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Editor's Message

Teaching in the 21st century has brought on new and renewed discussions on the construction of race and how it interacts within urban spaces. The National Journal of Urban Education and Practice Volume 6, Issue 1 is featuring a special issue on “Race and Urban Space: A Discourse on Power, Struggle, and Change.” I am fortunate to have the opportunity to serve as guest editor and bring together a unique and complimentary group of authors all writing about the vast intersections of race and urban space. The Journal approaches these multi-faceted ideas with “top-down” and “bottom-up” perspectives, understanding that the enduring crisis of structural racism has many components. As editor, I was particularly concerned with reframing the discussion on race as a lens to magnify important issues relating to urban educators.

It is important to note the theme of power, struggle, and change. A discourse on power play reveals how people can marginalize explicitly or implicitly. On the other hand, change requires struggle. Uniquely, struggle can propel us toward progress and eventually a sense of autonomy that comes with power. Each author in this series employs strategic tools to address and combat the powerlessness of their subjects in urban classrooms. From teacher efficacy, to closing gaps, to community involvement, the ultimate goal for educators is the student’s empowerment. The National Journal of Urban Education and Practice seeks creative discussions on how struggles over power influence the way we examine, exhort, and expect progressive change. The list of tools for empowerment can be inexhaustible. Educators can deconstruct literature and biography, language and culture, environment and behavior, or performance and rebellion as done in this issue.

One of the great strengths of urban education is its broad shoulders. There is no shortage on the diversity of solutions available. Everyone can have and should have an invested interest in urban education. Writer and activist Jane Jacobs contended that “Cities have the capability of providing something for everybody, only because, and only when, they are created by everybody.” In other words, we should all be stockholders equipped with equality and equity to make urban environments the best place to learn. The challenges for urban education regarding the consequences of structural racism are constantly being revised within scholarship. I believe each article serves fresh and nuanced arguments that can easily impact the mindsets of educators and researchers today and those to come.

It is my pleasure to introduce the work of two leading scholars and three rising scholars within this issue. The lead qualitative article in this journal features the work of H. Richard Milner and Elizabeth A. Self (Vanderbilt University), on “Getting Real about Race: Colorblindness as Complicit (Instructional) Ineffectiveness.” Their article presents the age old adage of “I don’t see color.” Milner and Self consider the salience of race in education and explore the ways in which students’ learning opportunities can be hindered when educators fail to consider their own racial backgrounds and that of their students. The importance of seeing students as “racial beings” is paramount to preventing the complicit attitudes that fuel instructional ineffectiveness in today’s schools. Milner and Self compel educators to have open and honest conversations on race and most importantly understand how their beliefs shape their actions in the classroom. Their article dispels the myth of a post-racial society that for some has come to mean no more apologies, no more blame, and no more cultural responsibility. What has commonly been written about in the form of anecdotes and feelings is now presented from a scholarly perspective that provides depth and relevancy. In short, race matters in urban education and the authors’ findings on “complicit instructional ineffectiveness” will undoubtedly enhance the literature available.

The following lead article features the quantitative research of Ivory A. Toldson and Mercedes E. Ebanks (Howard University), on “Collateral Damage in the Classroom: How Race and School Environment Influence Teachers’ Attitudes and Behaviors toward their Students.” It serves as a great follow-up to Milner and Self as it pertains to teacher empathy and punitive attitudes in shaping student outcomes and behaviors. The article entails a study on Black, Latino, and White students who completed the National Crime
Victimization Survey: School Crime Supplement of 2009 (NCVS-SCS). Results reveal that in general, students with higher grades perceived their teachers to be more “caring, respectful, and empathic.” However, students of color who made similarly good grades were less likely than their white counterparts to perceive respect and empathy from their teachers. The article opens with staggering statistics on Black and White disparities regarding suspension and expulsion in urban schools. For students of color, perception is reality. In this study Black students generally perceived their teachers as more punitive. Conversely, critical race theory served as lens to magnify white students’ privilege over students of color. With strong quantitative design and high-level statistical analyses, the implications of Toldson and Ebanks’ study suggest the best ways for developing effective teacher education programs. It is an excellent piece on teacher cultural awareness. Indeed, both lead articles show the importance of multicultural training in teacher/student outcomes. In a qualitative and quantitative sense, these lead articles challenge educators to see students as people and not problems.

Along similar channels, Nicole Trujillo-Pagan’s (Wayne State University) article explores “Commitments to Community: Latina/o Studies Past and Present” by examining Latina/o Studies departments and program course offerings to understand the meaning and relevance of community service today. Trujillo-Pagan employs the pedagogical framework of Community Service Learning (CSL), which involves and invests students in local Latino communities. CSL is intended to give Latino Studies relevancy to the university and the community at large. Historically, the first ethnic studies departments to be formed in the late 1960s and early 1970s were born in struggle to expand opportunities to students of color. These early programs often put physical communities surrounding their college and university campuses at the forefront of their missions. Trujillo-Pagan explains the significance of having reciprocal relationships between the university and the community. The hope was to have students not only be “of their community,” but “for their community.” The departments shared a concentration in urban areas with their communities whose problems, including segregation, have only intensified since the 1970s. The author captures an issue that will continue to evolve through the shifting migratory realities of the Diaspora as well as economic demands on the university. Trujillo-Pagan takes time to explain what community service is and more importantly how we define community. She moves us out of the classroom and into the “barrio” to understand the interrelated mission of success for the group, not just the individual. This article is a useful text on how a university can commit to a community and replace the traditional paternalism of the ivory tower with partnership.

The next two articles deal with the interpretive meanings of biography and literature in the classroom as it applies to students of color. Lisa M. Corrigan (University of Arkansas) examines the role of autobiography, the badman complex, and social change in urban education. “Claiming Urban Space for the Rebellion: Rap Brown and the Performativity of Black Power” is the first scholarly analysis of the politics of urban rebellion and the performativity of black masculinity and class in SNCC leader and honorary Black Panther member H. Rap Brown. Through Brown’s autobiographical manifesto Die Nigger Die! Corrigan contends that Brown’s style, performance as a black badman, anecdotes about the insecurity of his boyhood, and interest in both self-defense and violence, create an ethos surrounding black power leadership that is exclusively masculine and focused on the politics of urban black male resistance to white supremacy. Corrigan vividly illustrates where educators have new opportunities to teach, learn, and practice social change through the lens of autobiography and memoir. For Corrigan, Brown serves as a usable past for urban educators who can use his autobiography to understand critical whiteness as well as challenge white supremacy and colorism. So often, leaders of the Black Panther movement have become demonized. Yet, Corrigan humanizes Brown and makes him and his autobiography accessible, teachable, and valuable for urban educators alike.

The following article by Casarae Gibson (Purdue University) employs the use of literature to examine critical race theory in the classroom. In “Teaching Anna Deavere Smith’s Twilight through a Critical Race Theory Lens” Gibson discusses the difficulty of developing effective conversations on the complexities of race with students. She argues that this reality has continued to serve as a disadvantage for students living and learning in a multicultural society. The work of Anna Deavere Smith’s Twilight, is a one woman play
that attempts to encapsulate the tensions of over 200 witnesses to the Los Angeles riots of 1992 sparked by the brutal beating of Rodney King and the acquittal of two police officers. Drawing on Critical Race Theory (CRT), Gibson deconstructs the major tenets of CRT for readers to connect the deeply metaphorical aspects of the play into classroom discussion. In addition, Gibson’s article weaves together the stories of four American narratives all offering different perspectives on the riots. The power of storytelling is provocative for both the audience to which Ann Deavere is performing and the classroom in which students are engaging the play. Without question, Gibson has presented us with a unique way of discussing race and all its forms, with the tool of theater and CRT. I believe her work will encourage educators seeking alternative practices to discuss ongoing urban crisis alongside American’s past.

Finally, Teresa A. Booker (City University of New York) explains “The Political Context for Understanding the Existence of the TRIO Program Upward Bound.” Her findings examine the utility of TRIO and the circumstances surrounding its implementation during President Lyndon B. Johnson’s War on Poverty. Booker discusses in detail the Higher Education Act of 1965 that led to the creation of the Upward Bound Program and employs the use of Hofferbert’s model of public policy to deconstruct the six variables that influenced the future of the program. Mostly importantly, Booker highlights how these programs have come under constant threat of being dismantled completely. Often political battles hold TRIO in the balance and this article helps readers to understand the “how” and the “why” of government subsidized educational programs. As a product of the Ronald E. McNair Scholar’s program, I can personally attest to the utility of such programs and the success they contribute to the lives of their participants. Booker’s work explains a model that I hope all educators will seek to protect.

To echo the words of Jane Jacobs, urban areas are perhaps best equipped to “provide something for everybody.” Urban education is big enough and broad enough to tackle the struggles for power and the need for change regarding race and racism. All six articles renew and invigorate conversations within their field. These articles represent what several scholars can do “only because and only when” we work together. It is my hope this issue that will encourage you to activism.
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Harvard University
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Abstract

This article considers the salience of race in education and explores the ways in which students’ learning opportunities can be hindered when educators fail to consider their own and their students’ racial backgrounds. We discuss colorblind mindsets among teachers that are particularly troubling in education – that race does not matter to teachers, that teachers “just see students,” or that being colorblind means a teacher is “not a racist” – and the instructional implications for such mindsets. In doing so, we argue that it is essential for all teachers, both preservice and in-service, to come to see themselves and their students as racial beings and develop the ability to talk about race openly and honestly with both their colleagues and students if they are to avoid being complicit in instructional ineffectiveness present in some of today’s schools.

Getting Real about Race: Colorblindness as Complicit (Instructional) Ineffectiveness

It is still common for teachers, without vision impairment, to claim that they do not “see color.” We have heard this proclamation from teachers – that they do not “see color” – among those from a range of ethnic backgrounds (Asian American, African American, and European American). For liberal-minded, progressive citizens in the United States (U.S.), such a position can make people believe that we in the U.S.
are post-racial – that as a country we have transcended and overcome racism and other forms of discrimination. However, for teachers, this way of approaching their work can be harmful to the students with whom they work (Milner, 2010; Howard, 2010; Irvine, 2003).

Race continues to be an important area of study in education and in teacher education because race is and will continue to be a salient and permanent issue in the U.S. and education (Chapman, 2011; Ladson-Billings, 1999; Milner, 2008). Thus, while individual educators may not (consciously) commit racist acts, broader policies and practices are often rife with racism (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Howard, 2008). Accordingly, educators and, for the purposes of this discussion, teachers who do not view themselves as racist individuals can have trouble recognizing how racism works and how it can manifest in broader, systemic and institutionalized structures and forms to prevent certain groups of students, such as African American students, Latino American students, those whose first language is not English, and students living in poverty, from succeeding in the classroom and beyond. When teachers do not believe that they are racist or for those who believe that racism has ended, it can seem most logical for them to ascribe to and embrace colorblindness in their curriculum development and enactment in a P-12 classroom.

In this article, we focus on several mindsets of teachers who claim to be colorblind and discuss how this thinking can shape what they do with students in classrooms. We attempt to trouble and problematize these somewhat common and what might seem to be commonsensical ways of thinking and teaching that many teachers have. Gay (2010a) has provided a compelling argument that teachers’ beliefs deeply shape their actions. Moreover, McCutcheon (2002) has argued that until teachers develop the ability to meta-cognitively examine their beliefs, their beliefs have the potential control them. We are suggesting that teachers’ decisions to be colorblind and/or their decisions to not think about race at all result in a form of what we call complicit instructional ineffectiveness in that instruction without attention to the complexities of race leave too many students left out of meaningful learning opportunities. To be clear, we are arguing against colorblindness as a rationale and appropriate framework for teachers to embrace in their work as educators. Our position transcends social contexts; we believe that teachers should be race conscious in highly diverse contexts as well as those that might be perceived as racially homogenous, although we understand that there is no such thing as a homogenous environment.

Race And/In Education

Race is an enormously complex and important factor to consider in educational research, particularly when we consider persistent systemic and structural inequalities that schools seem to perpetuate sometimes implicitly (Anyon, 1980; Howard, 2010; MacLeod, 1995) and even in teacher education (Cochran-Smith, 1995, 2003; Ladson-Billings, 1999; Sleeter, 2008). We argue that when teachers take a colorblind approach to their work, they are complicit in ignoring structural and individual practices that can stifle students’ opportunities and access to learning. Our point here is that when teachers deliberately avoid thinking seriously about race, they seem to be under-serving students, and such an approach can be exacerbated in highly diverse and urban contexts (Lewis, 2001; Milner, 2010).

Dating back to the pivotal work of DuBois
(1903) and Woodson (1933), researchers and theorists have attempted to unravel, disentangle, and understand the salience of race and education. Race is not a myopic, linear, simple construct, although it is sometimes inappropriately used as an explanatory category in educational research as well as theory. DuBois’ and Woodson’s work demonstrates that for as long as discussions have focused on race and education, scholars have been attempting to figure out just what race is and how it can be studied and conceptualized to improve educational experiences and practices of those who have historically been marginalized and underserved in schools across the U.S.

To address decades of uncertainty and a lack of conceptual tools to study race in education, Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995), building on the foundation established by Bell (1976, 1980), advanced and formally introduced critical race theory into education in a Teachers College Record article. They argued that although studies and conceptual discussions examining race existed in the field of education and had been established for many years, the field of education suffered from lack of analytic tools to assist in explaining empirical and theoretical arguments related to race. In short, Ladson-Billings and Tate argued that race was under-theorized, not under-researched, in education and that although studies existed in the field of education that examined race as its central focus, the field suffered from a lack of conceptual and analytic tools to discuss race, operationalize it, and ultimately move the field forward. The overarching, most basic premise of critical race theory is that race matters (Howard, 2008) and is a significant and permanent factor in U.S. society and consequently in education. The idea is that it is important to consider race when examining policies, theories, and practices in education.

The question remains, however, what is race?

According to many scholars, race is physically, socially, legally, and historically constructed. The meanings, messages, results, and consequences of race are developed and constructed by human beings, not by some predetermined set of scientific laws or human genetics. Genetically and biologically, individuals are more the same than they are different. According to Nakkula and Toshalis (2006), “there is no biologically sustainable reason for establishing ‘races’ as distinct subgroups within the human species. . . . Race is a concept created in the modern era as a way of drawing distinctions between people such that some might benefit at the expense of others” (p. 123). Our analysis of empirical research and policy will not allow us to accept a “eugenics” movement – one that would suggest that there is a “biological basis for the superiority of Whites” (Howard, 2010, p. 28). In the simplistic and plainest of terms, White people are not biologically or genetically superior to other groups in terms of intelligence, cognitive ability, aptitude or skill.

Rather, race is

- **physically constructed**: Based on skin color, people in society construct ideas, characteristics, and beliefs systems about themselves and others. These physical constructions are sometimes inaccurate, but the constructions remain. It is important to note that physical constructions of race vary from one society to the next. For instance, constructions of race in continents such as Africa or Asia are different from constructions of race based on phenotype in North America.

- **socially constructed**: Based on a range...
of societal information and messages, people construct and categorize themselves and others. These social constructions are linked to how groups of people perform, for instance. Societal constructions of race, however, vary depending on a range of factors including history and geography.

- **legally constructed:** Laws in U.S. society, for example, help us construct what race is. Landmark cases and legal policies such as the *Naturalization Law* (1790), *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896), *Takao Ozawa v. United States* (1922), *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954) and subsequently *Brown II* all influence our constructions and definitions of race in U.S. society. In this way, the legal system has played an important role in how race is historically and socially constructed.

- **historically constructed:** Historical realities related to how people have been treated and how people have fared in a society also shape the construction of race. In U.S. society, for instance, a history of Jim Crow laws, slavery, and racial discrimination force us to construct and think about race in particular ways. This history has a bearing on the physical construction of race – that is, perceptions of skin pigmentation which have evolved and continue to evolve over time. Similarly, the historical constructions of race also shape societal and legal constructions of it.

With a brief discussion of how we conceptualize race as a construct throughout this article established, we turn now to colorblindness in teaching and learning practices.

**Methods for Conceptualizing Troubling Mindsets**

It is important to note that, as coauthors, Milner is Black and Self is White. We introduce three pervasive mindsets that have colorblindness embedded throughout their fabric. These mindsets regarding colorblindness are those that we have heard and collected over the years working with teachers, both preservice and inservice. Milner, for instance, has taught in at least four different teacher education programs across the U.S. and one abroad. In addition, he has conducted dozens of professional development workshops with teachers across the country with race as a focus, and many teachers with whom he has worked adopted colorblindness as a belief space and instructional reality for their work. Self has been made privy to such mindsets as an inservice teacher, especially during a period when her school was moving through a series of schoolwide conversations on race, as a graduate students in classes with pre-service teachers, and in her own early research work with inservice teachers in less racially diverse school systems.

Although the mindsets and actual words below are not taken verbatim from systematic inquiry, over the years, Milner has conducted qualitative research with teachers where he interviewed teachers (King, 1999; Mishler, 1991; Rubin & Rubin, 2005) and observed their practices (Bogdan & Biklin, 2007; Burgess, 1997) with intense, systematic attention to issues of race in teaching and learning. Some of these studies occurred in teacher education programs (Milner, 2006), while others actually occurred in the actual P-12 classroom, mainly middle (Milner, 2010, 2008) and high school (Milner, 2005a). The studies paid particular attention to issues of race (Banks, 1998; Milner, 2007; Sheurich &
Young, 1997; Tillman, 2002), and colorblindness was a consistent theme uncovered, inductively, through these studies. The mindsets below are a consequence of collective data-points at various times that seem consistent among many teachers, especially White teachers, who claim that they do not see color and would suggest that we “move beyond race” in attempting to meet the needs of students, all students.

**Colorblindness**

The research literature suggests that student learning opportunities can be hindered when educators fail to consider their own and their students’ racial backgrounds and when they fail to acknowledge and to think carefully about how race can and does emerge in P-12 classroom learning opportunities (Lewis, 2001; Schofield, 1986; Johnson, 2002; Causey, Thomas, & Armento, 2000). This research also suggests that when educators adopt colorblind beliefs, ideologies, worldviews and consequently practices, they can miss or perhaps overlook important features of students that should be included in how teachers plan and implement lessons. When educators pretend to be colorblind, they are in effect addressing students they see as incomplete, rather than the complete beings their students are, and student performance often suffers as a result. Lorde (1982) maintained that individuals who adopt colorblind ideologies and approaches to their work believe they can “conquer it [racism and discrimination] by ignoring it” (p. 81). As mentioned, we consistently hear educators and teachers in particular declare that they do not see the race of their students. These educators maintain that they “just see children” or that they “just see students.” Banks (2001) explained that “a statement such as ‘I don’t see color’ reveals a privileged position that refuses to legitimize racial identifications that are very important to people of color and that are often used to justify inaction and perpetuation of the status quo” (p. 12).

Furthermore, educators who adopt and enact colorblind mindsets and practices can lack the racial knowledge necessary to achieve pedagogical success with racially diverse students, especially for those who are often relegated to the margins of teaching and learning in education (Milner, 2003; Banks & Banks, 1995; Sleeter, 1992). Because educators can fail to attend to the multilayered identity characteristics of students and even intentionally avoid race as a central issue in their decision making regarding curriculum content and also instructional designs, it can be difficult for them to understand how important race is in their work as teachers. Educators with a colorblind mindset may not recognize how their own race and racialized experiences and privileges can shape what they teach, how they teach it, and how they assess what has been taught (Milner, 2010). For example, when educators do not include curriculum content related to Black Americans, students are actually learning something about Black Americans through the absence of the content in the curriculum. Although and perhaps unknowingly, these educators who avoid infusing Black American content into the curriculum can be denying these students and their classmates the right to recognize racialized contributions of their group to the fabric of U.S. society. Moreover, those from other racial and ethnic backgrounds miss opportunities to deepen their knowledge of that group. This forces students, very often, to learn from a curriculum dominated by White contributions and White norms to the exclusion of curriculum contributions from other racial and ethnic groups (Banks, 2001; Foster,
Irvine (2003) provided some compelling examples of how colorblindness can lead to instructional incompatibility in a classroom – where instructional practices prevalent in a classroom is inconsistent with the needs, backgrounds, worldviews, and most importantly outside of school experiences of students (Foster, 1997; Gay, 2010b; Howard, 2010). Similar to instructional incompatibility is curriculum incompatibility where the curriculum does not well match with the students learning it. These incompatibilities, inconsistencies and mismatches are also known as incongruence that can result in students being underprepared in schools. In a similar vein, racial incongruence theory suggests that the racial differences between educators and students can make it difficult for them to connect, in terms of both the curriculum and instruction (Oates, 2003; Rivkin, Hanushek, & Kain, 2005). Such mismatches are a growing concern given the current demographics of public schools in the U.S. and the racial incongruence between teachers, who are predominantly White, and students, who are increasingly of color (Banks, 2007).

However, Gay (2000) reminded us that if students and educators are of the same race, it “may be potentially beneficial, but it is not a guarantee of pedagogical effectiveness” (p. 205). Hence, educators from any racial background can be successful with any group of students when the educators have, or are able to acquire, the knowledge, attitudes, dispositions and skills necessary to understand and be responsive to their students’ needs (Gay, 2010b; Howard, 2010; Ladson-Billings, 1995; 2009; Milner, 2010). Approaching the teaching and learning exchange through colorblindness, though, can prevent educators from building the kinds of knowledge, skills, mindsets, and approaches necessary for student success. In this sense, it is what teachers know and are willing to learn that matter more than their racial background.

Still, it is clear that teachers of color, because of their experiences associated with race, often have a deeper understanding of students of color, and teachers are accordingly able to create learning opportunities that students can relate to and connect with (Irvine, 2003; Nieto, 1994; Siddle-Walker, 2000). Consequently, increasing the percentage of teachers of color should be an important aim for public, private, parochial, and independent school systems across the U.S. The research literature (Banks, 2001; Foster, 1997; Irvine, 2003; Milner, 2005b; Siddle-Walker, 2000) suggested, for example, that teachers of color

- can relate to their students of color and empathize with them during race-related experiences, such as feeling discriminated against or experiencing acts of racism from others in the school;
- consciously decide to incorporate materials in the curriculum that showcase and speak from the point of view of their students of color;
- develop examples in the curriculum and through instructional decisions that are explicitly related to students of color;
- address disciplinary conflicts in the classroom to avoid sending students to the office and provide tough love when necessary; and
- recognize “diamonds in the rough” and build on the knowledge and skills that students of color bring to the classroom because they recognize assets among students.

Teachers can sometimes design curriculum and instructional practices, which are
grounded in a “White norm,” (Foster, 1999) that culturally diverse students simply have to accept or just deal with because they may not have the power to counter. In this sense, the teacher has the power to decide what is taught and how it is taught. Students experience curriculum and instructional practices in many schools where their voices are marginalized and not heard, and Nieto (2000) has made it clear that students’ concerns and needs should be placed front and center.

Lewis (2001) found in her study of a mostly White school that many educators and adults (including parents) refused to discuss or acknowledge the ever-present social and institutional race-related matters in their social context. When Sylvie, a student of color, brought up her experiences of racism in the school, educators in the community ignored her concerns and rationalized that the student was “playing the race card” (whatever this means!). Lewis explained that the adults essentially adopted a colorblind approach and mindset to their work and lives. The adults in Lewis’s study believed that issues of race were not important in their learning environment because most of the students, educators, and parents were White. Consequently, as made clear from Lewis’s study, some educators in general may believe that when there is not a critical mass of people of color, race is insignificant. Educators may fail to understand that race affects all people in society and in education, even White people.

Thus, we argue that it is critical that educators recognize their own and their students’ racial backgrounds in order to plan for, work with, and teach complete students, rather than fragmented, disconnected students (Irvine, 2003; Obidah & Teel, 2001; Ladson-Billings, 2009). How do or might teachers unknowingly and inadvertently contribute to individual and structural forms of racism that can have influence on student opportunities through a colorblind orientation to their work? Clearly, the adoption of colorblind ideologies, positions, and practices can make it difficult – if not impossible – for educators and/or researchers to recognize broader, systemic disparities and dilemmas in educational policies and practices such as:

- An overrepresentation of students of color in special education (Artiles, Klingner, & Tate, 2006; Blanchett, 2006; O’Connor & Fernandez, 2006);
- An underrepresentation of students of color in gifted education (Ford, 2010; Howard, 2010);
- An over-referral of African American students to the office for disciplinary actions and consequences (Davis & Jordan, 1994; Skiba, Michael, Nardo & Paterson, 2002);
- An overwhelming number of African American and Latino American students expelled or suspended (Monroe, 2006; Noguera, 2003);
- An underrepresentation of students of color in school-wide clubs, organizations, and in other prestigious arenas, such as the school’s homecoming court and student government (Milner, 2010).

Colorblind approaches make it difficult to recognize the disparities and realities outlined above and students – many times students of color, those whose first language is not English, and those living in poverty -- are the ones who appear to suffer most.

Troubling Mindsets about Race and Colorblindness

In this section, we use three common colorblind mindset sites we have encountered among teachers, especially preservice and
inservice, that we believe are troublesome in educational practice. We have discovered that educators have a range of inadequate, unproductive, and underdeveloped ideas about race and colorblindness that show up in their instructional practices with students.

Mindset #1: As a preservice teacher, I can be colorblind and not think about race in my teacher education program because I plan to teach in a mostly White learning environment once I have graduated from my teacher education program. Race won’t matter much to me when I start teaching because I will teach in a predominantly White school. Therefore, I refuse to spend energy thinking or talking about it.

Mindset #2: My parents taught me to “just see people” and to not consider the racial background of people. I was not raised in a “racist” household, and we never talked about race. Children are just children, and I appreciate my parents for never allowing me to address race.

Mindset #3: I should avoid talking about race and pretend to be colorblind because I don’t want others to perceive me as a racist. I don’t want others to judge me if I admit my reservation and uneasiness about race. It is easier to just not mention it or think about it.

These mindsets, assertions, and conceptions can manifest in seriously destructive ways in the P-12 classroom, and when teachers do not problematize these perceptions of race, they can be complicit in developing ineffective instructional practices because they have not considered and centralized race.

Mindset #1: Race Does Not Matter in White Spaces.

Although teachers may read in textbooks or may hear in lectures that teaching involves developing understanding of the intersection of race, teaching, and learning, we have found that many still do not believe it will matter in their particular classroom or situation. To illuminate, many White teachers who attended largely racially and ethnically homogenous P-12 (White) schools as students themselves, aspire to and believe that they will return to their hometowns and teach in very similar schools. While they accept a reality that race (or diversity more broadly speaking) matters for some teachers, they struggle to see how race will matter or will make a difference for them, their work, and their students because they do not understand how race manifests in White social contexts with predominantly White people as well.

Consequently, teachers sometimes believe that emphasizing race is disadvantageous for them because they feel that such an emphasis is forcing them to think about issues that really do not or will not exist in their particular situations. They fear that they are “making something out of nothing” (Milner, 2010). Unfortunately, these teachers sometimes do not realize that they may not be able to return to their “dream” job or school – a mostly White school where they believe race is inconsequential for instance. They may not understand that they may indeed teach in one of “those” highly diverse or urban school with large populations of non-white students.

We have found that White teachers as well as teachers of color sometimes did not understand the relevance of race and teaching because they attended what they believed to be pretty homogenous schools themselves (whether public or private). Nonwhite teachers who attended mostly White P-12 schools
sometimes did not “see” how race works in every social context. In this way, we have observed that many teachers did not see themselves as racial or cultural beings. White teachers perhaps see others as having a race or a culture, and they use themselves as the racial and the cultural norm or standard by which others should be compared. Thus, some saw (1) themselves, particularly White “middle class” people, as the norm, (2) others as “diverse” or having a culture or race, and (3) a focus on race and teaching as irrelevant. Some teachers found it annoying, to a degree, that an emphasis would be placed on race because their worldview and frames of reference had precluded and not required such an emphasis, and they struggled to envision how diversity would play any real role in their professional lives as teachers.

Relying on colorblindness, many teachers had a “prove to me that race is worth my time” mentality. When teachers have such a mindset, too much time can be spent in a teacher education course on trying to make a case for why race matters, rather than focusing on what teachers can do in their practices and how they can do it to address the range of needs that their students in P-12 schools have. Especially when teachers believe that race is inconsequential in predominantly White spaces, they can struggle with why race matters when they want “just to teach math” or “just to teach science” and to help students get “good at it.” Developmentally, teachers may not understand that they cannot teach math or science without knowing who they are teaching these subjects to (Milner, 2010) – knowing students is a critical element in meeting the needs of all learners. An essential component of knowing students is understanding students’ racial identity, even in White spaces (Tatum, 1994).

Mindset #2: I was raised to “just see people.” We did not talk about race in my family.

One should not underestimate the role parents and other family members play in what people believe, what their epistemology is, and what they do. The potency of parental views can have a lingering influence. Take, for instance, the number of people who continue to vote their parents’ political party or who follow their parents’ religious preferences long into adulthood. We have found that teachers rely on their experiences with their parents and other family members in which colorblindness is concerned in two ways: (1) they report that their parents never talked about race and that they were taught to see people, not people who have a race, and (2) they report that they heard their parents use raced language but never engage in racist acts. To explain, while teachers may admit that their parents have held racist beliefs and views about others and while they may admit that they have heard their parents use racist language, they often fail to see and equate that language with actions. Inappropriately, teachers separate the racist language they have heard from their parents with racist acts. In short and essence, they may not understand that language is action (Freire, 1998).

We have heard from teachers that they have heard racist, sexist, and homophobic comments from their parents while growing up. Rarely, though, did they report instances when they actually witnessed some form of racism or sexism from their parents. Perhaps it is this disconnection—the fact that teachers with whom we have worked do not equate words or mindset to action—that make it difficult for teachers to understand how their mindsets and beliefs could shape their practices. In terms of one teacher’s familial roots, Milner learned from a teacher that her mother
would express “racist” and “prejudiced” views about different groups of people, such as African Americans. She remarked how her mother would have “lost it” if she had decided to date a “Black guy” during high school. When asked if it would have mattered if the “Black guy” was an honor student, she did not hesitate in her reply: “No.”

Teachers also report that they never talked about race growing up in their families. They claim that their parents avoided conversations about race because the idea was if they did not have real conversations about race that it might mean that race did not matter or at best it would just “go away.” We have learned that teachers sometimes reported that if, as young children or as adolescents, they posed questions about race or witnessed something that clearly had racial undertones, parents of these teachers would shun the question and force them to ignore the happening because the parents aspired for somewhat of a utopia where they seemed to believe that issues of race would disappear if they were not talked about.

**Mindset #3: I should pretend to be colorblind and avoid conversations about race because I don’t want to be perceived as a racist.**

Sometimes, even when teachers are not colorblind, they are unwilling to “see” race or talk about it out of fear of being perceived as racist. Consequently, teachers may choose not to talk to their students or colleagues about race or to incorporate issues of race and racism into their curriculum and teaching. Teachers who recognize the role of race in education may be hesitant to talk about it because they are afraid of being accused of “blowing things out of proportion” or bringing race in where it does not belong. Over the years, we have seen teachers make certain moves in conversations about race that reflect this mindset, from resisting any kind of discussion about race to playing down the role of race in a clearly race-related situation.

In general, many teachers are unwilling to even engage in conversation about race and racism. For many teachers, race is an especially taboo topic (Tatum, 1992). Even when facilitators try to create a safe, supportive space, it can be difficult to overcome teachers’ deep-seated self-consciousness when talking about race. This is particularly the case in racially mixed settings. For example, a White teacher in a class with a Black professor may fear speaking freely about her views on race because she fears she might say the “wrong” thing, causing the professor to think poorly of her, possibly in a way that affects her grade. Similarly, a Black teacher in a professional development session in an inservice situation dedicated to addressing issues of race in the school may be hesitant to voice concerns about how Black students are treated by his White colleagues or administrators for fear of being ostracized or accused of so-called “reverse racism.” And then there are situations where people worry about talking about race because too much of the conversation tends to focus on Black and White while other racial groups seem to be left out of the proliferation (Howard, 2010).

When teachers are pushed to talk about race, they often shape their language in ways to minimize the use of racial terms or to avoid being seen as racist. We often hear teachers avoid direct reference to racial groups, even when talking about racially-based issues like affirmative action or busing patterns that occurred pre-desegregation. Teachers seem afraid to say the word “Black” or try to pick up on whatever terms others are using to stay in a perceived safe, neutral zone-space. Teachers would sometimes use replacement
words, talking about “those” students when referring to African American or Latino American students, for instance. Or they will latch on to what they perceive as race-neutral terms, talking about “Title I students” or “the free-and-reduced lunch kids” when they are only really talking about Black Title I students or the Brown students on free-and-reduced lunch. When teachers do talk explicitly about race, especially specific racial groups, they often preface their comments by saying, “I’m not a racist, but...". This attempt at racialized mitigation commonly comes in front of essentializing language about groups of students. For example, we hear teachers say, “I’m not a racist, but none of my Black students’ parents ever come to parent-teacher conferences.” When teachers use this phrasing, they might follow it with sweeping generalizations about entire racial groups couched in absolutist language (“none” or “ever”) without allowing for the variation that inevitably exists within any group. Further, there is typically no evaluation, critique, or analysis of the school’s role in the underrepresentation of parents’ showing up at parent-teacher conferences. This preface to racist, or at best generalizing, language allows teachers to speak their mind within what they perceive as a safety net but does not allow them to say what they really want to say and feel.

Finally, teachers may engage in conversations about a racist or discriminatory act that has happened in their school only to de-racialize it. Lewis (2001) gives an example of a teacher in her school talking about racial slurring as “kid put-downs” (p. 790). We frequently see this move, especially in discussions where intersectionality is at play. Teachers will foreground less taboo topics like socioeconomic status (as in the example above of “Title I students” or “free-and-reduced lunch kids”) rather than acknowledge the role of race. This kind of semantic move can be seen even in the current political dialogue around poverty. Some politicians are unwilling to talk about race as a factor in the readily evident disparities in American U.S. society and so instead focus on class and socioeconomic status. In this way, teachers not only censor their own talk for racialized language but can de-racialize others’ talk in an effort to position themselves as “colorblind” and “not a racist.”

What many “colorblind” teachers do not realize is that their unwillingness to talk about race actually sends messages to their students, who do see race. Phinney and Rotheram (1987) found that children as young as three notice racial difference, and Banks (2001) declared that children develop a White-bias at a very young age. It is adults’ responses to their observations that can socialize children into a fear of talking about those differences. When race is not acknowledged, when children are made to feel ashamed for noticing racial differences or commenting on them, or when adults are unwilling or unable to respond to children’s questions about race, children develop a sense that race is a taboo topic or something they, too, should ignore and not talk about. Consequently, in their zeal to be seen as “not a racist,” teachers are complicit in the development of subsequent generations of colorblind individuals.

We attempt to summarize many of these ideas in Table 1 below.
Table 1: Summary of Troubling Mindsets and Potential Consequences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educators’ Mindsets</th>
<th>(Instructional) Consequences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mindset #1: As a preservice teacher, I can be colorblind and not think about race in my teacher education program because I plan to teach in a mostly White learning environment once I have graduated from my teacher education program. Race won’t matter much to me when I start teaching because I will teach in a predominantly White school. Therefore, I refuse to spend energy thinking or talking about it.</td>
<td>Consequence #1: Educators teach their students in a myopic manner; they do not consider how racially diverse students experience the world inside the classroom, inside the school, and in society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindset #2: My parents taught me to “just see people” and to not consider the racial background of people. I was not raised in a “racist” household, and we never talked about race. Children are just children, and I appreciate my parents for never allowing me to address with race.</td>
<td>Consequence #2: Curriculum and instructional decisions are grounded in a “White norm” that students of color have to just “deal with.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Mindset #3: I should avoid talking about race and pretend to be colorblind because I don’t want others to perceive me as a racist. I don’t want others to judge me if I admit my reservation and uneasiness about race. It is easier to just not mention it or think about it. | Consequence #3: Educators do not recognize, critically examine, or talk with colleagues about why there is:  
  - an overrepresentation of students of color in special education (Artiles, Klingner, & Tate, 2006; Blanchett, 2006; O’Connor & Fernandez, 2006);  
  - an underrepresentation of students of color in gifted education (Ford, 2010; Howard, 2010);  
  - an over-referral of African American students to the office for disciplinary actions and consequences (Davis & Jordan, 1994; Skiba, Michael, Nardo & Paterson, 2002);  
  - an overwhelming number of African American and Latino American students expelled or suspended (Monroe, 2006; Noguera, 2003); and  
  - an underrepresentation of students of color in school-wide clubs, organizations, and in other prestigious arenas, such as the school’s homecoming court and student government (Milner, 2010). |
Conclusion and Implications

In conclusion, we have explained what we mean by race and colorblindness and explored several common mindsets that are troubling in education because they can contribute to what we call teachers’ complicit instructional ineffectiveness. Race is physically, socially, legally, and historically constructed and is and will continue to be a salient issue in the U.S. and in education. As such, we have attempted to demonstrate that colorblind mindsets can leave students out of meaningful learning opportunities, making the teacher complicit in opportunity gaps (Milner, 2010) that persist in P-12 educational settings because teachers’ practices are shaped by what they think, believe and their overall mindset.

Teachers who have these mindsets cannot be truly effective with their students, especially those who have historically been marginalized and underserved in schools across the U.S. What teachers put in and leave out of the curriculum have implications for their students, and colorblindness puts race in the null curriculum (Eisner, 1994) in a way that may stifle students’ opportunities and access to learning. When teachers think that race does not matter in education, they may fail to prepare for diverse settings do not come to realize the importance of knowing students as part of all good teaching, even in predominantly White settings. When teachers “just see students,” they may fail to see the whole student and refuse to see the role of race in society in general. Likewise, when teachers pretend to be colorblind and avoid conversations about race for fear of being seen as a racist, they can end up talking around race in ways that further contribute to its “taboo” status and pass on their practices to students.

As teacher educators who recognize the troubling nature of colorblindness for teachers, we see specific implications for teacher education programs. In order to help teachers work through colorblindness, we suggest that teacher educators help teachers:

- Come to see themselves as cultural beings who have race and recognize that race has been significant in their lives, and in some cases to privilege them (McIntosh, 1990);
- Learn to see their students “with a cultural eye” and understand how a student’s race is relevant to curriculum and instruction (Irvine, 2003);
- Engage in open and honest discussion of race by establishing a safe, supportive environment (Tatum, 1992; Benton & Daniel, 1996); and
- Find anti-racist stances and models of teachers as agents of change (Cochran-Smith, 1991).

In addition, we must become cognizant of the ineffectiveness of colorblindness in other aspects of education, including disciplinary policy (Skiba, Michael, Nardo, & Peterson, 2002), tracking policy (Wantanabe, 2008), and researcher positionality (Milner, 2007).

Race is a permanent issue in the U.S. and in education (Bell, 1980), which means that colorblindness needs to be disrupted in the mindsets of U.S. teachers. We need to learn more about the link between colorblindness and the practices of teachers in P-12 classrooms, and additional studies are encouraged. In addition, professional development opportunities that allow teachers in P-12 schools to examine their beliefs about race. Indeed, attempting to reform and transcend entire schools and districts with this type of restructuring would be ideal. At whatever level of reform (micro-, meso-, or macro), we challenge schools, districts, and institutions that
prepare teachers to help teachers reframe colorblindness as an appropriate and useful way of approaching and thinking about the teaching and learning exchange.
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Racism has to do with discrimination based on race. Inherent in racism are notions of power and privilege, and racism occurs both implicitly and explicitly (Sheurich & Young, 1997).

Critical race theory emerged from law as a response to critical legal studies and civil rights scholarship. Legal scholar, Derrick A. Bell, laid the foundation for critical race theory in two law review articles: *Serving two masters: Integration ideals and client interests in school desegregation litigation* (1976) and *Brown v. Board of Education and the Interest Convergence Dilemma* (1980). In general, critical race theorists are concerned with disrupting, exposing, challenging, analyzing, critiquing and ultimately transforming racist policies (and consequently practices) that work to subordinate, marginalize, and disenfranchise certain groups of people and that attempt to maintain the status quo. Solorzano and Yosso (2001) stressed that critical race theory “challenges the dominant discourse on race and racism as it relates to education by examining how educational theory and practice are used to subordinate certain racial and ethnic groups” (p. 2).

Before the Ladson-Billings and Tate’s formal introduction, Tate, Ladson-Billings, and Grant (1993) cited scholarship associated with critical race theory in their analysis of the history of school desegregation law and related implementation. Later, in an article published in *Urban Education*, Tate (1994) referenced critical race theory as a school of thought associated with critiquing stock racial narratives while interjecting voice scholarship as a means to build theory and inform practice in the law.

For good discussions of the various tenets of critical race theory, see Ladson-Billings (1998), Dixson and Rousseau (2005), and Tate (1997).

The curriculum can be defined as what students have the opportunity to learn in schools (Eisner, 1994; McCutcheon, 2002). Eisner (1994) postulated several important forms of the curriculum: (a) the explicit curriculum concerns student-learning opportunities that are overtly taught and stated or printed in documents, policies, and guidelines, such as in course syllabi or on school websites; (b) the implicit curriculum is intended or unintended but is not stated or written down but is actually inherent to what students have the opportunity to learn; (c) a third form of curriculum, the null curriculum, deals with what students do not have the opportunity to learn. Thus, information and knowledge that are not available for student learning are also a form of the curriculum because *students are actually learning something based on what is not emphasized, covered, or taught*. What students do not experience in the curriculum become messages for them. For example, if educators are not taught to question, critique, or critically examine power structures, the students are learning something—possibly that it may not be essential for them to critique the world in order to improve it. From Eisner’s perspective, what is absent is essentially present in student learning opportunities.

We realize that there is no such thing as a homogenous school.
Intersectionality can be seen as a tool for theorizing and researching how intertwining identities interrelate, rather than act independently, to form multiple, simultaneous oppressions or privileges. Intersectionality commonly looks at models of oppression that are based on: race/ethnicity, gender, class, sexual orientation, nationality, language, geography, religion, and disability. For a recent, thoughtful consideration of intersectionality in P-16 education, see Grant and Zwier (2011).
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Abstract

This study examined how school safety and fairness directly influences teachers’ classroom attitudes and behaviors and indirectly shape student outcomes. Researchers used critical race theory and humanism as heuristic frameworks to conceptualize the process by which children of diverse backgrounds learn and develop in the classroom and how teachers experience the school environment. The study participants included all Black, Latino, and White students who completed the National Crime Victimization Survey: School Crime Supplement of 2009 (NCVS-SCS). Students of all races, who perceived their teachers as more caring, respectful, and empathetic, and less punitive, generally reported higher grades. Black students were less likely than white students to perceive empathy and respect from their teachers, even when they were making good grades. Similarly, Black students perceived their teachers to be significantly more punitive. Implications included suggestions for developing effective teacher education programs.

Collateral Damage in the Classroom: How Race and School Environment Influence Teachers’ Attitudes and Behaviors toward their Students

Racial disparities in discipline, grade retention, placement in special education, and assignment to honors classes suggest that Black students’ in the United States have a very tenuous presence within the school system. According to an independent analysis of the National Center for Education Statistics High
School Longitudinal Study of 2009 (Ingels, et al., 2011), 17.9 percent of Black males and 13.7 percent of Black females have repeated a grade, compared to 8.1 percent for White males and 5.6 percent for White females. Twenty-five percent of Black males and 14.5 percent of Black females have been suspended or expelled from a school, when the national average is 9.8 percent. Twenty-nine percent of the parents of Black students reported receiving a call from the school regarding problem behavior with their son or daughter, compared to 14 percent of the parents of White students.

The extent to which racial biases in schools and classrooms contribute to racial disparities in academic success is a subject of debate. Today, of the more than 6 million teachers in the United States, nearly 80 percent are White, 9.6 percent are Black, 7.4 percent are Hispanic, 2.3 percent are Asian, and 1.2 percent is another race (Toldson, 2011b). Eighty percent of all teachers are female. Relative to the composition of P-12 students in the United States, the current teaching force lacks racial and gender diversity. Black men represent less than 2 percent of the teaching force, of a student body that is 7 percent black male. By comparison, White female teachers comprise 63 percent of the teaching force, of a student body that is 27 percent white female (Toldson, 2011b). Some school advocates suspect that teachers who lack cultural proficiency may relate to Black and Hispanic students in a manner that undermines their potential. This study specifically examines how race and school environment influence teachers' attitudes and behaviors toward their students.

Literature Review
Race, School Environment and Student Discipline

Elevated public awareness and perceptions of violence have increased schools' reliance on suspensions, zero tolerance and other exclusionary disciplinary policies (Christle, Nelson, & Jolivette, 2004; Skiba & Peterson, 1999). One study found that black students with a history of disciplinary referrals were more likely to receive negative perceptions and less deference from teachers (Gregory & Thompson, 2010). There are also general concerns about the reliability and subjectivity in disciplinary referrals (Vavrus & Cole, 2002; Wright & Dusek, 1998). Through ethnographic research, Vavrus and Cole (2002) found that many suspensions resulted from a buildup of nonviolent events, where one student often carries the brunt of many students' misbehaviors. However, some studies suggest that school culture and administrative leaders can mitigate high suspension rates (Mukuria, 2002). For example, regular monitoring and analysis of narrative disciplinary referrals have been recommended to improve precision and application of disciplinary measures that are consistent with the students' infractions (Morrison, Peterson, O'Farrell, & Redding, 2004; Sugai, Sprague, Horner, & Walker, 2000).

With respect to disproportionate suspension rates among black students, many studies have noted the influence of ecological variables beyond the school (Day-Vines & Day-Hairston, 2005). Eitle and Eitle (2004) found that black students were more likely to be suspended in majority black grade schools. Cultural expressions of certain behaviors, such as movement and speech, may be misinterpreted as threatening to teachers who lack cultural awareness (Day-Vines & Day-Hairston, 2005).
Hairston, 2005). Another study revealed that natural adaptations to life in some impoverished areas indirectly influence the students' chances of being suspended from school (Kirk, 2009). Few studies have examined suspensions and disciplinary referrals among Hispanic students. One study noted Hispanic students' rates of suspensions and number of referrals were generally greater than whites, but less than Blacks (Kaushal & Nepomnyaschy, 2009).

Improving teacher efficacy and teacher-student dialogue and aligning their mutual understanding of school rules also demonstrated effectiveness (Pas, Bradshaw, Hershfeldt, & Leaf, 2010; Thompson & Webber, 2010). "Whole-school" and schoolwide interventions that focus on schoolwide improvements in instructional methods, positive reinforcement, such as teacher "praise notes" (Nelson, Young, Young, & Cox, 2010), behavioral modeling, and data-based evaluation, have also demonstrated effectiveness (Bohanon, et al., 2006; Lassen, Steele, & Sailor, 2006; Luiselli, Putnam, Handler, & Feinberg, 2005). Resilience and skill building among students also reduced behavioral problems and subsequent disciplinary referrals among students (Wyman, et al., 2010). Attention to students' mental health may also reduce suspensions and disciplinary referrals among Black male students (Caldwell, Sewell, Parks, & Toldson, 2009).

Race, School Environment, and Empathy and Respect

Research evidence suggests that persons of a privileged social group need to make conscious adjustments to develop authentic relationships with less privileged groups (Ullucci, 2011). Standard rubrics of evaluating teachers, such as knowledge, pedagogy and organization, are insufficient because they do not account for the vast diversity in the classroom or the sociocultural context of education (Nieto, 2006). Therefore, the teaching force, which is approximately 80 percent White, needs to develop mechanisms for teachers to cultivate empathy and respect for students of a different race. Empathy, moral and spiritual values, and self-interest are three factors that motivate people from privileged social groups to promote equity in the classroom (Goodman, 2000).

Exposing teacher educators to different cultures is one strategy to increase their cultural awareness and empathy toward racially different students (Houser, 2008; Marx & Pray, 2011). Multicultural training workshops have also been identified as a strategy to help teachers develop an awareness of their personal biases that may threaten their capacity to empathize with other races (Pickett, 1995). Some pedagogical methods have been evaluated that have demonstrated effectiveness in helping teachers develop and convey empathy toward their students. For example, one approach instructs teachers to allow students to self-reflect and connect classroom lessons to their community environment (Rios, Trent, & Castaneda, 2003). A sense of social justice, insight, and the ability to challenge conventional wisdom help teachers to cultivate an empathetic understanding of their students (Nieto, 2006).

A relationship between respect and academic success for Black males was found through analyzing three national surveys (Toldson, 2008). High-achieving black male students reported that their teachers were interested in them “as a person,” treated them fairly, encouraged them to express their views and gave extra help when needed. Teachers who were effective also routinely let their students know when they did a good job. Overall, black male students who were successful
perceived their teachers to be respectful people who treated them like they matter and nurturing people who builds up their strengths, instead of making them “feel bad” about their weaknesses.

Toldson (2011a) found that schools with more gang activity had lower overall levels of academic achievement among students. Students in schools with gang activity were also more likely to report being distracted from doing schoolwork because of other students misbehaving. These findings collectively suggest that, teachers and administrators in schools with more gang activity are perceived by students to spend more time confronting problematic students, which may compromise the academic priorities of the school.

Students in schools with less gang activity are more likely to report that teachers care about students, treat students with respect, spend less time punishing students, and are less likely to report that teachers do or say things that make students feel bad about themselves (Toldson, 2011a). Black students are significantly more likely to experience disillusionment with their teachers (Lewis, James, Hancock, & Hill-Jackson, 2008). Many teachers, particularly in urban school districts, may become disenchanted because they feel they have little control over the conditions and circumstances that weaken student achievement (Toldson, 2011a).

Theoretical Framework

Researchers used critical race theory and humanism as heuristic frameworks to conceptualize the process by which children of diverse backgrounds learn and develop in the classroom and how teachers experience the school environment. Critical race theory (CRT) examines White privilege and institutional racism. When viewing a racially diverse classroom with the tenants of CRT, a White teacher who takes a "colorblind" approach to teaching Black and Latino students, and ignores social inequalities, inadvertently promotes a racially prejudiced hegemony (Kohli, 2012). In previous studies, critical race theory has been used to demonstrate instructional techniques to develop agency and activism with students (Knaus, 2009), as well as the dynamic that leads to harsher punitive measures at majority minority schools (Zirkel, et al., 2011).

This study also used humanistic perspectives to explore interpersonal dynamics between teachers and students that are conducive to a healthy learning environment. Humanistic psychology is based on the principles that in order for a person to grow and mature, they require a nurturing environment that provides them with genuineness, unconditional positive regard, and empathy (Rogers, 1992). Genuineness is defined as an openness and self-disclosure, unconditional positive regard is the feeling of acceptance, and empathy is expressed in the ability to listen to and understand. Humanistic theorists believe that both educators' feelings toward their students and knowledge of culture are important to the learning process (Barr, 2011). Humanistic teachers do not separate the cognitive and affective domains; rather they insist that schools need to provide students with a nonthreatening environment so they will feel secure to learn. Once students feel secure, learning becomes easier and more meaningful (Boyer, 2010).

Research Questions

Studies have found that teachers who lack cultural proficiency may not be able to relate to minority children and therefore may undermine their academic potential. Teachers’ lev-
el of empathy, feelings of safety, and racial views can influence students’ performance, grades, and disciplinary actions (Day-Vines & Day-Hairston, 2005). Toldson’s (2011a) findings suggest that schools with more gang activity distract administrators and teachers from academic instruction and refocus priorities to problematic student behaviors. A noticeable void in the literature was research that examined the intersection of race and school environment on teachers’ attitudes and behaviors toward their students. Four research questions are proposed for further investigation:

1. Do teachers’ attitudes and behaviors toward students influence their academic success?
2. Does students’ race influence teachers’ attitudes and behavior toward their students?
3. Does the school environment influence teachers’ attitudes and behaviors toward students? and
4. Does the influence of the school environment depend on the race of the student?

Method

Participants

The study participants included all Black, Latino, and White students who completed the National Crime Victimization Survey: School Crime Supplement of 2009 (NCVS-SCS). The database was selected for this study because it had a clear indicator of academic success; had adequate Black and Latino adolescent representation; was a national survey that included multiple states and geographic areas; and had adequate measures of contributing factors, such as school environment and school safety measures. The database is indexed for public analysis at the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (United States Department of Justice Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2010).

Procedure

Using data from the Bureau of the Census, the Bureau of Justice gathered data for the SCS as a supplement to the NCVS. The NCVS-SCS used a stratified, multi-stage cluster sample design. The Bureau of Justice described their selection of respondents as a “rotating panel design,” in which households were randomly selected and all age-eligible individuals became members of a panel. Those selected in the panel were interviewed every six months for a total of seven interviews over a three-year period. The Bureau of Justice designated the first interview as the incoming rotation and the second through the seventh interview were in the continuing rotations. After the seventh interview, the household leaves the panel and a new household is rotated into the sample.

The NCVS-SCS surveyed 12- to 18-year-old adolescents who attended school in 2009. The survey population responded to questions regarding crime prevention measures employed by their schools, their participation in after-school activities, their perception of school rules, the presence of weapons, drugs, alcohol and gangs in their schools, and their fear of victimization at school. The NCVS-SCS used paper and pencil interviewing and computer-assisted telephone interviewing. Initial interviews were conducted in respondents’ households and subsequent computer-assisted interviews were conducted by an interviewer calling from a centralized telephone facility using an automated version of the paper instrument to administer the questions.

The Census Bureau’s Disclosure Review Board (DRB) vetted data collected for the NCVS-SCS. For confidentiality and ano-
nymity, recoding procedures and a control number scrambling routine were performed before the file was released for public use. Responses to the NCVS-SCS are confidential by law under BJS Title 42, United States Code, Sections 3735 and 3789g and by the Census Bureau under Title 13, United States Code, Section 9.

Measures

School environment and classroom dynamics

Fourteen continuous items were used that allowed students to rate various aspects of their school environment and dynamics within their classrooms. With the exception of the first two items, students rated these questions on a four-point scale with '1' indicating "strongly agree" and 4 indicating "strongly disagree." For the first two questions, the response options ranged from 1 indicating "never," to 4 indicating "most of the time." Where appropriate, items were reverse coded for analysis.

The first group of questions measured the level of distractions the students experienced from other students' misbehavior and teachers' disciplinary practices. The two questions asked, "How often do teachers punish students during your classes?" and "In your classes, how often are you distracted from doing your schoolwork because other students are misbehaving, for example, talking or fighting?"

The second group of questions measured students' knowledge, understanding and perception of school rules. The survey items included, (1) "If a school rule is broken, students know what kind of punishment will follow;" (2) "The school rules are strictly enforced;" (3) "The punishment for breaking school rules is the same no matter who you are;" (4) "Everyone knows what the school rules are;" and 5) "The school rules are fair."

The third group of questions asked students whether they believed their teachers were caring, respectful, and nice. Specifically, the survey asked whether students agreed with the following statements: (1) "Teachers do or say things that make students feel bad about themselves; (2) "Teachers treat students with respect;" and (3) "Teachers care about students."

The final group of questions measured whether students had adults at school who cared about them. The survey asked if students agreed to the following: (1) "At school, there is an adult who helps me with practical problems, who gives good suggestions and advice about my problems;" and (2) "At school, there is an adult I can talk to, who cares about my feelings and what happens to me."

Grades

NCVS-SCS recorded academic achievement with the item, “During this school year, across all subjects have you gotten mostly…” Students who participated in this survey responded by indicating the letter grade, A through F, that they were most likely to achieve during the school year. Codes for the categories were modify so that students who reported mostly A's received scores closer to 4.0, and those reported mostly F's received scores closer to zero.

School Safety

School safety was recorded with an index that included students' responses to questions that inquired about gang activity at the school and behaviors in response to threats at the school. Twelve dichotomous, yes or no questions were used to determine if students altered behaviors in response to violent threats...
at the school. Examples include staying away from hallways or stairs, cafeteria, school restrooms, activities, or avoiding school altogether.

Gang activity was measured with two questions. The first question was a dichotomous yes or no question asking, "Are there any gangs at your school?" The second was a continuous variable that asked, "During this school year, how often have gangs been involved in fights, attacks, or other violence at your school?" The response choices were: (a) Never; (b) Once or twice this school year; (c) Once or twice a month; (d) Once or twice a week; or (e) Almost every day. To normalize distribution of responses, these two questions were reconfigured to create the following categories for this study: (1) No gangs - those responding "no" to question one; (2) No gang activity - those responding no to question one, and "never" for question two; (3) Some gang activity - those responding "once or twice this school year" or "once or twice a month" to question two; and (4) A lot of gang activity - those responding "once or twice a week or "almost every day" to question two.

The resulting index ranged from 1 to 16. A score of 1 indicated the students' school has no gangs and the student does not feel he or she needs to avoid any areas of the school to remain safe. A score of 16 indicated the student attends a school with a lot of gang activity, has to avoid most areas of the school to remain safe, and may have avoided school altogether because of safety concerns.

Analysis Plan

The principle analytic technique used in this study was a 3 x 4 factorial analysis of variance ANOVA, whereby three levels of race (Black, White, and Latino) and four levels of academic achievement were tested for their independent main effects, as well as interactions between the two factors. General linear modeling approaches were used to reveal differences in the relationship between academic achievement and associated variables along race lines. The hypothesized relationships between academic achievement and external measures were tested and accepted or rejected based on the p-value (tested at .01). Means plots are displayed for select variables to display the linear relationship between various indicators of academic achievement and hypothesized covariates, across races. The plots include a dashed reference line on the Y-axis that marks the estimated mean of the variable of interest. The reference line is useful for determining the distribution of scores around the mean for various levels of academic achievement.

Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) was used to test the relationship between hypothesized causal factors and the equivalence between models that were constructed for Black, White and Latino male students. Using information gathered from multivariate analysis, the researcher selected variables for a path model to confirm their relationship in a trajectory model that evaluated the relationship between the school environment, classroom dynamics and student outcomes. AMOS 17 was used to test model fitness and calculate regression estimates of direct and indirect effects. Invariance between races was estimated for the overall model and the path estimates by imposing a series of model constraints through nested model comparisons.

Results

Descriptive Information

Participants of this study included 8,986 Black, Latino, and White male and female students who completed the NCVS-SCS of
2009. The racial and gender composition of the participants were consistent with the demographics of the middle and high school Black, Latino, and White students in the United States. Fourteen percent was Black, 21 percent was Latino, and 65 percent was White. Eighteen percent of the participants attended school in the Northeast region of the United States, 25 percent in the Midwest, 34 percent in the South, and 23 percent in the West. The mean age of the participants was 15 years old. Ninety-two participants attended public schools and 88 percent attended the regular school that most students in their neighborhood attended. The most common mode of transportation two and from school was a private vehicle (51 percent), followed by a school bus (37 percent). Most students (61 percent) lived within 15 miles of their school.

The Relationship between Race, School Environment and Academic Success

A factorial ANOVA was used as a preliminary test for three research questions: "Do teachers' attitudes and behaviors toward students influence their academic success?; Does the school environment influence academic success?; and Does students' race influence teachers' attitudes and behavior toward their students? Table 1 displays the means, standard deviations, and F-ratios of aspects of the school environment that have a hypothesized relationship with academic achievement among Black, Latino, and White male students. The table marks variables that are significant by race and academic achievement. All six of the variables analyzed had a significant relationship with academic achievement. Mean scores with a negative relationship with academic achievement, such as "Unsafe School," get smaller when reading from left to right as academic performance increases.

The opposite is true for variables, such as "Teachers Care for and Respect Students," with a positive relationship with academic achievement. Two of the six variables, "Unsafe School" and "Teachers Punish Students," were significant for race prior to performing any post hoc analyses.
### TABLE 1: Means, standard deviations, & F-ratios of school-related factors that are related to academic success among Black, White, and Latino students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>D's &amp; F's</th>
<th>C's</th>
<th>B's</th>
<th>A's</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers Care for and Respect</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>8.94 (2.29)</td>
<td>9.01 (1.87)</td>
<td>9.18 (1.67)</td>
<td>9.47 (1.75)</td>
<td>9.20 (1.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>8.84 (1.45)</td>
<td>9.18 (1.57)</td>
<td>9.55 (1.38)</td>
<td>10.04 (1.44)</td>
<td>9.71 (1.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>8.87 (1.61)</td>
<td>9.23 (1.67)</td>
<td>9.56 (1.46)</td>
<td>9.77 (1.44)</td>
<td>9.52 (1.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8.87 (1.64)</td>
<td>9.16 (1.66)</td>
<td>9.50 (1.45)</td>
<td>9.96 (1.48)</td>
<td>9.61 (1.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>3.25 (2.08)</td>
<td>2.46 (1.83)</td>
<td>1.95 (1.64)</td>
<td>1.95 (1.65)</td>
<td>2.12 (1.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe School</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>2.02 (1.61)</td>
<td>1.65 (1.28)</td>
<td>1.47 (1.00)</td>
<td>1.33 (0.88)</td>
<td>1.44 (1.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>2.94 (1.95)</td>
<td>2.21 (1.54)</td>
<td>2.03 (1.41)</td>
<td>1.79 (1.29)</td>
<td>2.04 (1.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.51 (1.86)</td>
<td>1.95 (1.50)</td>
<td>1.66 (1.23)</td>
<td>1.44 (1.04)</td>
<td>1.64 (1.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>15.88 (2.45)</td>
<td>15.58 (2.76)</td>
<td>15.90 (2.44)</td>
<td>15.95 (2.65)</td>
<td>15.84 (2.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair School</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>14.67 (2.22)</td>
<td>15.16 (2.14)</td>
<td>15.81 (2.25)</td>
<td>16.23 (2.29)</td>
<td>15.89 (2.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>15.32 (2.30)</td>
<td>15.67 (2.27)</td>
<td>16.02 (2.24)</td>
<td>15.97 (2.25)</td>
<td>15.90 (2.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15.07 (2.30)</td>
<td>15.38 (2.31)</td>
<td>15.87 (2.27)</td>
<td>16.17 (2.32)</td>
<td>15.89 (2.32)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. M = Mean; SD = Standard Deviation; *p < .01; **p < .001.
### TABLE 1 (con’t): Means, standard deviations, & F-ratios of school-related factors that are related to academic success among Black, White, and Latino students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>D’s &amp; F’s M (SD)</th>
<th>C’s M (SD)</th>
<th>B’s M (SD)</th>
<th>A’s M (SD)</th>
<th>Total M (SD)</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>Race Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>3.13 (0.81)</td>
<td>2.90 (0.90)</td>
<td>2.59 (0.88)</td>
<td>2.55 (0.86)</td>
<td>2.67 (0.89)</td>
<td>4.68**</td>
<td>15.02**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2.78 (0.88)</td>
<td>2.64 (0.83)</td>
<td>2.54 (0.82)</td>
<td>2.44 (0.79)</td>
<td>2.51 (0.81)</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>12.53**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>3.03 (0.84)</td>
<td>2.76 (0.93)</td>
<td>2.58 (0.83)</td>
<td>2.51 (0.87)</td>
<td>2.62 (0.87)</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>4.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.92 (0.86)</td>
<td>2.72 (0.88)</td>
<td>2.55 (0.83)</td>
<td>2.46 (0.81)</td>
<td>2.55 (0.84)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Classroom Distractions | Black | 2.94 (1.12) | 2.56 (0.99) | 2.43 (0.89) | 2.25 (1.01) | 2.44 (0.96) | 1.51 | 12.53** |
| White | 2.84 (0.88) | 2.58 (0.91) | 2.42 (0.88) | 2.29 (0.84) | 2.39 (0.87) | | |
| Latino | 2.55 (1.03) | 2.51 (0.92) | 2.38 (0.87) | 2.31 (0.84) | 2.40 (0.88) | | |
| Total | 2.77 (0.97) | 2.56 (0.93) | 2.41 (0.88) | 2.29 (0.85) | 2.40 (0.88) | | |

| Student Feels Supported | Black | 3.25 (0.86) | 3.27 (0.64) | 3.37 (0.56) | 3.35 (0.62) | 3.34 (0.60) | 1.57 | 4.19** |
| White | 3.41 (0.54) | 3.30 (0.57) | 3.34 (0.57) | 3.44 (0.56) | 3.38 (0.57) | | |
| Latino | 3.29 (0.64) | 3.25 (0.58) | 3.32 (0.60) | 3.41 (0.58) | 3.33 (0.59) | | |
| Total | 3.35 (0.63) | 3.28 (0.59) | 3.34 (0.57) | 3.43 (0.57) | 3.37 (0.58) | | |

Note. M = Mean; SD = Standard Deviation; *p < .01; **p < .001.
Although initial tests found no significance for race and "Teachers Care for and Respect Students," post hoc analysis revealed that Black students perceived care and respect from their teachers significantly less (p < .001) than White and Hispanic students. Figure 1a reveals that the difference in perception is most pronounced among higher achieving students, where Black students reporting mostly A's perceive less care and respect than the average of all students. Similar racial differences were found in students' reports of punishment from teachers. Black students were significantly more likely to report that teachers punish students, which was most pronounced as academic success diminished (See Figure 1b). Black students who reported "mostly C's" reported more punitive behavior among teachers than White students who reported "mostly D's and F's."

**FIGURE 1a & 1b:** Means plots of race (separate plots) and grades (X Axis) on teacher attitudes and behaviors (Y Axes) as reported by Black, Hispanic, and White students. Note: ● = Black students; ○ = Hispanic students; and □ = White students. The dashed reference line on the Y-axis marks the estimated mean of the dependent variable. **Main effects for grades and race.**
The analyses of academic achievement revealed the largest effect size for feeling unsafe at school (eta-squared = .03). Feeling unsafe at school also had the largest effect size for race (eta-squared = .02). Post hoc analysis of feeling unsafe at school found that Black and Latino students felt significantly more unsafe at school than White students. As indicated in Figure 2a, although students of all races who feel unsafe at school are also less likely to have higher levels of academic achievement, Black and Latino students’ feelings of being unsafe at school was above the mean, regardless of academic standing. Figure 2b demonstrates a relationship between academic achievement and classroom misbehavior, but no differences between races.

Although causality cannot be established, overall the results of the factorial ANOVA found evidence of a relationship between teacher attitudes, teacher behaviors and students' academic success. The analysis also found evidence that black students perceive their teachers to be more punitive and less respectful and empathetic towards their students.

**FIGURE 2a & 2b:** Means plots of race (separate plots) and grades (X Axis) on school and classroom dynamics (Y Axes) as reported by Black, Hispanic, and White students. Note: ● = Black students; ○ = Hispanic students; and ○ = White students. The dashed reference line on the Y-axis marks the estimated mean of the dependent variable. *Main effect for grades. **Main effects for grades and race.
The Structural Path of School Environment, Classroom Dynamics, and Student Outcomes across Black, Latino and White students

SEM was used for three primary purposes. The first was to find causal links between the correlated variable in the three research questions that were tested with factorial ANOVA. The second purpose was to determine, if the school environment influences teachers' attitudes and behaviors toward students. Finally, the analysis tested if the influence of the school environment on teachers depends on the race of the student.

Exogenous and endogenous variables were selected for a path model to test their direct effects on teacher attitudes and behaviors and indirect effects on students' grades and feelings of support. In the model, events hypothesized to occur earlier were placed further to the left of the model. In this model, school safety and fairness were treated as correlated exogenous variables, classroom misbehavior, teacher attitudes and teacher behaviors were treated as mediating variables, and grades and student support were outcome variables. Figures 3, 4, and 5 display the path models tested for Black, White and Hispanic students, respectively. The initial maximum likelihood test of the model resulted in a good

FIGURE 3: The relationship between factors associated with teacher empathy and subsequent grades among Black students. Note: The thickest lines represent standardized path estimates that are greater than .20, the medium lines represent estimates that are between .10 and .19, and the thinnest lines are not significant. Curved lines with two-way arrows represent covariance and straight lines with one-way arrow represent paths. The minus sign (-) indicates an inverse relationship. All path coefficients are significant (p < .01), except for the parameters represented by the thinnest lines. Ertr, ersq, and ess represent associated error of exogenous values (error representations for teachers punish students and classroom misbehavior are hidden from figure). Data from National Crime Victimization Survey - School Crime Supplement (2009).
overall fit, $\chi^2(18) = 29.20$, $p = .05$, $\chi^2/df = 1.62$, comparative fit index (CFI) = .99, root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) = .02, and normed fit index (NFI) = .98.

**Invariance between races**

Race differences between the path models and coefficients were further examined through SEM. The invariance of the path models across races was tested in three steps. First, the goodness of fit was calculated separately for Black, White, and Latino males. These preliminary evaluations confirmed an adequate fit of the data for all groups: for Black males, $\chi^2(6) = 8.74$, $p = .19$, $\chi^2/df = 3.8$, CFI = .99, RMSEA = .04, and NFI = .97; for White males, $\chi^2(6) = 11.38$, $p = .08$, $\chi^2/df = 1.90$, CFI = .99, RMSEA = .03, and NFI = .99; and for Latino males, $\chi^2(6) = 9.05$, $p = .171$, $\chi^2/df = 1.5$, CFI = .99, RMSEA = .03, and NFI = .97. All fit indices were similar across race groups.

Second, all regression weights in the initial models with all races combined were constrained to be equal across race. The constrained model differed significantly from the unrestricted model, $\Delta \chi^2(26) = 31.89$, $p < .01$.

---

**FIGURE 4: The relationship between factors associated with teacher empathy and subsequent grades among White students.** Note: The thickest lines represent standardized path estimates that are greater than .20, the medium lines represent estimates that are between .10 and .19, and the thinnest lines are not significant. Curved lines with two-way arrows represent covariance and straight lines with one-way arrow represent paths. The minus sign (−) indicates an inverse relationship. All path coefficients are significant ($p < .01$), except for the parameters represented by the thinnest lines. Ertr, ersq, and ess represent associated error of exogenous values (error representations for teachers punish students and classroom misbehavior are hidden from figure). Data from National Crime Victimization Survey - School Crime Supplement (2009).
indicating that the regression weights were invariant across race. The third was to constrain the structural covariance, while allowing the regression weights the freedom to vary across races. Results of this analysis did not indicate a significant attrition in model fit, $\Delta \chi^2(2) = 6.80$, indicating that the covariance between school safety and school fairness was not significantly different between Black, White, and Latino males.

**Direct and indirect effects on disciplinary referrals and grades**

Nested group comparisons confirmed structural invariance between the regression weights of Black, Latino and White students. Figures 3, 4, and 5 illustrate the path coefficients for each race of students, whereby several distinct differences emerged. First, note the direct effects of school safety on classroom dynamics. There is no difference in the effect of school safety on classroom misbehavior between Black and White students, yet unsafe schools significantly influence Black students' grades.

**FIGURE 5: The relationship between factors associated with teacher empathy and subsequent grades among Latino students.** Note: The thickest lines represent standardized path estimates that are greater than .20, the medium lines represent estimates that are between .10 and .19, and the thinnest lines are not significant. Curved lines with two-way arrows represent covariance and straight lines with one-way arrow represent paths. The minus sign (-) indicates an inverse relationship. All path coefficients are significant ($p < .01$), except for the parameters represented by the thinnest lines. Ertr, ersq, and ess represent associated error of exogenous values (error representations for teachers punish students and classroom misbehavior are hidden from figure). Data from National Crime Victimization Survey - School Crime Supplement (2009).
students’ perception that their teachers are more punitive and lack empathy and respect for students in general.

Second, a very strong direct effect of teacher empathy and respect emerged for White and Latino students; however, the relationship was not significant for Black students. This is likely associated with the findings that Black students at higher levels of academic achievement perceive their teachers as significantly less empathetic and respectful. Finally, teachers punitive actions toward students had a significant the direct effect on Black and Latino students' grades, but not on White students' grades. This is related to the finding that Black students at higher levels of academic achievement are more likely to report teacher punishment than White students with similar academic standings.

Monte Carlo parametric bootstrapping was used to measure the indirect effects of school safety and fairness on student outcomes. School safety significantly \((p < .01)\) indirectly affected grades among all students; however it only indirectly affected feelings of support among Black and Latino students. School fairness had significant \((p < .01)\) indirect effects of feelings of support for all students, but did not have significant indirect effects for grades only for Black students.

Overall, SEM found evidence that school safety and school fairness directly influenced teachers' perceived level of empathy and respect toward their students, and indirectly influence students' grades and feelings of being supported. Invariance between nested models for Black, Latino, and White students suggest that the path to good grades and feeling supported was significantly different across races. Notably, the overall safety of the school was a much stronger determinant of teachers' punitive behaviors, lack of empathy and respect toward Black students than it was for white students. Teacher empathy and respect led to greater feelings of being supported among all students; however, no relationship emerged between empathy and respect and students grades for Black students. Compared to White students, perceived punishment among Black and Latino students had a significantly stronger impact on students' grades.

**Discussion**

On a basic level, this study found that teachers’ attitudes and behaviors toward students and the school environment had a relationship with academic success among Black, Latino, and White students. Students of all races, who perceived their teachers to be more caring, respectful, and empathetic, and less punitive, generally reported higher grades. These students were also more likely than low achieving students to perceive their school environment to be safe, supportive, and fair.

Black and Latino students were more likely to feel unsafe in their school. Black students were also less likely than white students to perceive empathy and respect from their teachers, even when they were making good grades. Similarly, Black students perceived their teachers to be significantly more punitive. A Black student who reported C's was far more likely to perceive their teachers to be punitive than a White student who reported D's and F's.

The overall safety and fairness of the school influenced teachers' empathy and respect for Black students significantly more than for White students, as reported by the students. Black students at unsafe schools also reported more punitive teacher behaviors. Among students of all races, school safety significantly indirectly affected grades, however for Black and Latino students, safety
indirectly affected feelings of support.

When revisiting the theoretical framework, the findings demonstrate that teacher empathy is associated with improved academic outcomes, which is consistent with a humanistic perspective. With respect to CRT, racial dynamics appeared to alter the school environment along racial lines. White students' response patterns demonstrated a structure whereby teacher empathy and respect was central to students' academic success, school safety had no measurable influence on teachers' compassion for their students, and teacher punishment had no measurable impact on students' grades. Contrarily, Black students’ response patterns reflected a dynamic, whereby school safety significantly diminished the overall level of empathy and respect that students perceived from teachers and punishment from teachers significantly reduced students' grades.

The results of this study have implications for policymakers, curriculum writers, teacher preparation programs, and professional development and training sessions. Teacher preparation programs should expand multicultural class offerings and incorporate multicultural emersion experiences. Teacher trainees' educational process should allow students to examine their own beliefs, biases, and attitudes toward other races. Courses should include discussions and assignments that encourage students to understand their fears and vulnerabilities which will enable them to be conscious of their decision making process to be fair to all students regardless of race.

Readers should consider several limitations within the context of the findings. First, since data were collected about socially desirable attributes, some participants may have used impression management during self-report procedures. Although all surveys were confidential, it is likely that some respondents may have embellished grades and other desirable attributes, and denied suspensions and other negative attributes. In addition, the survey was lengthy and solicited information beyond this study’s scope. The length may have created some fatigue and led to “Yea-Saying” or “Nay-Saying”, whereby respondents tend to select only the positive or negative answers on the survey. Finally, this study measures students' perceptions and does not objectively record teachers' attitudes or behaviors.

A special issue of The Journal of Negro Education established guidelines for effective teacher education programs (Toldson, 2011b), which are relevant to the study findings. Overall, effective teacher education programs:

- Should prepare teachers of all races, genders, and socioeconomic backgrounds to educate diverse classrooms;
- Should contribute to eliminating the achievement and discipline gaps that exist between Black students and students of other races;
- Use modern approaches to helping teacher trainees understand diverse classrooms, such as the use of multimedia, documentary film, service learning, and volunteering;
- Use effective recruitment strategies to diversify America’s teaching force;
- Understand the influence of federal- and state-level educational policies on building teacher education programs to accommodate Black students;
- Respect the unique role of historically Black colleges and universities in preparing and recruiting Black teachers; and
- Actively work to combat institutional racism and culturally biased assess-
ments to promote teacher diversity and when training teachers to serve diverse classrooms.

**Recommendations for educational intervention and future research**

Research on the effects of teachers’ attitudes and its effects on Black, Latino, and White students is a vital concern as to develop culturally appropriate strategies to reduce teacher attrition, prevent high school dropout, and mitigate the impact of high stakes testing. School leaders need to understand how the teachers’ negative attitudes and behaviors towards students originate and what interventions improve the learning environment. Future research should focus on studying the benefits of teacher preparation programs. Multicultural awareness, teacher philosophy and theory, and classroom management courses should encourage open dialogue about self-awareness, identify their own biases, judgments, and behaviors towards other races.

Local and national measures and educational policies should address students’ feeling of safety, fairness, and support by school personnel. A replicate study should address the limitations of the current study and design a more specific survey with fewer questions to prevent fatigue and possible false responses. Future studies should also investigate if there is a significant difference between Black, Latino and White teachers with respect to their attitudes and behaviors toward Latino and Black students and the effects that may have on students and their perception and academic performance.

**Conclusions**

There are several important findings from this study, which contributes to the current literature base on teachers’ attitudes on race, environment, and behavior toward Black, Latino, and White students. The current research addresses a topic that is often ignored because of the discomfort with discussing biases and unfair treatment within the education system. Students’ perception of their teachers’ attitudes and behaviors affect their learning experiences. This has an accumulating and detrimental effect on the future of children and their education, which affect communities and society, and long-term effects on the lives of these children.
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Abstract

The first ethnic studies departments to be formed in the late 1960s and early 1970s often put physical communities surrounding their college and university campuses at the forefront of their missions. These departments shared a concentration in urban areas with their communities whose problems, including segregation, have only intensified since the 1970s. Many of these departments eventually merged with “area studies” programs that claimed to address the shifting migratory realities of the diaspora as well as economic demands on the university. How has the mission of “community service” and engagement experienced this transition? This paper surveys Latina/o Studies departments and program course offerings to understand the meaning and relevance of community service today.

Commitments to Community: Latina/o Studies Past and Present

As an ethnic minority, Latinos have long tied their struggles for integration to the educational system. Whether protesting segregation in the “Mexican Schools” of Texas during the 1940s or challenging irrelevant curricula in the East Los Angeles walkouts of the late 1960s, Latino communities have long rallied for influence in mainstream educational institutions. The economic and social changes of the late 1960s made the university a symbol of access to opportunity and the American Dream. The missions of early ethnic/Latino studies programs and departments
that emerged from these struggles emphasized improving the lives of the urban communities surrounding the university.

Most early Latina/o studies programs and departments began as the product of student struggles to expand opportunities at a particular university and to excel in academia. These struggles responded to a systematic failure by the university to provide Latina/os access to a quality education and, indirectly, by mainstream society to offer legitimate equal opportunity. Students advocated the increased presence of Latina/o faculty so they could see themselves represented in academia and proposed curricula that promoted positive self-images. Latino students also sought to introduce initiatives that responded to more specific needs within the community, such as bilingual education.

Latina/o Studies programs and departments were the product of both student struggles and community needs. Generally considered a “manifesto” for similar programs in Latino/Chicano Studies, students at the University of California-Santa Barbara, drafted the Plan de Santa Barbara in 1969 that outlined these needs. The Plan argued progress toward the American Dream required Latina/os to assimilate, which involved a loss of self and identity that also required the individual to leave the “barrio and la colonia,” loosely translated as both a physical and symbolic neighborhood and community. As a result, the “barrio and colonia” remained “exploited, impoverished, and marginal.”(Smith and Bender, 2008, 141)The Plan seated the distinction between the Latina/o individual and his/her community as a central problem that had to be challenged for both self preservation and collective progress.

The emergence of early Latina/o Studies programs and departments was often a reflection of how this central problem was tied directly to academia. Latino communities lacked institutional power, which made educational institutions an important and accessible stage for student struggles. The Plan viewed Chicano youth organizing campuses and communities in solidarity. It argued that students struggled to form Chicano Studies programs and departments in order to bring “university and college resources” into the community. The Plan called for “a strategic use of education” and recognition of “the central importance of institutions of higher learning to modern progress, in this case, to the development of our community.” It did not envision a top-down approach to development. Instead, it called for community involvement in Chicano students’ actions. For instance, it called for “barrio input” in designing and running programs and suggested a variety of community-university relationships that ultimately granted the former control over resources such as college credit, community centers, special programs and services, and some publishing and hiring at the university. Ultimately, the Plan stipulated “the best educational device is being in the barrio as often as possible.” The Plan recognized every “barrio” had its unique needs and it recommended students work in conjunction with other organizations. The Plan criticized the volunteer’s approach for reproducing a power imbalance between students and “the unfortunate.” Instead, the plan advocated students see they were “of the community, for the community.”

Latino Studies courses designed around community engagement were an important way to fulfill the Plan’s call to be “in the barrio as often as possible.” Although these courses varied, they institutionalized community engagement such that it became an important and systematic aspect of a department’s curriculum. One example is the peda-
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Logical model Community-Service Learning (CSL), which allows departments to revitalize founding missions that involve university students’ local communities. CSL also resolves two important dilemmas facing students. First, CSL validates Latino students’ community-based and potentially oppositional knowledge (Collins, 2008; Anzaldua). Second, CSL provides an important alternative for challenges facing Latino Studies departments.

Since the late 1960s, students in Latino Studies have become increasingly diverse. This diversity is both racial/ethnic and class-based, which present unique challenges to traditional modes of analysis in Latino Studies’ classrooms. For instance, the question of mobilizing and politicizing students begs the question of what ends such political action—should have. CSL outside of Latina/o Studies programs and departments clearly envision a different set of objectives. For example, in a CSL setting, the ethnic studies model competes with the idea students are “border crossers” and privileged in relation to the clients they serve. (Chesler, et.al., 2006)

Similarly, Latino Studies departments have also changed (Flores, 1997; Cában, 2003). Increasingly, student demands have pushed universities to prepare students for a global society and adopt Latin American/Latino Studies programs. These changes include Ivy League universities, many of which are removed from areas with surrounding Latino communities. Latina/o Studies programs and departments have also accommodated increased university demands to include area studies as part of their curriculum. For instance, some “Chicano Studies” became “Chicano and Latin American Studies” departments. Amidst these demographic and disciplinary shifts, students do not always come from local neighborhoods, communities or the barrio. Traditional classroom learning is increasingly detached from students’ lived experience and questions of how Latinos are represented intensify. As a direct and sustained form of community engagement, CSL has the potential to mediate bias in representing ethnic communities.

Latino Studies programs and departments are also increasingly challenged by the university context. On the one hand, Latino Studies faculty face increasing pressure to publish and changing expectations for tenure reduce the incentive for developing and teaching labor-intensive community-service learning courses. As Jones et al. note, “Faculty members confront balancing the additional demands required in teaching a service-learning class with...the goal of a thorough treatment of the course subject matter, and meeting the requisite publications for a successful tenure decision.” (Jones, et al. 2003, 210) Latino Studies departments also struggle for legitimacy in the university amidst threatened budgets. On the other hand, amidst budget challenges that include cutbacks, departmental consolidation or elimination, and hiring freezes, CSL is one way of making Latino Studies departments more relevant to the broader university.

At the same time that students and universities are distanced from their local context, many Latino communities face needs that exceed those stimulating the development of student struggles and demands. For instance, over 90% of the Latino population is located in urban areas. Studies show they remain geographically concentrated in barrios and residential segregation has increased since 1970 (Telles and Ortiz, 2008). This geographic concentration means Latino students are experiencing higher rates of school segregation than they were in the late 1960s and these rates are increasing (Orfield, 2001).
The following sections explore how Latino Studies departments institutionalize community engagement.

**Defining Community Service**

Community-service learning is *one* important avenue for realizing a variety of missions that involve students’ local communities. In its original conception, “giving back to the community” referred to a redistribution of resources from the university to the community. The meaning of barrio has changed, however, and its conceptual boundaries have become increasingly porous (Perez and Gurydy, 2010). Clearly “community” has changed meaning as students have diversified and as the “Latino community” itself is increasingly understood as part of an interconnected diaspora. The first step toward a viable understanding of CSL must first take into account what that community is, who it represents, and what resources it needs. For instance, Pedro Cabán (2003) considers Latino alumni, many of whom are leaders in their community, as an important basis of support for Latino Studies programs. Local communities and national organizations set up organizations that serve areas with a large Latino community, such as the YMCA. Religious communities also vary and serve large Latino populations by offering specific services in Spanish. In this study, however, a Latino “community” refers to a local (within reasonable distance from a college/university) and a geographically bound group of people that is physically accessible to university students.

Community service need not be organized by an organization. For instance, some department’s understanding of CSL may involve a class or university-wide project to assist community residents by building web pages, establishing community gardening, etc. What distinguishes this service is suggested by the *Plan*. More specifically, CSL should involve some redistribution of resources from the university to the community that avoids the detached action of a volunteer. CSL ideally seeks to disrupt the power dynamic embedded in a college student’s unreflexive performance of an action, such as clerical work or serving food in a soup kitchen. Instead, the student can represent a conduit for the infusion of technology and skill into the community. Beyond a flow of resources into the community, in much the same way the *Plan* prescribed community support for student action, it also suggested social change was a reciprocal relationship of respect and support between students and their community.

In this study, CSL includes projects involving community residents and/or organizations in effecting a particular outcome, participating in a community-based organization’s work as part of a course requirement, participatory-action research, and any other physical and direct engagement with a local Latina/o community. This definition is consistent with scholarship on Black Studies programs that “stressed ‘direct practical participation of the student within the structure of the black community.’” (Ford in Rogers 2010, 1125) Ideally, community engagement relies on some measure of student reflection. Community analyses without engagement, such as public policy courses, were excluded from consideration. CSL also assumes action is carried out by the student. As a result, other university-community liaisons, such as those initiated for the purposes of recruitment, are excluded from consideration as CSL. Although reciprocity between students and community-based institutions is ideal, it is beyond the scope of this study to analyze each program and/or department’s use of CSL.
Sample

The sample of CSL courses in Latino Studies programs and departments focused on colleges and universities that train students in a traditional classroom format. As a result, any courses, workshops, or seminars offered by research institutes like the Inter-University Program for Latino Research (IUPLR), the Institute for Latino Studies at the University of Notre Dame, or the Mauricio Gastón Institute for Latino Community Development and Public Policy were excluded from this study. Activism and community work by student clubs were also excluded. Finally, two-year community colleges that may have Latina/o Studies programs (such as Richland College’s Mexican/American Latino Studies Program) were excluded because they were assumed to increase the likelihood of undermining data integrity. Graduate programs and their research curricula were also excluded from this study in order to promote comparability with other research on ethnic/racial studies and community engagement.

Older Latino Studies programs, formed along nationalist lines, frequently used more specific labels that rejected an earlier generation’s goal of full cultural assimilation into the U.S. mainstream and affirmed cultural identity. Some departments adopted names like “Chicano and Latino Studies,” while others retained more specific labels like “Chicana/o Studies.” These changes have been marked by some tension (Rowe, 2010). As departments adopted the more inclusive title of “Latino,” some also moved beyond the masculine form to more gender neutral-language and changed their names to include “Latina/o or Chicana/o” in their names. These labels were used to identify departments and programs through an internet search, which informed the initial sample for this study. In contrast to these programs and departments, “Ethnic Studies” departments without a Latino program or concentration were excluded from the sample because they were assumed to be too generalized to answer the question of Latino Studies’ changing relationships to the community.

Changes at the university level meant many Latino Studies programs are now hyphenated and adjoined with area studies foci, i.e. Latino-Hispanic Studies, Latino/Latin American Studies, etc. It is nonetheless worth noting that this hyphenation is not only the result of university budgets. Circular migration and transnationalism have conjoined ethnic minorities and their immigrant counterparts (Pastor and Rosner, 2006). Increasingly, Latinos are embedded in a global process and live in homes with multiple generations (first, second, third) of immigrants.

Despite the increase of immigration from Latin America, approximately 60% of the Latina/o population is U.S. born. This study understands the concept of Latino to be grounded in the United States, and distinguishes Latino Studies from Latin American Studies. Although the importance of ethnic/racial inequality is potentially underscored by both types of departments, the study of native minorities’ experience is central to discovering persistent problems within local U.S. communities. Some departments studied Latina/os, but ultimately centered on Latin America. For example, the Latin American and Iberian Studies Department at the University of California at Santa Barbara “examines the people and cultures of Spanish and Portuguese speaking countries throughout the world. Such study encompasses … the Chicano and Puerto Rican populations in the U.S. However, most students center their studies on Latin America.” Other examples of this phenomenon are Oberlin College’s Department of Latin American Studies and
Department of Hispanic Studies, the University of Miami’s Center for Latin American Studies, or the University of South Florida’s Cuban Studies Certificate. Even the “Latino Studies” Program housed at Columbia College in Columbia University mirrored this tendency. Area studies departments that centered on Latin America and excluded an analysis of Latinos as an ethnic minority native to the United States were excluded from this study.

Method

Following the method adopted by similar scholarship in Black Studies (Rogers, 2010), this study surveyed online course catalogs for CSL offerings in programs and departments that met criteria outlined in the sample. The survey sought evidence of courses that required direct, physical engagement with a local Latina/o community because, as previous scholarship notes, “programs and departments tend to require those courses that their leaders believe are the most vital to their students’ disciplinary development.” (Rogers, 2010, 1128) Although this method meant a heavy reliance on website information, individuals were contacted for clarification in cases of discrepancies between the online course catalog and the program or department’s website, e.g. to ensure a course was not inactive. Confirming these discrepancies meant course catalogs tended to retain inactive courses. As a result, despite efforts to clarify discrepancies, one limitation of this method is that CSL offerings may be overestimated. They may be listed in a department’s catalog but remain inactive.

In other ways, this study considered courses in a wider variety of courses, programs and departments. Unlike previous scholarship in Black Studies, the survey was neither limited to required courses nor programs and departments offering a major. Instead, the survey distinguished those programs and departments that offered a specialization, certificate, minor, or major. It also distinguished required and elective CSL courses. The study assumes programs and departments that require a CSL course emphasize the importance of community engagement, but offering a CSL elective also provided students with an opportunity to actualize their academic learning through concrete experience working in the Latina/o community.

The question naturally arises of what the term working in the Latina/o community means. Despite increased attention to the Latina/o diaspora, study abroad programs were excluded from analysis because this study is particularly interested in engagement with U.S. based communities. Directed study and directed research courses were also excluded from analysis because they occur on an individual basis and do not reflect a curriculum’s commitment to community engagement. Finally, special topics courses that involve CSL were also excluded because they do not represent sustained engagement with a community.

In order to understand how Latino Studies programs and departments understood community involvement, i.e. working in the community, this study performed qualitative analysis of CSL-like course descriptions. Descriptions were coded for the purpose and type of community engagement. Work in the community could refer to an internship, a course explicitly labeled as “community-service learning,” research methods courses that explicitly stated there was a field methods component, and any other course that required field observation.
Findings

Based on the sampling criteria outlined above, 100 Latino Studies-focused programs and departments were identified. The internet search used to identify the sample may have inadvertently excluded smaller programs, departments, colleges, or universities. A state-by-state identification of programs or departments meeting the sampling criteria is listed below.

Each program and department was counted individually, even if they were part of a larger consortium. For instance, each college in the Five College Consortium in Massachusetts (Amherst, Hampshire, Mount Holyoke, Smith, University of Massachusetts-Amherst) was counted once because, even though each may offer additional minors and majors, they collectively offer a certificate in Latin American, Caribbean, and Latino Studies. Similarly, a major in Chicana/o-Latina/o Studies is offered cooperatively through the five Claremont Colleges (Claremont McKenna, Harvey Mudd, Scripps, Pitzer, and Pomona).

Of the 100 undergraduate programs and departments, 46 offered certificates, specializations, or minors. The rest of the sample was major-granting departments in some variety of Chicano/Latino/Puerto Rican Studies program or department. These included Latino Studies programs and departments within interdisciplinary studies and ethnic studies majors, such as those offered by California State University-Fullerton (Chicana and Chicano Studies), Sonoma State University (Chicano and Latino Studies), and City College of New York (Dominican Studies).

The majority (56/100) of undergraduate programs and departments in the sample explicitly used the term Latino in their name. One third (33) explicitly referred to Chicana/o in their program or department names. In contrast, only four “Puerto Rican,” three “Mexican American,” one “Dominican,” “Black and Hispanic,” and “Transborder” programs or departments were included in the sample. The shift toward a panethnic identification may suggest programs and departments have broadened their attention beyond local communities. In contrast, the majority of programs and departments that were identified only as “Chicano” or “Chicana/o” offered or required some form of direct community engagement within their curriculum.

Of the 100 undergraduate programs and departments, 61 offered some form of engagement outside the classroom with a Latina/o community. This engagement was

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Programs or Departments</th>
<th>States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CT, CO, DC, IA, IN, MD, MN, NH, OH, OR, PA, WY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>AZ, KY, NE, NM, WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MI, NC, TX, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
not necessarily required, institutionalized, or even local. Local community engagement could be limited to observational field trips within a course. Similarly, courses with some form of community engagement, including CSL, could be elective, inactive, or infrequently offered. As a result, although a majority of programs and departments demonstrated some concern for community and empirical engagement as part of their curriculum, the meaning of this engagement varied greatly.

Analysis

Data was collected on courses that included the key words “internship,” “service learning,” and “field” in their description. This method revealed community engagement is not standardized. A course that explicitly used the term “service learning” was, upon further analysis, comparable to those referring to “fieldwork,” “field research,” “field project,” “field internship,” or an “internship.” Some courses did not use these terms although they clearly involved “work” in the community. For instance, the Chicana/o Studies Program at California State University Dominguez Hills has a course titled “Practicum in Chicana and Chicano Studies.” The description referred to “supervised work experience in a Chicano/Latino community with emphasis upon social and economic development in a local, national, or international setting.” Some form of community engagement was required in 14 of the 61 programs and departments, less than one quarter of the sample.

Initially, this study hypothesized that, rather than the reciprocity a “service learning” course could encourage, reference to fieldwork or an internship implied the student was the primary beneficiary in an engagement with a local community. Hypothetically, a lack of CSL courses within a program or department could be a finding that programs and departments do not generally see service to the community as a vital aspect of their students’ development. Upon further analysis, however, the frequency with which programs and departments used multiple descriptors for courses that involved local communities suggests “service” is one of several ways community engagement is labeled. The use of multiple descriptors may allow programs and departments to adapt their offerings to their local environments, which include demands placed on them by university administrators.

Community “service learning” was only formally and directly mentioned in 22 courses, across 61 programs and 119 courses that offered some form of community engagement within the sample. Of these opportunities for community service, a pattern emerges. “Service learning” is an irregularly offered course or one aspect of a course that is not consistently tied to CSL. CSL most frequently represented an elective or one of several options for fulfilling a degree requirement.

As one of several options, references to CSL in degree requirement descriptions considered it to be interchangeable with study abroad opportunities in seven cases. For instance, DePaul University’s Latin American and Latino Studies program encourages an internship, which can be in “a Latino community organization...[or] a U.S.-based organization that focuses on Latin America, or as part of a study abroad experience with a public service organization in a Latin American country.” Although the three options offer students radically dissimilar experiences, the example suggests departments do not consider direct, physical engagement with a local community to be vital to their students’ development. It also suggests that studying Latinos in the United States is interchangeable with un-
nderstanding the experience of Latin Americans abroad.

Some community-based and community-service learning did not originate in a Latina/o studies programs or departments. For instance, students with a concentration in Latina Studies at the University of Michigan have a series of options for CSL. Requirements stipulate they must be “in a Latino context,” but the courses are offered by traditional departments like Sociology and Psychology. As a result, past ideals about redistribution of resources no longer seems explicitly tied to “service.” In another example, Amherst College offers several community-based learning courses whose organizations, like Holyoke High School and Northampton Jail, indirectly serve a large Latino (Puerto Rican) population. Despite the coincidence, the courses do not count directly toward the Five College’s Latin American, Caribbean, and Latino Studies (LACLS) Certificate. Instead, courses counting toward the certificate are approved in advance by a student’s advisor.

This example of CSL at Amherst demonstrates a broader trend where individual students could request a course count toward a certificate. Many programs and departments have shifted responsibility away from institutionalizing CSL and onto program directors for evaluating experiential learning. The problem with this practice is that standards may vary by director. This individualized practice also fails to systematically tie curricula to community engagement.

Study abroad programs, directed study, directed research, and special topics courses were excluded from the analysis for this study. Nonetheless, the variety of experiences offered by programs and departments made this exclusion difficult. For instance, instances where a student was required to seek instructor permission for community engagement, particularly when it included field research or an internship, closely resembled what many departments would label a “directed study” or “directed research.” This phenomenon suggests that community engagement is not institutionalized in many programs, even though the majority of programs and departments at least offer some form of community engagement.

Some departments encouraged students to engage in a relatively ambiguous “immersion” experience. For instance, Northwestern University’s Latina and Latino Studies’ Department requires students to have an “experience with Latina/o communities in the US or a Latina/o transnational counterpart.” The experience may include study abroad, field studies, an internship, a senior thesis, a service-learning project, or courses in “performance with a US Latina/o focus.” The program director is responsible for evaluating this experience based on an individual, case-by-case review. Similarly, the field referred to in a “field study” course was distinguished by course number in the Latin American and Latino Studies Program at University of California-Santa Cruz. One of the two courses defined the field to include “Latin America, the Caribbean, or nonlocal Spanish-speaking community in the U.S.”

Discussion

Changes in Latino Studies programs and departments suggest the meaning of “interdisciplinary” has shifted to include “area studies” and an expanded understanding of the Latino diaspora. Circular migration and transnationalism have rendered “the Latino experience” an increasingly variegated subject of study and analysis. This shift appears to have displaced a more nationalist understanding of the Latino experience formerly
centered on ethnic displacement and colonization. Although the expansion of indisciplinarity and analysis of “difference” may enrich our understanding of the Latino in the United States, it requires grounding in empirical evidence and lived experience. After all, difference is dynamic and shifts according to an ever-evolving context.

In the past, the community was a central subject and critical aspect of Latino Studies programs and departments. For instance, the Latina/o Studies Program at Williams College writes:

“the earliest Latina/o Studies programs...distinguished themselves through their adherence to three theoretical and pragmatic ideals that characterize many Latina/o Studies programs to this day: collective work and scholarly collaboration; a commitment to uniting theory and practice; and an interdisciplinary focus. One of Latina/o Studies’ other central characteristics is its reliance on a theoretical development that is not removed from the lived realities of subjugated communities and individuals.”

Unfortunately, this paper’s analysis reveals many Latina/o Studies programs do not institutionalize these ideals in their curricula.

An analysis of community engagement, particularly through CSL courses, demonstrates that programs and departments largely confine analysis of the Latino experience to textbooks and traditional classroom settings. Courses involving direct contact with a local Latino community that are not a required, institutionalized or coherently integrated aspect of a particular program or department’s curriculum means students miss not only the rich, integrated understanding a local community can provide, but also alternate possibilities for understanding the Latino experience. For example, the Department of Africana and Puerto Rican/Latino Studies at Hunter College (City University of New York) offers two courses that involve fieldwork in African-American/Black and Latino Communities. It sees its history as a response to community needs and as a product of community mobilization. In their struggles at Hunter, Black and Latino communities and students forged a coalition and sought not only greater inclusion and relevance in school curricula, but also improvement in the quality of instruction, which involved the introduction of bilingual education, instruction on Black and Puerto Ricans’ historical and cultural experiences, and community control over elementary schools. Black and Puerto Rican students “petitioned, picketed, sat-in, and took over campuses to make the public aware of the fact that the University, which had been established to serve the city's working class more than a century before, was reneging on its mission.”

As part of a mission that responded to community needs, students sought to introduce open admissions, academic and counseling support for low income students, and Black and Puerto Rican studies departments. The department continues to struggle against exclusion in the academy and the nation, which includes “forging links between the College and the communities we study.”

As Latino Studies curricula lessen its commitments to local communities, it misses an opportunity to play a role in mediating the negative consequences for community development occasioned by our current, protracted recession. The social and economic challenges facing Latino communities include increased residential segregation and school re-
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segregation. More recent data also show Latinos have been disproportionately affected by the recession and increased the wealth gap relative to Whites (Kochhar, et. al. 2011, 1). A “missed opportunity” in this context literally means that Latino Studies programs and departments are failing to address a problem of “separate and unequal” in local Latino communities that stimulated their development. Even where a program and department did not develop in the late 1960s, all Latino Studies programs and departments owe an intellectual debt to their predecessors that fostered a new generation of Latina/o scholars and scholarship.

CSL promotes the ideal of redistributing resources from the university, through students and their education, to the community. For example, CSL courses can provide college and university students with experiences that include mentoring high school students. This mentorship can help lessen the effects of increasingly strained budgets faced by urban schools. The experience could promote college readiness and reduce costs in remedial courses. The University of Minnesota’s Department of Chicano Studies offers a course that compliments academic learning on “youth education” with the requirement that students tutor and mentor “in culturally grounded programs.” In another example, the University of California Santa Barbara’s Chicana and Chicano Studies Department offers a course that places students in area schools as part of a research team on bilingual and multicultural education.

Increasingly, Latino students find themselves shut out of a college or university for financial reasons. Each academic year includes tuition hikes that challenge working-class and Latino students’ ability to attain a higher education. Similarly, sources for scholarships and financial aid are declining amidst our extended recession. Students face challenges in finding part-time jobs they normally used to subsidize their education. These experiences tie Latino students more closely to their communities than ever before.

Ideally, CSL in Latino Studies programs and departments offer mutual benefits to students and community. The findings of this analysis demonstrate CSL has become equivalent to an internship or field research, which offer students professional opportunities in and outside of academia. CSL also promotes the likelihood students can expand professional networks and find a job after graduation. Students can apply and strengthen their academic learning, for instance, in learning how to write grants with community-based organizations. Particularly amidst rising tuitions and the high unemployment of an economic downtown, students experiencing financial troubles can interrupt their sense of personal isolation and develop an understanding of how social, economic, and political problems are socially patterned public issues. Finally, scholars like Randall Osborne, et. al. find that in similar courses, service-learning participants were more likely to show positive improvements in “cognitive complexity, social competency, perceived ability to work with diverse people, and self-certainty” (Osborne, et. al., 1998, 5).

Latino Studies programs and departments are frequently challenged to prove their value amidst shrinking university endowments. Service learning also has broader political support that can strengthen Latino Studies programs and departments. In 2009, President Obama signed the Edward M. Kennedy Serve America Act, which “reauthorizes and

\[^{2}\text{Ibid.}\]
expands” earlier national service programs instituted under the National Community Service Trust Act (NCSTA). NCSTA had “provided high school and college students with funding to perform community service for academic credit...[and] allowed students to serve their communities in exchange for college tuition.” (Jones, et. al., 2003, 209)

Currently, grants are available to higher education institutions under the “Learn and Serve America” program to promote service learning projects.

**Conclusion**

As Latino Studies curricula lessen its commitments to local communities, it misses an opportunity to play a role in mediating the negative consequences for community development occasioned by our current, protracted recession. A missed opportunity in this context literally means that Latino Studies programs and departments are failing to address a problem of “separate and unequal” in local Latino communities that stimulated their development. Even where a program and department did not develop in the late 1960s, all Latino Studies programs and departments owe an intellectual debt to their predecessors that fostered a new generation of Latina/o scholars and scholarship.

Of perhaps greater concern is studying Latinos without experiencing community may risk reifying difference. Increasingly, Latino Studies programs and department appear to be moving the transmission of knowledge away from the Plan’s call for direct experience with “the lived realities of subjugated communities and individuals.” In essence, former lessons on displacement and colonization have taken on a new face. Local communities are displaced and colonized as objects of Latino Studies programs and departments.

Latino Studies programs and departments may inadvertently create a discipline that students originally struggled against. Recognizing that circular migration and transnationalism render the Latino experience increasingly complex and dynamic, a particular program or department’s failure to engage local communities mean individual students do not see themselves represented in the curriculum and may feel alienated. This alienation is undoubtedly a product of increased inequality within the Latino community. At many colleges and universities, working-class Latina/o students that hail from local communities may find they share little in common with another student who is primarily interested in understanding Latin America. Nonetheless, many Latino Studies programs and departments do not directly engage the “barrio and la colonia” in their curricula. In this way, they inadvertently reproduce the barrio’s status as an “exploited, impoverished, and marginal” object of study.
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Abstract

This essay is the first scholarly analysis of the politics of urban rebellion and the performativity of black masculinity and class in SNCC leader and honorary Black Panther member Rap Brown’s autobiographical manifesto Die Nigger Die! The analysis contends that Brown’s style, his performance as a black badman, his anecdotes about the insecurity of his boyhood, and his interest in both self-defense and violence in the text, create an ethos surrounding black power leadership that is exclusively masculine and that is focused on the politics of urban black male resistance to white supremacy. Finally, the essay argues that urban educators can use Brown’s text to understand critical whiteness as well as to challenge white supremacy and colorism.


The Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) was well known for its nonviolent direct action programs in Southern cities during the 1960s. From the sit-ins to the Freedom Rides, SNCC’s prestige in the American South grew because of these public confrontations with white supremacy, despite the youth of its organizers and participants. Founding leaders like John Lewis, Fannie Lou Hamer, Julian Bond, Ella Baker, James Forman, and Bob Moses steered the organization toward direct action campaigns that challenged the segregated public spaces of
the American South and their efforts produced the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party in the winter and spring of 1963–4 and the March on Washington in August of 1963. By the beginning of 1966, however, ideological battles raged in SNCC between the old guard, led by executive secretary James Forman and chairman John Lewis, and the new guard, led by Stokely Carmichael and H (ubert) “Rap” Brown. The growing dissatisfaction with the nonviolence of the group, the disappointment with traditional modes of political power, and the increasing influence of Malcolm X’s separatism led SNCC to split into two factions (Haines, 1988). The first was still committed to an interracial struggle for civil rights and led by Forman and Lewis. Led by Carmichael, the second embraced Malcolm X’s Black Nationalism.

As SNCC members embraced Carmichael’s slogan of “black power,” they also “rejected the use of white organizers, accepted self-defense, and replaced the goal of integration with that of black pride and separatism” (Haines, 1988, p. 61). Veterans like John Lewis and Julian Bond resigned due to Carmichael’s emphasis on black separatism, which began to undermine SNCC’s ability build multiracial coalitions (McCartney, 1992, p. 113). The absence of these veterans hampered SNCC’s projects in the South, while also hindering the organization’s ability to secure northern funding for its activism (Carson, 1981). Ultimately, this break marked the decline of SNCC, though not before it transformed the racial landscape in America as the civil rights struggle focused on the intersection of race and power in more northern urban spaces.

In May of 1967, twenty-three-year old activist H. “Rap” Brown (now Jalil al-Amin) succeeded Stokely Carmichael as the chairman of SNCC and tried to re-energize black power agitation after Carmichael’s resignation from an organization that increasingly saw him as a public lightening rod for criticism. Brown “was initially chosen for the post because it was believed that he would be less abrasive and less vulnerable to charges of irresponsibility and extremism” than Carmichael (Haines, 1981, p. 61). James Forman wrote that Brown’s “way of speaking, his whole style, has a grass-roots quality that gave him mass appeal” (1972, p. 504). It was this kind of appeal that made Brown a controversial and popular speaker on black power; it also marked him as a target by the federal government.

The Newark and Detroit rebellions prompted Brown to speak about this pervasive urban unrest on July 23, 1967, in Cambridge, Maryland, a town with a population of
14,000 residents, one-fifth of which were black (Levy, 2003). Brown spoke for forty minutes about racial pride and told the city’s residents, “If America don’t come around, we going burn it down, brother” (in Carson, 1981, p. 255). He also “warned that black people were faced with genocide as a result of poor living conditions and the drafting of young black men to fight in Vietnam. He told black people to take over white-owned stores” and “advised blacks to prevent whites from coming into their community” (in Carson, 1981, p. 255). Though no violence occurred during Brown’s speech in Cambridge, shots were fired between black residents and police afterwards. Brown led rioters to Cambridge’s business district where they burned and looted stores and a black primary school that Brown had derided as inferior to white schools (Carson, 1981, p. 255).

The clash in Cambridge between the local police officers and black residents prompted a major FBI investigation and was widely covered in the press as yet another race riot. This was party due to what Kennicott and Page (1971, p. 326), have termed Brown’s “persuasive potency” as a fiery orator and partly due to the fear that black power advocates inspired in urban communities as they transgressed white civic space. Vice President Spiro Agnew weighed in after Cambridge, hailing Carmichael and Brown as “twin priests of violence,” “apostles of anarchy [who] spew hatred,” and a “malignancy out of control” (Williams, 2006, p. 90). After Cambridge, Brown became the target of extreme state repression at the top of FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover’s Rabble Rouser Index (O’Reilly, 1989, p. 277). Hoover was particularly threatened by the popularity of orators such as Brown, who he feared would become a “black messiah” (D’Arcus, 2003, p. 726). Hoover saw Brown as the epitome of a new kind of mobile troublemaker, traveling across the country inspiring urban rebellions. In response, he urged the passage of harassment and anti-riot laws designed to disrupt the organizing of black power organizations like SNCC (Jones, 1988).

Given that Brown was such a polarizing leader in one of the most important civil rights organizations of the movement, scholars would hope to find much work on his role in SNCC’s transformation and decline, but scholarship on Brown and his legacy has been sporadic at best since the 1970s. This essay resuscitates an important place for Brown in histories of the black power movement by providing the first close textual analysis of the gender and racial dynamics of his autobiography Die Nigger Die! and an assessment of its contribution for urban educators and their students. As a method, close textual analysis is an essential tool in comprehending the rationales for black power, as movement leaders understood it, because of the method’s focus on the relationship between the narrative of the text and its relationship to political context (Lucas, 1988). Close textual analysis is particularly appropriate since it helps the reader understand textual violence, dominance, and resistance by examining how racism is expressed and how it is understood textually (Meijer, 1993).

Consequently, the essay begins with an examination of the politics of urban rebellion and the performativity of black masculinity and class in Brown’s autobiography. I argue that Brown’s legitimacy and ethos as an urban leader emanates from his position as a heroic badman where his willingness to embrace self-defense highlights his dedication to eradicating the structural inequality in urban America. Next, I contend that Brown’s urban style, performance as a black badman in games like the dozens, and interest in both
self-defense and violence in the text serve as inventive possibilities for his leadership of SNCC, especially as he confronts the racism of white liberals and the colorism within black communities.

Finally, from this textual case study of Brown’s public discourse, educators have a historical and literary context through which to understand the perils and promises of black masculinity in urban America, the instrumental nature of violence and self-defense in urban centers, and the emergence of radical pedagogies that encourage reflections on critical whiteness and radical blackness. As Pough (2002, p. 470) reminds us, close textual engagement with Black Power autobiographies provides “useful pedagogical tools” because these writings offer “enlightening, informative, and provocative examples” of resistance praxis. Analyses of the text and context of these memoirs become starting points for critical thinking and writing “that allow students the opportunity to question the education they received” (p. 475). Given the close relationship between the Black Power movement and the rise of both Black Studies and multicultural education in the American academy, a prominent leader like Brown provides substantial space for pedagogical reflection on issues of gender, race, and class in social activism (Joseph, 2010; Rojas, 2007; Collins, 2006; Gates, 1989).

Black Heroes, Badmen, and the Dozens: Resisting White Authority

To understand the leadership of men like Brown involved in the black power phase of the civil rights movement, it is incumbent to understand the political archetype of the black “badman.” In black history and folklore, the black “badman” has been an audacious and heroic slave figure with a heightened sense of injustice that has led him into confrontation with white slave masters. Badmen were lauded for their style, and wit as they exposed the hypocrisy of their enemies and criticized white institutions, values, and norms (Cobb, 1994, p. 169). Historical badmen like Gabriel Prosser, Nat Turner, Frederick Douglass, Jack Johnson, and Malcolm X as well as badmen of black folklore like Stagolee, Casey Jones, and John Henry have circulated so widely as heroes in black life because they provide inventive possibilities for black masculine performance as resistance to white racism. “These badmen…were so bad…that they threatened to live forever in the eternal arch of myth: to kick ass (as the vernacular would have it) for one lifetime and to take names for the next” (O’Meally, 1982, p. 44). The badman makes such an impact on the popular imaginary because he “violates social conventions and spaces, virtually at will and thereby represents not just black disdain for American oppression…but the ability to face hardship and to win” because of his cleverness and raw power (O’Meally, 1982, p.44). Although black badmen abound in black folklore, fiction, and history, there is a shortage of critical inquiry into the genesis and performance of badmen in social movements where they emerge to rally publics to social action. Badmen like Fredrick Douglass, Marcus Garvey, Malcolm X, and Stokely Carmichael have served as a constant source of radical vision for black leaders and have helped to create what Moses (2004) has termed the “creative conflict in African American thought.” Although Williams (2006, p.90), places Brown in the company of these badmen as a significant black power leader, no study to date has placed Rap Brown himself into the framework of the black badman to understand his contribution to SNCC’s urban politics.
Nonetheless, just a glance at the list of badmen in black history highlights the differences among their ideologies, styles, and political positions. O’Meally argues that there are two kinds of black badmen: “the bad badman and the moral badman” (1982, p.44). No law governs the bad badman and he is quick to use violence to settle a dispute, often against other blacks. The bad badman is also stylish and verbally adroit, which illustrates his leadership within a community of male peers. Moral badmen, however, believe in working within American institutions to change society. They “achieve their victories by annihilating stereotyped conceptions about black strength and aggression under pressure; by coolly beating the white man at his own game” (O’Meally, 1982, p.45). Ultimately, badman lore preserves the black (male) hero, providing hope for a new beginning, and encourages black Americans to fight their (white) oppressors more directly.

Brown combines the best traits of both types of badmen: the morality and self-awareness of the moral badman and the style and aggressiveness of the bad badman. Brown sets himself up to be the perfect ratio of the two types of badmen, which is embodied in his confrontational urban style. Pearson (1994) notes that after becoming chairman of SNCC, “Brown had completely transformed himself. His natural was larger than Carmichael’s, and he constantly wore sunglasses. He no longer sported fratboy-like clothing, choosing instead casual street clothes” (p.139). His style also came to include a beret and boots, similar to the uniform of the Black Panthers, which helped to build the military style of the freedom fighter and revolutionary. West (1993, p. 40) notes that historically, black men have used their physicality to challenge patriarchy within both black and white communities. He contends, “For most young black men, power is acquired by stylizing their bodies over space and time in such a way that their bodies reflect their uniqueness and provoke fear in others.” Brown certainly adhered to this strategy in using his body as a constant challenge to white masculinity in the cities where he spoke. His “outlaw” style, fiery oratory, and occupation of white space “engender[ed] fears...that derive from the sense of public space as uncontrolled pace, as a space in which civilization is exceptionally fragile” (Mitchell, 2003, p. 13). In places like Cambridge, Newark, Detroit, and San Francisco, Brown’s racialized and gendered performances of black power politics rendered visible the dynamics of exclusion that marked public space (D’Arcus, 2004, p. 355).

Brown’s body politics as a badman were an intervention into the physical space of segregated cities that link him to an entire bodily history of black male resistance from slavery through the present. This kind of rebel black male body is forever connected to the history of lynching because it dually signifies eroticism and destruction where “the ritual dismemberment of black male bodies was an essential part of the attempt to deny to black men the power to resist, rebel, or revolt” (Carby, 1988, p. 129). Thus, Brown’s physical resistance to segregation in America’s urban centers links him to the leaders of slave revolts, to prison revolutionaries, and to Black Nationalism’s martyr, Malcolm X, who articulated the “renegade Black male viewpoint that developed during the enslavement of Blacks” (Jennings, 2006, p. 52). Brown’s lengthy discussion of Malcolm’s legacy is an indication that he sees his own urban leadership as a successor to him. This nostalgia for possibly the quintessential badman leader positions Brown against middle-class black people or Americans that supported integration.
but it also highlights the centrality of hyper-masculine physical performance to black power leadership. The badman persona helps to reaffirm that the history of black resistance has always been masculine and that any move to assert black leadership must be done by replicating this style of black masculinity in boys and men.

**Black Heroes: Boyhood and Manhood**

In the replication of black masculinity, the passage from boyhood to manhood has been fraught with terror in the white supremacist culture. This is because slavery and segregation “shrank the youth of most black boys into a ‘tasteless sycophancy’ which not only disrupts adolescence but dooms these young men to a life of mimicry, to a mere...parody of masculinity, a parody which results in their being denied a full role in the patriarchal social and political order” (Carby, 1998, p. 32). In managing segregated space through surveillance and violence, whites have historically controlled the places where citizenship was performed or denied, from the most mundane rituals of childhood to the most spectacular political clashes in public space. Racial and gender anxiety is most apparent at the boundaries of urban public spaces, which “provide important concrete settings in which citizenship in enacted” (D’Arcus, 2004, p. 358). For many black men, the badman archetype has helped to highlight both the repression and opposition that characterize this intersection of race, masculinity, and social class where the performance of citizenship in public space is defined by segregation and patrolled by violence.

Brown begins his critique of white supremacy through anecdotes about his boyhood, where he narrates the terror of black boyhood, especially in the white spaces of Baton Rouge, Louisiana. At the Blundon Orphanage Home, where his formal education began, Brown says, “It was operated by white missionaries whose role was similar to that of whites in Africa. Civilize the savage through Christianity. Savages in this case being Black kids from families too poor to support them” (p.14). In the orphanage, boys had to fight, run, or tom. Brown writes that he perfected all three, adding, “We didn’t even have time for a childhood. If you acted like a child, you didn’t survive and that’s all there was to it” (p. 18). Without a childhood, black boys quickly became men under the watchful eyes of benevolent whites and they emulated the tougher boys in their urban neighborhoods. Here, hypermasculinity and aggressive self-protection were socialized within white institutions, though these were also coping strategies necessary for survival in impoverished urban centers (Williams, 2006, p. 90).

Brown remembers the childhood heroes who earned his respect on the streets and he talks generally about how boys become leaders in their urban communities. He writes of the heroes that will never be remembered outside of Baton Rouge, noting, “In this world, the Cats like Pie-man, Ig, Yank, Smokey, Hawk, Lil Nel...Young bloods wanted to be like these brothers. They were the men in our community. They had all the women and had made their way to the top through sports and knowing the streets” (p. 15). These badmen underscored how manhood was proven: through women, sports, and street smarts. In this passage, the replication of generations of young black male leaders again takes place through other men, rather than through women, who are merely commodities that indicate status rather than sisters in the struggle.

Brown also voices approval of the badmen who are the templates for his black power leadership style. He boasts, “Once I’d es-
tablished my reputation, cats respected it” (p. 15). But he sees this space of black boyhood as a place where young black boys were “perpetually at war” because of the tribes and gangs that parcel out neighborhoods in Baton Rouge (p. 15). For black boys, urban mobility was limited by both segregation and gang activity; unless you were recognized as a badman, you could not move freely through neighborhoods without having to fight (p. 15). Although Brown seems acutely aware of how the competitiveness of the streets often becomes “black-on-black” violence, he still heroizes the badmen of his neighborhood who earned the respect to move unobstructed through town. This descriptive strategy highlights how black power becomes palatable to young urban black men because it acknowledges their propensity for both resisting and conforming to white patriarchy through violence.

In acknowledging the complexity of this transition from boyhood to manhood, Brown attributes the permanence of this warring tribalism in urban communities to civilizationist-brain washing but he also acknowledges the black poverty in the urban South. In his critique of this intersection of class and race, Brown writes of the fatalism of young black men saying, “You grow up in Black america and it’s like living in a pressure cooker. Babies become men without going through childhood. And when you become a man, you got nothing to look forward to and nothing to look back on” (p. 17). These pressures lead young black men to take up drinking, drugs or religion to cope with the poverty of their present and the lack of a future. Brown adds, “America is the country that makes you want things, but doesn’t give you the means to get those things” (p.18). This intersectional critique of class and race underscores the sense of worthlessness pervading impoverished urban communities and asks the reader to identify and understand the origins of Brown’s cultural nationalism. Brown argues that a black man’s worth in America is directly related to his property. If you don’t have property, you don’t exist. To this Brown adds, “When a race of people is oppressed within a system that fosters the idea of competitive individualism, the political polarization around individual interests prevents group interests…. So individuals join tribes or groups to further their own personal ambitions. It’s one of the things that keeps us fighting ourselves instead of the enemy” (16-17).

Here, self-defense and violence in American cities are prefigured by white violence and poverty in those urban spaces that create competition. The alternative to this paradigm is to become an activist, and Brown’s strategy here is to recruit among the hopeless by directing their energy at the state, rather than at each other.

Brown spent his youth in Baton Rouge perfecting his skills at the dozens, a verbal duel that ruins the reputation of an opponent by making fun of him through rhyming taunts (Gates, 1988, p. 71-74). By perfecting black vernacular on the street, Brown taught himself the rhetorical skills necessary to express his emotions, undermine the credibility of an opponent, humiliate an enemy, rally a crowd, and build his notoriety as a verbal tactician. Playing the dozens was a key component in building a reputation among badmen through signifying in competition where the winner of a bout “was determined by the way they responded to what was said. If you fell over each other laughing, then you knew you’d scored. It was a bad scene for the dude that was getting humiliated. I seldom was. That’s why they call me Rap, “cause I could rap.” (p. 26-27) Hubert Brown was reborn as “Rap” and through the dozens, he was recog-
nized for his style and his rhetorical prowess. As his notoriety spread, Brown’s style and coolness embraced the inherent aggression, ritualized sexuality, verbal play, ambivalence towards women, and cruelty that often mark this vernacular. But even prominent analyses (Gates, 1988) of Brown’s thrilling performances ignore the role that signifying played in Brown’s passage from boyhood to manhood, from adolescent to black power leader. Brown reports that playing the dozens develops the respect central to a positive black masculinity, especially in combating the self-hate and cultivated by the competitive atmosphere of their urban neighborhoods (Brown, 2002, p. 15). For Brown, self-defense was an obvious extension of the social hierarchies inherent in the urban space of his childhood and it also underscores the importance of self-reliance in the rhetoric of black power, since insecurity often characterizes black boyhood.

In the anecdotes about his childhood, Brown also highlights the centrality of illegitimate “authority” exercised by the state, even against young boys. Here, the illegitimacy of state authority provides the warrant for badman behavior against the oppressiveness of urban segregation. Brown explains that white authority pervades black life by telling black men “what’s right and what’s wrong and how to do and how not to do and all of it is designed to keep him oppressed, to keep him down. All of that is reinforced by negro america, which is a mirror of the big white world and does the white world’s job inside the black community” (p. 47). Here, Brown’s confrontational rhetoric challenges white Americans by marshaling the ethical authority to name and undermine institutionalized racism. By internalizing white supremacy, Brown argues that black Americans internalized their oppression and perpetuated their submission through accommodationism.

This rhetorical strategy allows for no compromise with white America: only a total loyalty to Black Power and its black male heroes.

In his anecdotes about his time as a college student at Southern University, Brown extends this argument by highlighting the difference between legitimate and coercive authority, which frames his black power ideology. As civil rights agitation began to grip black communities in the South in 1960, Brown began to question the separate rules of conduct and decorum that policed the boundaries of white and black worlds, especially when they collided in the urban university. His experiences caused him to theorize about the nature of coercive authority in educational space and he comments at length about the importance of earning respect rather than submitting to authority. He explains, “[W]hen you’re in a certain position and you tell a cat to do something with no grounds for it, it provokes a type of rebellious behavior” (p. 48). In this contrast between legitimate and coercive authority, we are encouraged to see Brown’s rebellion against authority as a synecdoche of political struggle from childhood, through college, after joining SNCC, and as he became a black power leader. This theme of illegitimate white authority becomes a key warrant for Brown’s identity as a badman and also a part of his articulation of black power because he sees it as the source of urban oppression.

Brown’s elaboration on the difference between respect and authority is accompanied on the succeeding page by two pictures. At the top of the following page is a round slogan (Fig. 1), which says “LBJ for the USA” as President Johnson looks sternly at the reader (who is presumably internalizing Brown’s message). Below the image of Johnson is a
picture of President Kennedy signing legislation in the presence of Hubert Humphrey and several other self-congratulating white legislators.
Brown’s dialogue on respect and authority continues on the following pages replete with images of Hubert Humphrey, whose head is pasted onto the body of Tarzan (complete with loincloth), with Fay Wray at his feet. Next to the image is the slogan, “America’s Number One Hero” (Fig. 2).

On the facing page, Brown writes, “In this country, authority is a cover for wrong. I don’t respect wrong and I don’t respect authority that represents wrong. And old cracker [expletive] Lightning Bug Johnson knows
that’s true, because I told him myself” (p. 51). These pictures indict the ethics of the Johnson administration, undermine the masculinity of Johnson and Humphrey, and serve to highlight the politics of whiteness that frame his interaction with them, thereby articulating Brown’s dominance over these politicians.

Brown continues by recollecting his altercation with Johnson during a visit at the White House when he visited as the Chairman for the Non-Violent Action Group (NAG) during the Selma March. He recalls Johnson as “arrogant as hell and mad ‘cause we were there” (p. 52). He explains that Johnson’s whole attitude was dismissive. During the visit, Brown began to get insulted by the accommodationist tone that the NAG folks were using with Johnson. He reports that he told Johnson, “I’m not happy to be here and I think it is unnecessary that we have to be here protesting the brutality that Black people are subjected to. And furthermore, I think that the majority of Black people that voted for you wish that they had gone fishing” (p. 53). This confrontation provides a prime rhetorical space for Brown to demonstrate his verbal prowess as a badman. Brown castigates the LBJ White House for its civil rights failures. As a badman, Brown uses a language of dominance that destroys Johnson’s credibility as a man and as a leader through a vernacular that would appeal to urban black readers. Brown adds,

To me, Johnson was a dude who used his position against people and I can’t buy that…. The President ain’t nothing but another man. And Johnson was a big-eared, ugly, red-necked cracker…. And when I was tearing into Johnson’s [expletive], Humphrey, who is supposed to be a ‘liberal,’ was getting madder than a pimp with dog [expletive] on his shoe. So I looked at him and knew where he was at. The little red punk. (p. 53)

This penetrating invective undermines the “authority” (and masculinity) of Johnson on civil rights issues, replacing the President’s leadership on civil rights with Brown as a legitimate movement leader. In this commentary on white supremacy, Brown’s narrative highlights what bell hooks (1995) calls “whiteness in the black imagination” as Brown articulates the foolishness of white dominance in his confrontation with Johnson. Hooks writes, “One must face written histories that erase and deny, that reinvent the past to make the present vision of racial harmony and pluralism more plausible” (p. 41). Thus, Brown’s recollection of Johnson’s attitude on civil rights is at odds with popular memory surrounding the Johnson administration’s handling of civil rights after Kennedy’s assassination and demonstrates the personal and political complexity of the moment (Dalleck, 1999, p. 327). As a result, scholars can read Brown’s race analysis and his performance as an urban badman as an intervention into historical whitewashing of the civil rights movement and the Johnson administration’s relationship to its leaders. Brown then moves into a discussion of the inevitable black revolution to explain how the illegitimate authority of white supremacy informs black resistance in urban centers.

Understanding the Social Construction of Race and Forging the Black Revolution

At the center of this discussion of political resistance is the figure of the badman as a social movement leader. Brown moves from personal anecdotes to theoretical analysis to discuss how the aesthetics of urban black masculinity and the performance of rebellion needs to be understood as an embodied lead-
ership style premised upon bodily confronta-
tion with white people in power and encompassed in the black badman persona. C.P. Henry (1981, p.479) stresses that “both the myth and the reality of the black badman constitute a continuing historical source of revolutionary vision” that should be understood as a distinct leadership style, rather than castigated as pathological, dysfunctional, or nihilistic if not linked to white benevolence. Brown’s autobiography is a prime example of this intersection between urban black masculinity and rebellion that forms the template for black power leadership at the end of the 1960s.

As a leader, Brown articulated his argument for revolution by indicting racial binaries and justifying the need for urban rebellion. Brown writes,

All of white america is a structure of institutions that says to Black people, “N-[expletive], you ain’t [expletive].” All standards of excellence, beauty, efficiency, and civilization are such that any comparison between Black and white is designed to favor white and put down Black. And it’s ground into a Black person every minute of every day, whether you’re at work or whether you’re out trying to have some fun, it’s N-[expletive] you a’int [expletive]. “Die N-[expletive] Die!” (p. 40)

Herein lies the source for the title of the manifesto and the phrase repeated throughout the text as a synecdoche for white attitudes about black Americans. Brown argues that the entire American culture is premised upon these white values, which are replicated by the black institutions that form the backbone of the black middle-class. He adds, “Everything black is bad. That’s white nationalism” (p. 68). Paired with his critique of institutionalized racism, this statement forms the basis of Brown’s own oppositional consciousness and the underlying reason that he cannot perform accommodationism: at its core, accommodationism privileges whiteness by asking non-whites to accept and conform to existing white norms and behaviors.

Brown delineates between the three Americas coexisting and competing within the nation-state: white america, negro america, and Black america. For Brown, the contradictions within these communities of practice produce the conditions that demand revolution, which he deems as inevitable. As a black badman, Brown seeks strength in black communities through black self-determination that rejects the politics of colorism. He continues,

Negroes have always been treated like wild, caged animals by the white man, and have always felt the passions of caged animals (because they were living in cages), but they would always act civilized with whites, that is, what white people told them was civilized. But inside, the “civilized” negro was an undying hate. This hate, however could only be released in negro america. If it was ever released in white america, it would prove to whites that negroes were savages. That hate became self-hate. (p. 10).

Brown argues that for “negroes,” self-hate was a coping strategy, a survival mechanism to deal with the impetus to embrace the promises of the United States and yet deal with the reality of its institutionalized racism. Likewise, he sees accommodationism and other strategies of the black middle-class as coping mechanisms that have long outlived their usefulness. In these indictments of white nationalism,
Brown urges a black urban rebellion predicated upon black culture and black pride.

For Brown, rebellion is the foundation of black culture in America and he links his ideology to that of the leadership of slave revolts. This strategy unmasks the continuity of resistance while simultaneously acknowledging that leaders of slave revolts are widely held as badmen heroes renowned for their use of violence to break free from bondage. He says, “It is self-evident that people always rebel against oppression and there has been one continuous rebellion in Black America since the first slave got here” (p. 11). This is an important argument to forge, first, because it asserts a continuous (masculine) legacy and counter-history of black America, which declares resistance and revolution as intrinsic to the culture. Second, Brown’s argument about the continuity of revolution underscores his appreciation for the interplay between dominant ideology, subaltern cultures, and self-hate since his depiction makes it quite simple to see how “Black america” and “negro america” come to be positioned against each other, by whites as well as by the communities themselves. Each large community seeks to preserve its boundaries by maintaining the differences that make it distinct.

Brown’s understanding of the way that “race” works as a trope of difference for white culture and the way that “color” and “class” work for black America is a useful tool in explicating the relationships between these sub-strata of U.S. culture. Brown makes it possible to see how (white) nationalism fuels the growth of “negro america” while needing to simultaneously suppress the revolution burning inside of urban “Black america.” This simultaneity constitutes the power of white America. Brown adds, “if you’re Black, then you do everything you can to fight the white folks. If you’re negro, you do everything you can to appease them. If you’re Black, you’re constantly in and out of trouble because you’re always messing with “the man”(p. 55).“Blackness” constitutes an oppositional identity that opposes the arbitrary authority exercised by white patriarchy. This rhetorical strategy makes positive connotations of blackness a prerequisite for rebellion since Brown sees so-called “Negroes” as just barely removed from the slave system. Brown’s close proximity with whites and middle-class blacks as a youth convinced him that he needed an identity that wasn’t predicated upon subservience to whites; he says, “I knew I didn’t want to be a slave” (p. 45).

It is here that Brown also condemns integration as an historical strategy of the movement for black liberation. To Brown, integration is an instantiation of white nationalism. Brown argues that the civil rights movement was concerned with “controlling the animalistic behavior of white people…. We were letting white folks know that they could no longer legislate where we went or what we did” (p. 56). Brown explains that the civil rights movement was never concerned with being able to get close to white people; instead, it was about trying to reign in the violent, uncivilized behavior of whites against blacks in public places. However, Brown’s analysis of the dialectic between white nationalism and black resistance doesn’t see white culture substantively changing as a result of the civil rights movement and instead argues that black separatism is really the only option for ending white violence and forging a group consciousness that empowers black people to their reclaim their movement and their space.
Pedagogies of Social Change

The strategy of embracing the values of black power, including self-defense and separatism, was a departure from SNCC’s multiracial coalitions. And, as SNCC followed Carmichael and later Brown into the black power phase of the organization, these new values shaped the tactical and rhetorical strategies of SNCC but also foreclosed the possibility that the aggression inherent in black power would really win the day. Unfortunately, this aggressive black masculinity “reserves for black males an inordinate number of places in the country’s prisons and justified the maintenance of a massive counterforce of police officers and prison guards whose own ‘macho’ orientation is thereby legitimated” (Austin, 1992, p. 1785). The criminalization of “rabble rousers” like Brown, whose activism challenges the white tyranny over civic space, demonstrates the repression of the state in urban centers, particularly as it has been magnified since the War on Terror began (Giroux, 2010, p. 83). As a result, the system of white supremacist misogyny that creates segregated urban space trickles through to black communities and is reinforced by privileging macho black culture where boys are its easiest victims (Lemelle, 1988, p. 221).

Although it is tempting to highlight only the miscalculations of the black power movement as well as its outright misogyny, we would be remiss to ignore the fact that black power autobiographies like Brown’s were a central contributor to the “movement to define the contemporary public self” (Farred, 2000, p. 627). Brown’s autobiography, in particular, is a significant site for the investigation into racial discourses that produce what he calls “white America,” black American, and “negro America,” especially in urban spaces where these signifiers and their populations clash over performing citizenship in public spaces. As such, Brown’s autobiography is useful for educators interested in “learning to teach for social justice, social change, and social responsibility,” particularly in the context of the civil rights movements (Cochran-Smith, 2001, p. 3). Brown’s performance of the dozens, his confrontational style, and his racial analysis provide much fodder for critical classroom discussion of the promises and pitfalls of badmen as social movement leaders.

Courses or units on critical race theory (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995), Whiteness studies (Leonardo, 2009; Lipsitz, 1996), and anti-oppressive education (Kumashiro, 2000; hooks, 1994) would all benefit from the frank tone and clear race, gender, and class analysis found in Brown’s memoir. While educational research has consistently pointed out the ways in which white teachers avoid race-talk or minimize the importance of race by refusing to discuss racial problems openly (Sleeter, 2000, p. 123-5), scholarship on leaders like Brown create pedagogical spaces for what McDonough (2009, p. 529) has called “discourses of possibility,” where educators have new opportunities to both teach, learn, and practice social change. Brown’s autobiography creates a place for discussions of whiteness and black separatism in urban spaces to understand how race and class create and limit the possibilities of public dissent in the context of civil rights. Especially in Brown’s own discussions of education, teachers have an opportunity to examine the complex dynamics that continue to inform the evolution of racial consciousness and urban rebellion of black badmen.
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“Teaching Anna Deavere Smith’s Twilight Through a Critical Race Theory Lens”
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Abstract

Discussing race in the classroom can be difficult for students who have not experience discussing the complexities of race in a confined space. This reality has continued to serve as a disadvantage for students living and learning in a racialized society. To this end, this paper explores ways of using Critical Race Theory as a theoretical framework to discuss Anna Deavere Smith’s *Twilight, Los Angeles 1992* in the classroom. Drawing on Critical Race Theory, the author contends that an important part of articulating topics that include race in the classroom is the beginning of critical awareness in how we deal with race in our society.

“Teaching Critical Race Theory through *Twilight* by Anna Deavere Smith”

“As such, students enter the classroom with their own pre-conceived notions of race and ethnicity according to their lived experience” (Stanley, 2005, p. 193).

“[Race] seems that it has a utility far beyond economy, beyond the sequestering of classes from one another, and has assumed a metaphorical life so completely embedded in daily discourse that it is perhaps more necessary and more on display than ever before” (Morrison, 1992, p.63).
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Anna Deavere Smith’s *Twilight Los Angeles, 1992* (1994), is a play with potential for opening spaces for collegiate classroom discussions on how students understand race and racism. Smith’s dramatic work, known in many playwriting circles as documentary theatre, chronicles the 1992 Los Angeles race riot/uprising that sparked after the acquittal of two police officers in the beating of a Black American named Rodney King. Smith interviews over 200 witnesses, citizens, politicians and academic professors. She fictionalizes the interviewees’ stories into a one-woman play and performs verbatim the shared experiences of the uprising to explore the race and class issues surfacing from the devastating event. According to Stanley (2005), Smith’s play is useful as a teaching activity to challenging the current discourse about identity politics in a post-identity age. Stanley uses Smith’s play to trouble her student’s general notions about their identity and how race and class play an undeniable role in it. Stanley, concludes at the end of her classroom activity that we all “must engage in introgressive spaces, in dialogue with one another” (p. 193) as faculty and as students in order to construct theoretical questions about identity politics in a multicultural classrooms. Stanley used *Twilight* in her class as an activity to encourage students to think about their own theoretical questions about identity in a multiethnic centered class. She goes on to say that her vision for the entire course would focus on “a theoretical, rather than historical overview, focusing on shared theoretical concerns about literatures associated with people of color” thus, “the class [would also] explore questions concerning canon formation, gender, race/ethnicity, class, disability and sexuality” (p. 191). My study of *Twilight*, however, is a literary analysis of Smith’s play and teaching examples derived from Stanley’s article that will be used to guide the teaching components illustrated throughout this article are not my own observations. Similarly, I find it useful to combined a literary interpretation of *Twilight* and provide teaching examples from Stanley’s article because both pieces combined help to illustrate that Critical Race Theory (CRT) methodology offers additional insight on how to construct conversations about race and class in a collegiate setting. In this article, I argue that teaching CRT through *Twilight*, helps tease out multiple perspectives about dealing with race and class in collegiate classrooms and in society.

The creation of *Twilight* gives insight to three historical narratives during and leading up to the uprising. In the general production note of the play those events include, “1) the video of the Rodney King beating; 2) the killing of Latasha Harlins by a Korean shop owner; and 3) the beating of Reginald Denny, a white truck driver beaten by four black men” (Smith, 1994, p. 4). Each of these events was heavily replayed on major national television news networks. Thus, in each event, race is conceptualized through a Black/White binary. CRT is an epistemological approach used to create a counter-storytelling about these narratives from *Twilight* and delivers a multi-dimensional perspective that gives each person involved in the incidents right or wrong a critical voice. The critical voice is a major component in CRT that provides the original narrative or counter-storytelling mentioned previously. Narrative, as CRT theorist Gloria Ladson-Billings (1998) asserts, “add[s] necessary contextual contours to the seeming “objectivity” of positivist perspectives” (p. 22). In other words, the critical voice in the narrative gives agency to the marginalized group or dispossessed individual. The critical voice is an important tool that Smith uses in *Twilight* entirely. In
the next paragraph, I will discuss the origins of CRT, explain CRT’s five tenants, do a close reading of *Twilight* chapters and major insights, at the end of the close reading provide potential ways of using CRT to teach these insights in the collegiate classroom and conclude with an iteration of CRT’s usefulness.

CRT is a sub-division of Critical Legal Studies (CLS) that emerged in the early 1990s as a response to the lack of critical attentiveness of legislation, affirmative action, criminal sentencing and discrimination in hiring and educational practices that could not be resolved from 1950s and 1960s Civil Rights theories and methods. Legal scholars Derrick A. Bell, Charles Lawrence, Kimberle Crenshaw, Richard Delgado and Lani Guinier to name but a few, criticized and wrote scholarly work on the normalized inequalities faced in their respective field(s) due to practices that resulted in race discrimination. These scholars believed that the core foundations of CRT tackled the disparaging inequalities of racially based social and economic oppression. From their scholarly work, five critical tenants of CRT are widely used in law, education, political science, history and many other disciplines.

In the following pages, I will list the five tenants of CRT that can briefly be summarized as follows:

1. Racism is endemic in United States society.
2. Interest convergence model; in order for Black Americans (or people of color) to gain racial equality they will have to converge with the interests of powerful White Americans.
3. The experiential knowledge from people of color is appropriate to legitimate, analyze and argue the inequality of racism. Also known as counter-storytelling.
4. An interdisciplinary perspective is key to challenging historical notions of race and racism. Race and racism should be put at the center of the discussion to interrogate the historical conflict that it spawns.
5. The commitment to social justice and equality should be at the center of Critical Race Theory.

CRT emphasizes that racism is endemic to United States society connoting the role racism plays in our daily lives. The function of CRT interrogates the role of racism by detailing the Black/White binaries seen in legal and historical representations of these depictions in our society. Toni Morrison (1992) centralizes this point as she argues the manifestation of race in our daily literary discourse that assumes what she calls a “metaphorical” life beyond its social construction in everyday society. Morrison goes on to say that race not only becomes metaphorical, but “disguises[es] forces, events, classes, and expressions of social decay and economic division far more threatening to the body politic than biological “race” ever was” (p. 63). Her latter point about race presenting itself as a disguise is seen fluid in examples such as *Twilight* because race is conceptualized as part of an historical moment that becomes the primary narrative of the Los Angeles riot/uprising. Many CRT theorists would agree race is a primary component in *Twilight* that should be examined to confront “the historical centrality and complicity of law in upholding white supremacy” (Crenshaw, 1995, p. xi). Moreover, Morrison’s polemical argument of race is a beginning point for this paper to discuss the racialized historical underpinnings of *Twilight*.

Similarly, CRT challenges history to include race and racism at the center of the
analysis to determine how race and racism are functioning in this particular space. In the rest of the paper, I will do a close reading from chapters of *Twilight* that illustrate what CRT offers. A useful starting point when teaching *Twilight* is to encourage students to examine the history of the Rodney King verdict and later the Los Angeles riot/uprising that spawns as a result.

The acquittal of four police officers on trial for the Rodney King beating in 1991 sparked an uprising in South Central Los Angeles that caused ethnic communities to retaliate against one another. African Americans were outraged because of the acquittal and demanded that justice be served. The “riot initially was a frustrated response to injustice, not just a reaction to ongoing brutality” for African Americans (Abu-Lughod, 2007, p. 237). African Americans rioted in order to be heard, but the severity of the riot sparked tensions between African Americans and Korean Americans. “Collectively, the Korean American community felt betrayed. They accused the Los Angeles police department of abandoning them while retreating to defend white-owned stores in fancier neighborhoods” (Stanley, 2005, p. 248). Scholar Cornel West (1993) argues that race became the “visible catalyst, not the underlying cause” (p. 4). West’s point is valid because many African Americans believed that the beating was provoked by racial animosity. However, the Rodney King incident revealed other pressing issues that affected the South Central, Los Angeles community.

The first underlying issue was police brutality. Police brutality has been an issue in the Los Angeles police department for quite sometime. The second, but most important underlying issue is classism in multicultural neighborhoods in South Central, Los Angeles. In South Central, after the uprising, one of the primary reasons ethnic communities retaliated against each other was because each group was discriminating against another group based on their social and economic status. African Americans and Latino Americans were conscious of the social and economic issues in South Central and presented many of their concerns to the local government. After the Rodney King beating and uprising, African Americans, Latino Americans, and Korean Americans shifted their ideas concluding that race was the major concern, but these groups knew that classism and poverty are other issues effecting South Central alongside race related issues. These issues are captured in Anna Deavere’s Smith’s *Twilight: Los, Angeles, 1992*. The community at large is convinced that race is the immediate issue (that should be discussed in relation to the Rodney King beating and uprising); however, the community acknowledges that classism is also an issue that should be addressed in South Central. Class complicates racial differences. Smith sheds light on these contentious issues in *Twilight* in order to discuss the racial ramifications that disrupt community alliances between African Americans, Latino Americans, and Korean Americans.

In *Twilight*, each monologue features a real-life person that witnessed the riot/uprising and discusses their experiences of the riot and how the riot personally affected him/her. For this paper, Elaine Young’s “The Beverly Hills Hotel” and Congresswoman Maxine Water’s “The National Guard Comes to L.A.” are examined together. These stories contrast each other and identify the difference in social class and economic status as well as examining racial insensitivity. Following, the paper will also retell Reginald Denny’s narrative “A Weird Common Threat in Our Lives” and a counter-narrative Paul Parker’s “No justice, No Peace/My Room” to address how
race is examined differently among various racialized groups and how they choose to react to racialized incidents. Concluding the paper, Mrs. Young-Soon Han’s “Swallowing the Bitterness” is discussed. Mrs. Young-Soon Han is a former liquor storeowner in South Central whose store was affected by the riot. She is one of the many Korean Americans who felt abandoned both socially and economically. She lost her job during the riot, and she felt betrayed by the local government for not protecting her civil rights. She also felt betrayed by other ethnic groups who looted from her store. Young-Soon Han’s story will identify the interethnic tensions displayed between Korean Americans and African Americans.

Certainly, the importance of teaching the Los Angeles 1992 riot/uprising as a contemporary moment in history presents a way for college students to discuss urban life and how it coincides with race. Rarely in the classroom is urban life and race discussed alongside each other to position the ways in which communities function in these spaces that are primarily compact, populated, and sometimes lacking in educational resources and economical resources. *Twilight* offers students to critically think about the societal conditions of racial discrimination and how it plays a continued role in shaping prejudice among marginalized groups that do not gain the critical attention in canonized classroom settings where interdisciplinary approaches to education are rarely considered. Classrooms like Stanley’s that uses literature as an examining approach to discuss these concerns about race, ethnicity, and identity are well considered and helpful for students who may be unfamiliar with these concepts. Moreover, the use of CRT as well in assessing and theorizing these historical moments that involve racial, economic and social intensity should be examples in collegiate classrooms across the United States and this paper forges ways where this point can be addressed.

In the forthcoming section, I provide several narratives that present the complexity of racial conflict played out in *Twilight* using CRT as a theoretical approach. In this section, I provide a critical discussion of CRT to illustrate its usefulness regarding *Twilight* and in the collegiate classroom. CRT has many varied definitions but I define it as a theory used as a social construct to expose various racial practices institutionalize/non-institutionalize that continue to marginalize people of color based on their phenotypical appearance. Parker and Lynn define CRT as “a legal theory of race and racism” (p. 148) that argues for racism to be reexamined in legal systems in American society. Overall, much of the theory exposes the cruel and insufficient ways institutionalized racism has withstood a social, political and economic force in society that continues to disservice African Americans and other disadvantage minorities in the United States and surrounding nations.

CRT also aims to “recover and revitalize the radical tradition of race-consciousness among African Americans and other peoples of color,” (Crenshaw, 1995, p. xvi). Within this perspective, *Twilight* is a clear example of exposing race and racism as an institutionalized system. Moreover, the critical voices found in each narrative give explanatory examples of race and racism widely known during and after the L.A. riot/uprising that has become endemic in American life. Without the concept of CRT, Anna Deavere Smith’s brilliant play about race in its contemporary perspective in the academic and legal discourse can continue to receive the critical attentiveness it deserves as illustrated in this paper. In the next several sections, close readings are given of different monologues from
witnesses and participants who were interviewed by Smith for her one-woman play. These close readings should give insight into what is happening during the riot and how people deal with their emotions amidst stringent circumstances. To follow the monologues closely, each one is presented with a subtitle of what their monologue is called. Following the close literary analysis of the monologue, a CRT perspective and useful ways to teach this concept to students to help them draw connections to *Twilight* are discussed at the end of the analysis.

**“The Beverly Hills Hotel” by Elaine Young**

In “The Beverly Hills Hotel” by Elaine Young, racism is not a concerning factor in Elaine Young’s life. Young is a wealthy White real estate agent and currently separated from her husband. As Smith describes, Young has a real estate office in Beverly Hills; her clients are mostly movie stars; she is very outgoing, and she has been written about in many magazines—most notably for her plastic surgery malfunction (p. 150). Smith reiterates that Young is a talkative person and her version of the riot exemplifies her outgoing personality. However, her version of the riot also exemplifies her lackluster attitude about the riot. In other words, her version lacks the emotion and vulnerability that most ethnic communities feel when discussing the severity of the riot. Young’s story is titled “The Beverly Hills Hotel” which tells her account of the L.A. riots at the Beverly Hills Hotel. Young’s version of the riot displays her obliviousness to the central issues that the riot revealed: people who were caught in the riot without any viable means to support themselves or their families. Also how race became an immediate topic of discussion in the South Central community and the suburban community of where Young lives. This story will also examine how Young’s reality at this moment is not the severity of the riot, but the loneliness that she feels from her very recent separation from her husband. What Young’s reality reveals is the lack of understanding about why the riot erupted in the first place. Instead she ignores or seems uninterested in the politics of the riot and instead passes it off as another daily problem that does not affect her. Young fails to recognize that she is part of the problem because she takes for granted her white privilege and economic status.

In addition, Young never mentions in her story whether she watched any news coverage about the riots. Instead she only refers to the news saying, “[it] is what got me in trouble on television and really made me feel bad” (p.150). What really made Young feel bad is the anonymous letter that she got from a man who was appalled by her rendition of the riot on a local news station. The man calls Young a bimbo and says she is an embarrassment because she was, “talking about having fun during the riots at the Polo Lounge” at the Beverly Hills Hotel (p.154). Young is surprised by this letter and feels compelled to explain, “that in no way did [she] mean to be flippant on television about the riots” (p.155). Young was being self-involved not flippant. Her story does not convey the same seriousness that the victims actually experienced. Young, though, supports her claim arguing, “In no way did I accept the riot in any way as...or even joke about it, because...I can’t imagine anybody jokin’[sic] about it”(p.153). Young’s statements are contradictory. She asserts, “And I finally went [to the Beverly Hills Hotel] for three nights and stayed till [sic] two or three in the morning so I wouldn’t be alone” (p.153). She chooses to
stay at a hotel and converse with other people about the riot. However, there is no further mentioning from her in the story if she actually discussed the social, political, economic, or racial concerns erupting in Los Angeles County.

The devastation of the riot benefited her because she was able to get over her own loneliness, however, she did not try to help the actual victims that were in need. Young mentions at the end of her story that “No one can hurt us at the Beverly Hills Hotel because it was like a fortress” (p.155). What is problematic about this comment is that she mentions that the hotel was a place of security for her and the other people who stayed there; however, Young was never really in any real danger. She never mentions in her story that she felt like she was in danger. She even mentions that she “went there for three nights” (p.153). She never mentions the struggle or sacrifice that she made in order to drive to the hotel. She also does not mention the destruction that is occurring. Is there a riot actually going on anywhere near the Beverly Hills Hotel? Young’s story is ambiguous because she never mentions anything about a riot going on outside the hotel. She never mentions anyone looting or attacking people. Details such as these are left out of her story and leaves readers to wonder why Young’s insensitive story, Con-

issues that do not affect people like Young. In turn this will help people like Young foster more consciousness and sensitive dialogue with other citizens of Los Angeles who can understand her story without thinking that her ideas come from an elitist perspective.

As a teaching moment, Young’s story offers students a clear understanding of colorblind ideology and the normalizing of white privilege in the United States. Denise T. Baszile (2011) accesses this privilege akin to colorblind ideology asserting, “The insistence that racial difference is inconsequential—is one such example which works to normalize and rationalize the power of privilege associated with whiteness, and in so doing also absolves White people of not only their feelings of guilt and self-doubt, but also their individual responsibility and collective responsibility to a just democracy” (p. 269). Because Elaine Young is white and wealthy, she can remove herself from the turbulent conditions of the riot both emotionally and physically. As her story recites, she does not address any responsibility for addressing the racial divisive-ness established in Los Angeles. The only responsibility she accepts is her commentary about the riot that only happened after a letter was written about her in a pejorative manner. In examining her disconnect to the racialized conditions erupting in Los Angeles, I believe it is important to use this moment as a theoretical teaching strategy to teach race as a defining moment oblivious to Young. In doing so, will enlighten students about racism as a systemic problem that not only disrupt the confines of society but also institutions of higher learning.

“The National Guard Comes to L.A.”
by Maxine Waters

Unlike Young’s insensitive story, Con-
gresswoman Maxine Waters’ speech at the African Methodist Episcopal Church in Los Angeles discusses the severity of the riot. She begins her speech authoritatively, bringing the audience in with a call and response routine. She begins with the root of the problem: police brutality and the promises of the Kerner Commission Report that was suppose to fix the social and economic decline since the Watts Riots in 1965. The National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders established the “Kerner Report” in an effort to stop the “disturbances in minority neighborhoods—especially in predominately African American communities” such as Watts (Collins, 2006, p.1). The Kerner Report was supposed to tackle “America’s troubled race relations,” but the report should have focused on solving race relations and class relations (Abu-Lughod, 2007, p. 4). As Waters asserts, “it seems as though we are talking about what that report cited some twenty years ago still exists today” (Smith, 1994, p.160). Instead of addressing the issue as a politician, she develops a personal connection with her black audience and in her speech she is consciously aware of the racial issues that are happening not only in South Central, Los Angeles but also in other parts of the United States where economic and social decline is also prevalent. Waters does this by shouting to her audience, “They’re hungry in the Bronx tonight… They’re hungry in Atlanta tonight…They’re hungry in St. Louis tonight” to signal to her audience that these are national issues effecting other urban cities (p. 160).

Waters makes her presence known to the black audience by singling out her opponents she wants to address. She refers to president George H.W. Bush and California governor Pete Wilson as Mr. President and Mr. Governor several times throughout the speech. By addressing her colleagues this way, she is positioning herself as the victim instead of the leader. This strategy not only provides a closer connection to her audience, it also reintroduces the same racial and economic discussions that have been overlooked by the local and national governments. Waters addresses the president first saying, “Mr. President, our children’s lives are at stake” (p. 160). She breaks down her speech saying that these children who are adolescents and young adults are suffering from the economic decline severely and have no support from the government to fall back on. She goes on to mention that these same kids “don’t show up on anybody’s statistics, They’re not in school, they have never been employed” (p.160). She addresses statistical issues that are prevalent within these communities and is asking the government to look at the bigger picture that people are surviving, but they are not living. In other words men, women, and children who represent the working class poor have no other social and economic outlets to support themselves. Since the government is not providing outlets Waters argues that the government cannot fault these people who have been traumatized by governmental neglect as well as by police brutality. Waters raises this point when she says: “We know you’re not suppose to steal, but the times are such, the environment is such, that good people reacted in strange ways. They are not all crooks and criminals… If they are, Mr. President what about your violations?” (p. 161). She forces politicians to think about why the community is acting in this manner. She also asks the politicians to not judge the faults of the poor who have no means.

Waters addresses the Rodney King verdict proclaiming that the public is angry about the news (p. 161). Lastly she says, “Whether we like it or not, riot is the voice of the unheard” (p. 162). The rioters’ acts were a result
of feeling neglected and dispossessed of their civil rights. They no longer believed in a system that criminalized them for frivolous crimes. In the Rodney King verdict, justice was not served and it forged an angry response from the defeated victims and also Waters who felt defeated for her district. She says this when she tells the media “don’t you dare dictate to me about what I’m suppose to say. It’s not nice to display anger…I am angry” (p. 162). What her words capture is a politician who is trying to connect with the greater public about the traumatic issues that are affecting the nation. She also is speaking on behalf of the unheard that are African American, the working class and the poor. Waters is actually discussing issues and pleading to the president and local government in order to get a response, in order to make them finally see that there is an issue that is occurring in Los Angeles. The contrast to Young’s story is that Young does not seem serious about trying to do something about the crisis. Waters shows in her speech that indeed there is a racial and economic divisiveness disenfranchising people and there should be some type of planning that will help the community rebound.

Moreover, Waters addressed the issues of racialized identity and how that identity forges a sense of knowing about the volatile feelings of African Americans who believed that their local government did not invest in their concerns. As a teaching moment, students can compare both Young and Waters’ stories to dismantle the Black/White binary of racial categories that are often essentialist ideals in their society. In addition, both stories offer counter-narratives to which students can use the CRT method of counter-storytelling especially from Maxine Waters’ narrative. The students can illustrate how Waters story is counter to Young’s story and also how experiential knowledge from these stories are used to address real issues that are happening in the South Central community. Thus, using the classroom as a way to dismantle this binary is an important starting point that is discussed further in the next section.

“A Weird Common Threat in Our Lives” by Reginald Denny

Similarly, Reginald Denny’s narrative “A Weird Common Threat in Our Lives” and a counter-narrative Paul Parker’s “No justice, No Peace/My Room” details the racial undertones of both conversations through a CRT perspective. Each person’s story varies on the idea of who benefits in a racial hierarchy and how racial hierarchy overpowers the social and economic conditions in South Central, Los Angeles. Denny’s narrative made national news upsetting many African Americans who believed that his beating overpowered the initial Rodney King beating and verdict. In his own interpretation of the event, Denny, a working class white male knew his attackers were black males. However, because people of all ethnic origins saved his life and supported him at the hospital, he denied seeing the interethnic tension as a racial issue. His lawyer, African American Johnnie Cochran and Reverend Jessie Jackson supported him at the hospital. Instead of imagining the riot as a Black/White issue (because of a coma he has no recollection of the riot), Denny chooses to be optimistic and proposes that, “there won’t be a color problem” (Smith, 1994, p. 114). He proceeds telling interviewers and supporters that after his recovery he will create a riot room that will “be a happy room” and not “a sad room” (p. 114). Denny concludes:

I just want people to wake up. It’s not a color it’s a person! So this room, it’s
just gonna be people. just a wild place! It’s gonna be a blast. One day, it’ll happen. Lord willing it’ll happen. (p. 115)

Denny presents color-blindness as a solution to the racial tensions in his community. Further, he wishes to create a color-blind utopia in his riot room as an ideal location of celebration towards interethnic unity rather than a continuum of interethnic divisiveness.

In contrast, CRT strongly opposes the colorblind wishful thinking that has continued to grow in the post-Civil Rights era. As Edward Taylor (2000) notes, CRT is critical about color-blindness techniques because it “allows us to ignore the racial construction of whiteness and reinforces its privileged and oppressive position” (p. 542). Regarding Denny’s colorblind utopia, he dismisses race as a social construction in America, the continued manifestation of race in society and how it reinforces white privilege in his favor. He can choose to forget about racial turmoil subjugated in the riot/uprising. However, Paul Parker, a black male reiterates in his narrative that his blackness carries weight that does not allow him the same privilege that Denny exemplifies.

Paul Parker, chairperson of Free the L.A. Four Plus Defense Committee is the brother of Lance Parker—a young black male who is accused of attempted murder of Reginald Denny. In his narrative, like Denny he creates his own riot room. But this riot room unlike Denny’s re-imagines the riot/uprising as a site of injustice for African Americans. Parker calls the room “No Justice No Peace” and it will give credence to the sacrifices he has made to free his brother and the other four men accused of attempting to kill Denny. The room will also become a site of history that he will pass on to his children:

My children can know what Daddy did. You know, if I still happen to be here, God willin’, they can just see what it takes to be a strong black man, what you gotta do for your people, you know. (p. 118)

Parker ends his narrative with a reinterpretation of the race and class differences in the South Central, Los Angeles neighborhood. He motions his audience with high emotion and then states, “They’re talkin’ about “You burned down your own neighborhoods,” “And I say, First of all, we burned down these Koreans [stores] in this neighborhood... The Koreans was like the Jews in the day. And we put them in check” (p. 119). Parker’s conversation about Denny shifts to his frustration and confirmation of reclaiming his neighborhood from Korean American store merchants. The complexity of race in Parker’s dialogue is meshed with classism as he makes it a point to reinforce that Korean immigrants owned stores in South Central; however, they lived in other neighborhoods that were divided by their income that placed them in communities outside of South Central. The potentiality of Parker’s later argument is that despite the ethnic origins of the Korean American store merchants they are still superior to African Americans in impoverished neighborhoods because they own capital at the expense of lower class African Americans. Overall, Parker’s argument raises immediate concerns that the African American community experienced during the riot/uprising and expressed: relentless oppression both racially and economically. Furthermore, his critical narrative helps us to articulate that because of the racial and economic complexity of the situation that the option of privilege is not in African Americans’ favor.

As Cheryl Harris (1993) further notes this privilege can only be occupied by “white pos-
“Swallowing the Bitterness” by Mrs. Young-Soon Han

One of the most recited pieces by Anna Deavere Smith from *Twilight* is “Swallowing the Bitterness” by Mrs. Young-Soon Han. Han is a former liquor storeowner whose store was looted and vandalized by African Americans and Latino Americans. Han suffered financially from the riot and was unable to rebuild her business. Once her business is ruined, Han struggles to identify the culprits. She also struggles with her identity as a Korean immigrant turned United States citizen. She questions the kind of country she lives in and wonders whether her ethnic identity has hindered her from receiving the same advancements (social and political power) that other ethnic communities such as African Americans, have received. Han’s story examines the differing experiences of other ethnic communities that believed they still did not receive any justice from the local government. The play also mentions that Korean immigrants owned stores in South Central; however, they lived in other neighborhoods that were divided by their income, which placed them in communities outside of South Central.

Even though Han was able to have financial stability, she questions the rights she has as a United States citizen. Han asks, “What is our right? Is it because we are Korean? Is it because we have no politicians? Is it because we don’t speak good English? Why?” (Smith, 1994, p. 245). Han raises several points that she believes prohibits her from receiving social equality as an immigrant who becomes a permanent citizen in Los Angeles. Because Han does not know exactly who to blame for her “American Dream” turned nightmare, she blames both the local government and the African American community. She blames the local government for not protecting her rights (p. 245). She blames African Americans for looting her store and not recognizing that as an ethnic community Korean Americans too, suffer from the same racial degradation as African Americans. The trauma of the riot has once again uncovered both a racial and an economic and social wound in the community.

Han’s description of how she believes that the African American community betrayed her is an example of the divide between ethnic communities who struggle to receive the same civil rights. She describes how she feels African Americans have infringed upon her rights by looting her store, “[African Americans] finally found that justice exists in this society. Then where is the victims rights?
[African Americans] got their rights by destroying innocent Korean merchants…” (p. 247).

Han describes the interethnic tensions between Korean Americans and African Americans living in South Central. Tensions between these groups have existed since Korean merchants moved to Los Angeles under the U.S. immigration law in 1965 (Abu-Lughod, 2007, p. 244-245). African Americans and Latino Americans had animosity towards Korean Americans because Korean Americans owned many small grocery and liquor stores that only hired family labor (p. 245). Many Korean Americans did not live in the same neighborhoods as their businesses, which also created more interethnic tensions. Han became a victim of the interethnic tensions during the riots. She says that Martin Luther King, Jr. is “the only model for [the] Black community” that she respects (Smith, 1994, p. 247). What she respects about King is that he was a prominent figure in the community who stressed civil equality in American society for all people. She uses King as her main point to argue that African Americans contradicted themselves during the riot. They contradicted themselves because their actions represented opposition to civil equality for all people in America.

Though Han’s point is valid, it is still problematic. It is problematic because Han’s story does not examine the issue of class. In a mini biography about Han, the biography states that Han lives in an upper-middle class neighborhood with “Hasidic Jews and yuppie types” and her liquor store is in South Central (p. 244). Han does not live in close proximity to her liquor store. What this reveals is that Han works in a poverty stricken neighborhood in South Central; however, she lives in a suburban neighborhood. Han does not have the same social and economic experiences as her predominately African American and Latino American customers who live in a lower class neighborhood. In the mini biography there is no mention of African Americans and Latino Americans living in Han’s suburban neighborhood. Han’s only interaction with these ethnic groups is in South Central. Han’s tunnel vision testimony reveals that she cannot separate ethnic identity from her story, which has troubled notions of class identity. Han tries to settle her differences about African Americans wishing that “[she] could live together with eh [sic] Blacks, but after the riots there were too much differences” (249). Han never lived with African Americans previously. So she is basing her differences off of a traumatic incident that in turn continues the divisions between Korean Americans and African Americans. Moreover, Han is only referring to a fraction of African Americans who live in working class and poverty stricken neighborhoods, that in turn, do not make up the entire population that live in other demographics.

Han’s story also offers more critical thinking about xenophobia in the United States. Though Han is economically well off then her former customers of African American and Latino American descent, her story does speak to feelings of identity exclusion because of her immigrant status. Exclusive xenophobia (Jones, 2011) iterates that an immigrant turned civilian can still feel excluded because they are “fundamentally different from and therefore exist outside of [the] imagined community” (p. 35). This feeling of xenophobia may attribute to Han’s story because as a marginalized Other relative to immigration status, she feels excluded and cannot imagine herself as being a part of a community that acknowledges her global citizenship. Furthermore, it is not revealed in her story of how her own community in the sub-
urbs of Los Angeles treats her as a racial Other or an immigrant turned naturalized citizen. She can well be stigmatized for her racial identity and experience other types of xenophobia that speak to the questioning of her naturalized citizenship and foreigner status as a threat to American nationalism and communities that are narrow minded about global citizenry around the world. Furthermore, as a teaching moment, this example can be used to discuss the ramifications of race, class, and immigration in the United States and how it resonates with the continued debates about teaching these complex topics in the academy and in higher education.

**Conclusion**

*Twilight* is still reenacted today by Smith in her one woman series “Four American Characters” (2005). The one woman nationwide show depicts one of four characters from each of Smith’s plays she has performed for decades. From the *Twilight* series, she gives a thought provoking performance of Mrs. Young-Soon Han. Han’s story has been by far one of the most thought provoking because it intersects race, class, global citizenry and gender in dynamic ways. In this paper, I did not delve into more ways to discuss intersections of gender and global citizenry as educational approaches that can disrupt the binary of conventional thinking in academe. However, the point that I want to make is that my paper’s aim is to examine fictionalized stories such as Smith’s based on non-fictive moments to identify more epistemological approaches to teaching race and class in academe. Using CRT is my aim to framing this theoretical approach, but it is in no way to give an essentialist view to analyze the politics of African Americans, other marginalized groups and working class citizens.

Respectfully, CRT as a theoretical approach gives agency to my topic because the approach centralizes the issue of race in order to problematize the immediate issues that are presented forth in academic texts or historical moments that will soon write those texts. CRT gives topics subjectivity; it provides insight, and further addresses the multi-layers of race beyond the Black/White binary that is tackled in classrooms with multi-ethnic topics. As educators it is our responsibility to dismantle these binaries if we are to see important critical perspectives about race in the classroom be explored honestly.
Law students active in the Civil Rights Movement and protests against the Vietnam War founded Critical Legal Studies (CLS) in 1977. CLS is a study that argues that law and politics cannot be separated and that in order to have a just society in the United States, American lawmakers and grassroots activists have to fight against injustices and inequalities together in order to produce social change.

The Los Angeles riot/uprising erupted in the aftermath of the Rodney King verdict acquittal of two police officers in 1992. I use riot and uprising interchangeably throughout the paper as do the many journalists, scholars, and citizens used in Anna Deavere Smith’s play *Twilight, Los Angeles 1992*.

I define racism as a systematic operation where an individual is made to think what he/she is experiencing is only happening to them as an individual problem rather than to a people collectively through an institutionalized framework. Since we live in an environment where we are all made to believe that we live in a colorblind society, identifying racism is met with opposition from mainstream society. Critical Race Theory allows for people to discuss racism openly and constructively through a critical lens.

As said before, Anna Deavere Smith uses these real-life stories and performs them verbatim in her one-woman play titled *Twilight Los Angeles, 1992*.

White privilege has been theorized heavily in Critical Legal Studies, Critical Race Studies, and in education to examine codes of white culture as a dominate worldwide advantage by virtue of whites constructed identity based primarily on skin color, culture, and language.

The Watts riot/uprising of 1965 marked as one of the most severe riots in Los Angeles history prior to the South Central riot/uprising of 1992. The chaos of the riot exposed the interethnic tensions between black and white Americans, surmountable police brutality in the black community and economical disparities that left much of the neighborhood in grave conditions.

I discuss class throughout this essay alongside race to provide a way of how race and class intersect in Smith’s *Twilight*. I did not, however, devote a section to class tensions specifically because the overall point of my paper that I wanted to explore was how to theorize and use Critical Race Theory as an additive perspective in discussing *Twilight* while also showing ways of how it can be used as a theoretical approach in the education.

Xenophobia as a topic for theoretical discussion continues to grow in Western philosophy and thought. The term has been used in many discussions related to Islamophobia in the United States and Europe as well as to discuss immigration laws and foreign policy. For this paper, while I do not focus on xenophobia as a theoretical framework, I do include it to discussed the varied experiences of Mrs. Soon-Young Han as not only a person who has benefited from the “American Dream” because of her economic success but also shortfalls of feeling excluded as a part of an immigrant community in the United States.
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The Political Context for Understanding the Existence of the TRIO Program Upward Bound
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Abstract

Nearly fifty years ago, President Lyndon B. Johnson declared a War on Poverty which would replace poor people’s despair with opportunity. The purpose of this paper is to discuss the circumstances that surrounded the implementation of the primary instrument of that war (the Higher Education Act of 1965) that led to the creation of the Upward Bound Program. Using Hofferbert’s model of public policy, the six variables that influenced the future of the program will be discussed.

The Political Context for Understanding the Existence of the TRIO Program Upward Bound

On November 22, 1963, in his State of the Union address, President Lyndon B. Johnson announced his War on Poverty saying:

Unfortunately, many Americans live on the outskirts of hope — some because of their poverty, and some because of theft color, and all too many because of both. Our task is to help replace their despair with opportunity. This administration today, here and now, declares unconditional war on poverty in America. I urge this Congress and all Americans to join with me in that effort. It will not be a short or easy struggle, no single weapon or strategy will suffice, but we shall not rest until that war is won. The richest Nation on earth can afford to win it. We cannot afford to lose it. One thousand dollars invested in salvaging an unemployable
youth today can return $40,000 or more in his lifetime. (Internet Archive, 2002, para. 18-20)

There are currently eight Federal TRIO Programs which are funded by the U.S. Department of Education. Designed to “identify and provide services for individuals from disadvantaged backgrounds” and “assist low-income individuals, first-generation college students,” these “outreach and student services” include: Educational Opportunity Centers, Ronald E. McNair Postbaccalaureate Achievement, Student Support Services Talent Search, Training Program for Federal TRIO Programs Staff, Upward Bound, Upward Bound Math-Science, and Veterans Upward Bound (U.S. Department of Education Federal TRIO Programs Homepage, n.d.). Before there were eight, however, there were just three: Upward Bound, Talent Search and Student Support Services. And, before there was this “trio,” there was the one: Upward Bound. The purpose of this paper is to discuss the circumstances that surrounded the implementation and implication of President Johnson’s War on Poverty—the Higher Education Act of 1965 that led to the creation of Upward Bound.

Describing the Hofferbert Model of Policy

In 1974, Richard Hofferbert published a book called The Study of Public Policy in which he explained how policy is formed in the public arena. According to his model, there are six variables that influence how policy is formulated before they are ultimately converted to policy. Five of the variables are: historic, socio-economic, mass-political, governmental institutions and elite. According to Hofferbert not only do “events” (the sixth variable) rain down on the five variables thereby influencing how those variables actively impact on the creation of policy, but the formulated policy (the output), becomes an “event” which again rains down on the five variables (historic, socio-economic, mass-political, governmental institutions and elite) that actively impact on the creation of policy.

The Six Variables Impacting on the Formulation of Policy

For the sake of convenience as well as clarity, Hofferbert’s variable names have been retained in the analysis which follows, beginning and ending with “events” due to its feedback nature. That is to say that, prior to President Johnson’s announcement of the War on Poverty in November 22, 1963, several other events had already taken place.

1. Events

Five days before his announcement of a War on Poverty, President Kennedy was assassinated. However, in the five months prior to his assassination, President Kennedy had: 1) activated the Alabama National Guard after Governor George Wallace stood blocking the doorway of the University of Alabama and prohibited two African American students from entering; 2) called the “civil rights issue . . . a ‘moral crisis in our nation’”; and 3) not only proposed “the most comprehensive and far-reaching civil rights bill proposal to Congress, including provisions for equal access to ‘all facilities that are open to the public’ [but a proposal allowing] the federal government to initiate public school desegregation suits” (Presidential Timeline Summer Teacher Institutes, n.d).

2. Historical-Geographic Factors

Since Upward Bound was intended to serve individuals from disadvantaged backgrounds—particularly those who were low-
income and first-generation college students, it is important to note that, according to Stark, “not since president Roosevelt in 1933 did a president call for “a wholly new set of programs” (Stark, 1967, p. 23) In fact, in the early 1900s . . . private social instruments of all kinds [rather than the government] were developed to serve the poor and mitigate their condition . . . (Ginsberg and Shiffman, 1966, p.159). According to Sanford (1966), “early America left the treatment of the poor to private charity and scattered government aid and activity” (p.77). Assistance was usually distributed through poorhouses away from society’s view. Some communities went to the extreme and drove the poor out of their cities but, over time, various groups developed programs to help the poor as well as their own political purposes. Sanford declared that “later some cities and states developed specialized programs to aid the most appealing groups of the poverty-stricken—the abandoned mothers, the elderly, and the blind‖ (p. 77).

In the mid-1960s, it is estimated that 32,000,000 million people were poor (Humphrey, 1966, p. 6). Even at the time, it was believed that poor people were poor because of “the maintenance of social barriers in the form of caste, class, and custom—specifically as it pertains to “racial discrimination with regard to opportunities to qualify for and to obtain work‖ (Lampman, 1965, p. 524). According to Lampman (1965), “only a fifth of the [poor of the time were] nonwhite, and [sic] only a minority of the nonwhites [were] presently poor‖ (524). He added:

…arbitrary barriers or market imperfections are observable in the case of sex, age, residence, religion, education, and seniority. They are formalized in employer hiring procedures, in the rules of unions and professional and trade associations, in governmental regulations concerning housing and welfare and other programs, and are informally expressed in customer preferences. Barriers, once established, tend to be reinforced from the poverty side by the alienated [people] themselves. The poor tend to be cut off from not only opportunity but even from information about opportunity. A poverty subculture develops which sustains attitudes and values that are hostile to escape from poverty. (Lampman, 1965, p.525)

No group was more alienated than the Africans who arrived in the United States as slaves. The geographic distribution those slaves in the United States between 1619 and 1863 created a caste system in the United States that existed among their descendants long after 1863 and through the mid-1960s. Nowhere else was racial caste more prevalent than in the South where millions of slaves poured into the ports of Boston, New Port and Charleston (to mention a few) —slaves for life. Once one of the richest regions in the country, the emancipation of slavery in the South resulted in former slaves migrating from country sides to cities, the North, and also the West. While some African-Americans stayed on with former masters as sharecroppers, the South never again gained the former glory that it had from free labor.

The geographic location of slaves overlapped with the unwillingness of educating Blacks with public funds. Not only did the segregation of races during slavery continue under Jim Crow after emancipation—particularly in the geographic South—but so did the discrimination against Blacks with regards to education. For example, a year before slaves were emancipated, the Morrill Act gave states land to build colleges for its citi-
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izens. However, it was not until the Second Morrill Act nearly thirty years later (in 1890) that those land grants included black institutions (Lightcap, n.d.). Six years later, in 1896, Plessy v. Ferguson mandated separate facilities for Blacks and 58 years after that (in 1954) the Supreme Court ruled in Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka that segregated school were unequal. Three years after Brown (and six years before President Johnson announced his War on Poverty), President Eisenhower sent federal troops to enforce the Brown ruling, backing off the Arkansas National Guard sent to prevent nine students from integrating Little Rock High.

Educational segregation was not the only mark of caste for African Americans. As the United States became more and more industrialized as a country, Blacks faced exclusion in the workplace and also blue color jobs where they never did face that exclusion in field hand jobs. Over time, the formal exclusion of Blacks from unions was replaced by “more subtle forms” (Marshall, 1963, p. 376). Marshall (1963) said that the building and railroad unions, in particular, were particularly adept at:

[barring] Negroes by such informal means as: agreements not to sponsor Negroes for membership; refusal to admit Negroes into apprenticeship programs; refusal to accept applicants from Negroes, or simply ignoring their applications; general "understandings" to vote against Negroes if they are proposed . . . ; using examinations to refuse Negroes journeymen status which either are not given to whites or are rigged so that Negroes cannot pass them; and by exerting political pressure on governmental licensing agencies to see to it that Negroes fail the tests. (p. 376)

But, they did get work in the trades. According to Marshall, some trades in the South did have Blacks in their ranks in such large numbers that that “longshoremen, teamsters, roofers, hood carriers and common laborers, and hotel and restaurant employees” were “regarded as "Negro work." This was because those types of “occupations [were] relatively old and [had] stable techniques making it difficult for unions to exclude Negroes by monopolizing the latest technology” (Marshall, 1963, p. 378).

Surprisingly, some Blacks were able to break through a glass-caste ceiling and grasp coveted white collar jobs. For instance, Hope and Shelton (1963) found that “Negroes [had] been employed in the Federal service 1881” saying:

During the years from 1881 to 1962 total employment in the Federal establishment increased from 107,000 to 2,259,993, and Negro employment from 620 to 293,353. The percent Negro of total Federal employment during this period increased from 0.6 percent to 13 percent. Federal government employment reached its peak in 1944, when total employment rose to 2,295,614. There were 38,621 more Federal employees in 1944 than was tabulated on June 30, 1962. However, Negro employment was greater in 1962 (293,353) than in 1944 (273,971) both in percent and absolute numbers. However, the percent Negro of total employment in the Federal service increased only 1.1 percent over the intervening years. (Hope and Sheldon, 1963, p.371)

In addition to the above statistics, Hope and Sheldon added that “the limited participation of Negroes in the middle and upper grade
levels of Federal government employment [arose] from [limited skill development] as well as racial discrimination” (p. 371). There is little doubt that the perceived underdevelopment of, no doubt, all Blacks was due to the poor education that many received from overpopulated, underfinanced, and segregated schools. By striking down the "separate but equal" doctrine of Brown v. Board of Education, the Supreme Court also eliminated the enforcement of caste in a variety of other settings (Murray, 1965, p.57).

In sum, the geographic location of slaves, the delegation of freed slaves as second class citizens, and the impoverishment of many of their descendants (particularly in the South) —not to mention the segregation of African-Americans in schools, types of jobs, housing, etc. . . .—were all important historic events of the nation that provide context for President Johnson’s rationale and/or reception of his announcement to declare a War on Poverty by implementing the Educational Opportunity Act of 1964.

3. Socio-economic Factors

Despite having “the highest standard of living the world [had] ever known,” (and by December 1965 an unemployment rate as high as 6.6 percent and as low as 4.1 percent), there existed an “other America” in which one-fifth of the country (32,000,000 people) . . . [lived] without adequate education, housing, or medical care. Nearly fifteen million of those living in abject poverty [were] children (Humphrey, 1966, p.6). Curran (1967) indicated that poverty was not spread only in “homogeneous pocket[s]” across different regions but all over the country, but included those living in “urban and rural settings, whites and nonwhites, members of all age groups, employed and unemployed, large families and small families, etc. . . .” (p.109).

What that meant for the people of 1963-65 was that:

- [This means that] an individual with an income less than $1,540 in 1965 is poor and
- that about $500 would have to be added for each dependent to keep the group or family above the poverty line, that is, to keep them out of the poverty class . . . . Thus, the Social Security Administration measuring rod would call a family of four with less than $3,130 annual income "poor" . . . .

In 1963, there [are] 35 million people living in poverty. This means that close to 20% of our population is in the poverty category, as so defined. There are certain groups who are especially likely to be in the poverty category; namely, those under eighteen, those over sixty-five, and non-whites. (Curran, 1967, p.108)

In the “affluent sixties” poverty was described many ways: Extending the historical/geographic theme, Sanford (1966) argued:

Poverty can be the family suddenly fatherless, the handicapped individual with insufficient means to relieve his suffering, the child born into life without family, the blue-collar worker pushed out by the machine, the Negro struggling in a white man's world, the marginal farmer in an increasingly urban America, the coal miner in the age of nuclear energy, and the ill-educated in a time which . . . demands education. (p. 77)

Poverty, it seems, was not viewed as a simple lack of money but included “race relations, aspirations, and education,” as well (Henderson, 1967, p.42). Hence, while it was “economically "bad" to be poor . . . it [was] socially "bad" to be a Negro,” and Black chil-
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The children who were poor were at the bottom of the bottom (Henderson, 1967, p.42). The projections/statistics for poor Blacks was far from hopeful but can be summarized by Gallaway (1967) as follows: Although African-Americans represented only a tenth of the American population, they represented no less than 25% of all of the poor households in the country. Moreover, since poverty “tends to be a permanent state among certain groups in the society . . .” (Gallaway, 1967, p.31), being poor during one year almost assured that one would be poor in subsequent years. Saddest of all, according to Henderson (1967), “a Negro child’s level of aspiration is contingent upon his frame of reference. Thus, there are lower-income Negro students who maintain high or low levels of aspirations, depending upon their social class conditioning” (p.43).

It is important to note that, for the purpose of this paper, only the socio-economic factors of poverty and education have been used as illustrations. The complexities of socio-economic factors regarding what is not being said, at length, can be observed by pointing to Humphrey’s observation:

The impoverished man is the unskilled worker—the man whose job opportunities are shrinking. He is the skilled worker replaced by automation and cybernation. He is the sick, the disabled, the aged. He is the school dropout, the illiterate . . . The factor most common to almost all the unemployed and under-employed is lack of basic education . . . A decent standard of living cannot be had without money; money is gained through employment; a job requires education; and education takes money. Lack of education means no employment; unemployment means lack of funds for education of the children of the unemployed. It also means living in conditions of social as well as physical deprivation, which too often result in children entering school with such crushing handicaps that their eventual failure is assured. Hence poverty is passed on from generation to generation with almost genetic certainty (Humphrey, 1966, p.8).

In sum, the socio-economic conditions affecting the poor—particularly poor Blacks—had their roots in our country’s history and continued to make the social “hole” of race, (negatively) deeper and deeper, economically. The shortcomings that the poor seemed to inherit because of a lack of education were the very battlefields that the War on Poverty was intended to wage.

4. Mass Participation

President Johnson’s November 22, 1963 announcement did not occur in a vacuum. For nine months, the Kennedy-Johnson Administration was witness to mass participation of ordinary citizens. An abbreviated timeline of 1963 (University of Mississippi Division of Outreach and Continuing Education) provides a simple snapshot:

- Feb. SNCC workers begin their Selma project; SNCC worker Jimmy Travis was shot in Mississippi.
- April SCLC began Birmingham protests; Dr King was sent to the Birmingham City Jail”; a CORE volunteer was killed while on a march”
- May SCLC organized a children’s demonstration in Birmingham, Alabama and demonstrations in Virginia
President Kennedy was assassinated on November 22, 1963, and President Johnson declared a War on Poverty five days later. Perhaps it is no coincidence that The Educational Opportunity Act of 1964 coincided during a time when the political power of Blacks grew, and when racial tensions among Blacks grew with an increased dissatisfaction over their rate of progress, and “segregationists resisted change” (Marshall, 1963, p.375). Murray (1965) said that the “resistance to discrimination” was partially due to “a redefinition of constitutional rights by the Supreme Court [and]... the failure of legal processes in parts of the South to facilitate... [change that]... led to the growth of militant protest movements and to new forms of expression of protest” (p.55). What’s more:

As more and more Negroes, encouraged by these decisions, [and] began asserting their long-ignored constitutional rights, they came into direct conflict with state and local governments in the South in which they [were] largely un-represented because of voting and other restrictions and whose officials [had] been the traditional guardians of white supremacy. Thus, after decades of patient litigation to have fundamental rights judicially determined, Negroes faced an array of hostile forces determined to maintain the status quo... (Murray, 1963, 59).

It is important to note that, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 included the sanction of Community Action Programs to be “developed, conducted and administered with the maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served” (Yale Law Journal Company, Inc,1966, p.599). The addition of the section 202(a)(3) calling for a "maximum participation of the poor," [was]... commonly interpreted as a mandate for federal assistance in the effort to create political organizations of the poor (Yale, p.599). Consequently, the interpretation to “organize citizen groups to achieve social action goals”... “ran into powerful opposition” on the part of local leaders when the “community power structure

- June Alabama Governor Wallace was met with the US National Guard when he failed to allow the admission of Black students at University of Alabama; NAACP Field Secretary Medgar Evers was assassinated; Riots caused the SCLC to suspend demonstrations in Georgia.
- June-August Civil rights protests occur in almost every American city
- July MLK and other civil rights leaders meet JFK to discuss March on Washington.
- August Two hundred and fifty thousand attend the March on Washington and witness Dr. King’s “I Have A Dream” speech
- Sept. Four girls were killed in the 16th Street Church bombing in Alabama
- Oct. “Two hundred and fifty thousand school children boycott Chicago’s segregated schools”
saw it as too dangerous a threat to its own leadership” (Burke, 1967, p. 446).

Therefore, with a period already ripe for change, Burke (1967) found that the “anti-poverty planners” were among the hostile forces determined to maintain the status quo. They said that the then current welfare programs were created by middle and upper class people who didn’t understand anything about the poor. “The poor, [they said], get not what they need but what [those] groups [deemed] desirable” (p.449). Moreover, “the first public signs of unhappiness with the poverty program came from big city mayors.” One mayoral conference resolved to “[accuse] the Office of Economic Opportunity of "fostering class struggle" (Burke, 1967, p. 444).

In sum, because the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 included the sanction of Community Action Programs, it was difficult to decipher which part of the Act was being met with hostility—especially since part of it was intended to help improve the education of the poor (e.g. Upward Bound).

5. Governmental Institutions

The governmental institutions immediately impacted by the Educational Opportunity Act of 1964 were the executive and the legislative branches. At the executive level, although President Johnson said that the United States had the duty to “strike away the barriers to full participation in our society,” Stark (1967) argued that the president “did not call for a wholly new set of programs as did Franklin Roosevelt in 1933” but relied on “existing programs in the fields of education, health, welfare, housing and labor” (p.23). Stark elaborated saying:

Under the Great Society banner these activities have been given greater scope and more funds—particularly education, health and housing. In addition, the "poverty" programs have been added. These include the area rehabilitation programs for Appalachia and other depressed regions, and funds for local community action in job development, vocational rehabilitation, Youth Corps, Work Experience, Vista, and the other related educational and welfare services (Stark, 1967, p. 23).

Ginsberg and Shiffman (1966) said that institutions in the 1960s fostered a maintenance of the status quo, claiming that “the personnel involved . . . [needed] to be redirected and reoriented (p. 160). They wrote:

All too often the courts and the law are stacked against the poor; the educational system organized to defeat the children from low-income, ghettoized communities; public and voluntary welfare structured so as to institutionalize poverty on both the material and psychological level; health services of such limited availability that the poor are often half sick and in complete despair. To some, these phenomena are a conspiracy of the "ins" against the "outs (Ginsberg and Shiffman, 1966, p.160).

As soon as President Johnson’s announcement was made, it sparked action on the part of the Congress. However, although Congress passed the Economic Opportunity Act in August, 1964 there was a delay “in appropriating money” (Phi Delta Kappa International, 1965, p.214). On the local level, “mayors predicted disaster if the anti-poverty officials in Washington continued to insist that the poor had to be involved in each community action program. The anti-poverty and coordinating agency on the local level . . . [and] the nation's mayors made it plainly clear that they opposed the principle of involving the poor” (Burke, 1967, p.444).
6. Elite
If institutions were dragging their feet with regards to the helping purpose of the Educational Opportunity Act of 1964, those citizens who held certain special positions of influence like advisers, politicians, economists, etc. . . . also had strategic opportunities to voice their opinions (pro and con) for the program. For example, some proponents of the act and community participation pleaded that:

Too often the initial governmental action has been a reflex to a symptom rather than a thoughtful response to the actual problem. Too little pre-planning goes into our governmental actions. . . . despite all the programs and economic development we have achieved in the last three decades [there are still over one-fifth of our citizens living in poverty] . . . a government alert to change is not enough. It must be responsive to the voices of those who need its help. When it is not representative, it cannot listen—and when it cannot listen, it ceases to be responsive (Sanford, 1966, p.80).

Others arguing for balance declared that “an attack on poverty must provide at least four . . . distinct remedies: job creation, job preparation, transfer payments, and equal employment opportunity” (Humphrey, 1966, p.8). Those recognizing the need to break down social barriers indicated that there needed to be “legisla[tion] against [the] practices of discrimination and…plans to bring the poor into the mainstream of community life” (Lampman, 1965, p. 529).

Similarly, there were those who truly believed that “higher incomes for the poor [would] work to reduce both acquired and at-birth limitations of ability (Lampman, 1965, p. 528). Many educational theorists believed that money used to support the education of the poor would be of great benefit. Individuals like Lampman (1965) justified the spending saying that:

The appropriation under that Act, while it seems small relative to the poverty income gap, is large relative to present outlays for education of the poor. I would estimate that the half-billion dollars or so thereby added increases to the national expenditure for this purpose by about one-seventh. To raise the level of educational expenditure for poor children-who are one—fifth of the nation's children but who consume about a tenth of educational outlay—to equal that of the average would cost in the neighborhood of $3 billion. (Lampman, 1965, p. 529)

Edgecomb’s (1967) words were even more enthusiastic:

We must sell education to the poverty culture as vigorously as the automobile industry attempts to sell the general public on having two cars in every garage. Every resource must be used to emotionally, socially, and educationally reach out to these young people. (p.469).

Some elites refused to divorce the issue of race from their support of the program, pointing out that two of the most important factors influencing the income transition rates of 1955-56 were “educational differences among subgroups and race” (Gallaway, 1967, p. 34). Opponents, on the other hand, inserted race as a backhanded issue by accusing:

the Federal Government [of giving Black] students a better chance of going to college while denying him an adequate college to attend. This is so because about five in ten Negro students go to Negro colleges. The mean-
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The increasing of pre-college programs (including those sponsored by private organizations and of the growing abundance of student aid) is clear: an increasing number of students will be going to college, and many Negro students will go to Negro colleges. So will some white students, just as more Negroes will attend white colleges. (Ware and Determan, 1966, p.468)

It is important to note that some proponents of the program were not only interested in helping poor Blacks but poor people all across the United States. Pointing out that “specific legislation aimed at specific groups [was] not the answer,” they argued:

[Poverty] . . . is not a homogeneous pocket (neither in a regional sense nor a class sense); rather, it includes urban and rural, white and nonwhite, all age groups, employed and unemployed, large families and small families, etc. (Curran, 1967, p. 109)

Some elites saw the creation of programs like Upward Bound as “the convergence of the Civil Rights movement with the growing inability of the developed institutions to deal with social problems and their causes” (Ginsberg and Shiffman, 1966, p.160). Others capitalized on public outrage over military spending for the Viet Nam War versus spending on the War on Poverty, saying “that spending for poverty programs may have been all right when there was "slack" in the economy . . . but now that we [were] approaching full employment, [they could] no longer afford poverty programs” (Blackburn, 1966, p.40). Still, a third set of voices argued that “military spending and poverty programs compete with private consumption and private investment, as well as [italics mine] all other objects of public expenditure (Blackburn, 1966, p.40). The pro-military spenders counter argued that the returns from antipoverty efforts may be far in the future” (Blackburn, 1966, p.42).

The Educational Opportunity Act of 1964 did not generate only economic debates. Some elites accused the US government of “doing only a partial job on the problem of the impoverished” at the local, state and federal levels (Terry Sanford, 1966, p. 80). Some individuals claimed that the “the resources required for this improvement [were] more than the Federal Government [could] or should supply” and that other local and private sources needed to be used to address the problem (Ware and Determan, 1966, p.468). Others claimed that “no level [had] a monopoly on solutions” and that “the states . . . [were] already involved in the problems of poverty through their welfare, education, health, employment and other activities” (Sanford, 1966, p.83).

There were those who believed that the economic system—if left alone—could correct the poverty problem. In the minds of those elites, incomes would rise and poverty would be reduced automatically (Sanford, 1966, p.79). Others knew that there are some obstacles that the economy would not overcome on its own because the poor were poor by choice and due to “a manifestation of laziness, not economic isolation” (Sanford, 1966, p.79). Still, there were those who admitted that, although the economy was not perfect in solving the problems of society, it did not be to be scrapped but only needed to “change or adjust some minor mechanism of government to reach those few people who need help. Therefore, governmental agencies and their programs . . . do not need changing or redirection but just need more money and more people to work for them” (Sanford, 1966, p.79). A different set of individuals claimed what was needed was simply a new way to
measure the reduction of poverty and, therefore, “take its place along with the unemployment rate and the growth rate and the consumer price index as guides to appraisal of the performance of the economy” (Lampman, 1965, p.522).

Some members of the elite were not in favor of tweaking the system if it meant “a redistribution of income (toward equality)” (Coldwell, 1967, p. 375). According to Coldwell, those individuals argued that “economic freedom and distributive justice, or simply freedom and justice, [were] inconsistent” (Coldwell, 1967, p. 370). The use of tax money towards the poor, they argued, to “lessen or eliminate poverty generally disregards [italics mine] the reason why one is poor; in this respect, it differs from most existing government transfer programs.” (Curran, 1967, p.108). In short, according to Edgecomb (1967), the critics “charged that too much has been spent with too little accomplished and pinpointed the Job Corps as an [example of] educational failure” (p. 469).

In sum, from the moment of the Educational Opportunity Act of 1964 was proposed and its beneficiaries known, there were a number of individuals—outside of mass groups—who were able to voice their criticisms for or against plans like the future Upward Bound. Arguments for and against the essence of the Act were influenced by how individuals —no doubt highly educated, themselves—viewed historical events, the socio-economic factors necessitating the policy, the protests in the streets, and the demonstrations of non-violent action.

7. (Outputs) Events

Viewing the Hofferbert model—and especially the outputs as they impact, first, events and then the six variables—is like looking at a light through a child’s kaleidoscope. You see different views depending on how you turn and tweak the lens. That is to say, that mass-political feedback and feedback from the elite regarding the inclusion of community activism became an event that affected Congress and the president. Congress was opposed to increased appropriations for the community action programs and, at one point, President Johnson “shied away from defending the local anti-poverty programs” (Burke, 1967, p.71). “[When he ultimately spoke of the programs] . . . only rarely [did] he mention the war on poverty, and when he [did he would refer] . . . to the non-controversial Head Start and job training programs” (Burke, 1967, p. 71).

Similarly, when the Educational Opportunity Act of 1964 (output) was finally passed and administered by Sargent Shriver (elite) and the Office of Economic Opportunity (governmental institutions), Ware and Determan (1966) said:

The Upward Bound Program . . . is designed to find and bring to higher education youngsters from low-income families. It differs from the typical college-oriented programs for disadvantaged students in that it is not directed expressly toward students of exceptional academic promise. 'We are not just looking for potential Rhodes scholars', Shriver says, ‘but poor kids we can help get out of poverty.’ (p. 465)

Based on this statement circa 1964, the implementation of the Upward Bound Program immediately became an historic variable in its own right. Moreover: 1) the benefits of the program would have affected participants (the socio-economic variables ); 2) more participants would have applied for the program and taxpayers would have either
supported or opposed the program (mass-political); 3) the Democrats controlling Congress would have continued to support Upward Bound in those early years and even considered implementing similar programs (governmental institutions); and 4) members of economic, political, social and other epistemic communities (the elite) would have continued either providing examples why Upward Bound did or did not work.

**Conclusion**

Nearly fifty years after a War on Poverty was declared and Upward Bound was created, new events and reminiscent variables threaten to dismantle this and other TRIO programs like it.

Today, historical hate, revamped prejudices, and new types of xenophobia are still influencing some elites to persist in their unwavering belief that there are whole groups of people who deserve overpopulated, underfunded, and neo-segregated schools primarily because their parents ---often undereducated and poor--- do not pay their “fair share” of the necessary property taxes which, in turn, support school districts. And, in the spirit of “equal opportunity,” the cries of the ’60s against Blacks have been substituted for cries against Mexican immigrants, Mexican-Americans, and any other “new” immigrant representing yet another burden on the “all-American” (property) tax payer.

Clearly, the economic events of 2004-2012 have had an effect on those who could benefit most from Upward Bound (not to mention, Student Support Services Talent Search, Upward Bound Math-Science, and Veterans Upward Bound) because there is a growing population in America of the unemployed, underemployed, working poor, and I-think-I’m-in-the-middle-class class. One would think, therefore, that a cry for programs, like Upward Bound, would be well-received by “everyone.” Sadly, no. Instead, the outrage of some—this time not over 1960 military spending in Vietnam, but (for instance) the debt incurred after the Wars of Afghanistan and Iraq—has generated nationwide we-can’t-afford-to-spend-money-on-education mantras. For instance, elites currently running (and strategizing) for the 2012 U.S. presidency are currently stating (and restating) their official platforms for or against educational programs were their party to win the November election. Depending on the final outcome, TRIO Programs will continue, or they will be scrapped altogether (along with, according to one former presidential candidate, the disassembling of the entire U.S. Department of Education).

Three months ago, 171 Upward Bound Programs failed to receive another five years of funding which would have served nearly 5,000 students. Although programs can miss the cut by even a fraction of a point, the implications for the remaining Upward Bound Programs (in addition to the hundreds of programs served by the seven other TRIO programs whose funding could be cut next) is that there is a need for current program participants to become part of the political masses who apply deliberate pressure to those elites who would threaten to cut these educational programs. Equally important is the need for past participants ---especially those who have participated in more than one TRIO rung and/or gone on to have successful careers as the result of their participation TRIO programs like Upward Bound---to not forget the hand they were extended, but to combine their activist voices to the political masses.
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