

4 Race Reflexivity: Examining the Unconscious for a Critical Race Ethnography

Laura C. Chávez-Moreno

Research about race in schools (and arguably other inquiries as well) requires a researcher to engage with their personal, educational and scholarly training about race and racism. This chapter takes readers on my journey as a scholar in learning race scholarship, particularly in employing critical race theory (CRT), and some of the reflexivity I engaged in. To start, I briefly situate the ethnographic tradition in which I locate my study, and I summarize my inquiry into a two-way dual-language (DL) program. The chapter's main section describes the race-reflexivity typology: the three levels of race reflexivity in relation to my learning about, and use of, CRT and other race theories. More specifically, I provide scholars with an example of using the typology of race reflexive modes of thought outlined by sociologists Mustafa Emirbayer and Matthew Desmond (2012) and extended by sociologist Wendy Moore's (2012) critique of Emirbayer and Desmond's article. As such, the chapter contributes a scholar's race reflexivity, an example of considering one's knowledge acquisition and unconscious when conducting a Critical Race ethnography to study white supremacy, race and racism in schooling contexts.

Critical Race Ethnography in Education

I selected ethnography as my study's mode of inquiry because it encourages thick description about everyday cultural practices and interactions between people in their lived environment, for example, institutional activities in schools. Many rich ethnographies examine questions centering race and racism (Bartlett & Brayboy, 2005; Carter, 2005; Haddix, 2012; Lee, 2009; Pollock, 2009) by asking, for example, how the complexities of race/racism in schooling influence the interactions between teachers, youth and other school community members (Lewis, 2011; Valenzuela, 1999). My study follows this tradition by utilizing a specific type of ethnography: 'Critical Race ethnography' (Duncan, 2005; Vaught, 2011; see also Coles, this volume). While this chapter

explores reflexivity and does not aim to offer an example of how to conduct a Critical Race ethnography or elaborate on this as a methodology, I briefly mention below some key features of Critical Race ethnography in order to situate the study for readers.

A Critical Race ethnography is similar to ethnographies that contribute insights into and thick description of how race operates as a stratifying force in localized school contexts and thus larger society. However, a Critical Race ethnography goes further, as Sabina Vaught (2011: 24) elaborates – it is not just attention to race and racism that makes a Critical Race ethnography, but its adherence to and development of ‘central conceptual arguments of CRT’. The central concepts from CRT’s legal tradition are, like all concepts, decided on by each researcher, and I suggest some of the most influential in education have been interest convergence (e.g. Alemán & Alemán, 2010; Castagno, 2014; Milner, 2008), intersectionality (e.g. Harris & Leonardo, 2018; Harris & Patton, 2019; Pérez Huber, 2010) and whiteness as property (e.g. Annamma, 2015; Powell, 2018). The fundamental difference between a critical ethnography and a Critical Race ethnography is the latter’s aim of explaining the observed sociocultural practices through CRT and, through this, then expounding on CRT concepts.

I aimed for my study to advance as the theoretical and analytical framework the concept of whiteness as property (Harris, 1993), a choice guided by the rationale of focusing on the material consequences of race. Following Vaught, I capitalize Critical Race ethnography to differentiate it from critical ethnographies that study race/racism and to signal that my project advances a key concept from CRT. Next, I briefly describe the context of the Critical Race ethnography I conducted.

The Study

My investigation took place in a two-way DL bilingual education program, which is a bilingual model said to improve students’ academic achievement and to develop biliteracy by balancing a classroom’s number of English-dominant students and (in my context) Spanish-dominant students. I focused on two racially diverse schools with DL programs, a high school and its feeder middle school. Almost all the youth had participated in DL since early elementary school. The DL elementary school’s logic of labeling students as either Spanish dominant (in this case Latinxs¹) or English dominant continued to organize the secondary-level classrooms, even though the adolescents mostly self-identified as bilingual. Reflecting its midwestern public school district’s issue with racial disparities, the DL program faced tensions between the program objective of focusing on Latinxs (many of whom were labeled ‘English language learners’) and that of teaching White youth, who comprised most of the English-dominant half. My ethnography explores the policies, program practices,

pedagogy and ideologies of the DL program. For example, I examined the teachers' practices in regard to culturally relevant pedagogy's socio-political consciousness (Ladson-Billings, 2014). I also examined how the policies and program practices attended to equity for Latinxs. The study intervened in the fields of bilingual education and race studies in education by showing how a DL program perpetuates Whites' inequitable material accumulation and the superiority of a white racial identity. I found that DL whitewashed bilingual education through policies benefiting Whites while excluding many Latinx students and other students of color from a bilingual education (Chávez-Moreno, 2018; see also Heiman & Yanes, this volume).

The next section comprises the chapter's main argument and contribution, that of describing a type of race reflexivity and providing examples of this reflexivity.

Race Reflexivity

Unlike post-positivist attempts to sanitize the researcher's influence from the study, critical research paradigms and ethnographic traditions consider the researcher as determinative to the study (e.g. Banks, 1998; Carspecken, 1996; Madison, 2019; Villenas, 1996). I understood myself as formative to the inquiry and therefore an instrumental part of the study. This stance requires considering my own positionality and engaging in reflexivity practices to help me account for my interpretations when conducting fieldwork in the analytical description and interpretation of the data. Furthermore, because racial ideologies are pervasive yet invisibilized in US society, I submit that to conduct research that examines race requires a researcher to engage in reflexivity about race – that is, their unconscious ideas, assumptions and scholarly training about race.

For my Critical Race ethnography, I sought theoretical guidance for a rigorous practice of reflexivity for race scholars. I decided to adapt the race reflexive thinking suggested by sociologists Emirbayer and Desmond (2012) and extended by Moore's (2012) push to attend to the systemic racism and white normativity within academia. I mention my choice not to suggest that, in order to do a Critical Race ethnography, one must follow the race reflexivity recommended by these particular scholars. Rather, after considering several reflexivity conceptualizations, I chose this approach as the one most appropriate for my situation and research. I anticipated this approach would help me be explicit about the assumptions guiding my decisions for my study for several reasons. For one, like Emirbayer and Desmond, I disagree that a scholar's racial vantage point and/or identity *in and of itself* leads to scholarly advances.

Reflexivity can help scholars from different racial standpoints to provide constructive theories that advance race scholarship (see also May & Caldas, this volume). Another reason I chose this approach was because

I did not initially understand and/or (ultimately) agree with all of Emirbayer and Desmond's points (which I describe below). Meaning, I chose this approach in order to not engage with the obvious and/or an 'easy' reflexivity practice, but to embark on a practice that would challenge me into reading more about new ideas.

Emirbayer and Desmond argue that advancing race scholarship requires scholars from across fields to share practical knowledge on race reflexivity in order to (1) grow scientific knowledge of racial structures and practices, (2) develop ways to theorize and address racial injustice and (3) promote appreciation of racial differences without resorting to essentialized platitudes that reify race. Scholars should not narrate their life-history, but rather engage in 'rigorous institutional analyses of the social and historical structures that condition one's thinking and inner experience' (Emirbayer & Desmond, 2012: 591). In so doing, they should 'pass on to one another their accumulated practical knowledge regarding the multifarious ways in which the academic unconscious shapes seemingly even innocuous "choices" such as the selection of research questions or the crafting of objects of study' (Emirbayer & Desmond, 2012: 591), the latter of which I do elsewhere (Chávez-Moreno, 2018). Emirbayer and Desmond (2012) note that individuals are products of institutions, like schools and universities, and thus they argue that reflecting on different dimensions of reflexivity is not to establish legitimacy or be an exercise in navel-gazing, but to benefit one's study and advance social science. Moore (2012) reminds us that the academy was founded on, and still engages in, white supremacist ideologies and practices, and that it behooves race scholars to analyze the contexts and institutional structures and processes that formed their ideas.

Basing their conception of race reflexivity on Pierre Bourdieu's ideas on reflexivity, Emirbayer and Desmond (2012) describe three levels of the unconscious a scholar should consider when engaging in race theory scholarship: the social unconscious; the disciplinary unconscious; and the scholastic unconscious. The following three sections each describe one level of reflexivity and provide examples of the reflexivity I engaged in for my study of race in a DL program. To do the latter, I weave into each of the three levels of reflexivity identified by Emirbayer and Desmond (2012) my reflections on the beliefs which informed my research's aims and my researcher decisions. These reflections touch on how I adapted the three levels for my own situation and learning, how I learned about race theory and how various learnings came to influence my goals for my Critical Race ethnography. My description of the disciplinary reflexivity level is lengthier than the other two because I believe reflexive thinking about how one's academic traditions conceive of race is the most underexplored in educational scholarship.

The Social Unconscious

The first level of reflexivity, the social, involves a scholar recognizing their racial vantage points and their view as limited. Emirbayer and Desmond (2012) call for race scholars to consider their location(s) in society's racial order and the impact of whiteness, either alone or, depending on what is germane for the particular study, in some combination with gender, class, religion and so forth, and to consider their particular trajectories across spaces, as well as the trajectories that have led to their position(s). Emirbayer and Desmond (2012) claim that the most common form of reflexivity is exploring how identity and background have influenced one's vision of the world – which is necessary yet insufficient. Moore (2012) adds that the difficulty of the reflexivity process is caused by white normativity being ingrained in our social institutions, and thus some scholars' reflexivity wants for nuance.

I heeded the call to consider the social unconscious, and thus share relevant parts of my personal background, perspective, assumptions and social agenda in relation to my study. While I engaged in an intersectional analyses (e.g. of gender, education, class, religion and sexuality) of my multiple identities (e.g. woman of color, (im)migrant and Chicana), below I largely focus on significant points from my institutional schooling experience regarding race, white normativity, language and literacy because my Critical Race ethnography is of a DL program.

I grew up in Sonora/Arizona border cities and became a Mexican (im)migrant to the United States when I was eight years old. Given that I knew almost no English when I was enrolled in an Arizona elementary school, I would have been labeled an 'English as a second language' (ESL) student, but my father refused to disclose that we spoke Spanish at home because he heard that ESL classes treated students like tontos (à la the Lone Ranger). Consequently, I suffered through elementary school and required several interventions in order to not 'sink' in my English-only classes.

The Title 1 border schools I attended had more than 85% Mexican heritage students and had many of the issues that are frequently documented for youth such as myself. For example, I see many parallels in my schooling experiences with Angela Valenzuela's (1999) description of 'subtractive schooling', in which she suggests that systemic problems for US-Mexican youth in education include: discounting alternate definitions of education; assimilating youths' culture and language; and disregarding the importance of care as an essential element in schooling. My schooling had very culturally and linguistically subtractive assimilationist practices, such as having an education that did not develop our bilingualism and biliteracy but did teach us how to square dance (for a racialized and gendered history of square dancing, see Pennacchia, 2017).

As a middle-school student seeking to improve my Spanish literacy, I enrolled in the only Spanish courses available, even though they were designed for English speakers. I became frustrated that my schooling did not provide a rigorous education, and that I had to maintain my Spanish through interactions with family and friends instead. As I progressed through middle and high school, I ascended to the higher-tracked courses that had an over-representation of White students compared to my previous classes. There, I noticed a clear pattern of White students being preferred by teachers and regarded as ‘smart’, despite how I saw many Mexican students just as academically capable.

In high school, I decided to become a secondary-level teacher to help adolescents like me develop their biliteracy and have a better education than mine. As a teacher of Spanish in Philadelphia public schools, I ended up teaching Spanish as a foreign language to classes of mostly White and Black students because secondary-level bilingual programs were (and remain) uncommon. The schools where I taught did have Latinx students from Spanish-speaking homes who were interested in learning and improving their Spanish literacy; however, the schools did not use resources for Spanish heritage language courses. As a teacher, I advocated for these classes to be offered, but was unsuccessful in expanding the school’s course offerings. Needless to say, I was disturbed by the inequitable distribution of resources and attention to students who looked and sounded like me. This discomfort motivated me to begin my graduate studies and, once there, I became interested in racial formation and the materiality of race in the lives of students of color.

In my trajectory, I experienced various economic class statuses, private/public schooling both in Mexico and the United States, being seen as an exceptional learner or an ‘at risk ESL immigrant’ and moving back and forth between countries and languages. I have crossed in and out of statuses as a student and as a teacher of both ‘gifted’ and ‘at-risk’ students, and have seen the sameness in their intellectual potential, except for their class/racial positioning. These crossings have changed my positioning in society’s racial order and given me an understanding of ‘race’ as constructed not only from color, but also from other markers, such as language.

Concerning my assumptions about language, I start by mentioning that Spanish is a colonizer language that has eradicated some indigenous languages and continues to marginalize and/or invisibilize others (e.g. Mexico’s Nahuatl, Zapotec, Maya, Otomí, Purépecha), which perpetuates the erasure of indigeneity (Calderon & Urrieta, 2019; see also McCarty, this volume). I also see the Spanish language in the United States as being a foundational characteristic, for better and for worse, of the social construction of the ‘Latinx’ racialized group (Chávez-Moreno, 2021), which has helped form the racial coalition ‘Hispanic/Latinx’ (Mora, 2014). The Spanish language also assists Latinxs in holding on

to, and passing down, history in order to understand present injustices. For example, Richard Delgado (2009) argues that lynchings of Mexican Americans in the Southwest are not better known because the accounts of these atrocities were in Spanish newspapers. Thus, language and literacy loss contribute to being disconnected from written histories and other knowledges.

My struggles with providing youth with a biliterate, culturally relevant education thus inform my understanding of the district where my ethnographic study takes place as providing a rare and promising opportunity for some of its language-minoritized youth to receive that education. As a researcher, when I sat in most of the classes I studied, I wished I had had this type of education, or even this particular teacher and course. I would have benefited greatly from having a bilingual education program that shifted from a subtractive to an additive model of schooling in my schools, both as a student and as a teacher. However, while I recognize the potential of the DL program I examined, given my understanding of racial realism, I still wondered how such an opportunity can cause unintended consequences and/or perpetuate white supremacy.

This section shows how my research agenda grew from my social identity, which explores issues in the intersection of race and language in the tradition of contributing a robust critique of societal structures that maintain and/or challenge oppression.

The Disciplinary Unconscious

Emirbayer and Desmond's (2012) second reflexivity level involves the scholar acknowledging both that the cultural knowledge they produce is informed by their discipline or larger social-scientific field (e.g. education, an interdisciplinary field), and that their academic tradition places limits on their understanding of the questions and solutions they explore (see also May & Caldas, this volume). Drawing from Bourdieu's 'academic unconscious', Emirbayer and Desmond note that each academic tradition has national peculiarities, shared beliefs and common sense, lines of thought that may exist in mutual antagonism, presuppositions stemming from the speciality's history, unavoidable problematics, constructions of what counts as evidence, censorship and constraints on publishing certain findings.

Emirbayer and Desmond recommend scholars learn their academic tradition's particularities and how the field/discipline expresses racial knowledges in order to appreciate earlier conceptions and frameworks of race and to understand what new frameworks are constructed. Toward this end, Emirbayer and Desmond argue for the need to read, rather than dismiss, the cast-aside theories that have informed the discipline's collective memory (e.g. Ogbu's 1978 oppositional culture from *Minority Education and Caste*). On the one hand, serious study allows a race scholar

to recognize their position within their academic tradition, and to see the openings and constraints for innovative scholarship, which significantly informs how scholars engage in their scholarly work. On the other hand, Moore (2012: 617) cogently rejoins that, while there is a need for scholars to read and understand the work we critique, spending time studying foundational works that express white supremacist and imperialist views would not only have scholars of color legitimizing (even if indirectly) ‘scholarship that pathologizes and dehumanizes’ their communities, but it also takes time away from exploring and advancing anti-racist alternatives (see also Deiri, this volume).

Along a different line, Emirbayer and Desmond (2012: 584) also note the importance of crossing into other disciplinary spaces, and they call for great skepticism of ‘academic tendencies toward parochialism and overspecialization’, such as specifically focusing on one single racial group, which ‘propagate[s] a distorted view of the social world wherein (reified) racial groups exist in relative isolation from one another’ (Emirbayer & Desmond, 2012: 585).

Disciplinary reflexivity for my study means discussing my exploration of what it means to be a scholar of race trained in education, which I later came to understand as an interdisciplinary field (and one at the bottom of the academic hierarchy; Lagemann, 2000). I learned early on in my graduate training that the field of US education is historically founded on psychology and is influenced by that discipline’s preoccupation with wanting to be regarded as a rigorous science (Lagemann, 2000). Knowing this foundation and psychology’s scientific racism allows me to better appreciate connections to education’s research on racial difference (Skiba, 2012), testing and eugenics (Stoskopf, 1999) and the learning style ideas ethnocentric origins (Fallace, 2019). As a result, I also learned about and gravitated more toward CRT (see also Coles, this volume). Below, I weave in my learning about CRT in order to explain how CRT and its foundational discipline – legal studies – influenced my understanding of race.

As previously mentioned, I used CRT in education, founded by legal scholars as a critique of liberalism, as my study’s framework. Thanks to Gloria Ladson-Billings and William Tate (1995), CRT has given education scholars the language with which we talk about race in education (e.g. Dixon & Rousseau, 2005; Leonardo, 2013; Lynn & Dixon, 2013; Solórzano & Yosso, 2001; Tran, 2019). As I read about CRT during my Boston College graduate studies and thought of the possibility of adapting CRT for my research, I heeded Ladson-Billings’ (1998: 22) advice to ‘study and understand the legal literature in which it is situated [... and be] serious about intense study and careful rethinking of race and education’. Because my training is in teaching and curriculum studies, not legal studies, I enrolled in my university’s law school course, ‘Education Law and Public Policy’. There, I read court decisions and learned

about the fundamentals of the legal tradition such as the structure of the US system of laws and the nature of legal analysis by which legal decisions are made. This foundation helped me better understand CRT legal scholars' claims about the limits of the law in occasioning social justice – for example, their critique of the idea of incremental progress eventually leading toward justice. I continued to learn about CRT scholars' critiques, along with their calls for changing or even discarding, for example, the US Constitution (an argument I heard developed in the 2015 LatCrit Conference of legal scholars, with the theme 'Critical Constitutionalism'²). I learned about how the legal discipline has historically conceptualized race, oppositions to its traditional conceptions of race and what questions are asked about race.³ In addition to knowing how laws are interpreted, CRT readings helped me obtain a deeper appreciation for the implications of the US legal tradition's construction of race as an immutable characteristic and of the limits of strict scrutiny toward achieving justice (e.g. Carbado & Gulati, 2000; Haney López, 1997, 2006; Perea, 1997, 2004; Tehranian, 2019).

Legal studies' construction of race left me wanting a more robust theory of race. As I learned more about CRT, Zeus Leonardo's (2013) claim that race in CRT is assumed and not defined and that CRT did not have a 'racial theory' became more pronounced. Looking to sociology became fruitful for learning about race theory, an approach later validated by other scholars (Cabrera, 2019; Lewis *et al.*, 2019). Delving into sociology, I found a spirited debate with nuanced theorizations of race that most influenced my understanding of race (e.g. Bonilla-Silva, 1997, 2004, 2010; Desmond & Emirbayer, 2009; Fields & Fields, 2014; Golash-Boza, 2016; Omi & Winant, 2015; Roth, 2016; Twine, 2004; Winant, 2000). This literature helped me move beyond the trite precept of race as a social construction to seeing race as ill-defined in education (Leonardo, 2013), and later recognizing CRT in education as largely focused on examining racism and not on contributing to racial theories (Cabrera, 2018). I found it useful, as an education scholar, to look toward sociology's advances on racial theory to understanding race, as suggested by Lewis *et al.* (2019). With these understandings, my research study's scope included inquiring into Latinidad as a shifting racial category and into the role of bilingual education in racialization, something mostly ignored in scholarship (Chávez-Moreno, 2019).

On the subject of my inquiry's scope, I return to Emirbayer and Desmond's (2012) call for scholars to eschew studying just one single racial group – advice I was more hesitant to accept than their other suggestions. One of my interests and intentions for my research was to contribute to advancing the education field's understanding of equity issues in secondary-level DL schooling, specifically concerning Latinxs. Setting aside my reluctance, I opened my study to consider whiteness and blackness in relation to my questions and my inquiry into what Latinidad means.

While readers will judge for themselves, I believe this provided my study with more theoretical nuance than a narrower lens would have afforded.

Traversing disciplines such as psychology, law and sociology gave me an appreciation of the nuanced differences in academic currents, and allowed me to see more clearly the affordances and limitations of my own academic tradition. For example, not until reading debates of sociologists of race, which featured openly antagonistic criticisms explicitly naming the limitations of other scholars' ideas, did I appreciate how education was a 'nice' field, as described by Ladson-Billings (1998), where critiques are more indirect and muted. Although I had already understood that race was historically seen as a biological attribute across academic traditions, exploring other disciplines' conceptions of race helped me to situate my analysis within the field of social sciences more broadly, an important insight given the social sciences' significant role in developing and extending CRT (Crenshaw, 2010; Zuberi, 2011).

The Scholastic Unconscious

Emirbayer and Desmond's (2012: 578) third level of reflexivity, the scholastic, involves scholars recognizing the 'invisible determinations inherent in the intellectual posture itself, in the scholarly gaze that [one] casts upon the social world'. The authors critique academia's *modus operandi* of studying and explaining, (1) with a disinclination to concede that scholars' position from academia limits their understanding of the issues under inquiry, and (2) without an inclination to affect the material conditions of people. Emirbayer and Desmond contend that this level of reflexivity is the least practiced by scholars and leads to scholars engaging in an intellectual posture of withdrawing from the experiential and the practical, forgetting existing material inequities and overlooking the faults of people of color, which is another form of dehumanizing people along with attributing nothing good. Moore's (2012) rejoinder emphasizes that CRT has a tradition of engaging the reflexivity championed by Emirbayer and Desmond and adds that the authors should have paid more attention to the way institutional arrangements (my example is tenure evaluations that do not validate activism on a par with publishing scholarship) are influenced by white supremacist systems and by who has power to negotiate these arrangements.

For my study, I had to be conscious of not dismissing Emirbayer and Desmond's claims even though I understood (1) education as a 'practical' field that works on and proposes how to improve the schooling, learning and lives of youth and children; and (2) CRT scholars have called for much of the reflexive knowledge advocated by Emirbayer and Desmond (Harris, 2019; Moore, 2012). Connecting the two points, CRT education scholars have proposed not only critiquing the cherished victories from the civil rights movement (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995)

and exposing incidents of racism (Hylton, 2012; Ladson-Billings, 2009; Ladson-Billings & Donnor, 2005) but *also* imagining and proposing radical solutions for the education field's aim of improving the schooling and learning of youth (Ladson-Billings, 1998) – a practical goal differentiating education from sociology.

As someone who has suffered through subtractive schooling and is trained in critical theories that see truths as constituted from sociopolitical power (Lather, 2006), my scholarly gaze has been influenced to see my cultural production of research as needing to attend to the two aims of uncovering unintended consequences and of proposing radical solutions. For the first aim, I saw my study as illuminating the role of schooling in the reproduction of inequality. I believe that, to improve policies and programs intended to advance equity, the unintended or negative consequences of an intervention that affect communities of color – even in what is perceived as beneficial programs, like bilingual education – must be exposed in order to understand whether the interventions are actually combating racial inequities and addressing racial inequities (see also Heiman & Yanes, this volume). While some bilingual education models serving bilingual youth of color have been on shaky ground because of racist policies (e.g. Gándara & Hopkins, 2010; Gutiérrez *et al.*, 2002; Viesca, 2013), I still see it as necessary to critique how asset-based approaches to education are working, while also carefully explicating nuances and complexities. The social implications of my research study add to a push for a more explicit accounting of race and racism by bilingual education and teacher training programs.

Regarding the second aim, my personal and professional experience impact my sense of urgency to correct injustices that youth continue to face and inform my proclivity toward seeing a researcher's goal as that of ameliorating injustices (Lather, 1986b), as well as serving the public interest (Ladson-Billings, 2006). Thus, I kept in mind that ethnographic studies in the critical tradition should also respond to the social implications of the cultural description and the social usefulness of the research (Carspecken, 1996), and, as Patti Lather (1986a) argues, that openly ideological research should consider how the research engages in participants' own critical consciousness (Freire, 1970/2000; cf. Heiman & Yanes, this volume). Although I believe studying and theorizing injustices are necessary, my theory of change is informed by action research (Camarota & Fine, 2008; Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009), which prevents me from believing that calling attention to societal wrongs necessarily leads to emancipatory change (see also May & Caldas, this volume). That is, while scholarship can inspire folks toward critical consciousness and/or action, critique does not, by itself, advance justice. Acknowledging this led me to recognize one of my study's limitations: engaging in the cultural production of critiquing without working with those most affected by the oppressive structures to think of, and act toward, radical solutions.

One of the radical proposals I offered is not that different from what education theorists have been proposing for decades: an education that historicizes and that liberates the mind from dominant ideologies (Freire, 1970/2000; Illich, 1970/2012; Woodson, 1933/2009). Another radical (and perhaps unpopular) solution I proposed is to keep monies and resources intended for students from marginalized groups to serve these students (Chávez-Moreno, 2018).

My study did engage teacher participants in reflecting on their own practice, which pushed their conscientization. For example, a few teachers expressed relief in talking about the DL program's shortcomings in regard to equity and Latinx youth, and these teachers felt the study's findings validated their concerns. Additionally, other participants shared that they had never thought much about race and racism. Through the interview process and our informal discussions, they reflected that they shied away from including social justice teaching because of not knowing how to address topics like race/racism while being sensitive to students' perspectives. Through the process of thinking about justice and race, some participants were pushed to reflect on sociopolitical consciousness, an often forgotten aspect of culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 2014) – although, admittedly, reflection is insufficient if not acted upon (see e.g. Chávez-Moreno, *in press*).

Lastly, I understand that the racial order is fraught with tension between groups of color. Thus, I attended to tensions caused by whiteness and blackness between Latinx and Black communities, the latter of which is the second largest group of color in the school district and DL program. At times, these tensions seemed to reveal grievances stemming from hegemonic ideologies, which may be uncomfortable to expose. However, ignoring the unintended and/or negative consequences of implementing bilingual education programs that do not lead to educational equity for all groups of color will not permit stakeholders to see clearly the issues in order to improve them, and instead may contribute to silences, such as erasing tensions and/or alliances between the Latinx and Black communities (Johnson, 2013; Vaca, 2004). I also later noticed the invisible presence of indigenous folks in my inquiry, and I decided to rectify this in a subsequent study by engaging with questions about their invisible presence in Spanish/English DL programs.

Concluding Reflections on the Unconscious

The ability to perform the principles of CRT justice is more than just using the CRT framework as a lens to understand a problem, or merely stating that CRT (or another critical framework) encourages reflexivity. Thus, this chapter invites education researchers of race (and, arguably, even those not engaged in race scholarship) to broaden beyond identity

reflexivity to understand the positioning of their scholarly training and academic gaze.

My account of contemplating Emirbayer and Desmond's (2012) reflexivity typology and Moore's (2012) extensions serves as an example of an education scholar of race considering her own work. I continually engaged in a reflexive approach throughout the study's fieldwork and analyses by reflecting on my potential biases and assumptions, and, when needed, seeking feedback from colleagues who are familiar with the topics under study. Adopting a race-reflexivity approach for me means excavating my own biases, backgrounds and intersectional identities (e.g. race, ethnicity, class, gender, region and scholarship) both in, and after, the fieldwork, and acknowledging the ways these shape my research and cultural representations.

Adopting a race-reflexivity approach also means continuing to reflect on the three levels of the unconscious – even after one's empirical study is completed. This ongoing reflection and learning may lead to one's ideas having changed from those ideas in a manuscript in the publication process. For example, when this chapter was in the copyediting stage, I recognized a disciplinary unconsciousness to my thinking related to the education field's race-as-a-social-construction view. This disciplinary unconsciousness had not allowed me to grasp, as a graduate student, the nuances in other critical perspectives on 'race' and racialization that I now understand upon new readings (e.g. Hochman, 2019) and re-reading work I had read as a student (e.g. Darder & Torres, 2003). For me, engaging in race reflexivity will undoubtedly lead to more changes to my perspectives on race, racism and racialization.

So, while I thought, as I finished my 'final' draft of this chapter, that engaging in race reflexivity helped me approach an in-depth understanding of how my positionality and gaze affect my study, I am again reminded that the human condition is one of learning and changing. And I am again reminded of the value in inquiry and reflection, especially given that I, like all people in our society, have grown up with hegemonic ideologies made invisible to me and which are worth uncovering and challenging.

Notes

- (1) My use of Latinx includes Latina/Latino/Latine and is a political move to upset gender binaries and patriarchy. I use the term Latinxs to refer to a racialized group of people who reside in the United States, are imagined having a connection to the Spanish language and who suffer the effects of the histories of multiple colonialisms, specifically, Spanish colonialism, American colonialism and American imperialism (Chávez-Moreno, 2021).
- (2) See <https://latcrit.org/latcrit-conferences/>.
- (3) For readers interested in how disciplines like psychology, anthropology, law and/or sociology conceptualize race and engage with race questions, refer to the special issue of *Equity & Excellence in Education* (Leonardo, 2019).

References

- Alemán, E. and Alemán, S.M. (2010) 'Do Latin@ interests always have to 'converge' with White interests?': (Re)claiming racial realism and interest-convergence in critical race theory praxis. *Race Ethnicity & Education* 13 (1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13613320903549644>
- Annamma, S.A. (2015) Whiteness as property: Innocence and ability in teacher education. *Urban Review* 47 (2), 293–316. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-014-0293-6>
- Banks, J.A. (1998) The lives and values of researchers: Implications for educating citizens in a multicultural society. *Educational Researcher* 27 (7), 4–17.
- Bartlett, L. and Brayboy, B.M.J. (2005) Race and schooling: Theories and ethnographies. *Urban Review* 37 (5), 361–374. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-005-0021-3>
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (1997) Rethinking racism: Toward a structural interpretation. *American Sociological Review* 62 (3), 465–480.
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2004) From bi-racial to tri-racial: Towards a new system of racial stratification in the USA. *Ethnic & Racial Studies* 27 (6), 931–950. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0141987042000268530>
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2010) *Racism without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in the United States* (3rd edn). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Cabrera, N.L. (2018) Where is the racial theory in critical race theory?: A constructive criticism of the Crits. *Review of Higher Education* 42 (1), 209–233.
- Cabrera, N.L. (2019) Critical race theory v. deficit models. *Equity & Excellence in Education* 52 (1), 47–54.
- Calderon, D. and Urrieta, L. (2019) Studying in relation: Critical Latinx indigeneities and education. *Equity & Excellence in Education* 52 (2–3), 219–238. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2019.1672591>
- Cammarota, J. and Fine, M. (2008) *Revolutionizing Education: Youth Participatory Action Research in Motion*. New York: Routledge.
- Carbado, D.W. and Gulati, M. (2000) The fifth black woman. *Journal of Contemporary Legal Issues* 11, 701–729.
- Carspecken, P.F. (1996) *Critical Ethnography in Educational Research: A Theoretical and Practical Guide*. London: Routledge.
- Carter, P.L. (2005) *Keepin' it Real: School Success beyond Black and White*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Castagno, A.E. (2014) *Educated in Whiteness: Good Intentions and Diversity in Schools*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Chávez-Moreno, L.C. (2018) A critical race ethnography examining dual-language education in the new Latinx diaspora: Reinforcing and resisting bilingual education's racial roots. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Chávez-Moreno, L.C. (2019) Researching Latinxs, racism, and white supremacy in bilingual education: A literature review. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies* 17 (2), 101–120. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15427587.2019.1624966>
- Chávez-Moreno, L.C. (2021) The problem with Latinx as a racial construct vis-à-vis language and bilingualism: Toward recognizing multiple colonialisms in the racialization of Latinidad. In E.G. Murillo Jr and E.E. Garcia (eds) *The Handbook of Latinos & Education: Theory, Research, and Practice* (2nd edn, pp. 164–180). New York: Routledge.
- Chávez-Moreno, L.C. (in press) The continuum of racial literacies: Teacher practices countering whitestream bilingual education. *Research in the Teaching of English*.
- Cochran-Smith, M. and Lytle, S.L. (2009) *Inquiry as Stance: Practitioner Research for the Next Generation*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Crenshaw, K.W. (2010) Twenty years of critical race theory: Looking back to move forward. *Connecticut Law Review* 43 (5), 1253–1352.

- Darder, A. and Torres, R.D. (2003) Shattering the 'race' lens: Toward a critical theory of racism. In A. Darder, M. Baltodano and R.D. Torres (eds) *The Critical Pedagogy Reader* (pp. 245–261). New York: Routledge.
- Delgado, R. (2009) The law of the noose: A history of Latino lynching. *Harvard Civil Rights – Civil Liberties Law Review* 44, 298–312.
- Desmond, M. and Emirbayer, M. (2009) What is racial domination? *Du Bois Review* 6 (2), 335–355. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1742058X09990166>
- Dixson, A.D. and Rousseau, C.K. (2005) And we are still not saved: Critical race theory in education ten years later. *Race Ethnicity & Education* 8 (1), 7–27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1361332052000340971>
- Duncan, G.A. (2005) Critical race ethnography in education: Narrative, inequality and the problem of epistemology. *Race Ethnicity & Education* 8 (1), 93–114. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1361332052000341015>
- Emirbayer, M. and Desmond, M. (2012) Race and reflexivity. *Ethnic & Racial Studies* 35 (4), 574–599. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2011.606910>
- Fallace, T. (2019) The ethnocentric origins of the learning style idea. *Educational Researcher* 48 (6), 349–355. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X19858086>
- Fields, K.E. and Fields, B.J. (2014) *Racecraft: The Soul of Inequality in American Life*. New York: Verso Trade.
- Freire, P. (1970/2000) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (30th anniversary edn). New York: Continuum.
- Gándara, P. and Hopkins, M. (eds) (2010) *Forbidden Language: English Learners and Restrictive Language Policies*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Golash-Boza, T. (2016) A critical and comprehensive sociological theory of race and racism. *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity* 2 (2), 129–141. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2332649216632242>
- Gutiérrez, K.D., Asato, J., Pacheco, M., Moll, L.C., Olson, K., Horng, E.L., Ruiz, R., García, E. and McCarty, T.L. (2002) 'Sounding American': The consequences of new reforms on English language learners. *Reading Research Quarterly* 37 (3), 328–343.
- Haddix, M. (2012) Talkin' in the company of my sistas: The counterlanguages and deliberate silences of Black female students in teacher education. *Linguistics and Education* 23 (2), 169–181. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2012.01.003>
- Haney López, I.F. (1997) Race, ethnicity, erasure: The salience of race to LatCrit theory. *California Law Review* 85 (5), 1143–1211. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3481058>
- Haney López, I.F. (2006) *White by Law: The Legal Construction of Race* (2nd edn). New York: New York University Press.
- Harris, A. (2019) Racing law: Legal scholarship and the critical race revolution. *Equity & Excellence in Education* 52 (1), 12–23.
- Harris, A. and Leonardo, Z. (2018) Intersectionality, race-gender subordination, and education. *Review of Research in Education* 42 (1), 1–27.
- Harris, C.I. (1993) Whiteness as property. *Harvard Law Review* 106 (8), 1707–1791. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1341787>
- Harris, J.C. and Patton, L.D. (2019) Un/doing intersectionality through higher education research. *The Journal of Higher Education* 90 (3), 347–372.
- Hochman, A. (2019) Racialization: A defense of the concept. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 42 (8), 1245–1262.
- Hylton, K. (2012) Talk the talk, walk the walk: Defining critical race theory in research. *Race Ethnicity & Education* 15 (1), 23–41. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2012.638862>
- Illich, I. (1970/2012) *Deschooling Society*. London: Marion Boyars.
- Johnson, G.T. (2013) *Spaces of Conflict, Sounds of Solidarity: Music, Race, and Spatial Entitlement in Los Angeles*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1998) Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a nice field like education? *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 11 (1), 7–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/095183998236863>

- Ladson-Billings, G. (2006) Introduction. In G. Ladson-Billings and W.F. Tate (eds) *Education Research in the Public Interest: Social Justice, Action, and Policy* (pp. 1–16). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2009) Race still matters: Critical race theory in education. In M. Apple, W. Au and L.A. Gandin (eds) *The Routledge International Handbook of Critical Education* (pp. 110–122). New York: Routledge.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2014) Culturally relevant pedagogy 2.0: A.k.a. The Remix. *Harvard Educational Review* 84 (1), 74–84.
- Ladson-Billings, G. and Tate, W.F. (1995) Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record* 97 (1), 47–68.
- Ladson-Billings, G. and Donnor, J. (2005) The moral activist role of critical race theory scholarship. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (eds) *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 279–301). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lagemann, E.C. (2000) *An Elusive Science: The Troubling History of Education Research*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Lather, P. (1986a) Issues of validity in openly ideological research: Between a rock and a soft place. *Interchange* 17 (4), 63–84.
- Lather, P. (1986b) Research as praxis. *Harvard Educational Review* 56 (3), 257–277.
- Lather, P. (2006) Paradigm proliferation as a good thing to think with: Teaching research in education as a wild profusion. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 19 (1), 35–57. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09518390500450144>
- Lee, S.J. (2009) *Unraveling the 'Model Minority' Stereotype: Listening to Asian American Youth* (2nd edn). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Leonardo, Z. (2013) *Race Frameworks: A Multidimensional Theory of Racism and Education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Leonardo, Z. (2019) Race(ing) across the disciplines: An introduction. *Equity & Excellence in Education* 52 (1), 7–11.
- Lewis, A.E. (2011) *Race in the Schoolyard: Negotiating the Color Line in Classrooms and Communities*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Lewis, A.E., Hagerman, M.A. and Forman, T.A. (2019) The sociology of race and racism: Key concepts, contributions & debates. *Equity & Excellence in Education* 52 (1), 29–46.
- Lynn, M. and Dixon, A.D. (2013) *Handbook of Critical Race Theory in Education*. New York: Routledge.
- Madison, D.S. (2019) *Critical Ethnography: Method, Ethics, and Performance* (3rd edn). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Milner, H.R. (2008) Critical race theory and interest convergence as analytic tools in teacher education policies and practices. *Journal of Teacher Education* 59 (4), 332–346. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487108321884>
- Moore, W.L. (2012) Reflexivity, power, and systemic racism. *Ethnic & Racial Studies* 35 (4), 614–619. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2011.630097>
- Mora, G.C. (2014) *Making Hispanics: How Activists, Bureaucrats, and Media Constructed a New American*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Ogbu, J. (1978) *Minority Education and Caste: The American System in Cross-Cultural Perspective*. New York: Academic Press.
- Omi, M. and Winant, H. (2015) *Racial Formation in the United States* (3rd edn). New York: Routledge.
- Pennacchia, R. (2017) America's wholesome square dancing tradition is a tool of white supremacy. Quartz. See <https://qz.com/1153516/americas-wholesome-square-dancing-tradition-is-a-tool-of-white-supremacy/> (accessed 25 March 2020).
- Perea, J.F. (1997) The Black/White binary paradigm of race: The normal science of American racial thought. *California Law Journal* 10, 127–172.
- Perea, J.F. (2004) Buscando América: Why integration and equal protection fail to protect Latinos. *Harvard Law Review* 117 (5), 1420–1469.

- Pérez Huber, L. (2010) Using Latina/o critical race theory (LatCrit) and racist nativism to explore intersectionality in the educational experiences of undocumented Chicana college students. *Journal of Educational Foundations* 24 (1/2), 77–96.
- Pollock, M. (2009) *Colormute: Race Talk Dilemmas In an American School*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Powell, S.N. (2018) The paradox of a credit-recovery program: Alleviating and exacerbating racial inequity. *Race Ethnicity & Education* 23 (6), 784–799.
- Roth, W.D. (2016) The multiple dimensions of race. *Ethnic & Racial Studies* 39 (8), 1310–1338. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2016.1140793>
- Skiba, R. (2012) ‘As nature has formed them’: The history and current status of racial difference research. *Teachers College Record* 114 (5), 1–49.
- Solórzano, D. and Yosso, T.J. (2001) From racial stereotyping and deficit discourse toward a critical race theory in teacher education. *Multicultural Education* 9 (1), 2–8.
- Stoskopf, A. (1999) The forgotten history of eugenics. *Rethinking Schools* 13 (3), 12–13.
- Tehrani, J. (2019) Changing race: Fluidity, immutability and the evolution of equal-protection jurisprudence. *University of Pennsylvania Journal of Constitutional Law* 22, 1–80.
- Tran, H.V. (2019) Seeing the racial elephant: CRT and the focus of educational scholarship. *Equity & Excellence in Education* 52 (1), 24–28.
- Twine, F.W. (2004) A white side of black Britain: The concept of racial literacy. *Ethnic & Racial Studies* 27 (6), 878–907. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0141987042000268512>
- Vaca, N.C. (2004) *The Presumed Alliance: The Unspoken Conflict between Latinos and Blacks and What It Means for America*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Valenzuela, A. (1999) *Subtractive Schooling: U.S.-Mexican Youth & Politics of Caring*. New York: SUNY.
- Vaught, S.E. (2011) *Racism, Public Schooling, and the Entrenchment of White Supremacy: A Critical Race Ethnography*. New York: SUNY Press.
- Viesca, K.M. (2013) Linguicism and racism in Massachusetts educational policy. *Education Policy Analysis Archives* 21 (52), 1–34. <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v21n52.2013>
- Villenas, S.A. (1996) The colonizer/colonized Chicana ethnographer: Identity, marginalization, and co-optation in the field. *Harvard Educational Review* 66 (4), 711–732.
- Winant, H. (2000) Race and race theory. *Annual Review of Sociology* 26 (1), 169–185.
- Woodson, C.G. (1933/2009) *The Mis-education of the Negro*. Radford, VA: Wilder Publications.
- Zuberi, T. (2011) Critical race theory of society. *Connecticut Law Review* 43, 1573–1591.