In November 2008, then U.S. Senator Barack H. Obama was elected the 44th President of the United States. Because he was the first Person of Color to be elected president, the national media proclaimed that the United States had entered a “postracial” era, leading many people in U.S. society to surmise that racism no longer existed at an institutional level but was enacted exclusively at the individual level. This is reminiscent of what scholars refer to as a color-blind ideology, one that rationalizes contemporary racial inequality as the result of nonracial dynamics (Bonilla-Silva, 2010). However, since President Obama’s election and subsequent reelection, there have been a number of incidents illuminating race and racism’s continued presence and role in U.S. society and education. Three notable examples sparking national debate are the deaths of two unarmed Black teenagers, Trayvon Martin and Michael Brown, and 43-year-old Eric Garner. In February 2012, Trayvon Martin, an unarmed Black adolescent male, was shot and killed by a neighborhood watch coordinator in Sanford, Florida. The shooter was later acquitted of all charges. More recently, in August 2014, college-bound Michael Brown, another unarmed, Black adolescent male, was shot and killed by a White male police officer in Ferguson, Missouri, setting off months of confrontation between community members, state and local police, and the National Guard.
In November 2014, a grand jury issued a non-indictment. In July 2014, a White male New York City police officer placed Eric Garner in a chokehold (a move that is banned by the New York City Police Department) because he resisted New York City police officers’ claims that he was illegally selling cigarettes. Mr. Garner died during the incident, with the coroner’s office ruling his death a homicide. The grand jury for this incident also failed to issue an indictment.

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

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

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

Critical Race Theory in Higher Education

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

Critical Legal Studies

After significant civil rights advancements during the 1960s, critical legal studies (CLS) emerged in response to the perceived stalling of the
aforementioned rights during the 1970s. Critical legal scholars argued “that the reasoning and logic of the law was in fact based on arbitrary categorizations and decisions that both reflected and advanced established power relationships in society by covering injustices with a mask of legitimacy” (Taylor, 2009, p. 2). Critical legal studies’ primary goal was to expose and challenge the idea that legal reasoning was “neutral, value-free, and unaffected by social and economic relations, political forces or cultural phenomena” (Brown & Jackson, 2013, p. 12).

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

The Origins of Critical Race Theory

Critical race theory is grounded in the Civil Rights Movement and from its beginning has focused on social justice, liberation, and economic empowerment (Tate, 1997). Its origins can be traced to the critical legal studies movement of the 1970s (Brayboy, 2005; Lynn, Yosso, Solórzano, & Parker, 2002). Critical race theory emerged from critical legal studies because of the latter’s inability to address People of Color’s struggles (Brown & Jackson, 2013; Solórzano & Yosso, 2001; Stanley, 2006; Taylor, 2009; Yosso, 2005). Kevin Brown and Darrell Jackson (2013) expressed how critical race theory emerged from the convergence of historical developments and the need to respond to those developments. Dissatisfied with critical legal studies’ lack of focus on race and
racism in the legal process, a group of legal scholars convened to name and plan a legal research agenda that focused on the effects of race and racism (Brayboy, 2005; Lynn & Adams, 2002; Lynn et al., 2002; Taylor, 1998, 2009). These scholars recognized the need for new methods for addressing the various ways racism manifests (Delgado & Stefancic, 2013; Museus, 2013). Thus, critical race theory emerged as a form of legal scholarship that sought to understand how White supremacy and its oppression of People of Color had been established and perpetuated. In doing so, race and racism was placed at the center of scholarship and analysis by focusing on such issues as affirmative action, racial districting, campus speech codes, and the disproportionate sentencing of People of Color in the U.S. criminal justice system (Lynn & Adams, 2002; Taylor, 1998).

**Critical Race Theory**

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

**Key Tenets of Critical Race Theory**

Critical race theory continues to emerge and expand as a theoretical framework and analytical tool for interrupting racism and other forms of oppression. Its tenets have been defined (see glossary for definitions of key critical
race terminology and concepts included in this monograph) and framed in a number of ways (see Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Solórzano & Yosso, 2002; Taylor, 2009). In this monograph, we specifically focus on the following critical race tenets: (a) the permanence of racism; (b) experiential knowledge (and counterstorytelling); (c) interest convergence theory; (d) intersectionality; (e) Whiteness as property; (f) critique of liberalism; and (g) commitment to social justice.

The Permanence of Racism

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

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

Daniel Solórzano, Miguel Ceja, and Tara Yosso (2000) succinctly stated “racism is about institutional power, a form of power, [P]eople of [C]olor—that is non-Whites—have never possessed” (p. 61). For example, the Jim Crow laws of the Deep South institutionally marginalized Black people.
Critical race scholars recognize that racism is not a random isolated act (Ladson-Billings, 2013). It is so engrained in U.S. society that it seems natural and is often unrecognizable or invisible to most individuals (Ladson-Billings, 1998; Taylor, 1998, 2009). When racism is invisible, individuals believe it no longer exists or that it is connected to a specific “isolated” incident (Lopez, 2003). Edward Taylor (2009) surmised that when oppression (such as racism) no longer seems like oppression to the perpetrator, racial incidents become isolated horrific encounters and events.

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

**Experiential Knowledge (and Counterstorytelling)**

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

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

**Interest Convergence Theory**

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

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

Interest convergence is grounded in Marxist theory—that the bourgeoisie (middle to upper class) tolerate the proletariat’s (working class) advances when those advances also benefit the bourgeoisie (Taylor, 2009). Bell’s (1980) theory of interest convergence posits that Black people and other People of Color...
advance when their interests converge with the interests of powerful White people, whereas Gloria Ladson-Billings (2013) suggested that interest convergence is about “alignment, not altruism” (p. 38). In higher education, an example of visible interest convergence would be an institution that admits Students of Color in an effort to meet specific diversity goals, even though the campus climate may not be inclusive and the resources necessary to support Students of Color’s persistence at that institution may be limited. Historically, White people in the United States have been willing to sacrifice People of Color’s well-being for economic self-interests and the continued subordination of People of Color (Taylor, 1998). Considering this, critical scholars recognize critical race as a form of oppositional theory and maintain that conflict is inevitable and that progress is made through resistance3 (Taylor, 2009).

**Intersectionality**

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

**Whiteness as Property**

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

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

Whiteness as a concept is based on power relations (Harris, 1993). More specifically, Whiteness is based on White dominance and the subordination of People of Color. In describing the meaning and value associated with Whiteness, Ladson-Billings (1998) positioned critical race theory as an important
intellectual and social tool for “deconstruction, reconstruction, and construction: deconstruction of oppressive structures and discourses, reconstruction of human agency, and construction of equitable and socially just relations of power” (p. 9). Critical race scholars have claimed that the concept of Whiteness can be considered a property interest because those individuals allowed to self-identify as White have social advantages (DeCuir & Dixson, 2005; Harris, 1993).

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

**Critique of Liberalism**

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

Color blindness, the belief that race does not matter (Worthington, Navarro, Loewy, & Hart, 2008), fails to consider the permanence of racism. Manning (2009) suggested it is the misguided belief in the equality of people because they are human. DeCuir and Dixson (2004) suggested that
embracing color blindness ignores “that inequity, inopportunity, and oppression are historical artifacts that will not easily be remedied by ignoring race in the contemporary society” (p. 29). Whereas, Ford and Airhihenbuwa (2010) surmised that critical race theory challenges the erroneous belief that color blindness is synonymous with the absence of racism. Individuals committed to social justice must consistently challenge the ways that racial advancements are promoted through White self-interest and a color-blind ideology (Patton et al., 2007).

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

**Commitment to Social Justice**

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

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

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

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

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

In the second chapter, we review selected works that informed the critical race movement in education and connect the extant literature using the tenets presented within the context of People of Color’s experiences in the academy. Using the history and tenets as our foundation, in the third chapter we examine critical race theory as a research methodology. We review the key elements (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002) of a critical race methodology as well as its utility. Also in this chapter, we focus on counterstorytelling and discuss its functions. In addition, we review critical race’s descendent theories and discuss the tension and possibility of “growing” the counterstory beyond qualitative
methodologies (incorporating quantitative and mixed methodologies). In the fourth chapter, we connect critical race theory with student development theories as a means for understanding Students of Color’s racialized experiences in higher education. More specifically, we explore how critical race theory and the intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1991) of students’ multiple identities affect their holistic development and experiences in higher education. In the fifth chapter, we examine a more subtle form of racism, racial microaggressive behavior. We discuss the types of microaggressions and how they have replaced covert forms of racism in higher education. We conclude by discussing critical race theory’s potential for growth during the next 20 years and its emphasis on social justice, and we offer provocations for how scholars and practitioner—educators can extend or initiate their critical race praxis.