is very troubling because a great deal of time meant to fight racism is instead dedicated to tending to White people's fear of being called "a racist" (Matias, 2013; McKinney, 2003). There is a mistaken notion that White supremacy derives only from White supremacists (Bonilla-Silva, 2006). If we know the methods by which White people ignore and therefore perpetuate systemic racism, we begin to have a roadmap for disrupting this system. Essentially, this chapter has highlighted the counterproductive behaviors, emotions, and ideologies that perpetuate systemic racism. The next chapter builds upon this and moves to a somewhat novel approach to the study of racism in higher education: how Whiteness becomes embedded in the social fabric, organizational culture, and physical infrastructure of colleges and universities.

Institutional Whiteness and Higher Education

Comfort is about an encounter between more than one body, which is the promise of a “sinking” feeling. To be comfortable is to be so at ease with one’s environment that it is hard to distinguish where one’s body ends and the world begins . . . White bodies are comfortable as they inhabit spaces that extend their shape . . . In other words, whiteness may function as a form of public comfort by allowing bodies to extend into spaces that have already taken their shape.

(Ahmed, 2007, p. 158)

AHMED (2007) ILLUSTRATES IN this quotation the complex interplay between race and space. By space we mean both the physical environment as well as the policies, climate, and organizational culture of an institution. In general, the intersection of Whiteness and space is designed to produce comfort for White individuals (Ahmed, 2007; Cabrera, Watson, & Franklin, 2016; Gusa, 2010). The same cannot be said or assumed for People of Color, and disputes over space have recently made national headlines. For example, the University of Texas, Austin featured a large statue of Jefferson Davis (president of the Confederate States of America during the U.S. Civil War). After much protracted struggle, the statue was removed after the University of Texas student body voted to remove the large statue due to its

association with slavery and racism (Neuman, 2014). There was a suit by the Sons of Confederate Veterans to not remove the statue, but it failed.

This example highlights the complex interplay of Whiteness and the college campus that is more than simply the interpersonal Whiteness detailed in the previous chapter. Rather, the physical infrastructure of colleges and universities send messages about a campus' inclusivity/exclusivity and the interpretation of those messages frequently differed by race/ethnicity (Cabrera et al., 2016; Neuman, 2014). In addition, these cultural symbols function as physical manifestations of the institutions values, which directly affects the campus climate (Milem, Chang, & antonio, 2005). This is why similar disputes about university mascots are seen at institutions such as University of Illinois and University of Utah that have long had American Indian or Indigenous mascots (Rogers, 2013). The disputes often involve Students of Color finding it both racist to use Natives as mascots while objecting to the stereotypical behavior it allows from fans (e.g., the "tomahawk chop"), whereas White alumni and students express that the mascots are deeply tied to their identity and the identity of the institution. Without explicitly labeling these disputes as such, they are frequently about either the normalizing of or challenge to Whiteness in the collegiate environment (Cabrera et al., 2016; Johansen, 2010). Given this complex interplay of race and space, ontological expansiveness (Sullivan, 2006) and Whiteness as property (Harris, 1993) are particularly relevant to this discussion throughout the chapter. The latter helps explain resistance to challenging Whiteness in the environment (e.g., Jefferson Davis statue), whereas the former contextualizes White entitlement to all cultural symbols; even those that do not belong to them such as headdresses (Sullivan, 2006).

Within this context, and the inequitable power struggles along the color line, Whiteness frequently is the dominant culture and climate of institutions, in particular at PWIs (Gusa, 2010; Harper & Hurtado, 2007). Together the climate and culture of higher education institutions contextualize the development of individuals on the college campuses (Hurtado, Alvarez, Guillermo-Wann, Cuellar, & Arellano, 2012). Therefore, there is some overlap between this chapter and the previous one, but we separate the two for conceptual clarity. Within this context, we first investigate how Whiteness affects the

culture of higher education institutions. Second, we explore how Whiteness informs the climate of higher education institutions. Third, we examine how Whiteness informs the ecology of these institutions. Finally, we interrogate how climates and cultures imbued with Whiteness have different impacts on the development of college students.

Space, Race, and College Campuses: Three Perspectives

Frequently when the subject of race or racism arises, the unit of analysis is either interpersonal discrimination or individual racial identity development (Cabrera et al., 2016). Although these are important areas of inquiry, the intersection of race and space is frequently ignored (Lipsitz, 2011). Instead of being aberrations into contemporary society, Whiteness and White privilege are woven in the fabric of higher education and U.S. society (Allen, 1985, 1992). Whiteness is embedded in the climate of higher education institutions (Harper & Hurtado, 2007), and the longstanding cultures of postsecondary institutions (Milem, Chang, & Antonio, 2005). Frequently appearing as “normal” parts of the inner workings of higher education institutions, this chapter unmask the ways in which Whiteness is nested into the institutional structures of higher education.

Within the past 3 decades, higher education institutions have seen some growth of Students and Faculty of Color (Hussar & Bailey, 2014). Though more People of Color have enrolled in postsecondary institutions, many campuses today are still predominantly White in numbers of students and faculty and are operated from a historically White perspective (Gusa, 2010; Harper, 2012; Hussar & Bailey, 2014; Smith, 2004). That is, the racial composition of higher education may be changing, but this does not mean the institution’s racial culture, climate, or ecology is changing. Although there is a great deal of overlap among these three concepts (culture, climate, and ecology), they are distinct and we offer each as a mechanism for moving campus-based racial analyses beyond the interpersonal.

Campus Culture

Before we explore how Whiteness is deeply embedded in the campus culture of postsecondary institutions (Chesler et al., 2003; Feagin, 2010; Feagin et al., 1996; Gusa, 2010; Harper, 2012; Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Karabel, 2005; Picca & Feagin, 2007), we first need to define culture. The terms climate and culture are often used interchangeably not only in informal conversations but also in higher education literature. Despite being somewhat similar terms that can refer to similar phenomena, there are distinctions between the terms “campus culture” and “campus climate” (Bauer, 1998; Museus & Jayakumar, 2012; Peterson & Spencer, 1990). Campus culture, according to Kuh and Whitt (1988), is defined as:

The collective, mutually shaping patterns of institutional history, mission, physical settings, norms, traditions, values, practices, beliefs, and assumptions that guide behavior of individuals and groups in an institution of higher education which provide a frame of reference for interpreting the meaning of event and actions on and off campus. (pp. 12–13)

Kuh and Whitt (1988) state that their definition “emphasizes normative influence on behavior as well as the underlying system of assumptions and beliefs” (p. 13). Instead of a monolithic culture, college campuses have many subcultures (Museus & Jayakumar, 2012). The subcultures are important because they can differ from the larger culture of the institution. For example, a student may participate in a subculture such as Greek organizations that are traditionally White, compositionally White, and frequently prevent cross-racial interactions from occurring (Cabrera, 2014b; Chang & DeAngelo, 2002). The subcultures themselves create space on campus (symbolically and physically) that can send messages to students that they are welcome or not welcome. These subcultures along with the larger culture of an institution help shape and manipulate the climate of an institution. Museus and Jayakumar (2012) find that there are four components of subcultures:

1. In interaction with other subcultures

-
2. Has distinct values, assumptions, and perspectives that guide behavior of group members
 3. Transmits those values, assumptions, and perspectives to newcomers to facilitate conformity to them
 4. Differs from the dominant culture of the campus. (p. 7)

Within this context, the culture of a campus is deeply rooted in the institution its historical legacy. Thus, the culture of an institution is often difficult to change due to the history attached to an institution. Although there is some conceptual overlap, the culture of an institution is a feature distinct from the climate.

Higher Education Campus Climate

Bauer (1998) states that campus climate is “the current perceptions, attitudes, and expectation that define the institution and its members” (p. 2). The term *climate* has been used for over 7 decades to describe perceptions of a social environment (Lewin, Lippert, & White, 1939). One of the first published usages of the term *campus climate* to describe the environment of higher education institutions was in 1949 by sociologist Hylan Lewis in *Phylon* a journal from Clark Atlanta University (p. 361). In discussing higher education for African American men and the role of professors, Lewis (1949) stated:

High morale is the only weapon the college for Negroes has to fight the stultifying and demoralizing effects of insularity. The pivotal point is the Negro college teachers who feel most acutely the necessary conflicts between self-conceptions, roles and statuses that come with working in a college for Negroes; the level on which they make their adjustments goes far to determine the campus climate because they are closest to the student. Important for the teacher is the ability to respect his peers and administrators, and the receipt of recognition and respect from them; it is important that he feel that he and the administrators are interested in and working toward the same ends. (p. 361)

The way in which Lewis conceptualized campus climate over 70 years ago is similar way that scholars use the term campus climate today. Like Lewis's nonexplicit description, campus climate can be thought of in many ways. Campus climate and campus racial climate is described as "intangible" because it is often referred to as the perceptions of students, faculty, and administrators and varying components of the campus environment can contribute to the campus climate (Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, & Allen, 1998).

Hurtado et al. (1998) offered a four-dimensional framework to help dissect and understand the complexities that make up campus climate specific to race. The first dimension, historical context of inclusion or exclusion of colleges, is very similar to the campus culture and is important in understanding the present climate that minoritized students encounter. For example, colleges and universities have historically been segregated, and the long-standing effects frequently go unnoticed. Therefore, the isolation of Students of Color witnessed today on campuses can appear normal and even natural (Harper & Hurtado, 2007).

The second dimension of campus climate is compositional diversity⁹ or the number of historically underrepresented People of Color on campuses (Milem et al., 2005). This is one of the most discussed and misunderstood dimensions of the campus racial climate. The proportional representation of Students of Color on campus is a central focus, for example, when affirmative action court cases are heard. In this sense, the compositional diversity of a campus frequently is used as a standalone indicator of the campus climate instead of seeing it as one of its central components. The compositional diversity has numerous effects on the institution. For example, the lower the representation of students of color on campus, the greater the reported incidents of racial harassment by minoritized students (Hurtado & Ruiz Alvarado, 2015).

The third dimension of campus climate is the psychological dimension or how welcoming/hostile students perceive the campus climate to be (Hurtado et al., 1998). This is critically important because a negative campus climate can take a psychological toll on Students of Color (Smith, Allen et al., 2007). The dynamics of student relationships between peers and faculty

affect how students view the campus climate. The path a White student walks across campus may be very different psychologically from that of a Student of Color because of the various prejudicial or discriminatory instances that may occur.

Finally, Hurtado and colleagues (1998) offer the fourth dimension of campus climate, a behavioral component that consists of (a) general social interactions, (b) interactions among different racial/ethnic groups, and (c) the nature of intergroup relations on campus. Student involvement in on-campus activities and programs plays an important role in their experience on college campuses. Historically, marginalized students are not afforded the comfort level that the dominant White student population is accustomed to on college campuses. Students of Color are situated and surrounded among White students with very different racial ideologies in historically White institutions and self-segregation is a response to such conditions (Cabrera, 2014b).

Milem et al. (2005) updated the Hurtado et al. four-dimensional framework with a fifth dimension: organizational diversity. Milem and authors argue the organizational/structural dimension whether or not diversity is a core component of the campus' curriculum, tenure policies, budget allocations, and general university policies. The previous four dimensions were created based upon critical reviews of the existent literature on the subject; the organizational dimension was primarily a theoretically generated one (Milem & Cabrera, 2012). Regardless, these dimensions of the campus racial climate are not standalone concepts. Rather, they interact and influence each other, and thus, inclusive campuses holistic approaches are needed because addressing one dimension (e.g., compositional) cannot improve the climate by itself (Hurtado et al., 1998; Milem et al., 2005). Strongly related to the campus racial climate is exploring higher education institutions as ecological systems.

Campus Ecology

Related to climate and culture of an institution is campus ecology, which developed from the theorizing of Uri Bronfenbrenner. Bronfenbrenner (1976, 1977, 1979, 1994, 1995) critiques experimental psychology for being too

contrived and not representing the environment in which development occurs. Instead, he argues that to understand human development, one needs to understand the multiple layers that constitute the ecology that he labels the microsystem, mesosystem, exosystem, macrosystem, and chronosystem. Bronfenbrenner argues that each successive layer is farther in proximity to the individual, but each can and does have a profound impact on human development and there is frequently dynamic interplay among the different layers.

Campus ecology is typically thought to be the messages sent to individuals on campus as a result of the physical environment (Banning, 1992). Banning and Kuk (2005) define campus ecology as the study of an ecological system that is composed of three components: the inhabitants (students, faculty, administration, visitors, and staff), the setting or environment (social, cocurriculum, extracurricular, and physical college environment), and the activities/behaviors component (learning, research, and development). The concept of campus ecology refers to the “mutually independent relationships among inhabitants, environments, and behaviors with a special emphasis on how the ecology of the campus can support or hinder the traditional goals of student growth and development” (Banning & Kuk, 2005, p. 9). Banning and Bryner (2001) state that the concept of campus ecology allows for student affairs professionals “to develop and change campus environments to foster student learning and development” (p. 1).

Banning and Bartels (1997) argue that four types of messages of the ecology are sent to students: belonging, safety, equality, and societal roles. The majority of campus ecology literature does not consider the impact of structural inequality and racism that lead to certain campus ecologies (Cabrera et al., 2016). It is common in the campus ecology literature that there is a discussion of the student development and the various components of a campus' ecology, but it rarely discusses White privilege and the impact of Whiteness on the ecology (Banning, 1992; Renn, 2003, 2004; Renn & Arnold, 2003). In fact, rarely are climate or culture discussed in the context of Whiteness. Therefore, we offer some critical explorations of how Whiteness is infused throughout the components of the college campus ecology.

Whiteness Informing Culture, Climate, and Ecology

Although we separated the campus racial climate, culture, and ecology into separate sections, there is a high degree of overlap among them. For example, the history of an institution is a foundation of the institutional culture (Kuh & Whitt, 1988), whereas the historical legacy of inclusion/exclusion is a core dimension of the campus racial climate (Milem et al., 2005). Within this context, we offer numerous ways in which Whiteness is embedded in and becomes normalized within the very fabric of college campuses. Specifically, we focus on the relationship between Whiteness and history, Whiteness and meritocracy, Whiteness and traditional housed Greek life, Whiteness and safe space, and Whiteness and the campus ecology.

Whiteness and the History of U.S. Higher Education

In order for U.S. higher education to move beyond its troubled racial past, it needs to take account of this history. The name “higher education” indicates how it was not meant to be a populist form of education, and instead was largely meant to educate the elite of society (Geiger, 2005). This elitism also reflected and reinforced existing societal inequality broadly speaking. The first U.S. universities, in particular Ivy League institutions, were explicitly about supporting the male children of the aristocracy (Karabel, 2005; Thelin, 2004). It was not just that they actively recruited these students, but they also created exclusionary policies (both implicit and explicit) that excluded non-White, nonmale, and nonwealthy students from gaining access. For example, many Ivy League institutions put quotas on the number of Jewish students who could enroll in a given year, and Princeton gave preference to taller students as these were young men who were seen as potential future leaders (Karabel, 2005). Similar logics of exclusion also applied to the hiring of faculty, thereby forming an institutional cultural norm around Whiteness in the creation of U.S. higher education (Gusa, 2010; Karabel, 2005; Thelin, 2004).

Universities were able to exclude certain individuals partly due to the sentiment in U.S. society that was controlled by elite White men. Even when institutions were initially created to support marginalized students,

external pressures helped to recreate mechanisms of exclusion. As Nidiffer and Bouman (2004) carefully document, the University of Michigan began with a populist mission intentionally including poor students in the student body. However, as external forces began to lead to increased tuition and the university administration began focusing more on its research mission, the poor students were increasingly denied access. Thus, the University of Michigan went from the “university of the poor” to a “university that studies poverty.”

At Harvard, Yale, and Princeton, Karabel (2005) extensively documents how non-White people, women, and Jews were actively excluded from enrolling. He highlights the social club, White atmosphere of early U.S. universities with his discussion of eating clubs at Princeton and F. Scott Fitzgerald’s depiction of the university as “the pleasantest country club in America” (Karabel, 2005, p. 126). Instead of being places of academic inquiry, Harvard, Princeton, Yale, and other early universities were seen as places for wealthy individuals to send their children regardless of academic intentions. Such institutions were merely to reproduce class and racial structures. To demonstrate such views existed with university presidents, Veysey (1970) quoted former Princeton President Woodrow Wilson, “[T]he college is not for the majority who carry forward the common labor of the world [but] it is for the minority who plan, who conceive, who superintend” (p. 245). In other words, the explicit purpose of the university was to train the aristocracy and their children, and this aristocracy was not only wealthy but also White.

Harper, Patton, and Wooden (2009) meticulously detailed and critiqued how higher education access has been consistently denied to African American students specifically. Higher education had been effectively denied to African Americans for the bulk of the country’s history in a way that protected Whiteness as property (Harris, 1993) via education. Directly after the Civil War, “only 28 of the nation’s nearly four million newly freed slaves had bachelor’s degrees” (Harper, Patton, & Wooden, 2009, p. 393). Access began expanding due to two trends. The first was the creation of Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), but even their creation was troubling. Many Whites creating schools for African Americans did so under the auspices of “civilizing” the newly freed slaves (Allen & Jewell, 2002). At the same time, the Morrill Land Grant Acts expanded access to higher education for all

students (Geiger, 2005; Trow, 1970), but these benefits were disproportionately accrued by Whites because the *Plessy* ruling allowed states to maintain “separate but equal” educational facilities again defending Whiteness as property (Harris, 1993). What this meant in practice was that African American students were primarily offered access to HBCUs and these institutions were systemically underfunded (Harper et al., 2009).

Although *Brown v. Board of Education* eliminated the “separate but equal doctrine,” integration did not occur due to the “all deliberate speed” clause (Bell, 1979). However, the creation of affirmative action helped increase African American access to higher education in the late 1960s and early 1970s (Harper, Patton, & Wooden, 2009). According to Harper, Patton, and Wooden, these modest but important gains were systematically and eroded via two concurrent trends: “(a) enrollment declines, inequitable funding, and forced desegregation at HBCUs; and (b) access, affirmative action, and race-based admissions at PWIs” (p. 398). That is, the primary producer of African American college graduates, HBCUs, were underfunded relative to PWIs while experiencing declining enrollments. Additionally, and in a callous form of ontological expansiveness (Sullivan, 2006), they were pressured to recruit more White students (Harper et al., 2009). Finally, in another manifestation of Whiteness as property (Harris, 1993), White students began legally challenging affirmative action programs claiming they represented “reverse racism” against them as White students (Santos, Cabrera, & Fosnacht, 2010).

The purpose of higher education has expanded, and during the early 20th century enrollments rose precipitously, leading from the shift from *elite* to *mass* higher education (Geiger, 2005). Trow (1970) argues that we have now shifted from *mass* to *universal* higher education. Although the notion of universal higher education has been disputed empirically (e.g., Posselt, Jaquette, Bielby, & Bastedo, 2012), there is little disputing that the expansion of higher education and the increasing value of a college degree means previously excluded populations are gaining some access to colleges and universities. However, when previously excluded groups gain access to higher education, this challenges the hegemony of Whiteness (Cabrera, 2009) and frequently leads to conflict (Kerr, 1994; Trow, 1970). Racial conflict is a predictable outcome of the tension

between higher education history and more contemporary realities. However, interpretations of the racial conflict are very telling. For example, both Trow (1970) and Kerr (1994) have been particularly critical of the racial politicization of college campuses during the 1960s: in particular, the University of California, Berkeley. Their criticisms tended to place primary blame on the Students of Color¹⁰ and faculty for organizing for causing campus unrest instead of critically examining the preexisting racial cultures and campus racial climates of these institutions.

Regardless, of expanding access to higher education, there are still massive gaps along racial/ethnic lines (Posselt et al., 2012). The low representation of minorities in colleges and universities frequently makes headlines, especially at elite and flagship institutions. This history illustrates that these trends are not an aberration. Rather, these institutions historically were not created to be inclusive, and struggling with this history is critically important to moving toward more inclusive environments and disrupting the assumptions of Whiteness that guide them. An additional component of Whiteness in higher education is the myth of meritocracy.

Whiteness, Framing, and Meritocracy

A core professed value of contemporary higher education is meritocracy. Essentially, the benefits of higher education are inequitably distributed, and meritocracy is supposed to disproportionately allocate them to those who are the “best and brightest” (Guinier, 2015). A number of problems arise in the practice of meritocracy. The first is that meritocracy as a concept was created as a satire for how elites in society justify their preexisting privileged status (Guinier, 2015). Additionally, the contemporary measures of merit tend to be better measures of whether or not a person was born White, or male, or to college-educated parents rather than their individual “ability” (Guinier, 2015). This is precisely why Critical Race Theorists frequently make the bold claim that meritocracy only serves as a mask for contemporary White supremacy while being a core facet of the perpetuation of racial inequality (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001).

Meritocracy has a certain draw in the U.S. ethos because it allows White people to think of themselves as individuals (e.g., “I made it of my merit”)

with no consideration of U.S. racial history (Guinier, 2015). This is part of a larger trend where analyses of race and racism related to higher education are frequently decontextualized, ahistorical, and colorblind (Bonilla-Silva, 2006; Harper & Hurtado, 2007). Feagin (2006, 2010) developed a theoretical frame to understand Whites' perceptions of People of Color and racism. Called the White racial frame, Feagin (2010) states it "provides the vantage point from which European American oppressors have long viewed North American society" (p. 10). The White racial frame includes (a) racial stereotypes (a belief aspect), (b) racial narratives and interpretations (integrating cognitive aspects), (c) racial image (a visual aspect) and language accents (an auditory aspect), (d) racialized emotions (a feelings aspect), and (e) inclinations to discriminatory action (Feagin, 2010, p. 10). Feagin (2010) argues:

The "white racial frame" is an "ideal type," a composite whole with a large array of elements that in everyday practice are drawn on selectively by white individuals acting to impose or maintain racial identity, privilege and dominance vis-à-vis People of Color in everyday interactions. People use what they need from the overarching frame's major elements to deal with specific situations. (p. 14)

Rooted in an historical account of the oppression of People of Color, Feagin (2006) recognizes that this disposition "is an integrated whole that is learned and reinforced in white social networks overtime" (p. 306). Within this context, meritocracy is informed by the White racial frame in terms of determining the arbitrary criteria that defines merit (Feagin, 2010).

Despite the professions of valuing meritocracy, Karabel (2005) describes this fluidity of a policies as "the iron law of admissions" in which universities would "abandon a particular process of selection once it no longer produces the desired result" (Karabel, 2005, p. 132). The desired result was an incoming class that reflected the wants of the administration and admissions officers that frequently reflects the White racial frame (Feagin, 2010). For example, Whites' operationalizing "merit" tends to vary by who is included in the discussion. When Whites are pitted against Blacks only, they tend to prefer placing a premium on SAT scores and grades. When the competition includes

Asians, they tend to downplay the relevance of test scores and grades in defining merit (Samson, 2013). Thus, just as beauty is in the eye of the beholder, so is merit.

Karabel (2005) makes the strong argument that the idea of meritocracy was an important and extremely fluid feature in the development of the higher education especially in the case of Harvard, Yale, and Princeton. The volatility of merit did not occur in a vacuum of the university, but rather “shifted in response to changing power relations among groups as well as changes in the broader society [and] reflected the values and interests of those who have power” (Karabel, 2005, p. 5). To support his claim, Karabel (2005) identifies how university presidents routinely changed the requirements to attend their institutions, which often had differential impacts for particular gender, racial/ethnic, and religious groups. Although definitions of merit may change, a relatively consistent feature of Whiteness in higher education is the traditional housed Greek system.

Whiteness and Traditional, Housed Greek Life

There is little debating that traditionally housed Greek life is dominated by White students from means from high socioeconomic status backgrounds (Syrett, 2009), and this is a bastion of Whiteness reproduction for two reasons. First, Greek life is one of the few areas on a college campus where members can explicitly exclude participants (Cabrera et al., 2016). Second, the connections to other members, including alumni, serve as a form of social capital to which few are allowed access (Syrett, 2009). Therefore, these campus-based organizations frequently function as the vanguards of White racial privilege reproduction (Cabrera et al., 2016). Within this context, they are also on the front lines of the campus climate and culture—in particular the climate and culture of racial exclusion.

Lee (1955) demonstrated that up until the first half of the 20th century, many Greek organizations banned non-White students from participation. Although policies to exclude Students of Color in Greek life were challenged in the 1950s and the policies were dropped, the culture of exclusion continued in Greek life and often does to this day (Lee, 1955; Park, 2008; Syrett, 2009). Prior to the opening of Greek organizations to Students of Color, there were

already African American fraternities and sororities. Despite the increased access to higher education for Students of Color in the late 1970s and 1980s, Greek organizations remain predominantly White (Sidanius, Van Laar, Levin, & Sinclair, 2004). Within this context, the term “traditional” Greek organizations becomes a euphemism for “White.”

Higher education scholarship has slowly interrogated how fraternities provide protections for Whiteness and even place extra value on Whiteness. Ray and Rosow (2012) investigated the two different realities for African American and White fraternity members. They found that the visibility and accountability in White and African American fraternities act as mechanisms of privilege. White fraternities were allowed invisibility and were unaccountable for their actions, whereas African American fraternities experienced a level of hypervisibility.

A line of research has demonstrated that participation in Greek organizations on campus is associated to being less open to diversity and diverse friendships (antonio, 2001; Park & Kim, 2013; Pascarella, Edison, Nora, Hagedorn, & Terenzini, 1996; Sáenz, 2010). Some research suggests that Greek organizations act as a catalyst for White self-segregation (Cabrera, 2014d; Milem et al., 2005; Sidanius et al., 2004). Additionally, research has found that White Greek students are less likely than non-Greek White students to have interracial friendships (Stearns, Buchmann, & Bonneau, 2009). Park (2014) investigated student organizations and campus racial climate and found that White students were most likely to be in primarily White environments when they participated in Greek life. Chang and DeAngelo (2002) found that racially diverse postsecondary institutions were associated with less White student participation in Greek organization. Similarly, participation in Greek organizations in college was a negative predictor interracial friendship groups and that increased structural diversity is negatively related to being involved in Greek life (Park & Kim, 2013). In other words, as structural diversity increases, students are less likely to be involved in Greek life and thus have more interracial interactions.

Greek fraternities and sororities are often at the center of what is referred to as racial theme parties or parties in which there is a theme that plays on popular stereotypes of racial groups. From an analysis of racial theme parties,

Garcia, Johnston, Garibay, Herrera, and Giraldo (2011) suggest that such parties are disproportionately held by Greek organizations. Racial theme parties might not be classified as a hate crime by the U.S. Department of Justice, but the parties send the message that Students of Color are not welcome in the university and actively promote negative stereotypes (Garcia et al., 2011). Although fraternities and sororities may intend these events to be out of the public purview, photography and social media have demonstrated the prevalence of such events on campuses across the country. Institutions of higher education are often reactive as opposed to proactive to racially charged incidents like racial theme parties and other racist events on campus as seen in recent events in Missouri (Williams, Berger, & McClendon, 2005). Given the prevalence of Whiteness and racism on college campuses, there have been several calls for establishing and nourishing safe spaces for “nontraditional students” (e.g., racial minorities, women, and students who are lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans*, or queer).

Safe Space?

Although safe space is a lofty goal, it frequently fails in practice due to the conflation of safety with comfort (Cabrera et al., 2016; Leonardo & Porter, 2010). In theory, safe spaces—or spaces where students can be assured that they will not be targeted or harassed due to their race, gender identity, sexual orientation, disability, and/or other social identities—are ideals that should be imbued throughout the college campus. However, the realities of contemporary higher education frequently make this difficult to practice.

All too often, the needs of Students of Color and White students are given equal weight in cross-racial space, and this serves only to recreate racial privilege (Harper et al., 2009; Museus & Jayakumar, 2012). Sometimes this takes the simple form of classrooms being overtaken by White voices (Applebaum, 2008). Sometimes, it means White people demanding to have their views and experiences with race be accepted as truth, despite these views frequently being informed by an epistemology of ignorance (Applebaum, 2010). Sometimes it means White students demanding calm as a prerequisite to talking about racial issues, which frequently means taking the pain of oppression out of the discussion (O’Brien, 2004) (O’Brien, 2004). Sometimes it means White students

being entitled to a sense of racial comfort that allows them to retreat from the conversation when issues become tense (Cabrera et al., 2016; Leonardo & Porter, 2010). Regardless, creating racially aware and racially inclusive college environments is incredibly difficult, in particular because White students are frequently not prepared to deal with racial dialogues and therefore disrupt the safe space of Students of Color (Leonardo & Porter, 2010).

This is unfortunate because White students can greatly develop their racial selves by learning in diverse environments. Research demonstrates that White students exhibit growth when being involved in race-specific university programs (Ngai, 2011). Ngai (2011) found that White students who engaged in cross-racial programming developed friendships and gained exposure to different perceptions and cultures. Cabrera (2012a) found that White students in a multicultural residence that discussed social justice regularly enabled participants to critique and explore their own racial privileges. Authors have found that racially conscious programming disrupts White space on campus (Gusa, 2010; Harper & Hurtado, 2007). Therefore, research has demonstrated that social discomfort and pushback against perceived White spaces might be needed to disrupt racial privilege (Cabrera et al., 2016), and these frequently require cross-racial interactions.

Educating Whites about racism often comes at the expense of People of Color via cross-cultural dialogues that often turn into nonsafe spaces for People of Color (Cabrera et al., 2016; Leonardo & Porter, 2010). Universities can use best practices to help Whites grapple with and learn about their privilege. Therefore, universities should provide opportunities in class and outside of class that encourage White students to learn about White privilege and how subtle racist actions may negatively affect the climate of the institution and their fellow students. All of these experiences exist within the overall ecology of the college campus.

Campus Ecology and Whiteness

In a critique of the campus ecology literature employing a critical Whiteness frame, Cabrera et al. (2016) offered both a critical review of the literature and a theoretical interpretation of the campus ecology through the lens of Critical Whiteness. They ultimately argue that the campus ecology literature

is too concerned with social and racial comfort for White students. Their analysis of campus ecology literature does not allow room for White students to be “maladjusted when it comes to the subject of racial injustice,” which frequently leaves White students in a state of racial arrested development (Cabrera et al., 2016, p. 129). As Ahmed (2007) argued, the Whiteness normed in space provides comfort to White bodies. By the same token, Whiteness embedded in and supported by the campus ecology leads to social comfort for White students. However, this entitlement to comfort too often enables Whites to ignore discomfort related to racism and campus ecology literature fails to address structural issues of racism and cognitive dissonance. The lack of understanding of the climate, culture, and campus ecology as related to Whiteness and White privilege can have a negative impact on Students of Color and White students.

How Whiteness Affects Students of Color

Students of color are affected by the normalization of Whiteness within the campus ecology, culture, and racial climate. This is, in our understanding, the most important component of doing Critical Whiteness research: understanding the adverse effects of racism on minoritized students. In the absence of this consideration, this form of inquiry becomes Critical Whiteness for White people, which inadvertently recenters Whiteness and White privilege (Apple, 1998).

Sense of Belonging for Students of Color

Hurtado and Carter’s (1997) research on sense of belonging is based on the first of two dimensions proposed by Bollen and Hoyle (1990), having a sense of belonging and moral association. These two dimensions originated from their definition of perceived cohesion, which states, “Perceived cohesion encompasses an individual’s sense of belonging to a particular group and his or her feelings of morale, associated with membership in the group” (p. 482). Bollen and Hoyle (1990) offer a definition that “captures the extent to which individuals and group members feel ‘stuck to,’ or a part of, particular social

groups” (p. 482). Bollen and Hoyle state that belonging is composed of both cognitive and affective elements. Additionally, Baumeister and Leary (1995) suggest that the need to belong is “a need to form and maintain at least a minimum quantity of interpersonal relationships” (p. 499). Their theory of belongingness requires that individuals maintain recurrent, positive interaction that is void of conflict and the relationship is stable well into the future. They find that people who lack social attachments are more likely to have psychological and physical health problems.

Centering sense of belonging for minoritized students, Hurtado and Carter’s (1997) findings indicate that perceptions of a hostile campus climate have a direct negative effect on sense of belonging in the third year for Latino students. As a result, Latino students feel less a part of the college community when they experience discrimination or perceive racial tension on a college campus. Similar to the work of Hurtado and Carter (1997), Hoffman, Richmond, Morrow, and Salomone (2002) argue that campus climate, peer interactions, and faculty support related to sustaining a sense of belonging. Hausmann, Schofield, and Woods (2007) find that, not surprisingly, African American students’ sense of belonging declines as their first-year progresses. Strayhorn (2012) illustrates the various ways in which the minoritized groups often lack a sense of belonging at historically White institutions. Johnson et al.’s (2007) analysis demonstrated that White students had the greatest sense of belonging relative to Students of Color, which makes intuitive sense because PWIs were developed centering the needs of White people (Gusa, 2010). Therefore, a sense of belonging to an overall campus environment directly relates to how welcoming/exclusionary the campus racial climate is. The more exclusionary for Students of Color, the more that Whiteness is the climate norm (Harper & Hurtado, 2007). The more that Whiteness is the norm, the lower the sense of belonging (Gusa, 2010). A large part of this dynamic is that there is a strong relationship between compositional diversity and the behavioral and psychological dimensions of the campus racial climate (Hurtado et al., 2012).

Hostile Cultures and Climate, Microaggressions, and Racial Battle Fatigue

The lower the compositional diversity, the greater the likelihood of Students of Color experiencing campus-based racial harassment such as microaggressions (Hurtado & Ruiz Alvarado, 2015). Some research has demonstrated the relationship among hostile campus climates, cultures, and racial microaggressions (Johnson et al., 2014). Solórzano, Allen, and Carroll (2002) argue that racial microaggressions are “layered” in that they attack “one’s race, gender, class, sexuality, language, immigration status, phenotype, accent or surname” (p. 17). These messages are sent to Students of Color and create an environment that is hostile, whether intended or not. Feagin, Vera, and Imani (1996) found that African American students felt unwanted in the classroom and in nonclassroom settings as a result of microaggressions. Smith, Allen, and Danley (2007) determined that African Americans are negatively affected in both the academic and social settings of the university. Although microaggressions may occur on a personal level in that they are directed to a single person, the cumulative effect of microaggressions affects one’s perceptions of campus climate (Smith, 2009a, 2009b). Microaggressions affect not only the climate but also other aspects of the life of a student such as their mental/physical health, academic performance, stress, anxiety, and depression (Sue, 2010). An emerging body of literature investigates how institutionalized racism, the prevalence of Whiteness, hostile climates, cultures, and racial microaggressions contribute to racial battle fatigue (RBF).

Central to the RBF framework is the cumulative, negative effect of racial microaggressions or the “everyday verbal, nonverbal, and environmental slights, snubs, or insults, whether intentional or unintentional, that communicate hostile, derogatory, or negative messages to target persons based solely upon their marginalized group membership” (Sue, 2010, p. 3). Pierce (1975) states that the oppressor in such situations controls a person’s space, time, energy, and motion (STEM). RBF draws on Pierce’s framework of mundane extreme environmental stress (MEES) and STEM framework to describe outcomes for People of Color. In doing so, the RBF framework examines the psychological, physiological, and behavioral stress responses associated with

being a Person of Color and experiencing institutionalized racism (Smith 2004, 2009a, 2009b; Smith et al., 2007; Smith, Yosso, & Solórzano, 2007).

RBF is unlike typical occupational or academic stress in that it “is a response to the distressing mental/emotional conditions that result from facing racism daily” (Smith, 2004, p. 180). People of Color can be exhausted in preparing for and coping against the everyday racial microaggressions they experience (Smith, 2009a). The long-term exposure to racial microaggressions from the time of childhood makes the health side effects of RBF physically, psychologically, and emotionally detrimental. The responses to RBF make predominantly White settings where racial microaggressions occur particularly hostile and uncomfortable places for People of Color (Smith, 2004, 2009a, 2009b).

Research on RBF has primarily been qualitative, but a quantitative study investigated RBF for Latinos (Franklin et al., 2014). Franklin et al. found that psychological and physiological stress responses were affected the most by racial microaggressions among Latino students. Some research has demonstrated that coping mechanisms employed by African American and Mexican American students can mediate the impact of racial microaggressions on stressors (Franklin, 2015). Studies have also found an association between perceived discrimination and depressive symptoms among Chinese Canadian students in Toronto, Canada (Dion, Dion, & Pak, 1992) and African American college students and adults (Sellers, Copeland-Linder, Martin, & Lewis, 2006; Williams, Neighbors, & Jackson, 2003). For African American students, racialized stress has been associated with low academic persistence (Neblett, Philip, Cogburn, & Sellers, 2006) and low graduation rates (Brown, Morning, & Watkins, 2005). Wei, Ku, and Liao (2011) found that the university environment was a significant mediator for the association between minority stress and persistence attitudes among Asian American, African American, and Latinx students. The campus environment can significantly affect the levels of stress for many Students of Color, but stress can affect other facets of the life of a person or group. Ojeda, Navarro, Meza, and Arbona (2012) found that ethnicity-related stressors significantly predicted life satisfaction in college students. Within this context, there is a dynamic interplay among the campus environment, the campus racial climate, and the racialized

stress individual Students of Color experience. These effects are markedly different for White students in ostensibly White environments.

What Campus Whiteness Accomplishes for White Students

White students come to campuses with racial identities that have been shaped by their previous surroundings that are often normed around Whiteness (Bonilla-Silva, 2006; Leonardo, 2009). This creates challenges for universities and colleges that seek to challenge White privilege. In discussing a healthy racial identity, Helms (1990) states that “in order to develop a healthy White identity, defined in part as a nonracist identity, virtually every White person in the United States must overcome one or more aspects of racism” (p. 49). Therefore, it is the case that White students need to recognize racism and then confront it and this means moving beyond colorblindness. What Whiteness accomplishes for White students is the ability to lead a life of racial ignorance that leads to racial bliss (Cabrera et al., 2016). Without confronting their colorblindness, Whites are afforded the opportunity to not confront the lived racialized realities of People of Color. As Cabrera et al. (2016) state, the avoidance of confronting campus-sanctioned Whiteness “limits White students’ abilities to develop their racial selves, keeping them in a state of *racial arrested development* which continues to reify the existing racial hierarchy” (p. 20, emphasis added).

Not only does Whiteness enable White students to live in racial bliss, it also enables them to feel entitled to move throughout any component of the campus. Unlike with racial/ethnic organizations that are often marginalized on campuses by way of location or resources, other organizations that are historically and predominantly White do not face such spatial restrictions (Feagin et al., 1996). As previously discussed, Sullivan (2006) refers to this as *ontological expansiveness*, or that White people act as if all space (literal and figurative) is open and accessible to them. In Harper and Hurtado’s (2007) review of campus racial climate research, they find a central focus on White space adversely affects the climate across several studies. When Whiteness is normed in space, ontological expansiveness increases (Sullivan, 2006).

Other authors have conceived of White space more related to campus racial climate. Gusa (2010) offers the concept of White institutional presence

(WIP) or “customary ideologies and practices rooted in the institution’s design and the organization of its environment and activities” (p. 477). One of the main ideas of WIP is White ascendancy or “thinking and behavior that arise from White mainstream authority and advantage, which in turn are generated from Whiteness’s historical position of power and domination” (p. 472). The assumptions of White superiority then lead to Whites claiming an entitlement of space (Sullivan, 2006) in addition to feeling entitled to White racial comfort (Ahmed, 2007).

Whiteness also provides the ability for Whites to distance themselves from People of Color. Some research has used diary methodology to see how Whites talk about People of Color in public and private space. Picca and Feagin (2007) investigated the campus racial climate by analyzing the journals of 1,000 White students who kept a log of witnessed acts of racism and discrimination, on and off their college campus. The journals provided 9,000 accounts of racial events that consisted of racial commentary, actions, and inclinations by other students and relatives. The authors found that racist events occur on the frontstage (out in public, sometimes in front of minoritized individuals) and the backstage (within closed settings with primarily other White students). Subtle racist actions and verbal sayings occurred in the frontstage, whereas overt racism was reserved to the backstage largely with other Whites. In the vein of Picca and Feagin’s (2007) work, Cabrera (2014b) investigated the racial joking of White males. The White male students frequently told and heard racist jokes, but they were framed as jokes that were not racist. Like Picca and Feagin (2007), Cabrera (2014b) found that jokes were told in the “backstage” or not in the presence of People of Color because they are “racially too sensitive” (p. 7). Cabrera argues that participants framed the joke telling as innocent and the problem was with sensitive Students of Color. This research demonstrates that White students do recognize the difference between overt and subtle racism, but it also demonstrates that White students feel they have the freedom to continue with overt racist actions while not in the presence of Students of Color. In many respects, their freedom stems from the tacit approval of the institution. That is, their institution did not say this type of behavior was wrong, which implicitly becomes a sanction of it.

Overall, these White students are able to do only this to the extent that they have a critical mass of White students, allowing for self-segregation, and that the institutional climate is normed around Whiteness.

Ontological Expansiveness and the Curious Case of Teach for America

Unacknowledged and unchecked Whiteness, in particular ontological expansiveness (Sullivan, 2006) is also a critique of Teach for America (TFA). TFA is a program that targets talented and motivated recent undergraduates (usually from elite universities) to teach for 2 years in low-income and majority–minority areas (Heilig & Jez, 2014; Lapayese, Aldana, & Lara, 2014). The students go through a 5-week summer training that is meant to be a substitute for traditional teacher training programs. The core idea behind this program is that energetic and academically talented young people can help address educational inequality (Teach for America, n.d.). Although this may be the philosophy, the reality is dramatically different.

Critiquing TFA is difficult because recent college graduates who participate in the program tend to be idealistic and committed, and we do not want to demean these efforts. Rather, our critique is centered on the false promises of the organization and the failures of higher education to adequately address racial issues during the undergraduate years. To be clear, our subsequent critique is one of a structure that has set up idealistic students for less-than-stellar results as opposed to the students themselves—a type of academic “hate the game, not the player” analysis, if you will.

The empirical evidence regarding TFA efficacy highlights that program participants are less effective than credentialed teachers at educating their students (Darling-Hammond, Holtzman, Gatlin, & Helig, 2005; Heilig & Jez, 2014). Given the structure of the program (minimal training and difficult teaching environments), these results are to be expected. So why is there so much attention and investment in this program? The individuals who participate as TFA corps members definitely accrue benefits in terms of professional advancement under the guise of altruism. This trend is so strong that it leads Lapayese et al. (2014) to conclude that TFA “effectively benefits the racial and economic interests of Whites” (p. 11). That is, the primary beneficiaries

of the program are the largely White teachers as opposed to the students they serve.

Critically examining post-Katrina New Orleans, Buras (2011) finds that TFA is at the center of the market-based reforms that gut the public school system, turning it over to the private sector, and effectively undermining Black political power in the community. Similarly, Kretchmar, Sondel, and Ferrare (2014) demonstrate the TFA plays a key role in the national privatization/charter school movement, which ultimately undermines public education. Cann (2015) critiques TFA for frequently relying upon a White savior complex to recruit members and garner corporate sponsorship. Finally, Sondel (2015) highlights how, in the instances where TFA is deemed “effective,” its members help their students modestly raise their test scores. She critiques this approach as primarily teaching to the test and, in function, undermining democratic education in favor of rote memorization and neoliberalism.

Within this context, is it fair to criticize *higher education* for the counterproductive nature of TFA? We argue yes and no. No, higher education cannot be entirely responsible for that which happens outside of the ivory tower. That said, unchecked and unexamined Whiteness, in particular developing ontological expansiveness among White students (Sullivan, 2006), is a large part of what makes TFA an attractive option for college students. Being unqualified for a job (in this case teaching) and still believing that one can succeed at that job in extremely difficult circumstances requires an incredible amount of self-delusion. Part of that self-delusion derives from the promise of elite education as well as the ideology that “anyone can teach” (Zenkov, 2014). In addition, it requires a deficit framing of communities of color that a White savior can alleviate (Cann, 2015; Pitzer, 2014). By deficit framing, we mean viewing minoritized communities as either incapable or unable to advance on their own. By White savior, we mean that the social problems highlighted within low-income communities of color can be alleviated via the help of outside White folk (Cann, 2015). This myth has become extremely popular in films such as *Dangerous Minds* (Giroux, 1997). Additionally, TFA requires space within institutions of higher education to recruit new corps members. Therefore, yes, higher education does deserve some of the blame for this counterproductive system as universities, in particular elite ones, are the primary

feeders of TFA. The inability for higher education to deconstruct Whiteness becomes a foundational component of TFA's successful recruitment.

Conclusion

In Star Trek, Captain Kirk famously referred to "Space, the final frontier." By the same token, space (physical and imagined) is a relatively new frontier for campus-based racial analyses (although definitely not the *final*). The structural and cultural conditions in which students live and learn profoundly affect their educational experiences (Hurtado et al., 2012). To the extent that Whiteness is the norm, institutions of higher education serve to replicate the existing racial paradigm of White supremacy (Gusa, 2010). Conversely, the more that campus climates and cultures can be racially inclusive, the more they can fulfill their larger democratic functions (Gutmann, 1987). As Cabrera (2014d) argues, "Democracy derives from the roots *demos-* meaning people and *-cracy* meaning rule. It is not possible to have a rule by the people if certain racial groups, with deference to George Orwell, are 'more equal than others'" (p. 42). Therefore, as institutions become more diverse and question inequitable social conditions on campuses, it is becoming increasingly important for institutions of higher education to address Whiteness and White privilege. Historically, challenges to institutional racism have been led by Students of Color (Rojas, 2006), but White students can also participate in disrupting White privilege. Within this context, the next chapter critically reviews the research on White allies in higher education.

Developing Racial Justice Allies

[Racism] is not a Black problem. It is a white problem. This is an American problem.

Jesse Williams¹¹

JORDAN DAVIS WAS an unarmed Black teenager whom Michael Dunn, a White man, shot and killed during an argument about rap music volume coming from the car in which Davis was riding (see footnote for more details). In the wake of Dunn's trial, *Grey's Anatomy* star Jesse Williams made this simple yet profound statement. The issue of a White man shooting an unarmed Black man raised many pressing issues, including how we frame issues of racism. In this instance, Jesse Williams was not satisfied with the racial violence experienced by the Black community being an issue limited to the Black community. Instead, he reframed this sentiment arguing that racism is both a White and a societal problem—one that all of us must work to address.

Within this context, the issue of racial justice allyship becomes a more salient issue. By racial justice ally, we mean White people who use their White privilege to be part of the collective that challenges and transforms systemic racism (Cabrera, 2012a). This chapter focuses on Whiteness on the college campus as it relates to developing racial justice allies. In doing so, we situate this chapter within the existing literature base of ally development, which almost exclusively focuses on students. We recognize that this does not address faculty and staff, and they are critically important actors in the development

of allies because of the importance of role models (Reason, Miller, & Scales, 2005). Unfortunately, due to a lack of empirical literature focused on White faculty and staff, this chapter primarily focuses on the development of student allies.

Previous chapters have described the landscape of higher education institutions as places that normalize Whiteness. The chapter is written with the intent to be critical in a positive way to make campuses and the individuals more aware of racism and White privilege. We then move through the two dominant areas of ally research—social justice allies and racial justice allies. We also provide a summation of research-driven recommendations to enhance the development of allies on campuses and offer a critique of the literature and gaps in order to continue the conversation. Although academically driven, the goal of this chapter is to educate practitioners and scholars on the research and recommendations related to the development of allies.

Ally Development: Context, Challenges, and Concepts

Predominantly White campuses are microcosms of the larger, White-dominated society (Hurtado et al., 2012). This is often referred to as the campus climate. Rankin and Reason (2008) argue that it is critically important to define terms so that interested parties are speaking about the same thing and able to engage in dialogue. This becomes tricky because developing racial justice allies entails developing White students' racial sense of self, but the definition of the term "White" is constantly evolving with blurry social boundaries (Omi & Winant, 1994). Therefore, it is necessary to define Whiteness, but constructing Whiteness as a thing of rigidity with prescribed boundaries can "lead towards the positioning (or self-positioning) of 'White' people as fundamentally outside, and untouched by, the contemporary controversies of 'racial' identity politics" (Bonnett, 1996, p. 98). Therefore, we begin this exploration of racial justice allies with this tension—treating Whiteness as real, tangible, but also porous and changing.

Predominantly White Institutions (PWIs) are institutions in which the campus is demographically dominated by White students, faculty, and staff, has a cultural foundation steeped in Whiteness, and creates a racially marginalizing and hostile campus climate for Students of Color (Gusa, 2010). As Gusa further explains, “Today’s PWIs do not have to be explicitly racist to create a hostile environment. Instead, unexamined historically situated White cultural ideology embedded in the language, cultural practices, traditions, and perceptions of knowledge allow these institutions to remain racialized” (p. 465). As previously discussed, Gusa refers to this as the White Institutional Presence (WIP), which:

focuses on the White normative messages and practices that are exchanged within the academic milieu. When these messages and practices remain subtle, nebulous, and unnamed, they potentially harm the wellbeing, self-esteem, and academic success of those who do not share the norms of White culture. (p. 471)

Whiteness as atmosphere, Whiteness as background, Whiteness as a normative culture is a pervasive problem within institutions of higher education. This normative Whiteness minimizes the experiences of People of Color and marginalizes communities of difference (Gusa, 2010). However, and as described in the third chapter, White people being in ostensibly White environments can lead to a state of racial arrested development (Cabrera et al., 2016). Therefore, racial justice ally development within PWIs generally means going against the cultural norms of the institution (Cabrera, 2009; Gusa, 2010).

Within this context, Alimo (2012) asks, “Should research that addresses racism via White people also be considered a part of an emerging transformative paradigm?” (p. 52). We agree with Alimo regarding the “standpoint of White people is one standpoint that is necessary to address racism” (p. 52) because they are simultaneously generators and deniers of Whiteness and racism. However, the reasons for White people working on their racial selves are also critically important. That is, we are both concerned with the end (racial justice allyship) but also the means (reasons for doing this work). The

reason this is so important is that sometimes White people want to become racial justice allies so they can see themselves as “good” (nonracist) White people. Instead, the importance of racial justice work is that it helps alleviate the racial burdens experienced by People of Color and promotes greater societal equity. Self-serving ally development can lead to racial justice being a “fad” in a White person’s life (Reason & Broido, 2005). This is why Reason and Broido caution against a “fair-weather ally who works only when it is convenient or easy, risks reinforcing the suspicions of target group members through more unfulfilled promises” (p. 87). Whereas People of Color combat racism as a matter of survival, one component of White privilege is the ability to choose to engage racism or choose to retreat (Watson, 2015). Reason and Broido (2005) highlight “that effective and sustainable ally behavior requires a solid foundation of self-understanding—that is, understanding based on continuous critical reflection into the roles of power and privilege in one’s life and relationships” (p. 81). That is, ally development is a constant process of engagement that requires sustained commitment to the larger goal of racial justice. Within this paradigm, racial justice allies are a specific manifestation of social justice allies, and therefore, we explore the contours of both of these concepts.

What Is an Ally?

An ally is a general term used to describe an individual from a majority group who is trying to step away from the confines of the majority context and is working to support a marginalized group. As Brown and Ostrove (2013) argue, “Allies are people willing to take action, either interpersonally or in larger social settings, and move beyond self-regulation of prejudice” (p. 2212). The work and goals of allies are a balance between supporting marginalized communities and interrogating the majority system of oppression *but* not so much that the conversation is recentered on the majority experience. Taking all of this into consideration, majority allies must also stay grounded in their experiences and remain cognizant of their majority status (Brown & Ostrove, 2013).

There are two critical reviews of the existing literature base surrounding allies, one from psychology and one from sociology: Brown and Ostrove

(2013) and Ford and Orlandella (2015). Both present the current literature on what an ally is at the broadest level as well as drilling down to highlight allies that are connected to particular marginalized communities. Brown and Ostrove (2013) illuminate a gap in the existing literature base: although “consensus is present in the allies literature on what qualities these individuals may possess, few empirical studies have been conducted to discern the characteristics of allies” (p. 2212). Although the characteristics may remain elusive, Bishop (1994) proposes six steps, actions, and habits that are fundamental to working as an ally:

1. understanding oppression
2. understanding the varying forms of oppression
3. consciousness and healing
4. working for self-liberation
5. developing as an ally
6. maintaining hope

Adding an alternate perspective to Bishop’s ally work, Brown and Ostrove (2013) “identified two broad qualities of allies as described by people of color: affirmation and informed action” (p. 2220). These qualities highlight the differentiation between an ally (high affirmation and high action), a friend (high affirmation and low action), and an activist (low affirmation and high action). Overall, they highlight that allies strive to make space for nondominant groups through the use of their privileges and work to enact systemic changes when nondominant individuals are not around. Commitment and longevity also play into the change to which allies are able to contribute.

Commitment to the larger cause is critically important to avoid the “fair-weather ally” Reason and Broido (2005) caution against. Specifically, when allies are not completely committed, burnout can occur “because of the energy needed to maintain their status as an exceptional member of the dominant group, denying both self and others their own oppressive socialization, and a need for continued acceptance from the other” (Edwards, 2006, p. 50). That is, the ally spends more time focusing on the status of ally instead of the actual work of social justice. This type of superficial social justice work can promote

burnout, and burnout is something that practitioners need to be aware of when developing allies.

Developing Social Justice Allies. Although the terms social justice ally and racial justice ally are often used interchangeably, the literature points to differences. For example, Broido (2000) defines a social justice ally as “members of dominant social groups (e.g., men, Whites, heterosexuals) working to end the system of oppression that gives them greater privilege and power based upon their social group membership” (p. 3). Within this context, Alimo (2012) provides an overview of social justice ally development research from the evolution of advocates to engagement behaviors highlighting the intentionality and points of connection for allies. Alimo argues that “social justice ally development is the process by which agents evolve into advocates for social justice” (p. 39). Edwards (2006) asserts that “development from self-interest to altruistic to blended underlying motivation is not only central to an individual’s desire to work towards social justice, but also the key to influencing individual effectiveness in those efforts” (p. 43). These scholars describe a process by which people of a socially dominant group learn to be truly committed and engaged with promoting social justice.

Broido (2000) investigated phenomenologically how students developed as social justice allies and synthesized three components that all of the participants identified that they said enabled them to be allies: (a) increased information on social justice issues, (b) engagement in meaning-making processes, and (c) self-confidence. When referring to catalysts for becoming an ally, students highlighted “external initiation,” recruitment opportunities, or leadership positions that expected social justice ally characteristics (Broido, 2000, p. 7). Concepts such as systems of oppression were mentioned in both informal (social settings) and formal learning settings such as classrooms. Students began to integrate the knowledge of systems of oppressions through discussions, self-reflection, and perspective taking. A key component that enables students to shift from social justice attitudes to social justice actions was self-confidence. Within this context, the development of racial justice allies is a similar process but with an analytical focus on racial issues.

Developing Racial Justice Allies. At the center of being a racial justice ally is an understanding of racism, power, and privilege, as well as one's role in perpetuating these. Ford and Orlandella (2015) define a White ally as:

[A] person who consciously commits, attitudinally and behaviorally, to an ongoing, purposeful engagement with and active challenging of White privilege, overt and subtle racism, and systemic racial inequalities for the purpose of becoming an agent of change in collaboration with, not for, people of color. (p. 288)

Social justice ally literature does not necessarily stress the role of racism. Reason, Scales, and Millar (2005) discuss ways that student affairs professionals can encourage students to become involved in racial justice work. The authors posit that racial justice allies develop this identity through three stages that include “understanding racism, power, and privilege both intellectually and affectively; developing a new White consciousness; and encouraging racial justice action” (Reason, Scales et al., 2005). Therefore, a significant difference from the literature about being a racial justice ally is the specific onus on White individuals to really be in touch with themselves as a racialized being and understand what their race, privilege, and positionality means in relation to racial justice. Borrowing from the work of Reason, Millar et al. (2005), Alimo (2012) argues that “the process of White college students developing confidence to advocate regularly against racism is a quality scholars associate with becoming White allies for racial justice” (p. 37). Similar to the previous section, developing self-confidence to engage in both social and racial justice work is critically important in the development of allies.

Warren's (2010) “head, heart, and hand” model helps explain the deepening commitment to racial justice for some White individuals. In his model, the head symbolizes individuals' knowledge of racism. The heart represents emotions and ethics and finally, the hands represent activism and relationship building (pp. 214–215). Warren explains the head, heart, and hand are intertwined and work together to build a racial justice outlook. Warren finds that the journey toward racial justice for White activists is sparked by a “seminal experience” that in turn can create a “moral shock” (p. 27). Among the

White activists in his study, Warren finds this moral concern regarding racial justice that led to action and multiracial collaborations. Within the collaborations, Warren cites that activists built relationships with People of Color in which they learned from their experiences with racism. Through friendships and collaborations with People of Color, White activists witness the role White people can have in combating racism in White dominant communities. Warren (2010) concludes that as the participants describe their racial justice journey, they all involve their metaphorical head, heart, and hand as described in the model. Warren's research, although seemingly simplistic, provides higher education practitioners a beginning point to better understand racial justice allyship and their possible development.

Inner Workings of Ally Development

As seen in the work of Reason, Cabrera, Edwards, Alimo, Broido, Linder, and Warren, the inner workings of ally development are personal, take time, and can be frustrating. Taking a step back, ally development is not only about the individual but also incorporates their environment and relationships. One of the most referenced models in higher education, the Input-Environment-Output model (I-E-O), has been used to contextualize this process. Astin's (1993) I-E-O model focuses on the relationships between inputs, the environment, and outputs in higher education to assess what affects undergraduates and how. Inputs include student demographics, their background, and previous experiences. The environment is the multitude of experiences of a student while in college, and the outcomes are the characteristics, knowledge, attitudes, beliefs, and values that exist after college. Students come to college with predefined demographics and experiences that inform their worldview.

The environment while in college can have a substantial impact and influence on the outcomes after college. If a student comes to college with few experiences with People of Color and has a White racial frame (Feagin, 2010), a diverse college that values inclusion and self-inspection of White privilege may produce an individual that has been resocialized as a racial justice ally (Cabrera, 2012a; Reason & Evans, 2007; Reason, Millar et al., 2005). On the other hand, the same student coming to a campus with hostile campus climates and cultures that does not reward self-inspection of privilege may

leave college with the same racial arrested development (Cabrera et al., 2016). Therefore, the environment in the I-E-O model is crucial in creating racial justice allies while in college.

Additionally, Linder (2015) stresses that an ally must possess an awareness on multiple interpersonal levels in order to be a good and sustainable ally. Linder (2015) argues, “[W]hile it is important to teach students the facts to power, privilege, and oppression, it is equally important for students to understand their emotional responses to working through their own privilege.” Linder (2015) goes on to state, “When students understand the ways in which their own guilt, shame, and fear get in the way of action, they may be able to move through these emotions to action” (p. 548). The emotions that Whites feel need to be put into action and Brown and Ostrove (2013) state that “White people’s ability to take action that is perceptible by and meaningful to people of color” is necessary (p. 2220). Too often, White individuals rely on People of Color to act as the catalyst for change, but the responsibility should instead be on White individuals. Ford and Orlandella (2015) additionally note that “aspiring allies must acknowledge the ways that they are implicated in the system of racism, investigate their prejudices and assumptions, and own their White privilege in order to become effective allies” (p. 297). This is similar to Applebaum’s (2010) argument that White people do not simply benefit from systemic racism, but they also contribute to it and are therefore complicit in the maintenance of contemporary White supremacy. As White individuals become more cognizant of race and their own racial selves, the act of being an ally inevitably leads toward the simultaneous termination of a monolithic Whiteness group resulting in origin groups and a focus on cultural traditions, difference, and connection points.

Research documents that developing White racial allies at times felt isolated from peers due to their use of White privilege to challenge Whiteness. Developing racial allies abandon isolation by bonding with individuals who share a similar connection to issues of race, those folks who identified as racial justice allies and People of Color (Bridges, 2011). Tatum (1994) argues that those who want to become allies need to recognize their racial identity, leave behind their socialized self that is often unconsciously racist and benefitting from White privilege, and finally understand what it means to be White.

Coming to terms with their Whiteness and understanding how their White identity contributes to systemic racism is part of developing a healthy White identity. Whereas Tatum (1994) implies that Whiteness can be reformed to develop racial justice allies, Ignatiev (1997) argues, “The point is not to interpret Whiteness, but to abolish it.” Although the abolishment of Whiteness may be ideal, Cabrera (2012a) contends, “If White people join the struggle against racism and disavow their White privilege, they still live in a racialized society” and therefore, modern-day abolitionists “ignore the practical realities of day-to-day struggles in favor of their utopian vision” (p. 378). Due to these complex realities, it is not surprising that the process of developing racial justice allies presents several additional challenges. At the center of many of these discussions is White privilege pedagogy.

White Privilege Pedagogy: Promise and Limitations

Here's how great it is to be white, I could get in a time machine and go to any time and it would be fuckin' awesome when I get there. That is exclusively a white privilege. Black people can't fuck with time machines. A black guy in a time machine is like hey anything before 1980 no thank you, I don't want to go. But I can go to any time. The year 2, I don't even know what was happening then but I know when I get there, "Welcome we have a table right here for you sir." ... Thank you, it's lovely here in the year 2.

Louis C. K.

As comedian Louis C. K. humorously details in his bit, there is no denying that being White ensures, on the aggregate, better treatment than being a Person of Color. This has nothing to do with an individual's racial attitudes or beliefs. Rather, it is a function of being born into a systemically racist society (Bonilla-Silva, 2006; Feagin, 2010; Omi & Winant, 1994). Therefore, to truly support a society where “all men (sic) are created equal,” it requires those in positions of systemic privilege to use those privileges toward undercutting the very systems that grant them these privileges in the first place.

With all of the issues of Whiteness and racism in higher education, White privilege pedagogy is one of the more promising approaches to disrupting systemic racism on college campuses. By White privilege pedagogy, we mean unpacking the unearned benefits that White people accrue on a daily basis simply as a function of being White (Kendall, 2006; McIntosh 1997). We do acknowledge that White privilege pedagogy is meant only to be a type of “Racism 101” as opposed to a graduate-level seminar. That is, as we previously highlighted, many White students are in a state of *racial arrested development* (Cabrera et al., 2016) and it is a developmentally appropriate way to address racism among students who are barely coming to a racial awareness. One cannot teach calculus to students who are just beginning algebra. Within this context, we are sensitive to a number of issues that have arisen when people engage in this pedagogical approach (we explore the promises in more depth in the fourth chapter).

First, Lensmire et al. (2013, aka “Midwest Critical Whiteness Collective”) argue that White privilege pedagogy is limited and even counterproductive for a number of reasons. The metaphor of a knapsack misrepresents the nature of White privilege. Within a system of contemporary White supremacy, it is not up to the individual whether or not they are the recipient of White privilege. Anyone can remove a knapsack; one cannot forgo White privilege. Rather, one can only creatively identify ways to use White privilege at the service of disrupting, transforming, and destroying systemic racism. However, White privilege pedagogy frequently misses this nuance, and instead becomes, in practice, a form of confession that serves to alleviate the racial guilt of the racially privileged. As Lensmire et al. (2013) argue, White privilege pedagogy frequently devolves into a space for White people to articulate how they are privileged, but with no connection to action. There is a severe lack of racial praxis, and within this context, White privilege pedagogy becomes self-serving. It makes the racially privileged feel good (i.e., “I may be White, but I’m the good type”), while doing nothing in terms of meaningful social change.

Leonardo (2004a) has a similar critique, as White privilege became a fad at educational conferences. He argues that White privilege pedagogy tends to individualize racism, offering no interrogation of the nature of

contemporary White supremacy or how it could be transformed. Instead, it falls into the almost clichéd trap of seeing people as good (nonracist) and bad (racist). Therefore, Leonardo riffs on McIntosh's (1997)¹² format of listing examples of White privilege. Instead, he directly links historical and systemic conditions of White supremacy "to create a selective list of acts, laws, and decisions, if only to capture a reliable portrait of white supremacy" (Leonardo, 2009, p. 85). The list of 29 examples is too long and exhaustive to replicate here, but a few examples include:

- Housing segregation limits black mobility and access to jobs and other kind of work.
- Colonization of third-world nations establishes white global supremacy and perceived white superiority.
- Inheritance laws favor whites, whose families benefited from free black labor during slavery. Centuries later, their children retain their parents' wealth. (Leonardo, 2009, pp. 85–87)

Although there are localized examples of White privilege (e.g., McIntosh's list), they are frequently divorced from a critical, structural analysis of White supremacy (Lensmire et al., 2013; Leonardo, 2004b). This lack of structural analysis creates an uninterrogated space where the cultural hegemony of Whiteness continues to mask the contemporary realities of systemic White supremacy (Cabrera, 2009). Although White privilege pedagogy is supposed to aid in the development of racial justice allies, it is not a panacea. There are several other pieces to this puzzle as well as an equal number of roadblocks.

Racial Justice Ally Development and Barriers

Although theorizing about racial justice allies is important foundational work, institutions are really in need of ways in which they can cultivate racial justice allies from their entire student body. We need more pragmatic models that provide potential allies with the ability to progress as allies as well as to fail and be able to pick themselves up to move forward. The existing models are constrained by a stepwise progression, a linear model that does not provide room for individuals to pause or regress, which we know is common.

Models that account for the possibility of regression are needed and are more in line with the reality of confronting Whiteness and racial privilege. Ford and Orlandella (2015) stress that being an ally “involves actively choosing to become an agent of change rather than entering into a hierarchical relationship” (p. 288). The mindset of an ally as described by Ford and Orlandella places that choice in direct opposition with the privileges afforded allies in their particular dominant group.

Brown and Ostrove (2013) remind us that it is necessary to account for the differences in the behavior of White allies. They add, “[I]n situations where their good intentions may not be widely known, such as interacting with unfamiliar or skeptical people of color, White allies may become more cautious in their informed action behaviors to avoid misinterpretation” (p. 2217). Alimo (2012) provides a recommendation:

[An] implication for student development or social justice educators may be to alter expectations of educational outcomes of these types of programs for White college students from increased to decreased levels of confidence, if there is an exception of increased self-awareness.
(p. 54)

That is, because developing allies is a slow process, frequently programs supporting ally development are overly critiqued for not producing enough positive results (i.e., racial justice allies). Instead, it is necessary to understand that there is no silver bullet for ally development and it requires sustained effort. Individual programs can be part of the solution but they are not the sole means to the end.

Finally, allyship development needs to push White students to be critically self-reflective. For example, allies must ask themselves, as did Gustafson (2007), “How did being White shape my worldview, my teaching, and my writing?” (p. 154). This is not easy because White people are not trained to see their worldview informed by being White. Instead, it is seen as just their individual perspective (Tatum, 1994). Gustafson discusses the value of the iterative reflective process in which she was able to revisit her Whiteness and process how her racial identity provided opportunities and hindrances to

being an ally. Although this literature base is informative, there are a number of gaps in the knowledge base regarding what can push students toward becoming racial justice allies.

Recommendations and Next Steps

Ford and Orlandella (2015) discuss the need for allies to possess authentic motives and intentional action because if these attributes are lacking, White people will frequently intellectualize concepts of socialization and domination without meaningfully engaging with the ways they benefit from the oppression of others. In sum, invoking an ally identity can serve as a defense mechanism and allow for continued oppressive behavior without ever fully embodying or understanding true allyship (p. 290). The interrogation of Whiteness can be a trying endeavor and folks will stumble for a myriad of reasons but it is a solid understanding of one's self, an honest intentionality to be an ally and remaining authentic in the face of doubt and adversity that will help pull individuals through the relentless attack by normative Whiteness (Warren, 2010).

Ultimately, there is no simple or single formula to becoming a racial justice ally. Colleges and universities cannot simply offer a diversity course requirement and expect students to come to a new realization regarding racism, power, and privilege. Ford and Orlandella (2015) warn that singular courses are not enough to promote change, "It is important to recognize that curricular interventions are only one avenue for encouraging the development of White allies... a course might be thought of as the initial step in a life-long search for the meaning of Whiteness and its implications" (p. 298). As Cabrera (2012a) argues, "[W]orking through Whiteness is not an end met, but a continual process engaged" (p. 397). Instead, universities need to confront racism, power, and privilege at all levels of the institutions. Next, we provide some recommendations that should not be taken piecemeal but rather as part of a comprehensive approach.

First, although institutions need to diversify their student bodies, they also need to diversify their curriculum as argued in the organizational dimension of the campus racial climate framework (Milem, Chang, & Antonio, 2005). Rankin and Reason (2008) state, "Infusing social justice courses

that educate students on issues of power, privilege, and harassment has great potential to raise awareness and decrease prevalence of harassment” (p. 267). Often when issues of racism, power, and privilege are discussed in the classroom, tensions can rise due to different positions on issues.

Within this context, Ford and Orlandella (2015) suggest that higher education institutions “need to intentionally create curricular and co-curricular synergetic spaces that challenge Whites students’ understanding of race and racism and encourage them to act as allies for racial justice” (p. 297). Others have similarly suggested that postsecondary institutions need to disrupt the racial arrested development of White students because their comfort on campus is often prioritized over the comfort of Students of Color (Cabrera et al., 2016).

Too often Students of Color are attacked verbally or microaggressed in classroom discussions on race and racism, but institutions and instructors need to know that it is not the responsibility of Students of Color to teach White individuals about racism, power, and privilege (Reason & Broido, 2005; Solórzano, 1998). Students of Color may become guides in a classroom discussion because they are on the receiving end of racism, but they should not be the teachers in the classroom. Therefore, this requires institutions of higher education to hire, develop, and support instructors and professors who are racial justice allies themselves.

Higher education institutions often have mission statements that mention diversity and inclusivity, but reports from historically marginalized students typically bring to the forefront the inequalities and discrimination present on today’s campuses. Much of this rhetoric is seen as merely giving lip service to diversity. Rather, institutions of higher education should encourage and reward inclusivity and social justice perspectives on campus. Rankin and Reason (2008) suggest, “Such policies would institutionalize advocacy and social justice in a manner consistent with the mission of higher education” (p. 266).

There is a need for role models when attempting to create more racial justice allies. As described in Broido’s (2000) study, becoming more aware of social justice and racial justice did not occur without prompts or requirements of employment. Instead, it required some type of role model or expectations to

create the conditions that would lead to a racial or social justice ally. Reason and Broido (2005) note the influence that role models can have on potential allies who need to be encouraged to move toward advocacy when stating “many students are reluctant to take action without encouragement and invitation, and student affairs professionals often are in positions to make such invitations” (p. 84). Such invitations to move toward advocacy require self-inspection of power, privilege, and oppression as well as a “thorough understanding of the role these constructs play in one’s own daily life” (Reason & Broido, 2005, p. 82). The process of self-inspection is difficult and can be a lonely journey. A role model can play an important role in making sure that the individual stays engaged and is active, but it is still the responsibility of racial justice allies to become more self-aware and inspect their power and privilege.

At times an honest assessment is needed. Brown and Ostrove (2013) found that “people of color gave lower affirmation ratings to White allies than the White allies gave themselves” and thus “an asymmetry can exist between the evidence that people of color and their allies use to evaluate affirmative behavior” (p. 2220). Regardless of the feedback that a person receives, Edwards (2006) reinforces the idea that allies need to be allies for their own betterment and, therefore, being an ally means that one must continuously check in and honestly ask if they are making the allyship an integral, valued, internal cyclical process. Edwards reiterates:

[A]llies are open to feedback not only as a way of helping the other but also as a means to illuminate their own oppressive socialization and privilege, a necessary part of the ongoing process of liberation members of the privileged group from their own internalized dominant socialization. (p. 52)

Regardless, potential allies need a starting point with examples of antiracist activists who would provide additional encouragement and support for Whites students while developing a healthy racial identity and positive ally behaviors (Ford & Orlandella, 2015).

We argue that White spaces on higher education campuses and within postsecondary education need to be disrupted. Space should be thought of not only as physical but how the meaning of physical space is interpreted along the color line should also be considered. Scholarship on campus ecology (see Banning, 1992) has investigated the use of space on higher education campuses and how spaces are perceived, but Whiteness scholarship has critiqued campus ecology literature that does little to investigate racism and the privileging of White perspectives in relation to campus ecology (Cabrera et al., 2016).

Reason and Broido (2005) argue that confronting racist comments and behaviors in classroom and informal settings can disrupt the Whiteness in spaces on campus. They argue though that the confrontation should be a way to educate instead of demean or embarrass the individual. Another way to disrupt White space is to forge environments where ally behavior is expected (Reason & Broido, 2005). If the expectations of instructors, faculty, and administrators include allyship and a recognition of racism and privilege, students may be more likely to conform to such expectancies. Many changes in White spaces may come from physical changes such as moving the racial/ethnic student center from the corner of the union to a more centrally located area of the union. Scholarship also demonstrates that White spaces on campuses can be *partially* disrupted through institutional policy changes such as requiring a diversity statement of potential faculty hiring or requiring more than a single diversity course for graduation eligibility.

Next, institutions of higher education need to address the structural diversity on their campuses. Too often institutions of higher education believe only admitting more Students of Color or hiring more Faculty of Color will address claims of racism on campus and White privilege. Admitting a critical mass of Students of Color will not alter hostile campus racial climates or meaningfully change the culture of an institution (Museus & Jayakumar, 2012). However, altering the composition and perspectives on campus will help address racism and White privilege, but it is not a panacea.

We are encouraged by the use of intergroup dialogues in higher education on issues of White privilege and racism (Zuniga, Nagda, & Sevig, 2002). These conversations often bring to light the everyday experiences with racism

in the face of privilege of Students of Color and help humanize the pain of racism. Less often, White students use these spaces to confront their position of privilege as a White person in a White dominant society. Although these conversations can have extreme value if conducted by experienced, trained professionals, they can be a site of linguistic violence against People of Color (Leonardo & Porter, 2010). Cabrera and others (2016) suggest that intergroup dialogue facilitators need to do three things. First, facilitators need to make sure that participants feel the environment is a space where all ideas are welcome. Second, facilitators need to make sure participants understand racism, sexism, homophobia, ableism, etc. are not welcome in the intergroup dialogue, and this likely will create friction with the first suggestion. Finally, the facilitator needs to help participants understand that there will be frustration as they work through the unlearning of racism and privilege.

Finally, more research on allyship needs to incorporate faculty, staff, administration, and trustees into their analyses. The vast majority of the research on social justice allies, racial justice allies, racism, and White privilege focuses only on students. A huge gap in the literature exists in which students are placed under the microscope and development critiqued, yet members of the campus community in positions of influence are not included or worse, it is believed that they do not need to be pushed about issues of Whiteness and ally development.

Conclusion

In this chapter, we have included findings from empirical studies on strategies and programs used by individuals and institutions to develop more racially conscious White individuals within postsecondary education. The development of allies contributes not only to the improvement of campus racial climates but also to changing the culture of higher education institutions that have been dominated by Whiteness and White privilege. Institutions of higher education need to take on the responsibility of fashioning campus climates that are free of racism and openly critique privilege (verbal and nonverbal occurrences). The institutionalization of ally advocacy and social justice by

colleges and universities will send an important message to the campus community that all students are welcome and should be able to thrive socially and academically.

Therefore, institutions need to develop allies or groups of individuals “not only committed to expressing as little prejudice as possible, but also invested in addressing social inequality” (p. 2211). Edwards (2006) argues that a successful ally is one who “creates a sustainable passion for social justice that is not dependent on the praise and favor of the oppressed” (p. 52) and this is what institutions of higher education need. As a result, the larger goal is to create an inclusive campus climate that “requires rigorous work of informed critical introspection that sees one’s performance of Whiteness, as well as sees the performance of Whiteness in the practice of others” (Gusa, 2010, p. 481). Altering the campus climate and culture and ultimately developing racial justice allies on campus will not happen without the commitment of higher education institutions and the unwavering support of their administrations. It is extremely difficult and constant work, but that is what makes it so necessary.

Implications and Futuring Whiteness Studies in Higher Education

THE CONTOURS OF Whiteness in higher education are complicated, nuanced, and omnipresent. The concepts of colorblindness (Bonilla-Silva, 2006), assumed racial comfort (Leonardo & Porter, 2010), epistemology of ignorance (Mills, 1997), Whiteness as property (Harris, 1993), and ontological expansiveness (Sullivan, 2006) are concepts that can be applied to the space, policy, climate, ecology, and campus culture issues. Most of the implications for policy and practice on an interpersonal level were addressed in the fourth chapter (Racial Justice Allies), but we detail the implications for institutional Whiteness in the beginning of this chapter. We then offer what we see as key, unexplored areas of Whiteness in higher education scholarship.

First, we are compelled by Bonilla-Silva's (2006) and Gillborn's (2008) parallel arguments that racism is so engrained in contemporary society that colorblind approaches to social policy are actually supporting the reification of systemic racism. Simply put, a racially unaware institutional policy will be guided by the hidden assumptions of Whiteness. This serves to reify the importance of racially cognizant approaches to higher education institutional improvements. To dive further into this issue, we return to the campus climate scholarship but with a caveat in framing.

Given the five dimensions of the campus climate, there are a number of areas where Whiteness can be challenged. First, just because an institution has an historical legacy of racial exclusion does not mean that it is forever destined

to be that way. Currently, Georgetown University is grappling with the history that it was built by slaves and its original endowment grew from the sale of 272 slaves. Representatives from Georgetown are currently trying to create a trust for the descendants of these slaves.¹³ Although this will not be a panacea for all racial issues at Georgetown, it is a step in the right direction and can also shift the culture of the institution.

Additionally, the compositional diversity of institutions of higher education needs to be increased (Milem, Chang, & Antonio, 2005). Part of this requires some critical self-reflection because a lack of compositional diversity frequently relates to institutions believing in meritocracy. As Guinier (2015) argues, traditional measures of merit, such as the SAT, are better assessments of whether or not a person was born rich or White than an evaluation of their ability. Within this context, institutions of higher education have to be willing to interrogate their selection criteria, which is doubly difficult given the record number of applications that are submitted every year as admissions at selective increasingly become more competitive.

The organizational dimension of diversity can be engaged to disrupt Whiteness in a number of ways (Milem et al., 2005). For example, administrators and deans can be evaluated based on how much they increase diversity amongst their students, faculty, and staff. Additionally, Whiteness can be challenged via the institutionally sanctioned curriculum. If the current lessons of K–12 education are any indication, the more that ethnic studies counts as a “real education,” the greater the positive impact on Students of Color (Cabrera, Milem, Jaquette, & Marx, 2014; Dee & Penner, 2015). This approach not only destabilizes normative Whiteness within the curriculum, but it can also increase minority student achievement in the process.

Even the interpersonal dimensions of climate (behavioral and psychological) can be improved via institutional policies. That is, we argue that the quality, quantity, and perceived quality of cross-racial interactions on campus can be improved via some changes in the organizational structure. For example, intergroup dialogues that center a social justice orientation, focusing on power, privilege, and oppression, can substantially improve campus cross-racial relations (Zuñiga, Nagda, & Sevig, 2002). However, for campuses to experience these improvements, they also must make an investment in

programs like this as well as training for the staff to effectively run them. Ultimately, focusing on one dimension of climate does little to foster racially inclusive campuses. Rather, a holistic approach that addresses multiple dimensions concurrently is necessary to actually foster institutional transformation (Milem et al., 2005).

There has been a troubling issue with applying the campus racial climate framework within higher education scholarship. It has played a central role in defending affirmative action via the “diversity rationale.” The diversity rationale demonstrates that by having more racially inclusive campuses, all students experience cognitive and affective growth—White students included (Milem et al., 2005). Our application of the campus climate framework differs slightly. Instead, we are using this framework as a systematic method for destabilizing the normativity of Whiteness within institutions of higher education. We appreciate the utility of the climate framework to this end, because relying exclusively on CWS work means success is defined by overthrowing systemic racism—an end none of us as authors think we will witness in our lifetimes.

The Future of Whiteness Studies in Higher Education

Ultimately, institutions of higher education serve the paradoxical function of both recreating and reinforcing systemic racism, while also being a site of some of the most salient challenges to contemporary White supremacy (Cabrera, 2009). Although the field of higher education has made some impressive developments in furthering the understandings of Whiteness, especially in the area of ally development, there are a number of areas that are in need of exploration. Therefore, to conclude this monograph, we project what the future of Whiteness studies in higher education should look like.

Individually: Moving Beyond the “Good White”/“Bad White” Dichotomy

When examining the literature on interpersonal Whiteness, there are a number of examinations of how White privilege and White supremacy are

continually recreated (e.g., Cabrera, 2014d; Gillborn, 2008). These critical interrogations of Whiteness are important in unmasking the inner workings of racial domination and how institutions of higher education are complicit in this process (e.g., Chesler et al., 2005). Additionally, examining how White people can work toward allyship and how institutions of higher education can support this development, is equally important (e.g., Cabrera, 2012a; Ortiz & Rhoads, 2000). However, these two veins of scholarship tend to fall into the overly simplified dichotomy of “Good White/Bad White,” where “Bad Whites” are racist and “Good Whites” are allies. This dichotomy is not explicitly stated in the scholarship, but it is frequently implied in the framing of the work.

The relationship between White people and White supremacy is much more complicated than an either/or framework, and White people are frequently self-contradictory. Future analyses of Whiteness in higher education need to play in the gray areas of Whiteness, individual development, racism, ideology, and action. For example, how would current Whiteness in higher education scholarship theorize a White student who is overtly antiracist in their professed ideology, and yet their actions continue to support systemic racism? Conversely, how would this same vein of research understand a White student who “doesn’t have time for antiracist work,” yet their actions serve to challenge contemporary White supremacy? Most of the scholarship highlights how White students can develop in the direction of being less racist (e.g., Cabrera, 2012a). Where is the scholarship on how White students become *more* racist within institutions of higher education? Future scholarship in this area needs to be able to grapple with these tensions as White students developmentally engage on their nonlinear path of understanding, misunderstanding, misrepresenting, interrogating, and questioning what it means to be White as well as the accompanying responsibilities. Finally, higher education scholarship would do well to move beyond simply focusing on undergraduate students and expand these analyses to include graduate students, professors, postdocs, staff, and campus administrators. Additionally, the bulk of the analyses in higher education regarding Whiteness have focused on White students, but none have engaged the possibility of Students of Color internalizing Whiteness.

Individually: People of Color Internalizing the Discourse of Whiteness

Returning to Leonardo (2009) conceptualization of Whiteness as a discourse as opposed to White people, it is possible for anyone to engage in the discourse of Whiteness. However, no one to date in higher education has deeply engaged with the issue of how People of Color can and do adopt discourses of Whiteness. Bonilla-Silva (2006) did briefly analyze internalized racism when examining if Blacks can also engage in colorblind racism, but scholarship such as this is few and far between. The bulk of it in higher education scholarship relates to racial identity development theory (e.g., Bell, 2007; Hardiman & Jackson, 1992), which frequently misses the critical component of CWS Future studies in Whiteness in higher education could carefully explore how Students of Color sometimes come to internalize and propagate the very system of contemporary White supremacy that serves to oppress them.

Internalized racism is not a new concept as Fanon (1967) wrote extensively about how the colonized can adopt the ways and mannerisms of their colonizers and try to emulate them. Their yearning to be European made him label this dynamic as *Black Skin, White Masks*. Although CRT has done an admirable job of critiquing, challenging, and transforming deficit frameworks when examining Communities of Color (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001), it has not yet developed a theoretical or methodological mechanism to understand and explore internalized racism within these same communities. There is even less empirically about how certain higher education subenvironments might promote an internalization of Whiteness among Students of Color. For example, it is theoretically possible but not empirically demonstrated that the normative pressures of the housed Greek system might cause Students of Color to internalize normative Whiteness and become complicit in their own marginalization. Although we think internalized Whiteness would be both a fascinating and critically important area of study, we also believe that it is extremely politically sensitive. The work could easily be twisted to reframe Communities of Color as deficient, in need, or dysfunctional. We do not have answers to these issues, but rather offer them as cautionary notes to those who might consider picking up the mantle of this research. In addition to complicating Students of Color's relationship to Whiteness, future

Whiteness in higher education studies also need to problematize our current understandings of what it means to be an antiracist ally.

Individually: Further Developing White Antiracism Studies

Higher education as a field of study has embarked on some of the best work on racial justice ally development to date (e.g., Cabrera, 2012a; Edwards, 2006; Ortiz & Rhoads, 2000; Reason, Scales et al., 2005), which is a testament to the field. Warren (2010) observed, “White studies of white racism could fill a small library, the studies of white anti-racism, if you will, could fit in a small bookshelf” (p. xi). However, there are several limitations to the current body of knowledge.

First, the bulk of the work on antiracist White people is largely retrospective in nature (e.g., Cabrera, 2012a; Warren, 2010). That is, it starts from the perspective of people who are already doing some level of antiracism work and are learning their personal histories to explore their personal development. Almost nonexistent from the literature are examinations of White people as they are beginning the process of exploring their racial privileges and their nonlinear struggles as it pertains to learning how to be racial justice allies. Ethnography is a particularly underused methodology for examining this critically underexamined issue in higher education. This would be a critically important development because the ethnographer would be able to witness ally development firsthand and not have the interview research limitation of recall bias.

Second, at the 2014 American College Personnel Association national meeting, Iowa State University Professor Robert Reason asked the provocative question, “When did antiracism become an identity and not a description of action?” The question highlights the way the bulk of the White antiracism work in higher education has been conducted. That is, it treats antiracism much like Helms’ (1990) work on White racial identity development where antiracist allyship represents the most developed stage. Dr. Reason was even critiquing some of his own work, as Reason, Millar, and Scales (2005) used Astin’s I-E-O (or Input-Environment-Outcome) conceptual framework to understand how White students become antiracist allies. However, as Cabrera (2012a) argues, “working through Whiteness is not an end met, but a

continual process engaged” (p. 397). Therefore, future work on White antiracism needs to complicate current understandings of what it means to be an ally.

This includes reframing allyship as an analysis of action as opposed to identity. That is, instead of asking what a person thinks of him- or herself regarding allyship, the analytical focus examines actions and whether or not they challenge racism. Within this context, it also means the label of ally is constantly changing within individual bodies based upon the actions of that body. When the White person is engaging in antiracism, they are an ally. When they are watching *Scandal*, they are not. Future analyses of allyship need to engage this intersection of action, temporality, and identification (instead of identity). The primary focus needs to be on observable actions as opposed to what White college students think about themselves. The context within which White students can develop into allies is another area that needs a great deal of future development. The specific environment in which this development occurs is critically important, and there is a great deal of work to do in terms of empirically exploring and theorizing the intersection of campus race and space.

Whiteness and Higher Education Space

Some of the most heated current debates in higher education relate to the intersection of race and space. As previously described, both theoretically (Gusa, 2010; Sullivan, 2006) and empirically (Harper & Hurtado, 2007), the presence of White space, especially at PWIs, serves to marginalize Students of Color on these campuses. However, there are a number of areas where the recreation of Whiteness is underexplored. For example, future studies should use geographic information systems to map the physical infrastructure of college campuses, analyzing the racial use/allocation of space as a function of race. This would allow researchers to empirically demonstrate the proportional control over space in an institution as a function of race.

In addition, although the campus ecology literature (e.g., Banning, 1992; Banning & Bartels, 1997) was very popular in the 1990s, this form of higher education analysis has laid relatively dormant for the past 15 years (Cabrera et al., 2016). This vein of scholarship tended to focus on the

marginalizing messages that different components of the physical infrastructure sent to minoritized communities (e.g., Banning & Bryner, 2001). New developments could critically engage how Whiteness frequently informs views of the campus ecology. For example, it is likely that White students and Native students would have dramatically different views on the presence of Native mascots (Cabrera et al., 2016). The previous work on campus ecology and campus climate tended to center the views and experiences of minoritized students. There is nothing inherently wrong with this, but the intersection of racial privilege, the physical environment of the campus, and the overall climate is critically underexplored.

Finally, work on the intersection of Whiteness and space has not explored resource allocation. That is, the ability to dominate space is frequently reliant upon the ability to leverage institutional resources. However, the authors are not aware of an empirical study that, for example, examines the differences in institutional allocations to Greek organizations relative to Student of Color community centers, controlling for number of students served. This type of empirical investigation can help illuminate institutional values because it is very easy to say that one values diversity in a press release or even a mission statement. However, if we operationalize the old adage “actions speak louder than words,” then institutional financial allocations (actions) speak louder than public statements (words). Returning to the power of words and discourse, we offer some suggestions regarding the intersection of race and listening.

Whiteness and Listening

The majority of the scholarship on Whiteness focuses on what White people say about issues of race (e.g., Feagin & O’Brien, 2003). A problem with the current empirical scholarship is that it tends to focus on the racist sentiments that White people profess, but missing from these analyses are ones that explore the value of silence and listening. For example, there is a tendency for White people to “whitesplain” when issues of race arise (see earlier section for explanation of concept). However, to truly develop empathy regarding the pains of racism, White people need to honestly listen to and hear the experiences of People of Color as they encounter racism

(Feagin, 2010). To this end, there is not currently a theoretical or empirical mechanism for exploring White listening, which becomes the mechanism for developing racial empathy, and this is one of the most critically important areas of developing White racial justice allies (Cabrera, 2012a; Dreher, 2009). That is, the more that White people in their White environments insulate themselves from the adverse impacts of racism, the more they become part of the problem of systemic racism (Cabrera, 2014b). Conversely, the more that White people hear and truly engage issues of racism empathetically, the more they become part of the solution (Feagin, 2010; Spanierman & Cabrera, 2015).

Listening is a very difficult subject to study for a number of reasons. First, how does one empirically demonstrate the absence of something? In this instance, it is the absence of spoken word. Second, how does one differentiate between different types of silence? For example, there is a massive disconnect between a group collectively rolling their eyes, waiting out a “cultural awareness training,” versus a White person truly hearing the experience of systemic racism. Both are taking in information on racism, but one is being dismissive whereas the other is engaged. How does a researcher or practitioner consistently differentiate between the two? The current review does not provide sufficient empirical evidence to allow for this question to be answered. However, let us collectively consider this a challenge to the future generation of higher education and racism scholars to take this issue and run with it. In order for one to truly listen, hear, engage, issues of racism, one must be at least willing to engage issues of racial empathy. This leads to a strongly related to the intersection of Whiteness and emotionality.

Whiteness and Affect

As Cabrera (2014c) argues, “Whiteness and racism in higher education are largely analyzed in terms of what students experience or think about issues of race. There is little regarding how students feel” (p. 770). Saying there is little in this area does not mean it is nonexistent. Linder (2015) argues that guilt, fear, and shame are frequent emotional responses for White women doing antiracism work. They also represent some of the key barriers to effectively doing this work. That is, focusing on White guilt distracts from actually doing

antiracism. Cabrera (2014c) highlights the limited range of emotions White men expressed when facing issues of race: anger or apathy. Matias (2016) does an extensive exploration of the intersection of Whiteness and emotionality, but hers is primarily focused on teachers and K–12 learning environments. Feagin (2010) argues that a key missing emotion in antiracist work is empathy, whereas Forman and Lewis (2006) argue that racial apathy is a core emotion that reinforces contemporary White supremacy.

Despite this work, there is a dearth of work on the relationship between emotions and racism, especially within institutions of higher education. This is a critically important area because, as Cabrera (2014c) postulates, racial analyses may be ignoring the most important component of racial formation: emotionality. If the work of Unzueta and colleagues is correct (e.g., Unzueta, Lowery, & Knowles, 2008; Unzueta, Gutiérrez, & Ghavami, 2010), White racial attitudes serve the function of ego maintenance. It might be that the racialized emotion comes first, and the racial attitude develops from this orientation. Also, the range of expressed emotions frequently varies by gender, with men tending to be more restrictive (Spanierman & Cabrera, 2015). Therefore, future higher education analyses need to seriously engage this issue—centering racialized emotions among college students and relating them to racial views. In addition, researchers will need to be sensitive to the differences in expressed emotions that arise as a function of gender. Just because men have fewer expressed emotions, or are somewhat emotionally naïve (Cabrera, 2014c), does not mean they are not feeling. Rather, they are suppressing feelings and it is going to take a great deal of creativity to uncover these emotional responses. Finally, there is a debate in Whiteness and emotion research. Matias (2016) finds White guilt to be a self-serving emotion whereas Spanierman and Cabrera (2015) highlighted how some forms of White guilt leads to an increased likelihood of antiracist action. Exploring this tension will be critically important moving ahead to understand under what conditions White guilt is productive versus counterproductive. Although the bulk of these new directions center on student experiences, these developments and experiences are contextualized within a higher education policy arena that can also be informed by the assumptions of Whiteness.

Whiteness and Higher Education Policy

Higher education policy is an area that is almost completely devoid of Critical Whiteness analyses. The bulk of the empirical work on Whiteness in higher education is rooted in the interpersonal analyses that centers students as the units of analysis (e.g., Cabrera, 2014a, 2014b, 2014c, 2014d). However, if we are to take Leonardo's (2002) work seriously that Whiteness is a discourse of racial power, then it follows that the development of higher education policy would frequently be guided by the assumption of Whiteness. Unfortunately, there are few interrogations of Whiteness in higher education policy. There have been some CRT interrogations of racism embedded in social policy (e.g., antiaffirmative action; Taylor, 2000). However, there are very few that critically engage higher education policy from the perspective of CWS.

There are some exceptions. Most notably, Gillborn (2008) argued that educational policy was created to reify White supremacy and therefore represented a racial "conspiracy" to maintain White racial dominance. Additionally, Cabrera (2012b) did argue that Arizona's HB2281 (anti-Mexican American Studies legislation) represented a state-mandated epistemology of ignorance, but analyses such as these are few and far between. Additionally, there have been a number of studies that critically examined racism embedded in social policy (e.g., Martinez, 2012; Taylor, 2000). However, few have explicitly taken a CWS-centered approach. For example, what would antiaffirmative action discourses look like if they were interpreted through the lens of Whiteness as property (Harris, 1993). What would debates about cultural centers being "exclusionary to Whites" look like if interpreted through the lens of ontological expansiveness (Sullivan, 2006)? How much are campus-based allocations based upon an aggressive ignorance that racism is a structural issue, or how much is race-based funding a function of epistemologies of ignorance (Mills, 1997)? How many cross-racial dialogues are predicated upon assumptions of racial comfort for White students (Leonardo & Porter, 2010)? How much does colorblindness inform institutional efforts to "diversify" higher education (Bonilla-Silva, 2006)? Each of these is a critically important question and does not come close to representing the questions that Whiteness in higher education poses.

The analyses do not have to be specifically limited to higher education policy. Haney-López (2006) detailed the legal construction of Whiteness, similar to Harris' (1993) argument that Whiteness represents a form of property. The intersections of law, social policy, and Whiteness represent a fruitful area for charting the future of Whiteness in higher education. However, to assess the issue of Whiteness and higher education social policy, scholars must also grapple with the issue of Whiteness and methodology. Although traditional methodologies may inform the beginning of these efforts (e.g., Babbie, 2007; Creswell, 2003), they were not sufficient to critically interrogate the contours of Whiteness in higher education (Cabrera, 2016).

Whiteness and Methodology

Studying Whiteness in education poses a number of difficult and challenging propositions to scholars in the field that make it a relatively unique area to study. For example, Cabrera (2016) finds that being a Man of Color interviewing White men created a strange insider/outsider dynamic. He is an outsider being a self-identified man of color, but could also talk with his participants “man to man.” Within this context, the White male participants are very open about their views on race/racism, and this has an unintended but important consequence. The interviews function as a running microaggression that Cabrera (2016) argues are compounded by the fact that his unconscious masculinity, and subsequent suppression of racial pain, make it very difficult to do the work. We offer this as a word of caution to Scholars of Color doing this type of work. We do not want to discourage people from engaging but rather encourage them to be aware of the emotional and psychological toll that critically exploring White racism can take on Bodies of Color.

In addition, Cabrera represents a unique type of Scholar of Color being a self-described “light-skinned Chicano” who can speak with a “standard English accent” (Cabrera, 2016). These racial markers, he argues, allow his racial/ethnic background to slip into the background. It would be very interesting to see what happens when darker-skinned minority scholars engage in these types of interrogations of Whiteness. Would the participants be more cautious, guarded, or “politically correct” in their responses, or would the

relatively safe environment of an interview allow them to be open and honest with their racial (and frequently racist) views? This is a critically important issue because aside from Cabrera's work, the bulk of Whiteness scholarship in higher education has been conducted by White scholars (e.g., Broido, Edwards, Evans, Linder, Reason, Watson). This is not inherently problematic, but rather, White people engaging Whiteness creates a different dynamic than People of Color doing the same research. Being White tends to afford a certain amount of access to White research participants that Scholars of Color are not afforded (Gallagher, 2000), but it also creates different interview dynamics. White/White interviews can potentially make the participants speak with a certain assuredness of mutual understanding ((Sleeter, 1994) "white bonding"). The overall point is that, just like interpersonal interactions of race, race-based interviewing is a very complicated process and researchers need to take careful account of what dynamics are at play and how they might influence the context and content of the interviews.

Finally, if Mills (1997) is correct about Whiteness representing an epistemology of ignorance, this poses an additional methodological problem for researchers. How does one grapple with interviews that are concurrently accurate and inaccurate? As Cabrera (2016) elaborates, "By both accurate and inaccurate, I mean that these narratives accurately describe the participants' views and feelings about race while concurrently being inaccurate representations of contemporary racial realities" (p. 14). Additionally, how much can we trust self-reporting of White students on survey-based analyses of race? For example, in surveys, it is "politically correct" to claim that one has a diverse friendship group, or at least "a Black friend" and this may push White students to inflate the diversity of their peer groups (Bonilla-Silva, 2006). Bonilla-Silva (2006) argues that quantitative measures of racism have too many normative cues to be valid measures. We argue this is an overstatement, but the general sentiment is well taken. That is, a certain amount of critical skepticism needs to be employed when understanding and analyzing White students' responses to diversity-related constructs on surveys. There has not yet been developed a way around this issue, and the next generation of Whiteness scholars need to grapple with the tension of accurate and inaccurate data.

Ultimately, we applied five central theoretical constructs throughout this monograph to chart the contours of Whiteness (i.e., colorblindness, epistemology of ignorance, Whiteness as property, ontological expansiveness, and assumed racial comfort), but they are rarely applied within higher education scholarship. Further examinations are warranted. For example, what would a higher education-specific epistemology of ignorance analysis look like for the emerging slogan, “Make America Great Again”? Additionally, higher education is a scholarly arena ripe for the development of concepts that push the boundaries of Whiteness research. What this looks like specifically is yet to be determined. One area could be theorizing the reemergence of overt racism amidst the 2016 presidential campaign, and the relevance of higher education structures at either fostering or working through this caustic rhetoric. Regardless, Whiteness in higher education is in its fledgling stages and has a great deal of development needed to reach maturity. The field of higher education is relatively open for this type of critical inquiry meant to destabilize the embedded assumptions and cultural norms of Whiteness within institutions of higher education.

A Concluding, Cautionary, and Challenging Note

W. E. B. DuBois (2015) famously argued that “for the problem of the Twentieth Century is the problem of the color-line” (p. 12). In the early 20th century when DuBois was writing, Whiteness was a symbol of inherent superiority (Omi & Winant, 1994). White people were ideologically and structurally constructed as a better form of human—genetically, culturally, and intellectually. This racist ideology was challenged during the uprisings of the 1960s, and the *inherent* superiority of Whiteness disappeared, but not the privileges associated with it. Instead, Whiteness was reconstructed as “normal”—an invisible social standard by which all other racial groups are judged, masking it as central to continuing racial domination (Omi & Winant, 1994). This invisibility, particularly its invisibility to White people, make it incredibly difficult to identify, challenge, and transform (Cabrera, 2009). Therefore, and riffing off DuBois’ profound observation, the problem of the 21st century will be invisible, oppressive Whiteness. To the extent that colleges and universities

are core sites of racial contestation (Rogers, 2012; Williamson, 2003), this is higher education's problem as well.

Thus, there is a pressing need for critical interrogations of Whiteness in higher education. The surging campus-based student activism can be interpreted, in part, as a rejection of the assumptions of Whiteness within the ivory tower (Barnhardt, 2014; Maldonado, Rhoads, & Buenavista, 2005; Muñoz, 2015). Despite the need to understand, explore, and challenge Whiteness within institutions of higher education, engaging in this type of scholarship can have an unintended, negative consequence. For example, critical examinations of Whiteness can inadvertently recenter Whiteness in the conversation (Apple, 1998). That is, by focusing critical dialogues on Whiteness, the needs of Students of Color can actually be pushed to the periphery.

Within this context, scholars and practitioners need to consider why they are engaging Whiteness. Is it to make White people feel better about themselves? Is it to work on behalf of People of Color because racism offends their moral sensibilities? Or, is it working *with* People of Color to move toward the ever-elusive goal of a nonracist society? Essentially, are we doing CWS to center White people or People of Color? In our assessment, the former is self-serving and does little to address the systemic conditions of Whiteness within institutions of higher education. The latter is a much more difficult praxis to develop, but it is also the one that actually does something to address contemporary White supremacy. Herein lies the contemporary challenge—forging multicultural, antiracist campus coalitions that concurrently do not recreate other forms of oppression, that incorporate White people but are not coopted by them, and collectively struggle for a more socially just future. Time to get to work!

1. For further discussion of *White fragility*, please see the second chapter.

2. Grundy, S. (2015, August 24). Saida Grundy, moving forward. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2015/08/24/saida-grundy-discusses-controversy-over-her-comments-twitter-her-career-race-and>

3. Microaggressing is a verb describing a microaggression occurring. Microaggressor refers to the person perpetrating the microaggression. Microagressee refers to the person targeted by the microaggression.

4. We use the term “perceived” to reinforce the notion that these are both strongly held beliefs by many White people, but they are also strongly divorced from any empirical reality (Bonilla-Silva, 2001, 2006).

5. The concept of “safe space” is a critically important issue in higher education scholarship, and we revisit it in the third chapter.

6. We are very specific about using *expressions* of racism to highlight how racism can be unconscious or systemic and not only limited to overt expressions of racial stereotypes or racial animus.

7. We provide more depth to this argument in the third chapter.

8. One of the authors lodges a similar critique using a counternarrative methodology instead of the results of student narratives via TCEs, but the overall argument is very similar (Williams & Evans-Winters, 2005).

9. This dimension was originally called “structural diversity,” but it was changed to “compositional” in Milem, Chang, and Antonio’s (2005) update of the campus racial climate framework. A rationale for this change follows.

10. We are aware that student organizing during the 1960s was more than just around issues of race; however, to keep the focus of our monograph, we discuss only this component of the controversies.

11. <http://atlantablackstar.com/2014/02/15/jesse-williams-michael-dunn-case-black-problem-white-problem/>

12. McIntosh (1997) does briefly mention that White privilege is related to contemporary conditions of systemic racism; however, this is rarely the context of White privilege pedagogy (Lensmire et al., 2013; Leonardo, 2004a). Thus, the critiques are primarily focused on White privilege pedagogy in practice, not conceptually.

13. http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/02/us/slaves-georgetown-university.html?_r=0

References

- Ahmed, S. (2007). A phenomenology of Whiteness. *Feminist Theory*, 8(2), 149–168.
- Alimo, C. J. (2012). From dialogue to action: The impact of cross-race intergroup dialogue on the development of White college students as racial allies. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 45(1), 36–59.
- Allen, W. R. (1985). Black student, White campus: Structural, interpersonal, and psychological correlates of success. *Journal of Negro Education*, 54(2), 134–147.
- Allen, W. (1992). The color of success: African-American college student outcomes at predominantly White and historically Black public colleges and universities. *Harvard Educational Review*, 62(1), 26–45.
- Allen, T. W. (1997). *The invention of the White race. Vol. 2: The origin of oppression in Anglo-America*. New York, NY: Verso.
- Allen, W. R., & Jewell, J. O. (2002). A backward glance forward: Past, present, and future perspectives on historically Black colleges and universities. *Review of Higher Education*, 25(3), 241–261.
- Antonio, A. L. (2001). Diversity and the influence of friendship groups in college. *Review of Higher Education*, 25(1), 63–89.
- Apple, M. (1998). Foreword. In J. Kincheloe, S. Steinberg, N. Rodriguez, & R. Chennault (Eds.), *White reign* (pp. ix–xiii). New York, NY: St. Martin's Griffin.
- Applebaum, B. (2008). "Doesn't my experience count?": White students, the authority of experience and social justice pedagogy. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 11(4), 405–414.
- Applebaum, B. (2010). *Being White, being good: White complicity, White moral responsibility, and social justice pedagogy*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college: Four Critical Years revisited*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Babbie, E. (2007). *The practice of social research (11th ed.)*. Belmont, CA: Thompson Wadsworth.

-
- Baldwin, J. (1963). *The fire next time*. New York, NY: Dial Press.
- Banning, J. H. (1992). Visual anthropology: Viewing the campus ecology for messages of sexism. *Campus Ecologist*, 11(1), 1–4.
- Banning, J. H. (1993). The pedestrian's visual experience on campus: Informal learning of cultural messages. *Campus Ecologist*, 11(1), 1–4.
- Banning, J. H. (1997). Assessing the campus' ethical climate: A multidimensional approach. In J. Fried (Ed.), *New Directions for Student Services: No. 77. Ethics for today's campus: New perspectives on education, student development, and institutional management* (pp. 95–105). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Banning, J. H., & Bartels, S. (1997). A taxonomy: Campus physical artifacts as communicators of campus multiculturalism. *NASPA Journal*, 35(1), 29–37.
- Banning, J. H., & Bryner, C. E. (2001). A framework for organizing the scholarship of campus ecology. *Colorado State University Journal of Student Affairs*, 10, 9–20.
- Banning, J. H., & Kuk, L. (2005, November). Campus ecology and student health. *Spectrum*, 9–15.
- Barnhardt, C. L. (2014). Campus-based organizing: Tactical repertoires of contemporary student movements. In C. J. Broadhurst & G. L. Martin, *New Directions for Higher Education: No. 167. "Radical academia"? Understanding the climates for campus activists* (pp. 43–58). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bauer, K. W. (1998). *Campus climate: Understanding the critical components of today's colleges and universities*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117(3), 497–529.
- Bell, C. C. (1980). Racism: A symptom of the narcissistic personality disorder. *Journal of the National Medical Association*, 72(7), 661–665.
- Bell, D. A. (1979). Brown v. Board of Education and the interest convergence dilemma. *Harvard Law Review*, 93(3), 518–534.
- Bell, L. A. (2007). Theoretical foundations of social justice education. In M. Adams, L. A. Bell, & P. Griffin (Eds.), *Teaching for diversity and social justice* (2nd ed., pp. 1–14). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bishop, A. (1994). *Becoming an ally: Breaking the cycle of oppression in people*. New York, NY: Zed Books.
- Boatright-Horowitz, S. L., Marraccini, M. E., & Harps-Logan, Y. (2012). Teaching antiracism: College students' emotional and cognitive reactions to learning about White privilege. *Journal of Black Studies*, 43(8), 893–911.
- Bollen, K. A., & Hoyle, R. H. (1990). Perceived cohesion: A conceptual and empirical examination. *Social Forces*, 69(2), 479–504.
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2001). *White supremacy & racism in the post-civil rights era*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2006). *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the Persistence of racial inequality in the United States* (2nd ed.). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Bonilla-Silva, E., & Forman, T. E. (2000). "I am not a racist but . . .": Mapping White college students' racial ideology in the USA. *Discourse & Society*, 11(1), 50–85.
- Bondi, S. (2012). Students and institutions protecting Whiteness as property. A Critical Race Theory analysis of student affairs preparation. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 49(4), 397–414.
-

-
- Bonnett, A. (1996). Anti-racism and the critique of "White" identities. *New Community*, 22(1), 97–110.
- Bridges, C. E. (2011). *Privileged students: White men as social justice allies* (Doctoral dissertation). Ohio University, Athens, OH. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/875244853?accountid=10906>
- Broido, E. M. (2000). The development of social justice allies during college: A phenomenological investigation. *Journal of College Student Development*, 41(1), 3–18.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1976). The experimental ecology of education. *Educational Researcher*, 5(9), 5–15.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1977). Toward an experimental ecology of human development. *American Psychologist*, 32, 513–531.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1994). Ecological models of human development. In M. Gauvain & M. Cole (Eds.), *Readings on the development of children* (2nd ed., pp. 37–43). New York, NY: Freeman.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1995). Development ecology through space and time: A future perspective. In P. Moen, G. H. Elder Jr., & K. Luscher (Eds.), *Examining lives in context: Perspectives on the ecology of human development*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Brown, A. R., Morning, C., & Watkins, C. B. (2005). Influence of African American engineering student perceptions of campus climate on graduation rates. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 94, 263–271.
- Brown, K. T., & Ostrove, J. M. (2013). What does it mean to be an ally?: The perception of allies from the perspective of people color. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 43, 2211–2222.
- Brown, S. (2016, October 6). When racism reappears, how can a campus show it has made any gains? *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.chronicle.com/article/When-Racism-Reappears-How-Can/237999?>
- Buras, K. L. (2011). Race, charter schools, and conscious capitalism: On the spatial politics of Whiteness as property (and the unconscionable assault on black New Orleans). *Harvard Educational Review*, 81, 296–331.
- Cabrera, N. L. (2009). *Invisible racism: Male, hegemonic Whiteness in higher education* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of California, Los Angeles.
- Cabrera, N. L. (2011). Using a sequential exploratory mixed-method design to examine racial hyperprivilege in higher education. In K. A. Griffin & S. D. Museus (Eds.), *New Directions for Institutional Research: No. 151. Using mixed-methods approaches to study intersectionality in higher education* (pp. 77–91). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Cabrera, N. L. (2012a). Working through whiteness: White male college students challenging racism. *Review of Higher Education*, 35, 375–401.
- Cabrera, N. L. (2012b). A state-mandated epistemology of ignorance: Arizona's HB2281 and Mexican American/Raza Studies. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy*, 9(2), 132–135.
- Cabrera, N. L. (2014a). Beyond Black and White: How White male college students see their Asian American peers. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 47(2), 133–151.
- Cabrera, N. L. (2014b) But we're not laughing: White male college students' racial joking and what this says about "post-racial" discourse. *Journal of College Student Development*, 55(1), 1–15.
-

-
- Cabrera, N. L. (2014c). "But I'm oppressed too": White male college students framing racial emotions as facts and recreating racism. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 27(6), 768–784.
- Cabrera, N. L. (2014d). Exposing Whiteness in higher education: White male college students minimizing racism, claiming victimization, and recreating White supremacy. *Race, Ethnicity, and Education*, 17(1), 30–55.
- Cabrera, N. L. (2015, March 18). What the Oklahoma frat video tells us about America. *Al Jazeera America*. Online: <http://america.aljazeera.com/opinions/2015/3/what-the-oklahoma-frat-video-tells-us-about-america.html>
- Cabrera, N. L. (2016). When racism and masculinity collide: Some methodological considerations from a Man of Color studying Whiteness. *Whiteness and Education*, 1(1), 15–25.
- Cabrera, N. L., Milem, J. F., Jaquette, O., & Marx, R. W. (2014). Missing the (student achievement) forest for all the (political) trees: Empiricism and the Mexican American Studies controversy in Tucson. *American Educational Research Journal*, 51(6), 1084–1118. doi: 10.3102/0002831214553705
- Cabrera, N. L., Watson, J. S., & Franklin, J. D. (2016). Racial arrested development: A critical Whiteness analysis of the campus ecology. *Journal of College Student Development*, 57(2), 119–134.
- Cann, C. N. (2015). What school movies and TFA teach us about who should teach urban youth: Dominant narratives as public pedagogy. *Urban Education*, 50(3), 288–315.
- Chang, M. J., & DeAngelo, L. (2002). Going Greek: The effects of racial composition on White students' participation patterns. *Journal of College Student Development*, 43(6), 809–823.
- Chang, J. (2014). *Who we be: The colorization of America's youth*. New York: St. Martin's.
- Chesler, M. A., Lewis, A. E., & Crowfoot, J. E. (2005). *Challenging racism in higher education: Promoting justice*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Chesler, M. A., Peet, M., & Sevig, T. (2003). Blinded by the Whiteness: The development of white college students' racial awareness. In A. W. Doane & E. Bonilla-Silva (Eds.), *White out: The continuing significance of racism* (pp. 215–230). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Chun, E., & Evans, A. (2016). *Rethinking cultural competence in higher education: An ecological framework for student development*. [ASHE Higher Education Report, 42(4)]. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Clark, D. A., Spanierman, L. B., Reed, T. D., Soble, J. R., & Cabana, S. (2011). Documenting weblog expressions of racial microaggressions that target American Indians. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 4(1), 39–50.
- Connell, R. W. (2005). *Masculinities*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Holtzman, D. J., Gatlin, S. J., & Heilig, J. V. (2005). Does teacher preparation matter? Evidence about teacher certification, teach for America, and teacher effectiveness. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association (AERA) conference.
- Dee, T., & Penner, E. (2015). *The causal effects of cultural relevance: Evidence from an ethnic studies curriculum (Working Paper 21865)*. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
-

-
- Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (1997). *Critical white studies: Looking behind the mirror*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2001). *Critical Race Theory: An introduction*. New York, NY: NYU Press.
- DiAngelo, R. (2011). White fragility. *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy*, 3(3), 54–70.
- Dion, K. L., Dion, K. K., & Pak, A. W. P. (1992). Personality-based hardiness as a buffer for discrimination-related stress in members of Toronto's Chinese community. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science/Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement*, 24(4), 517–536.
- Doane, A. W., & Bonilla-Silva, E. (Eds.). (2003). *White out: The continuing significance of racism*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Donovan, R. A., Galban, D. J., Grace, R. K., Bennett, J. K., & Felicie, S. Z. (2013). Impact of racial macro- and microaggressions in Black women's lives: A preliminary analysis. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 39(2), 185–196.
- Dreher, T. (2009). Listening across difference: Media and multiculturalism beyond the politics of voice. *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies*, 23(4), 445–458.
- DuBois, W. E. B. (1920). *Darkwater: Voices from within the veil*. New York, NY: Washington Square Press.
- DuBois, W. E. B. (1935). Back toward slavery. In *Black reconstruction: An essay toward a history of the part which black folk played in the attempt to reconstruct democracy in America, 1860–1880* (pp. 670–710). New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace and Company.
- DuBois, W. E. B. (2015). *Souls of Black folk*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Ebert, T. (1996). *Ludic Feminism and After*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Edwards, K. E. (2006). Aspiring social justice ally identity development: A conceptual model. *NASPA Journal*, 43(4), 39–60.
- Evans-Winters, V. E., & Hoff, P. T. (2011). The aesthetics of White racism in pre-service teacher education: A Critical Race Theory perspective. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 14(4), 461–479.
- Fanon, F. (1967). *Black Skin, White Masks*. New York, NY: Grove Press.
- Feagin, J. R. (2006). *Systemic racism: A theory of oppression*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Feagin, J. R. (2010). *The White racial frame: Centuries of racial framing and counter-framing*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Feagin, J., & O'Brien, E. (2003). *White men on race*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Feagin, J. R., Vera, H., & Imani, N. (1996). *The agony of education: Black students at White colleges and universities*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Fine, M., Weis, L., Powell, L. C., & Wong, L. M. (1997). *Off White: Readings on race, power and society*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ford, K. A., & Orlandella, J. (2015). The “not-so-final remark” the journey to becoming White allies. *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity*, 1(2), 287–301.
- Forman, T. A., & Lewis, A. E. (2006). Racial apathy and Hurricane Katrina. *DuBois Review*, 3(1), 175–202.
- Forman, T. A., & Lewis, A. E. (2015). Beyond prejudice? Young Whites' racial attitudes in post-civil rights America, 1976–2000. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 59(11), 1394–1428.
-

-
- Frankenberg, E., Lee, C., & Orfield, G. (2003). A multiracial society with segregated schools: Are we losing the dream? *The Civil Rights Project*. Retrieved from <https://www.civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/k-12-education/integration-and-diversity/a-multiracial-society-with-segregated-schools-are-we-losing-the-dream/?searchterm=A%20multiracial%20society%20with%20segregated%20schools:Are%20we%20losing%20the%20dream>
- Franklin, J. D. (2015). Racial battle fatigue and coping in a “postracial” era for African American and Mexican American Students: Implications for higher education institutions and students (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT.
- Franklin, J. D., Smith, W. A., & Hung, M. (2014). Racial battle fatigue for Latina/o students: A quantitative perspective. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 13(4), 303–322.
- Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed (30th anniversary ed.)*. New York, NY: Herder and Herder.
- Gallagher, C. A. (2000). “White like me? Methods, meaning, and manipulation in field of White Studies.” In F. W. Twine & J. W. Warren (Eds.), *Racing research, researching race: Methodological dilemmas in critical race studies* (pp. 67–92). New York, NY: NYU Press.
- Garcia, G. A., Johnston, M. P., Garibay, J. C., Herrera, F. A., & Giraldo, L. G. (2011). When parties become racialized: Deconstructing racially themed parties. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 48(1), 5–21.
- Geiger, R. L. (2005). Ten generations of American higher education. In P. G. Altbach, R. O. Berdahl, & P. J. Gumpert (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic challenges* (2nd ed., pp. 38–70). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- 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(1), 93–114.
- Gillborn, D. (2008). *Racism and education: Coincidence or conspiracy?*. London, England: Routledge.
- Giroux, H. A. (1997). Rewriting the discourse of racial identity: Towards a pedagogy and politics of whiteness. *Harvard Educational Review*, 67(2), 285–320.
- Guinier, L. (2015). *The tyranny of meritocracy: Democratizing higher education in America*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press
- Gusa, D. L. (2010). White institutional presence: The impact of Whiteness on campus climate. *Harvard Educational Review*, 80, 464–490.
- Gustafson, D. L. (2007). White on whiteness: Becoming radicalized about race. *Nursing Inquiry*, 14(2), 153–161.
- Gutmann, A. (1987). *Democratic education*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Haney-López, I. (2006). *White by law: The legal construction of race*. New York, NY: NYU Press.
- Hardiman, R., & Jackson, B. (1992). Racial identity development: Understanding racial dynamics in college classrooms and on campus. In M. Adams (Ed.), *Promoting diversity in college classrooms: Innovative responses for the curriculum, faculty and institutions* (pp. 21–37). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Harper, S. R. (2012). Race without racism: How higher education researchers minimize racist institutional norms. *Review of Higher Education*, 36(1), 9–29.
- Harper, S. R., & Hurtado, S. (2007). Nine themes in campus racial climates and implications for institutional transformation. In S. R. Harper & L. D. Patton (Eds.), *New Directions for Student Services: No. 120. Responding to the realities of race on campus* (pp. 7–24). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
-

-
- Harper, S. R., Patton, L. D., & Wooden, O. S. (2009). Access and equity for African American students in higher education: A critical race historical analysis of policy efforts. *Journal of Higher Education, 80*(4), 389–414.
- Harris, C. I. (1993). Whiteness as property. *Harvard Law Review, 106*, 1707–1791.
- Hausmann, L., Schofield, J., & Woods, R. (2007). Sense of belonging as a predictor of intentions to persist among African American and White first-year college students. *Research in Higher Education, 48*(7), 803–839.
- Heilig, J. V., & Jez, S. J. (2014). *Teach for America: A return to the evidence*. Boulder, CO: National Education Policy Center. Retrieved from <http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/teach-for-america-return>
- Helms, J. E. (1990). *Black and White identity: Theory, research, and practice*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Hill, M. (1997). *Whiteness: A critical reader*. New York, NY: NYU Press.
- Hoffman, M., Richmond, J., Morrow, J., & Salomone, K. (2002). Investigating “sense of belonging” in first-year college students. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice, 4*(3), 227–256.
- Hurtado, S., Alvarez, C. L., Guillermo-Wann, C., Cuellar, M., & Arellano, L. (2012). A model for diverse learning environments: The scholarship on creating and assessing conditions for student success. In J. C. Smart & M. B. Paulsen (Eds.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research, Vol. 27* (pp. 41–122). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Hurtado, S., & Carter, D. F. (1997). Effects of college transition and perceptions of the campus racial climate on Latino college students’ sense of belonging. *Sociology of Education, 70*(4), 324–345.
- Hurtado, S., Milem, J. F., Clayton-Pedersen, A. R., & Allen, W. R. (1998). Enhancing campus climates for racial/ethnic diversity: Educational policy and practice. *Review of Higher Education, 21*(3), 279–302.
- Hurtado, S., & Ruiz Alvarado, A. (2015). *Discrimination and bias, underrepresentation, and sense of belonging on campus*. Los Angeles, CA: Higher Education Research Institute.
- Hussar, W. J., & Bailey, T. M. (2014). *Projections of education statistics to 2022 (NCES 2014-051)*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.
- Ignatiev, N. (1997, April). The point is not to interpret whiteness but to abolish it. *Race Traitor*. Retrieved from <http://racetraitor.org/abolishthepoint.html>
- Johansen, B. E. (2010). Putting the moccasin on the other foot: A media history of the “Fighting Whities.” In C. R. King (Ed.), *The Native American mascot controversy: A handbook* (pp. 163–178). Lanham, MD: Scarecrow.
- Johnson, D. R., Soldner, M., Leonard, J. B., Alvarez, P., Inkelas, K. K., Rowan-Kenyon, H., & Longbeam, S. D. (2007). Examining sense of belonging among first-year undergraduates from different racial/ethnic groups. *Journal of College Student Development, 48*(5), 525–542.
- Johnson, D. R., Wasserman, T. H., Yildirim, N., & Yonai, B. A. (2014). Examining the effects of stress and campus climate on the persistence of students of color and White students: An application of Bean and Eaton’s psychological model of retention. *Research in Higher Education, 55*(1), 75–100.
- Karabel, J. (2005). *The chosen: The hidden history of admission and exclusion at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
-

-
- Kendall, F. E. (2006). *Understanding white privilege: Creating pathways to authentic relationships across race*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kerr, C. (1994). *Higher education cannot escape its history: Issues for the 21st century*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Kim, C. J. (1999). The racial triangulation of Asian Americans. *Politics & Society*, 27(1), 105–138.
- Kincheloe, J. L., Steinberg, S. R., Rodriguez, N. M., & Chennault, R. E. (Eds.). (1998). *White reign: Deploying whiteness in America*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.
- Kretchmar, K., Sondel, B., & Ferrare, J. J. (2014). Mapping the terrain: Teach for America, charter school reform, and corporate sponsorship. *Journal of Educational Policy*, 29(6), 742–759.
- Kuh, G. D., & Whitt, E. J. (1988). The invisible tapestry. *Culture in American colleges and universities*. [ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1]. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Ladson-Billings, G. J. (1996). Silences as weapons: Challenges of a Black professor teaching White students. *Theory Into Practice*, 35(2), 79–85.
- Lapayese, Y. V., Aldana, U. S., & Lara, E. (2014). A racio-economic analysis of Teach for America: Counterstories of TFA teachers of color. *Perspectives on Urban Education*, 11(1), 11–25.
- Lee, A. M. (1955). *Fraternities without brotherhood: A campus report on racial and religious prejudice*. Boston, MA: Beacon.
- Lensmire, T. J. (2008). How I became white While punching de tar baby. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 38(3), 299–22.
- Lensmire, T. J. (2011). Laughing white men. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 27(3), 102–116.
- Lensmire, T. J., McManimon, S. K., Tierney, J. D., Lee-Nichols, M. E., Casey, Z. A., Lensmire, A., & Davis, B. M. (2013). McIntosh as synecdoche: How teacher education's focus on white privilege undermines antiracism. *Harvard Educational Review*, 83(3), 410–431.
- Leonardo, Z. (2002). The souls of white folk: Critical pedagogy, Whiteness studies, and globalization discourse. *Race Ethnicity & Education*, 5(1), 29–50.
- Leonardo, Z. (2004a). The color of supremacy: Beyond the discourse of “white privilege.” *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 36(2), 137–152.
- Leonardo, Z. (2004b). The unhappy marriage between Marxism and race critique: Political economy and the production of racialized knowledge. *Policy Futures in Education*, 2(3–4), 483–493.
- Leonardo, Z. (2005). Through the multicultural glass: Althusser, ideology and race relations in post-civil rights America. *Policy Futures in Education*, 3, 400–412.
- Leonardo, Z. (2009). *Race, whiteness, and education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Leonardo, Z., & Porter, R. K. (2010). Pedagogy of fear: Toward a Fanonian theory of “safety” in race dialogues. *Race, Ethnicity, and Education*, 13(2), 139–157.
- Lewin, K., Lippert, R., & White, R. K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created “social climates.” *Journal of Social Psychology*, 10, 271–299.
- Lewis, A. E. (2004). “What group?” Studying Whites and Whiteness in the era of “color-blindness”. *Sociological Theory*, 22(4), 623–646.
- Lewis, H. (1949). Higher education for Negroes: A “tough” situation. *Phylon (1940–1956)*, 10(4), 356–361.
-

-
- Lin, A. I. (2010). Racial microaggressions directed at Asian Americans: Modern forms of prejudice and discrimination. In D. W. Sue (Ed.), *Microaggressions and marginality: Manifestations, dynamics, and impact* (pp. 85–104). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Linder, C. (2015). Navigating guilt, shame, and fear of appearing racist: A conceptual model of antiracist White feminist identity development. *Journal of College Student Development, 56*(6), 535–550.
- Lipsitz, G. (2011). *How racism takes place*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Lopez, I. H. (2014). *Dog whistle politics: How coded racial appeals have reinvented racism & wrecked the middle class*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Lowery, B. S., Knowles, E. D., & Unzueta, M. M. (2007). Framing inequality safely: Whites' motivated perceptions of racial privilege. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 33*(9), 1237–1250.
- Lukianoff, G., & Haidt, J. (2015, September). The coddling of the American mind. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved from <http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2015/09/the-coddling-of-the-american-mind/399356/>
- Macalpine, M. (2005). "On being White: There's nothing I can say": Exploring Whiteness and power in organizations. *Management Learning, 36*(4), 429–450.
- MacMullan, T. (2009). *Habits of Whiteness: A pragmatist reconstruction*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Maldonado, D. E. Z., Rhoads, R., & Buenavista, T. L. (2005). The student initiated retention project: Theoretical contributions and the role of self-empowerment. *American Educational Research Journal, 42*(4), 605–638.
- Malewski, E., & Jaramillo, N. (2011). *Epistemologies of ignorance in education*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Malkin, M. (2004). *In defense of internment: The case for "racial profiling" in World War II and the war on terror*. Washington, DC: Regnery Publications.
- Martinez, G. A. (2012). Arizona, immigration, and Latinos: The epistemology of Whiteness, the geography of race, interest convergence, and the view from the perspective of critical theory. *Arizona State Law Journal, 44*, 175–193.
- Marx, S. (2004). Regarding whiteness: Exploring and intervening in the effects of white racism in teacher education. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 37*(1), 31–43.
- Marx, S., & Pennington, J. (2003). Pedagogies of critical race theory: Experimentations with white preservice teachers. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 16*(1), 91–110.
- Matias, C. E. (2013). Check yo' self before you wreck yo' self: Counterstories from culturally responsive White teachers?... to culturally responsive White teachers. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Teaching and Learning, 3*(2), 68–81.
- Matias, C. E. (2015). White skin, black friend: A Fanonian application to theorize racial fetish in teacher education. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*. doi: 10.1080/00131857.2014.989952
- Matias, C. E. (2016). *Feeling white: Whiteness, emotionality, and education*. Boston, MA: Sense Publishers.
- Matias, C. E., Viesca, K. M., Garrison-Wade, D. F., Tandon, M., & Galindo, R. (2014). What is Critical Whiteness doing in OUR nice field like Critical Race Theory? Applying CRT and CWS to understand the White imaginations of White teacher candidates. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 47*(3), 289–304.
-

-
- Matias, C. E., & Zembylas, M. (2014). "When saying you care is not really caring": Emotions of disgust, whiteness ideology, and teacher education. *Critical Studies in Education*, 55(3), 319–337.
- McCoy, D., & Rodricks, D. J. (2015). *Critical race theory in higher education: 20 years of theoretical and research innovations*. [ASHE Higher Education Report, 41(3)]. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- McIntosh, P. (1997). White privilege and male privilege: A personal account of coming to see correspondences through work in women's studies. In R. Delgado & J. Stefancic (Eds.), *Critical Whiteness Studies: Looking behind the mirror* (pp. 291–299). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- McKinney, K. D. (2003). "I feel 'Whiteness' when I hear people blaming whites": Whiteness as cultural victimization. *Race & Society*, 6(1), 39–55.
- Milem, J. F., & Cabrera, N. L. (2012). Organizational context for promoting diversity in higher education. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of diversity in education* (pp. 1635–1637). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Milem, J. F., Chang, M. J., & Antonio, A. L. (2005). *Making diversity work on campus: A research-based perspective*. Washington DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Mills, C. W. (1997). *The racial contract*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Minikel-Lacocque, J. (2013). Racism, college, and the power of words: Racial microaggressions reconsidered. *American Educational Research Journal*, 50(3), 432–465.
- Morrison, T. (1992). *Playing in the dark: Whiteness and the literary imagination*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Muñoz, S. A. (2015). *Identity, social activism, and the pursuit of higher education: The journey stories of undocumented and unafraid community activists*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Museum, S. D. (2008). The model minority and inferior minority myths: Stereotypes and their implications for student learning. *About Campus*, 13(3), 2–8.
- Museum, S. D., & Jayakumar, U. M. (Eds.). (2012). *Creating campus cultures: Fostering success among racially diverse student populations*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Museum, S. D., Lambe Sariñana, S. A., Yee, A. L., & Robinson, T. E. (2016). A qualitative analysis of multiracial students' experiences with prejudice and discrimination in college. *Journal of College Student Development*, 57(6), 680–697.
- Museum, S., Ledesma, M. C., & Parker, T. L. (2016). *Racism and racial equity in higher education*. [ASHE Higher Education Report, 42(1)]. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Nakayama, T. K., & Martin, J. (1999). *Whiteness: the communication of social identity*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Neblett, E. W., Philip, C. L., Cogburn, C. D., & Sellers, R. M. (2006). African American adolescents' discrimination experiences and academic achievement: Racial socialization as a cultural compensatory and protective factor. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 32(2), 199–218.
- Neuman, S. (2014, August 30). Jefferson Davis statue comes down at University of Texas. Retrieved from <http://www.npr.org/sections/thetwo-way/2015/08/30/436072805/jefferson-davis-statue-comes-down-at-university-of-texas>
- Ngai, H. N. (2011). *"Border crossers" on a diverse college campus: Exploring motivation and experiences (Unpublished doctoral dissertation)*. University of California, Los Angeles.
-

-
- Nidiffer, J., & Bouman, J. P. (2004). "The University of the Poor": The University of Michigan's transition from admitting impoverished students to studying poverty. *American Educational Research Journal*, 41(1), 35–68.
- Norton, M. I., & Sommers, S. R. (2011). Whites see racism as a zero-sum game that they are now losing. *Perspectives in Psychological Science*, 6, 215–218.
- O'Brien, E. (2004). "I could hear you if you would just calm down": Challenging Eurocentric classroom norms through passionate discussions of racial oppression. In V. Lea & J. Helfand (Eds.), *Identifying race and transforming Whiteness in the classroom* (pp. 68–86). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Ojeda, L., Navarro, R. L., Meza, R. R., & Arbona, C. (2012). Too Latino and not Latino enough. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 11(1), 14–28.
- Omi, M., & Winant, H. (1994). *Racial formation in the United States*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Orozco, R. (2013). White innocence and Mexican Americans as perpetrators in the school-to-prison pipeline. *Association of Mexican-American Educators Journal*, 7(3), 75–84.
- Ortiz, A. M., & Rhoads, R. A. (2000). Deconstructing whiteness as part of a multicultural educational framework: From theory to practice. *Journal of College Student Development*, 41(1), 81–93.
- Park, J. (2008). Race and the Greek system in the 21st century: Centering the voices of Asian American women. *NASPA Journal*, 45(1), 103–132.
- Park, J. J. (2014). Clubs and the campus racial climate: Student organizations and interracial friendship in college. *Journal of College Student Development*, 55(7), 641–660.
- Park, J. J., & Kim, Y. K. (2013). Interracial friendship and structural diversity: Trends for Greek, religious, and ethnic student organizations. *Review of Higher Education*, 37(1), 1–24.
- Pascarella, E. T., Edison, M., Nora, A., Hagedorn, L. S., & Terenzini, P. T. (1996). Influences on students' openness to diversity and challenge in the first year of college. *Journal of Higher Education*, 67(2), 174–195.
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students: A third decade of research* (Vol. 2). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Pérez Huber, L., & Solórzano, D. G. (2015). Racial microaggressions as a tool for critical race research. *Race, Ethnicity, and Education*, 18(3), 297–320.
- Peterson, M. W., & Spencer, M. G. (1990). Understanding academic culture and climate. In W. G. Tierney (Ed.), *New Directions for Institutional Research: No. 68. Assessing academic climates and cultures* (pp. 3–18). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Picca, L. H., & Feagin, J. R. (2007). *Two-faced racism: Whites in the backstage and frontstage*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Pierce, C. M. (1975). The mundane extreme environment and its effect on learning. In S. G. Brainard (Ed.), *Learning disabilities: Issues and recommendations for research* (pp. 111–119). Washington, DC: National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
- Pierce, J. L. (2012). *Racing for innocence: Whiteness, gender, and the backlash against affirmative action*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Pitzer, H. (2014). The authority of experience, deficit discourse and Teach for America: The risks for urban education. In V. Ellis & J. Orchard (Eds.), *Learning teaching from experience: Multiple perspectives and international contexts* (pp. 127–142). New York, NY: Bloomsbury Academic.

-
- Posselt, J. R., Jaquette, O., Bielby, R., & Bastedo, M. N. (2012). Access without equity longitudinal analyses of institutional stratification by race and ethnicity, 1972–2004. *American Educational Research Journal*, 49(6), 1074–1111.
- Rankin, S. R., & Reason, R. D. (2005). Differing perceptions: How students of color and white students perceive campus climate for underrepresented groups. *Journal of College Student Development*, 46(1), 43–61.
- Rankin, S. R., & Reason, R. D. (2008). Transformational tapestry model: A comprehensive approach to transforming campus climate. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 1(4), 262–274.
- Ray, R., & Rosow, J. A. (2012). The two different worlds of Black and White fraternity men: Visibility and accountability as mechanisms of privilege. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 41(1), 66–94.
- Reason, R. D., & Broido, E. M. (2005). Issues and strategies for social justice allies (and the student affairs professionals who hope to encourage them). In R. D. Reason, E. M. Broido, T. L. Davis, & N. J. Evans (Eds.), *New Directions for Student Services: No. 110. Developing social justice allies* (pp. 81–89). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Reason, R. D., & Evans, N. J. (2007). The complicated realities of Whiteness: From color blind to racially cognizant. In S. R. Harper & L. D. Patton, *New Directions for Student Services: No. 120. Responding to the realities of race on campus* (pp. 67–75). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Reason, R. D., Millar, E. A. R., & Scales, T. C. (2005). Toward a model of racial justice ally development. *Journal of College Student Development*, 46(5), 530–546.
- Reason, R. D., Scales, T. C., & Millar, E. A. R. (2005). Encouraging the development of racial justice allies. In R. D. Reason, E. M. Broido, T. L. Davis, & N. J. Evans (Eds.), *New Directions for Student Services: No. 110. Developing social justice allies* (pp. 55–66). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Renn, K. A. (2003). Understanding the identities of mixed race college students through a developmental ecology lens. *Journal of College Student Development*, 44, 383–403.
- Renn, K. A. (2004). *Mixed race students in college: The ecology of race, identity, and community on campus*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Renn, K. A., & Arnold, K. D. (2003). Reconceptualizing research on college student peer culture. *Journal of Higher Education*, 74, 261–291.
- Richeson, J. A., & Shelton, J. N. (2007). Negotiating interracial interactions: Costs, consequences, and possibilities. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 16(6), 316–320.
- Rivera, D. P., Forquer, E. E., & Rangel, R. (2010). Microaggressions and the life experiences of Latina/o Americans. In D. W. Sue (Ed.), *Microaggressions and marginality: Manifestations, dynamics, and impact* (pp. 59–84). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Rogers, I. H. (2012). *The Black campus movement: Black students and the racial reconstitution of higher education, 1965–1972*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Rogers, M. (2013, December 13). Most colleges adjust to moving away from Native American mascots. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2013/12/10/most-colleges-adjust-moving-away-native-american-mascots>
- Rojas, F. (2006). Social movement tactics, organizational change and the spread of African-American studies. *Social Forces*, 84(4), 2147–2166.
- Sáenz, V. B. (2010). Breaking the segregation cycle: Examining students' precollege racial environments and college diversity experiences. *Review of Higher Education*, 34(1), 1–37.
-

-
- Samson, F. L. (2013). Multiple group threat and malleable White attitudes toward academic merit. *DuBois Review*, 10(1), 233–260.
- Santos, J. L., Cabrera, N. L., & Fosnacht, K. J. (2010). Is “race-neutral” really race-neutral?: Adverse impact towards underrepresented minorities in the UC System. *Journal of Higher Education*, 81(6), 675–701.
- Schneider, B. (2005). Uncommon ground: Narcissistic reading and material racism. *Pedagogy*, 5(2), 195–212.
- Sellers, R. M., Copeland-Linder, N., Martin, P. P., & Lewis, R. L. (2006). Racial identity matters: The relationship between racial discrimination and psychological functioning in African American adolescents. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 16(2), 187–216.
- Sidanius, J., Levin, S., Van Laar, C., & Sears, D. O. (2008). *The diversity challenge: Social identity and intergroup relations on the college campus*. New York, NY: Russell Sage.
- Sidanius, J., Van Laar, C., Levin, S., & Sinclair, S. (2004). Ethnic enclaves and the dynamics of social identity on the college campus: The good, the bad, and the ugly. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87(1), 96–110.
- Sleeter, C. (1994). White racism. *Multicultural Education*, 1(4), 5–8.
- Smith, W. A. (2004). Black faculty coping with racial battle fatigue: The campus racial climate in a post-civil rights era. In D. Cleveland (Ed.), *A long way to go: Conversations about race by African American faculty and graduate students at predominantly White institutions* (pp. 171–190). New York, NY: Lang.
- Smith, W. A. (2009a). Campus wide climate: Implications for African American students. In L. Tillman (Ed.), *A handbook of African American education* (pp. 297–309). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Smith, W. A. (2009b). Higher education: Racial battle fatigue. In R. T. Schaefer (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of race, ethnicity, and society* (pp. 615–618). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Smith, W. A., Allen, W. R., & Danley, L. L. (2007). “Assume the position... you fit the description”: Psychosocial experiences and racial battle fatigue among African American male college students. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 51(4), 551–578.
- Smith, W. A., Yosso, T. J., & Solórzano, D. G. (2007). Racial primes and Black misandry on historically White campuses: Toward critical race accountability in educational administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 43(5), 559–585.
- Smith, W. A., Hung, M., & Franklin, J. D. (2011). Racial battle fatigue and the miseducation of Black men: Racial microaggressions, societal problems, and environmental stress. *Journal of Negro Education*, 80(1), 63–82.
- Solórzano, D. G. (1998). Critical race theory, race and gender microaggressions, and the experiences of Chicana and Chicano scholars. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 11(1), 121–136.
- Solórzano, D. G., Allen, W. R., & Carroll, G. (2002). Keeping race in place: Racial microaggressions and campus racial climate at the University of California, Berkeley. *Chicano-Latino Law Review*, 23, 15–112.
- Solórzano, D. G., Ceja, M., & Yosso, T. (2000). Critical race theory, racial microaggressions, and the campus racial climate: The experiences of African American college students. *Journal of Negro Education*, 69(1–2), 60–73.
- Sondel, B. (2015). Raising citizens or raising test scores? Teach for America, “No Excuses” charters, and the development of the neoliberal citizen. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 43(3), 289–313.
-

-
- Spanierman, L. B., & Cabrera, N. L. (2015). The emotions of White racism and antiracism. In V. Watson, D. Howard-Wagner, & L. B. Spanierman (Eds.), *Unveiling Whiteness in the 21st century: Global manifestations, transdisciplinary interventions* (pp. 9–28). Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Stearns, E., Buchmann, C., & Bonneau, K. (2009). Interracial friendships in the transition to college: do birds of a feather flock together once they leave the nest? *Sociology of Education*, 82(2), 173–195.
- Strayhorn, T. L. (2012). *College students' sense of belonging: A key to educational success for all students*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Sue, D. W. (2010). *Microaggressions in everyday life: Race, gender, and sexual orientation*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Sullivan, S. (2006). *Revealing Whiteness: The unconscious habits of racial privilege*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Syrett, N. L. (2009). *The company he keeps: A history of White college fraternities*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Tatum, B. D. (1994). Teaching White students about racism: The search for White allies and the restoration of hope. *Teachers College Record*, 95(4), 462–476.
- Tatum, B. D. (2000). *Why are all the Black kids sitting together in the cafeteria??: And other conversations about race*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Taylor, E. (2000). Critical race theory and interest convergence in the backlash against affirmative action: Washington State and Initiative 200. *Teachers College Record*, 102(3), 539–560.
- Teach for America. (n.d.). Building the movement to eliminate educational inequity: Teach for America business plan 2010–2015. Retrieved from <http://www.socialimpactexchange.org/sites/www.socialimpactexchange.org/files/TFA%20Business%20Plan.pdf>
- Thelin, J. R. (2004). *A history of American higher education*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Trepagnier, B. (2006). *Silent racism: How well-meaning White people perpetuate the racial divide*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Trow, M. (1970). Reflections on the transition from mass to universal higher education. *Daedalus*, 99(1), 1–42.
- Unzueta, M. M., Gutiérrez, A. S., & Ghavami, N. (2010). How believing in affirmative action quotas affects White women's self-image. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 46, 120–126.
- Unzueta, M. M., & Lowery, B. S. (2008). Defining racism safely: The role of self-image maintenance on White Americans' conceptions of racism. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 44(6), 1491–1497.
- Unzueta, M. M., Lowery, B. S., & Knowles, E. B. (2008). How beliefs about affirmative action as quotas protects White men's self-esteem. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 105(1), 1–13.
- Veysey, L. R. (1970). *The emergence of the American university*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Warren, M. R. (2010). *Fire in the heart: How White activists embrace racial justice*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Watkins, N. L., LaBarrie, T. L., & Appio, L. M. (2010). Black undergraduate experiences with perceived racial microaggressions in predominantly White colleges and universities. In D. W. Sue (Ed.), *Microaggressions and marginality: Manifestations, dynamics, and impact* (pp. 25–54). New York, NY: Wiley.
-

-
- Watson, J. S. (2015). *White undergraduate social justice advocates: Experiences that influence continued participation in racially and ethnically diverse campus settings (Unpublished doctoral dissertation)*. Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI.
- Wei, M., Ku, T.-Y., & Liao, K. Y.-H. (2011). Minority stress and college persistence attitudes among African American, Asian American, and Latino students: Perception of university environment as a mediator. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 17*(2), 195–203.
- Williams, D. A., Berger, J. B., & McClendon, S. A. (2005). *Toward a model of inclusive excellence and change in postsecondary institutions*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Williams, D. G., & Evans-Winters, V. (2005). The burden of teaching teachers: Memoirs of race discourse in teacher education. *Urban Review, 37*(3), 201–219.
- Williams, D. R., Neighbors, H. W., & Jackson, J. S. (2003). Racial/ethnic discrimination and health: Findings from community studies. *American Journal of Public Health, 93*(2), 200–208.
- Williamson, J. A. (2003). *Black power on campus: The University of Illinois, 1965–75*. Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Yosso, T. J. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race, Ethnicity, and Education, 8*(1), 69–91.
- Yosso, T. J., Smith, W. A., Ceja, M., & Solórzano, D. G. (2009). Critical race theory, racial microaggressions, and the campus climate for Latina/o undergraduates. *Harvard Educational Review, 79*(4), 659–690.
- Zenkov, K. (2014). Lying about teachers and their teaching. In P. C. Gorski & K. Zenkov (Eds.), *The big lies of school reform: Funding better solutions for the future of public education* (pp. 79–92). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Zuniga, X., Nagda, B. A., & Sevig, T. D. (2002). Intergroup dialogues: An educational model for cultivating engagement across difference. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 55*(1), 7–17.

Name Index

A

Ahmed, S., 50, 67, 72
Aldana, U. S., 73
Alimo, C. J., 78, 81, 82, 83, 88
Allen, T. W., 25
Allen, W., 52
Allen, W. R., 26, 35, 52, 53, 55, 56, 59, 69, 70
Alvarez, C. L., 51
Alvarez, P., 68
antonio, A. L., 32, 40, 51, 52, 55, 56, 58, 64, 89, 96, 97
Appio, L. M., 35
Apple, M., 19, 67, 109
Applebaum, B., 21, 31, 40, 48, 49, 65, 84
Arbona, C., 70
Arellano, L., 51
Arnold, K. D., 57
Astin, A. W., 28, 83

B

Babbie, E., 106
Bailey, T. M., 52
Baldwin, J., 19, 29, 30
Banning, J., 23
Banning, J. H., 57, 92, 101, 102
Barnhardt, C. L., 109
Bartels, S., 57, 101
Bastedo, M. N., 60, 61
Bauer, K. W., 53, 54
Baumeister, R. F., 68

Bell, C. C., 34
Bell, D. A., 60
Bell, L. A., 99
Bennett, J. K., 35
Berger, J. B., 65
Bielby, R., 60, 61
Bishop, A., 80
Boatright-Horowitz, S. L., 46
Bollen, K. A., 67, 68
Bondi, S., 25
Bonilla-Silva, E., 18, 20, 21, 22, 27, 30, 33, 37, 38, 43, 49, 62, 71, 85, 95, 99, 105, 107
Bonneau, K., 64
Bonnett, A., 77
Bouman, J. P., 59
Bridges, C. E., 84
Broido, E. M., 79, 81, 83, 90, 91, 92, 107
Bronfenbrenner, U., 56
Brown, A. R., 70
Brown, K. T., 79, 80, 84, 88, 91
Brown, S., 11
Bryner, C. E., 57, 102
Buchmann, C., 64
Buenavista, T. L., 109
Buras, K. L., 74

C

Cabana, S., 35
Cabrera, N. L., 17, 18, 19, 22, 23, 25, 27, 28, 30, 32, 34, 37–44, 46, 49, 50, 51,

52, 53, 56, 57, 60, 63, 65, 66, 67, 71,
72, 75, 76, 78, 83, 85, 86, 87, 89, 90,
92, 93, 96, 97, 98, 100–108

Cann, C. N., 74

Carroll, G., 69

Carter, D. F., 67, 68

Casey, Z. A., 87

Ceja, M., 35

Chang, J., 53

Chang, M. J., 51, 52, 53, 55, 56, 58, 64,
89, 96, 97

Chennault, R. E., 18, 37

Chesler, M. A., 31, 37, 53, 98

Chun, E., 12

Clark, D. A., 35

Clayton-Pedersen, A. R., 55, 56

Cogburn, C. D., 70

Connell, R. W., 43

Copeland-Linder, N., 70

Creswell, J. W., 106

Croom, N. N., 36

Crowfoot, J. E., 31

Cuellar, M., 51

D

Danley, L. L., 26, 35, 55, 69, 70

Darling-Hammond, L., 73

Davis, B. M., 87

DeAngelo, L., 53

Dee, T., 96

Delgado, R., 19, 37, 61, 99

DiAngelo, R., 27, 32, 33, 45

Dion, K. K., 70

Dion, K. L., 70

Doane, A. W., 37

Donovan, R. A., 35

Dreher, T., 103

DuBois, W. E. B., 16, 19, 31, 108

E

Ebert, T., 19

Edison, M., 64

Edwards, K. E., 80, 81, 83, 91, 94, 100,
107

Evans, A., 12

Evans, N. J., 21, 83

Evans-Winters, V. E., 47

F

Fanon, F., 99

Feagin, J., 32, 33, 102

Feagin, J. R., 18, 32, 34, 40, 41, 42, 43,
53, 62, 69, 71, 72, 83, 85, 102, 104

Felicie, S. Z., 35

Ferrare, J. J., 74

Fiascom, L., 14

Fine, M., 37

Ford, K. A., 80, 82, 84, 88, 89, 90, 91

Forman, T. A., 31, 104

Forman, T. E., 20, 21, 33

Forquer, E. E., 35

Fosnacht, K. J., 25, 60

Frankenberg, E., 32

Franklin, J. D., 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 30, 35,
36, 42, 50, 51, 52, 57, 63, 65, 66, 67,
70, 71, 78, 83, 86, 90, 92, 93, 101, 102

Freire, P., 48

G

Galban, D. J., 35

Galindo, R., 44, 46

Gallagher, C. A., 107

Garcia, G. A., 65

Garibay, J. C., 65

Garrison-Wade, D. F., 44, 46

Gatlin, S. J., 73

Geiger, R. L., 58, 60

Ghavam, N., 45, 104

Gildersleeve, R. E., 36

Gillborn, D., 19, 95, 98, 105

Giraldo, L. G., 65

Giroux, H. A., 74

Grace, R. K., 35

Grundy, S., 16

Guillermo-Wann, C., 51

Guinier, L., 61, 62, 96

Gusa, D. L., 18, 23, 50, 51, 52, 53, 58, 66,
68, 71, 75, 78, 94, 101

Gustafson, D. L., 88

Gutiérrez, A. S., 45, 104

Gutmann, A., 27, 75

H

Hagedorn, L. S., 64
Haidt, J., 35
Haney-López, I., 106
Hardiman, R., 99
Harper, S. R., 21, 23, 29, 51, 52, 53, 55,
59, 60, 62, 65, 66, 68, 71, 101
Harps-Logan, Y., 46
Harris, C. I., 23, 24, 25, 27, 31, 40, 51,
59, 60, 95, 105, 106
Hausmann, L., 68
Heilig, J. V., 73
Helms, J. E., 71, 100
Herrera, F. A., 65
Hill, M., 37
Hoff, P. T., 47
Hoffman, M., 68
Holtzman, D. J., 73
Hoyle, R. H., 67, 68
Huber, P., 26, 36
Hung, M., 26, 35, 70
Hurtado, S., 23, 51, 52, 53, 55, 56, 62,
66, 67, 68, 69, 71, 75, 77, 101
Hussar, W. J., 52

I

Ignatiev, N., 85
Imani, N., 18, 53, 69
Inkelas, K. K., 68

J

Jackson, B., 99
Jackson, J. S., 70
Jaquette, O., 60, 61, 96
Jaramillo, N., 22
Jayakumar, U. M., 53, 65, 92
Jewell, J. O., 59
Jez, S. J., 73
Johansen, B. E., 51
Johnson, D. R., 26, 68, 69
Johnston, M. P., 65

K

Karabel, J., 53, 58, 59, 62, 63
Kendall, F. E., 48, 86
Kerr, C., 60, 61

Kim, C. J., 39
Kim, Y. K., 64
Kincheloe, J. L., 18, 37
Knowles, E. B., 104
Knowles, E. D., 45
Kretchmar, K., 74
Ku, T.-Y., 70
Kuh, G. D., 53, 58
Kuk, L., 57

L

LaBarrie, T. L., 35
Ladson-Billings, G. J., 48
Lambe Sariñana, S. A., 35
Lapayese, Y. V., 73
Lara, E., 73
Leary, M. R., 68
Ledesma, M. C., 12
Lee, A. M., 63
Lee, C., 32
Lee-Nichols, M. E., 87
Lensmire, A., 86, 87
Lensmire, T. J., 41, 42, 87
Leonard, J. B., 68
Leonardo, Z., 17, 18, 19, 25, 26, 30, 39,
40, 42, 43, 65, 66, 71, 86, 87, 93, 95,
99, 105
Levin, S., 42, 64
Lewin, K., 54
Lewis, A. E., 31, 104
Lewis, H., 54
Lewis, R. L., 70
Liao, K. Y.-H., 70
Lin, A. I., 35
Linder, C., 83, 84, 103, 107
Lippert, R., 54
Lipsitz, G., 22, 52
Longbeam, S. D., 68
Lopez, I. H., 14
Lowery, B. S., 29, 31, 32, 45, 104
Lukianoff, G., 35

M

Macalpine, M., 31, 42
MacMullan, T., 25
Maldonado, D. E. Z., 109

Malewski, E., 22
Malkin, M., 19
Marraccini, M. E., 46
Martin, J., 37
Martin, P. P., 70
Martinez, G. A., 105
Marx, R. W., 96
Marx, S., 47, 48
Matias, C. E., 43, 44, 46, 47, 49, 104
McClendon, S. A., 65
McCoy, D., 12
McIntosh, P., 86, 87
McKinney, K. D., 34, 42, 49
McManimon, S. K., 87
Meza, R. R., 70
Milem, J. F., 51, 52, 55, 56, 58, 64, 89,
96, 97
Millar, E. A. R., 77, 82, 83, 100
Mills, C., 21
Mills, C. W., 27, 30, 31, 32, 95, 105, 107
Minikel-Lacocque, J., 36
Morning, C., 70
Morrison, T., 31
Morrow, J., 68
Mundane extreme environmental stress
(MEES), 69
Muñoz, S. A., 109
Museus, S., 92
Museus, S. D., 35, 38, 53, 65

N

Nagda, B. A., 92, 96
Nakayama, T. K., 37
Navarro, R. L., 70
Neblett, E. W., 70
Neighbors, H. W., 70
Neuman, S., 51
Ngai, H. N., 66
Nidiffer, J., 59
Nora, A., 64
Norton, M. I., 22, 42

O

O'Brien, E., 32, 33, 39, 65, 102
Ojeda, L., 70
Omi, M., 18, 49, 77, 85, 108

Orfield, G., 32
Orlandella, J., 80, 82, 84, 88, 89, 90,
91
Orozco, R., 34
Ortiz, A. M., 48, 98, 100
Orwell, G., 75
Ostrove, J. M., 79, 80, 84, 88, 91

P

Paglia, C., 19
Pak, A. W. P., 70
Park, J., 63
Park, J. J., 64
Parker, T. L., 12
Pascarella, E. T., 28
Patton, L. D., 21, 59, 60
Peet, M., 37, 53
Penner, E., 96
Pennington, J., 47, 48
Pérez Huber, L., 26, 36
Peterson, M. W., 53
Philip, C. L., 70
Picca, L. H., 40, 41, 42, 53, 72
Pierce, C. M., 69
Pierce, J. L., 25, 33, 34
Pitzer, H., 74
Porter, R. K., 26, 30, 39, 40, 65, 66, 93,
95, 105
Posselt, J. R., 60, 61
Powell, L. C., 37
Predominantly White Institutions (PWI),
78

R

Racial battle fatigue (RBF), 69
Racism 101, 86
Rangel, R., 35
Rankin, S. R., 21, 77, 89, 90
Ray, R., 64
Reason, R. D., 21, 77, 79, 82, 83, 89, 90,
91, 92, 100, 107
Reed, T. D., 35
Renn, K. A., 57
Rhoads, R., 109
Rhoads, R. A., 48, 98, 100
Richeson, J. A., 34

Richmond, J., 68
Rivera, D. P., 35
Robinson, T. E., 35
Rodricks, D. J., 12
Rodriguez, N. M., 18, 37
Rogers, I. H., 109
Rogers, M., 51
Rojas, F., 75
Rosow, J. A., 64
Rowan-Kenyon, H., 68
Ruiz Alvarado, A., 55, 69

S

Salomone, K., 68
Samson, F. L., 63
Santos, J. L., 25, 60
Scales, T. C., 77, 82, 100
Schneider, B., 34
Schofield, J., 68
Sears, D. O., 42
Sellers, R. M., 70
Sevig, T., 37, 53
Sevig, T. D., 92, 96
Shelton, J. N., 34
Sidanius, J., 42, 64
Sinclair, S., 64
Sleeter, C., 41, 42, 107
Smith, W. A., 26, 35, 52, 53, 55, 69, 70
Soble, J. R., 35
Soldner, M., 68
Solórzano, D. G., 26, 35, 36, 55, 69, 70, 90
Sommers, S. R., 22, 42
Sondel, B., 74
Space, time, energy, and motion (STEM), 69
Spanierman, L. B., 35, 43, 46, 104
Spencer, M. G., 53
Stearns, E., 64
Stefancic, J., 19, 37, 61, 99
Steinberg, S. R., 18, 37
Strayhorn, T. L., 68
Sue, D. W., 26, 36, 69
Sullivan, S., 22, 51, 60, 71, 72, 73, 74, 95, 101, 105
Syrett, N. L., 63

T

Tandon, M., 44, 46
Tatum, B. D., 31, 32, 84, 85, 88
Taylor, E., 105
Teach for America (TFA), 73
Terenzini, P. T., 28
Thelin, J. R., 58
Tierney, J. D., 87
Trepagnier, B., 39, 49
Trow, M., 60, 61

U

Unzueta, M. M., 29, 31, 32, 45, 104

V

Van Laar, C., 42, 64
Vasquez, P. L., 36
Vera, H., 18, 53, 69
Veysey, L. R., 59
Viesca, K. M., 44, 46

W

Warren, M. R., 82, 83, 89, 100
Wasserman, T. H., 26, 69
Watkins, C. B., 70
Watkins, N. L., 35
Watson, J. S., 22, 23, 27, 28, 30, 42, 50, 51, 52, 57, 63, 65, 66, 67, 71, 78, 79, 83, 86, 90, 92, 93, 101, 102, 107
Wei, M., 70
Weis, L., 37
White Institutional Presence (WIP), 78
White, R. K., 54
Whitt, E. J., 53, 58
Williams, D. A., 65
Williams, D. R., 70
Williamson, J. A., 109
Wilson, W., 59
Winant, H., 18, 49, 77, 85, 108
Wong, L. M., 37
Wooden, O. S., 21, 59, 60
Woods, R., 68

Y

Yee, A. L., 35
Yildirim, N., 26, 69

Yonai, B. A., 26, 69
Yosso, T., 35
Yosso, T. J., 19, 26, 35, 55, 69, 70

Z
Zembylas, M., 44
Zenkov, K., 74
Zuniga, X., 92, 96

Subject Index

A

Abstract liberalism, 20. *See also* Higher education, whiteness in
Ally, defined, 79. *See also* Racial justice allies, developing
American College Personnel Association, 100
Arizona's HB2281, 105. *See also* Higher education, whiteness in

B

Bacon's Rebellion era, 25

C

Campus climate, 53, 54
Colorblind orientation, 38. *See also* Interpersonal whiteness and higher education
Critical Race Theory (CRT), 19, 23
Critical Whiteness Studies (CWS), 18
Cultural racism, 20. *See also* Higher education, whiteness in

D

Dangerous Minds, 74

E

Emotions and whiteness, 43–46. *See also* Interpersonal whiteness and higher education

F

Framing, meritocracy and whiteness, 61–63. *See also* Institutional whiteness and higher education

H

Higher education, whiteness in, 16–17, 27–28; as assumed racial comfort, 26–27; as colorblindness, 20–21; as epistemologies of ignorance, 21–22; future prospects, 95–109; as ontological expansiveness, 22–23; as property, 23–26; as racial discourse, 18–20
Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU), 59
How Racism Takes Place, 22

I

In Defense of Internment, 19
Input-Environment-Output model (I-E-O), 83
Institutional whiteness and higher education, 50–52; affects students of color, 67–75; campus culture, 53–54; campus ecology, 56–57; culture, climate, and ecology, 58–67; higher education campus climate, 54–56; housed greek life, 63–65; space, race, and college campuses, 52–57; whiteness and campus ecology, 66–67

-
- Interpersonal whiteness and higher education, 29–30, 48–49; colorblindness, and higher education, 37–40; emotions and, 43–46; empirical scholarship, 37–48; invisibility and structured ignorance, 30–35; microaggressions, 35–37; racial segregation, 40–43; teaching, teacher education, and whiteness, 46–48
- K**
K–12 education, 96
- M**
Microaggressions, 26. *See also* Higher education, whiteness in
Morrill Land Grant Acts, 59
Mundane extreme environmental stress (MEES), 69
- N**
Naturalization, defined, 20. *See also* Higher education, whiteness in
- O**
Ontological expansiveness, defined, 22
- P**
Predominantly white institutions (PWI), 35, 78
- R**
Racial battle fatigue (RBF), 26, 35, 69
Racial justice allies, developing, 76–77; ally development, 77–94
Racism, minimization of, 20
Reverse racism, 22, 25. *See also* Higher education, whiteness in
- S**
Sigma Alpha Epsilon (SAE), 17
Sincere fictions, 33
Social justice ally, 81
The Souls of White Folk, 19
Space, time, energy, and motion (STEM), 69
- T**
Teacher/course evaluations (TCE), 47
Teach for America (TFA), 73
- U**
University of Oklahoma's (OU), 17
U.S. higher education, whiteness and history of, 58–61. *See also* Institutional whiteness and higher education
- W**
White ally, 82
White apathy, 46
White-Crit, 19
White fear, 46
White fragility, defined, 32–33
White guilt, 46
White institutional presence (WIP), 23, 71–72, 78
White melancholia, 46
White privilege, 45, 46, 86, 87
White racial bonding, 41
White racial narcissism, 34
White racism, 46
White rage, 46
White Space, 23. *See also* Higher education, whiteness in
White supremacy, 49
- Y**
YouTube, 17
-

About the Authors

Dr. Nolan L. Cabrera is an associate professor in the Center for the Study of Higher Education at the University of Arizona (UA). He studies the racial dynamics on college campuses, with a particular focus on Whiteness, and was the only academic featured in the MTV documentary *White People*. Dr. Cabrera is also involved in the controversy surrounding the Tucson Unified School District's former Mexican American Studies program where he studies the efficacy of this educational approach. He is a recipient of the prestigious education early career award, the Spencer/National Academy of Education postdoctoral fellowship. Dr. Cabrera's publications have appeared in such journals as *American Educational Research Journal*, *Review of Higher Education*, *Journal of College Student Development*, and *Research in Higher Education*, and his work has been used extensively in education, policy, and legal environments. Dr. Cabrera is a UA College of Education Erasmus Scholar, Emerging Scholar for the American College Personnel Association, faculty affiliate with the University of Texas Austin's Project M.A.L.E.S., a faculty fellow for the American Association for Hispanics in Higher Education, and a recipient of Tucson's "40 Under 40" award. He completed his graduate work at UCLA in higher education & organizational change and earned his BA from Stanford University in comparative studies in race and ethnicity (education focus). He is a former director of a Boys & Girls Club in the San Francisco Bay Area and is originally from McMinnville, Oregon.

Dr. Jeremy D. Franklin is a research associate at the Utah Education Policy Center. He studies the sociology of higher education with a focus on racial battle fatigue, racial microaggressions, campus racial climate/cultures, and Whiteness in higher education. Dr. Franklin's publications have appeared in journals such as *Journal of College Student Development*, *Journal of Negro Education*, and the *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*. He completed his graduate work at the University of Utah in sociology of higher education and earned his BA from Michigan State University in political theory.

Dr. Jesse S. Watson is the associate dean for graduate academic affairs for the University of Southern California Graduate School. He studies Whiteness and campus ecology in higher education. He oversees multiple areas including diversity, inclusion, and access (DIA) programs and the advisement of faculty, staff, and graduate students across the university. He coedited a volume of *New Directions for Community Colleges* titled *Marginalized Students: The View from the Community College Periphery*, has numerous other book chapters, and is published in the *Journal of College Student Development*. He is a Southern California native and U.S. military veteran, and he received his PhD from Michigan State University.

About the ASHE Higher Education Report Series

Since 1983, the ASHE (formerly ASHE-ERIC) Higher Education Report Series has been providing researchers, scholars, and practitioners with timely and substantive information on the critical issues facing higher education. Each monograph presents a definitive analysis of a higher education problem or issue, based on a thorough synthesis of significant literature and institutional experiences. Topics range from planning to diversity and multiculturalism, to performance indicators, to curricular innovations. The mission of the Series is to link the best of higher education research and practice to inform decision making and policy. The reports connect conventional wisdom with research and are designed to help busy individuals keep up with the higher education literature. Authors are scholars and practitioners in the academic community. Each report includes an executive summary, review of the pertinent literature, descriptions of effective educational practices, and a summary of key issues to keep in mind to improve educational policies and practice.

This series is one of the most peer reviewed in higher education. A National Advisory Board made up of ASHE members reviews proposals. A National Review Board of ASHE scholars and practitioners reviews completed manuscripts. Six monographs are published each year, and they are approximately 144 pages in length. The reports are widely disseminated through Jossey-Bass and John Wiley & Sons, and they are available online to subscribing institutions through Wiley Online Library (<http://wileyonlinelibrary.com>).

Call for Proposals

The ASHE Higher Education Report Series is actively looking for proposals. We encourage you to contact one of the editors, Dr. Kelly Ward (kaward@wsu.edu) or Dr. Lisa Wolf-Wendel (lwolf@ku.edu), with your ideas.