STUDENT ACTIVISM, POLITICS, AND CAMPUS CLIMATE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

EDITED BY DEMETRI L. MORGAN
AND CHARLES H.F. DAVIS III

Routledge

STUDENT ACTIVISM, POLITICS, AND CAMPUS CLIMATE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Student Activism, Politics, and Campus Climate in Higher Education presents a comprehensive, contemporary portrait of political engagement and student activism at postsecondary institutions in the United States. This resource explores how colleges and universities are experiencing unrest and in what ways broader sociopolitical conflicts are evident on-campus, ultimately unpacking the political dimensions of student engagement within campus climates. Chapter authors in this book critically synthesize relevant research, illuminate interdisciplinary perspectives, and interrogate how current issues of power and oppression shape participatory democracy and higher education at large. A go-to resource for researchers, faculty, administrators, and student affairs professionals, this text addresses the most intractable challenges facing society and its institutions of higher education.

Demetri L. Morgan is Assistant Professor of Higher Education at Loyola University Chicago, USA.

Charles H.F. Davis III is Assistant Professor of Clinical Education and Chief Strategy and Research Officer of the Race and Equity Center at the University of Southern California, USA.

STUDENT ACTIVISM, POLITICS, AND CAMPUS CLIMATE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Edited by Demetri L. Morgan and Charles H.F. Davis III

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

For Zoey B. Morgan, may higher education be a better place for your eventual entrance.
—DLM

For minoritized and marginalized students—of the past, in the present, and in the future—fighting for freedom and the right to self-determination.
—HF

We further dedicate this book to the memory of Rob Rhoads, an important and influential scholar whose mark on the field of higher education, and the study of student activism, is indelible.

CONTENTS

FOREWORD

Gary D. Rhoades

In nearly every major social movement and change in the United States in my lifetime, from the late 1950s to the present, young people, and particularly college students, have been central. Yet the literature on college students, the most empirically developed area of research in the field of higher education, largely overlooks student activism and political engagement. There are many studies of engagement, but overwhelmingly in a de-politicized sense of the word, and one that accords campus 'leadership' the role of engaging and socializing students. We talk about (civic) engagement largely without reference to politics and/or activism. So, I am delighted to write a Foreword for this timely edited volume by Charles H.F. Davis III and Demetri L. Morgan, *Student Activism, Politics, and Campus Climate in Higher Education*. It fills a big gap in the literature, and begins to chart a useful map of research for the field.

Historical context matters, particularly in relation to the question of the ways in which, if at all, past forms of activism and social movements play out in the current moment. It makes sense, then, to open as the book does with two chapters tracing campus activism over the past 50 years. Too often, observers and scholars take the view that students today have little sense of their history. Yet as Davis (2015) has found in his fieldwork with the Dream Defenders, the images, tactics, and purposes of former movements, such as the Civil Rights struggle of the 1950s and 1960s, are known, creatively drawn upon, and adapted to their own movement. That in itself along with the question of the connection between local activists and a national movement are important considerations, as in the case of Dreamers, for example (Ramos, 2016).

The editors of and contributors to this book rightly draw inspiration from Rhoads's (1998, p. 623) framing of campus activism "as a form of participatory democracy." At the core of those politics, as Rhoads (2000) revealed,

are challenges to and efforts to transform various established institutional and academic structures. Central among those are curricular structures, as studies of the social movements underlying ethnic studies and multicultural general education requirements have shown (Rojas, 2007; Yamane, 2001).

Some guideposts exist in the current volume and some other studies for how to further develop the analysis of the intersection between students' political participation and activism. For example, Renn's (2007) work explores the relationship between involvement in activism, leadership, and identity development for LGBTQ activists. Along similar lines, Hernandez (2013) provides a rich historical analysis of the process by which Latina students develop political consciousness and become activists. And a classic book on student activists (McAdam, 1988) tracing effects of activism in relation to seeding leadership in various social movements of the time, and to activists' life choices over time.

The second section of the volume takes the reader to an exploration of diverse groups of students and strategies. The range of cases is impressive, from addressing conservative students to Black, male athletes' labor activism, to Dreamers, to Muslim students, and to activism in the digital age. Of course, there are areas for further exploration here. To name a few, Kimball, Moore, Vaccaro, Trojano, and Newman (2016), for example, analyze disability activism in ways that expand and redefine our understanding of activism. Similarly, Linder, Myers, Riggle, and Lacy (2016) examine the use of social media in sexual violence activism. Moreover, there is room for the expansion of studies of labor activism on campus, from undergraduates to graduate students (Rhoades & Rhoads, 2003). And, it is worth emphasizing that student activism can focus not just on campus issues, not just on single campuses, and not only in the most elite institutions (Davis, 2015).

Importantly, the third and fourth sections of the book address campus actors other than students as allies, and institutional context. As I write this Foreword, the events of the past weekend and week—the massacre at Pittsburgh's Tree of Life synagogue, the announced efforts of the Trump administration to eliminate any recognition of trans* rights and indeed humanity, and the demonizing of the so-called migrant caravan—reflect the politics of hate. Part of that politics is an assault not only on a range of marginalized groups but also on facts, science, and core cultural institutions such as the free press and public (higher) education.

Yet, amidst all of this, the silence of the formal 'leadership' on campuses is conspicuous in its relative absence. As Morgan and Orphan (2016, p. 28) find in their study, that there is an "overwhelming adherence on the part of SSAOs [senior student affairs officers] to the concept of political neutrality." Such neutrality at best leaves a vacuum in the political education of students. At worst, it constitutes "a political act" that perpetuates established structures of power "because it sends a message to students that there are times when and places where 'being political' is misplaced" (ibid.).

More than that, there is evidence that campus context and organizational dynamics such as engagement of students with senior campus administrators can filter and pacify the activism of students, channeling it into social organizations and more contained forms of advocacy. In a multi-site study, Reyes (2015, p. 310) found that students in one campus organization "chose not to engage in contentious politics out of deference to their relationships with the administration." In other words, campus contexts can serve to undermine students' activism in the name of promoting less contentious, more "reasonable" forms of political and civic engagement.

Other work takes us the next step. A PhD activist at Brandeis University (Liu, 2016) has offered a personal narrative of a case of student activism at that institution that was met with "institutional amnesia" and "narrative reconstruction." She applies critical race theory and concepts such as interest convergence and Whiteness as property to detail how the university appropriated the protests to further advance its historical brand as a social justice university.

The closing two sections of Davis and Morgan's book are key in mapping out future research. It makes sense to address, as in Section III of the book, allies of student campus actors, such as faculty and student affairs practitioners. Little such work exists. Some that does is suggestive that non-student players in student activism can act as "tempered radicals," who due to their employment in the organization are likely to channel their work and that of students in particular forms and outcomes that may be less challenging to the institution (Kezar, 2010, 2012). That navigation and negotiation among groups in regard to the tactics and goals of student activism are much needed.

It also makes sense to address, as Section IV of the book does, the ways in which institutional contexts and pressures shape reactions to (and emergence of) student activism. And it is all more important to map, as Morgan does in the closing chapter, a typology for thinking about fostering political pedagogy that leads to politically vibrant campuses with much activism.

I am struck here by the potential significance of two broad concepts in framing our understanding of political engagement and student activism. As we theorize the phenomena in question, we could do well to weave in understandings of the ways in which the neoliberal economy and "academic capitalism" (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004) serve to reduce public space in the academy and institutions' openness to politics at all, and especially to politics that challenge established, raced, gendered, and classed structures of power and privilege, for fear of compromising fundraising and state/public support. Similarly, Foucault's (1991) concept of governmentality could be useful in helping us to analyze the organized practices by which higher education institutions, professors, and student affairs professionals cast and govern students in ways (e.g., individually as customers, as youth in need of "development") that neutralize their political engagement and activism and perpetuate the privileging of dominant groups in the academy and society.

Davis and Morgan have done us a significant service with this volume. Anyone interested in political engagement and student activism, broadly defined, needs to read this book. And anyone interested, as they are, in re-energizing democratic politics on and beyond our campuses has the opportunity to build on this work, which combines theorizing, analysis, and praxis, to advance a progressive project that collectively works to bend the arc of the moral universe towards justice.

References

Davis, C. H. F., III. (2015). *Dream defending, on campus and beyond: A multi-sited ethnography of contemporary student organizing, the social movement repertoire, and social movement organization in college* (Doctoral dissertation). Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Arizona.

Foucault, M. (1991). *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Hernandez, E. (2013). Mexican-American women's activism at Indiana University in the 1990s. *The Journal of Higher Education, 84*(3), 397–416.

Kezar, A. (2010). Faculty and staff partnering with student activists: Unexplored terrains of interaction and development. *Journal of College Student Development, 51*(5), 451–480.

Kezar, A. (2012). Bottom-up/top-down leadership. *The Journal of Higher Education, 83*(5), 725–760.

Kimball, E. W., Moore, A., Vaccaro, A., Trojano, P. F., & Newman, B. M. (2016). College students with disabilities redefine activism: Self-advocacy, storytelling, and collective action. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 9*(3), 245–260.

Linder, C., Myers, J. S., Riggle, C., & Lacy, M. (2016). From margins to mainstream: Social media as a tool for campus sexual violence activism. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 9*(3), 231–244.

Liu, C. W. (2016). Student activism, institutional amnesia, and narrative reconstruction: Lessons from Brandeis University's #Fordhall2015 protests. *eJournal of Public Affairs, 5*(2), 233–249.

McAdam, D. (1988). *Freedom summer.* London: Oxford University Press.

Morgan, D. L., & Orphan, C. M. (2016). Student political engagement in the co-curriculum: Understanding the role of senior student affairs officers. *eJournal of Public Affairs, 5*(2), 11–40.

Ramos, M. N. (2016). Memories of college activism in an undocumented student support group. *eJournal of Public Affairs, 5*(2), 250–259.

Renn, K. A. (2007). LGBT student leaders and queer activists: Identities of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and queer identified college student leaders and activists. *Journal of College Student Development, 48*(3), 311–330.

Reyes, D. V. (2015). Inhabiting Latino politics: How colleges shape students' political styles. *Sociology of Education, 88*(4), 302–319.

Rhoades, G., & Rhoads, R. A. (2003). The public discourse of U.S. graduate employee unions: Social movement identities, ideologies, and strategies. *The Review of Higher Education, 26*(2), 163–186.

Rhoads, R. A. (1998). Student protests and multicultural reform: Making sense of campus unrest in the 1990s. *The Journal of Higher Education, 69*(6), 621–646.

Rhoads, R. A. (2000). *Freedom's web: Student activism in an age of cultural diversity.* Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Rojas, F. (2007). *From black power to black studies: How a radical social movement because an academic discipline.* Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic capitalism: Markets, state, and higher education.* Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Yamane, D. (2001). *Student movements for multiculturalism: Challenging the curricular color line in higher education.* Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

PREFACE

Transforming Campus Climates by Reframing Student Political Engagement and Activism

Introduction

The practical and intellectual space this book occupies sits at the intersection of numerous disciplines that are concerned with relevant issues affecting democracy and postsecondary institutions in the U.S. context. As a result, defining concepts like 'activism' and 'political engagement' is not only intellectually challenging, but also potentially counterproductive to our espoused aims of providing a cohesive and critical lens from which to explore contemporary issues of activism and politics on college campuses. Bearing this caution in mind, let us offer key operational definitions and our insight into how readers should approach this work. Verba, Schlozman, and Brady (1995) classically defined political engagement as "activity that has the intent or effect of influencing government action—either directly by affecting the making or implementation of public policy or indirectly by influencing the selection of people who make the polices" (p. 38). The operative phrase in this definition is "government action," which has largely led scholars to limit our understanding of what constitutes political engagement to the traditional and accepted means of political participation (i.e., voting and electoral politics). In contrast, numerous scholars have contended that no agreed-upon definition of student activism exists (Altbach, 1989; Biddix, 2014; Kezar, 2010). Hence, Cabrera, Matias, and Montoya (2017) have recently offered a set of contemporary premises for researchers and educators to consider when engaging the topic of student activism. Of particular relevance are three specific premises which mark essential distinctions within the broader framework of political engagement. Cabrera et al. (2017) posit the following about student activism:

1. Student activism involves an intentional, sustained connection to a larger collective.

2. Student activism involves developing and exercising power.
3. Even though student activism seeks to change the political landscape, it is not the same as political governance (or campaigning).

(pp. 404–405, 408)

Within the aforementioned concepts are, of course, the people (i.e., students) engaged in collective political projects, some of which include participation in organized resistance. Commonly understood as activists or protestors, these political actors have continued to struggle against their ongoing disenfranchisement from and delegitimization within traditional political processes. To be sure, activism on college and university campuses is anything but new. However, activism and organized resistance has continued to evolve and even increased in recent years. While such advancements are at minimum observational and anecdotal, two distinctive data points substantiate this political reality. The first data point emerged from the Higher Education Research Institute's (2015) annual report several years ago, noting a 50-year high for protest participation by college and university students overall. Additionally, the report noted while students indicated an increased likelihood of participating in a protest, Black students were reported twice as likely as their white peers. This finding was better contextualized by a secondary data point in which, between 2014 and 2016, more than 84 campuses saw an issuance of socio-academic and political demands from student activists and organizers. Most of the demands focused on issues related to campus racial climate, which included increasing faculty racial/ethnic diversity across fields and disciplines; requisite training to improve racial literacy among existing faculty, staff, and students; and meaningful integration of racially diverse contributions to the curriculum (Davis, Ishimoto, Bishop, & Stokes, 2017). Perhaps by historical comparison alone, questions arise with regard to why, given all the presumed improvements to higher education (and society), such disruptive approaches are still necessary and whether they are effective. In part, the chapters included in this volume represent an effort of collective sense-making to answer some of these poignant and important questions.

Still, while the aforementioned literatures help us understand separately the two primary phenomena at the center of our text, existing higher education research does very little to address the relationship between government actions and grassroots organized resistance. Therefore, we assert the need for higher education scholars and practitioners to discontinue the common framing of student activism and the established (and accepted) forms of political participation as wholly dichotomous or oppositional. Instead, we offer this volume as a testament to our own theorizing regarding the symbiotic relationship between traditional and legitimate forms of political work and the intentionally disruptive actions of students committed to sociopolitical and campus change. That is to say, we explain contemporary political engagement of postsecondary students

as a symbiotic process in which 1) the aforementioned phenomena of activism and electoral politics are in fact "two sides of the same coin" and 2) exist within a broad and expansive arrangement of political activities on-campus and beyond. To be sure, we are not the first to advance this argument. Two decades ago, Rhoads (1998) offered a similar perspective with regard to understanding the campus activism of racially minoritized students as a democratic endeavor. Specifically, Rhoads writes:

> The efforts of diverse students to forge their own place in campus life through organized demonstrations may also be understood as a form of participatory democracy. Thus, [student activism and unrest] instead may be understood as democracy playing itself out, as diverse students seek to build a truly multicultural society through the colleges and universities they inhabit.
>
> *(p. 623)*

Building on Rhoads's reframing of campus activism as democratic action, what further connects concepts of activism and political engagement is the *possibility of transformation to the lived realities of people in a community*, regardless of a community's ecological location (i.e., campus, local, state, or national) within nested contexts of perception (Golash-Boza & Valdez, 2018). Importantly, the focus on *transformation* draws our attention to interrelated aspects of who students are (i.e., identity), what they do (i.e., actions and behaviors), and the mechanism best positioned to foster desired change, whether through actions of governance, organized resistance and collective mobilization, or both. Consequently, and again, we view student activism and engagement in politics as distinct but related concepts. To this end, chapter authors provide nuanced explorations of both concepts while maintaining a broader focus on how student activism and political engagement have and can potentially transform the campus climate for postsecondary institutions.

Additionally, what we have learned in recent years regarding contemporary student activism and politics is it must continue to move from margin to center within the study of higher education. What remains evident and persistent is the imperative of moving postsecondary campuses and our nation from deeply exclusionary structures and relationships of power to places of affect, appreciation, and inclusion of various dimensions of diversity. We also find it important to revisit the predominant frames offered in much of the existing literature on campus climate. In particular, while we broadly believe campus climate refers to the institutional contexts in which attitudes, perceptions, behaviors, and expectations shape the experiences of college and university communities (Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, & Allen, 1999, 1998), our political framing insists we amplify the role of external dynamics shaping college and university campuses. Consistent with Hurtado et al. (1998, 1999), who posited

both internal (e.g., compositional diversity and historical legacies of exclusion) and external forces (e.g., governmental policy and sociohistorical dimensions) impact campuses, we extend their inclusion of externalities to account for contemporary sociopolitical dynamics off- and away from campus. This is consistent with Hurtado, Alvarez, Guillermo-Wann, Cuellar, and Arellano's (2012) updated Mulitcontextual Model for Diverse Learning Environments, wherein they note that campus climate research should illuminate "the interaction of systems and reciprocal influences that constrain or lead to an institution's role in producing social transformation or the reproduction of inequality" (p. 103).

A response to this call is especially important as today's post–post–racial moment continues to illuminate a clear sociopolitical fracture to which students, faculty, and administrators—on-campus and within communities—are responding. Furthermore, as discourses regarding the intersectional disenfranchisement and forms of violence experienced by women, trans, and gender non-binary folks within sociopolitical contexts are becoming increasingly visible, more complex understandings of the broader sociopolitical landscape and its relationship to higher education contexts are necessary. Such understandings, as those presented herein, offer opportunities to excavate and engage new patterns and possibilities for student political engagement within postsecondary institutions, but also as developing civically minded citizens better prepared to engage processes of social change within a diverse political ecosystem. Let us now turn our attention to the organization of our book.

Organization of the Book

We invite readers to consider our edited volume as a sectional of multi- and interdisciplinary perspectives on contemporary student activism and political engagement in U.S. colleges and universities. In doing so, each section offers a set of scholarly perspectives on the distinct yet overlapping ways in which broader sociopolitical climates historically and contemporarily manifest on campus and the ways in which institutional stakeholders lay claim to taking decisive action. The first section focuses on the historical and contemporary foundations for student political engagement as activism. The second section engages the variations of political engagement for different populations of student stakeholders as well as contemporary strategies and tactics of student political actors. The third section frames the roles of non–student campus agents in postsecondary transformation and institutional structures within which student political engagement is fostered. The fourth and final section frames institutional responses to issues frequently undergirding and brought to the surface by students' political activities. Within these sections, individual chapters have been structured to describe, critically analyze, and discuss a phenomenon of political engagement and its implications for future research and/or practice.

Section I provides a historical and contemporary accounts of student activism in U.S. higher education and focuses on cross-cutting themes that span the last 50 years. The period of the last 50 years was specifically chosen to benchmark a significant year of student political engagement, especially activism, during the often regarded "golden era" of protest. For example, in Chapter 1 Christopher J. Broadhurst and Angel L. Velez establish the longstanding historical antecedents of contemporary student activism in college. Consistent with the critical thrust of the book, Broadhurst and Velez center the political histories of underrepresented and minoritized students, tracing consistency of student movements from 1968 to present. In particular, these scholars present as a through line the intractable social problems and persistent inequity that has long served as galvanizing forces undergirding student activism and political engagement, on-campus and beyond.

In Chapter 2, Nancy Thomas examines tensions on college and university campuses around student activism and free speech. For more than 100 years, rights to expressive freedom on campus have shifted to reflect the values and positions of those in or gaining power at the time. Thomas contends that this unacceptable but arguably inevitable pattern no longer works due to extreme political animosity and polarization among elected officials and everyday Americans and also the result of growing class, race, and gender disparities evidenced by the lack of political representation for most Americans. She calls for three recommendations: 1) education about the First Amendment, 2) education about the history and current state of access and inclusion in U.S. higher education, and 3) education and practice in improved political discussions through campus-wide conversations about free expression.

Comprised of five chapters, Section II builds on the historical foundation by illuminating the political experiences of different student populations on campus. Each chapter presents a new perspective to complicate dominant narratives about how certain students enact their politics or engage in activism. Each chapter also sheds light on the influence that enrolled students have in co-constructing campus climates nested within broader sociopolitical contexts. For example, Chapter 3 highlights how conservative student political ideology and the American Conservative movement manifested on college campuses alleged to be overtly politically liberal. Garrett H. Gowen, Kevin M. Hemer, and Robert D. Reason argue that conservative students thrive on the liberal characterization of higher education as it allows them to signal their conservative identity. Their case study focuses on provocative conservative student events, such as affirmative action bake sales, that, when viewed from the perspective of these students, illuminates a drive for recognition and distinction from their other politically involved peers. Although a hostile climate for other students might result, these practices are a necessary component of contemporary American conservatism.

Chapter 4, written by Júlia Mendes and Aurora Chang, unpacks the intersection of activism and immigration reform on college campuses. Many have chronicled undocumented student efforts to address Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) and Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors Act (DREAM Act) policies. Building on this work, this chapter excavates narratives that detail additional ways students contend with the unclear and frequently hostile environments created in the wake of this highly divisive political topic. Mendés and Chang expand on recent work on the 'hyperdocumentation' of undocumented students to capture the ways in which undocumented and *afraid* student activists enact agency through 'silent' activism. In particular, the explicit and hidden curricular logics that inform the ways in which undocumented activists view and accumulate social and educational capital is explored, interrogated, and connected to the ways these students (dis) engage with the political process.

In Chapter 5, Tomika L. Ferguson and Charles H.F. Davis III focus on the reemergence of student-athletes engaging in activism, both individually and collectively. The authors provide deep theoretical analysis to better understand the historical contexts and structural relationships of power pertaining to student-athletes in NCAA Division I programs and institutional change. More specifically, Ferguson and Davis explore the agentic role of Black male student-athletes in revenue-generating sports to engage in protest, either within sports or within broader milieus of political action. Then, building their analysis through employing resource mobilization perspectives and an interest convergence framework, the authors discuss the 2015 case of Concerned Student 1950 at the University of Missouri and the Mizzou football team's declaration of an intent to cease football operations (i.e., a labor strike). The authors close with implications for practice pertaining to student-athletes, student activists, and institutional leaders.

Chapter 6 presents the intersection of faith and politics through the perspective of students that identify as Muslim. Authored by Shafiqa Ahmadi, Mabel Sanchez, and Darnell Cole, this chapter brings attention to the unique challenges Muslim students face when they seek to enact their speech rights through activism. Their case study explores the intersection of faith and politics and how it shapes the educational experiences of these students. They conclude with a set of recommendations intended to aid postsecondary educators in creating educational climates that affirm the faith and political activities of students pushed to the margins.

Rounding out Section II, in Chapter 7, Charles H.F. Davis III establishes a theoretical framework for understanding student activism in a digital age. Perhaps the most distinctive feature of contemporary student activism is the ubiquity of technological tools that span the confines of campuses, which present a range of political challenges and opportunities for student activists. Grounded in multi-year ethnographic research with the Dream Defenders organization,

Davis illuminates the innovative new media tactics student activists employ within campus-community movements. Davis draws particular attention to the deterioration of previous boundaries of postsecondary life and the ways in which broader sociopolitical issues off- and away from campus attract student activists to become political engaged beyond higher education's purview. Davis then expands on the case study to insist that educators interested in understanding contemporary activism must account for ever-evolving technological realities of students' everyday lives.

Section III focuses on the roles of non-student campus agents and institutional structures within which student activism and political engagement are incubated. Collectively, the chapters in this section are orientated toward encouraging college and university faculty, staff, and administrators to take proactive and intentional roles cultivating politically engaged campus climates. More specifically, each of the three chapters introduces a key component that shapes students' political engagement experiences across multiple touchpoints of college and university life (i.e., the classroom, division of student affairs, and faculty relationships).

In Chapter 8, the college classroom is presented as a space prime for the intentional fostering of student's political identity development. Amy Wilkinson introduces the metaphor of "rehearsal and performance" to frame how this developmental process can unfold in the classroom. Leveraging the student-directed production of a politically themed dance performance as the case study, Wilkinson argues that the rehearsal and performance of a student's political identity fosters desirable educational and democratic outcomes. These outcomes, Wilkinson reasons, should be central to the efforts of all programs of study and faculty members tasked with teaching students amidst contentious sociopolitical dynamics.

Sy Stokes and Donté Miller discuss strategies for supporting student activist in Chapter 9. Grounded in their experiences as Black undergraduate student activists at the University of California Los Angeles, Stokes and Miller provide both a descriptive narrative and auto-ethnographic analysis of the challenges resulting from their digital video campaign #BlackBruins, which amassed more than one million views on YouTube in 2013. Their case study highlights the unexpected consequences of national notoriety while still existing in a hyper localized context on-campus. Additionally, Stokes and Miller recount the support provided by sympathetic faculty and administrators who stood in solidarity with their collective's effort to bring awareness to the underservice of non-athlete Black male students.

Chapter 10, written by Jade Agua and Sumun L. Pendakur, draws attention to the role of student affairs professionals in facilitating and supporting the political participation of students on-campus. In particular, the authors draw on more than a decade of professional experience to engage case examples of challenge and support with student activists seeking to create transformative

institutional change. In addition to supporting students, the authors illuminate the potential tensions for non-student actors complicit in acts of political dissent. They conclude by providing practical recommendations for navigating professional restrictions that often impede staff and administrative involvement in student-led political activities on-campus.

The two final chapters, presented in Section IV, seek to integrate student and institutional-level perspectives to demonstrate the fluidity and interconnectedness of how the campus climate effects different stakeholders. Serving as the conclusion to this edition, these chapters integrate various topics from preceding chapters to attend to both campus-level tensions and student specific dynamics. As prominent social institutions, college and university campuses are microcosms of the conflicts and opportunities inherent within a diverse democracy. Thus, these chapters illuminate how institutions can serve as important models for addressing systemic social and political tensions by successfully navigating issues that arise.

In Chapter 11, Devon T. Lockard, Dominique J. Baker, and Richard S.L. Blissett build on previous chapters by investigating administrative and student responses to the I, Too, Am (ITA) movement. The ITA movement primarily unfolded in digital spaces, yet, institutional reactions, often led by student affairs educators, occurred within the tangible confines of campus. Synthesizing multiple recent studies that leveraged both quantitative and qualitative approaches, the authors provide valuable insight into student mobilization that sits at the intersection of localized campus issues and broader national discourses. Implications for practice advocate for increased institutional awareness of the numerous issues that often precede student collective action.

Demetri L. Morgan concludes the book by offering a typology for locating and understanding opportunities for activism and political learning on campus. The Political Dimension of Campus Climate augments seminal campus climate literature and integrates numerous themes from each of the previous chapters by identifying how institutions and students shape the climate for activism and political engagement while being influenced by macro-level dynamics. Rooted in critical public sphere theory, the chapter reasserts the importance of educators, both inside and outside the classroom, operating with a commitment to a political pedagogy that leads to politically vibrant, inclusive, and edifying campus climates.

Engaging This Volume in Your Work

Despite the existing offerings from different academic fields and disciplines, including within the study of higher education, there are two fundamental assertions that drove our need to bring a curated cadre of collaborators together. First, postsecondary institutions are currently experiencing intensified public demands for transformation and accountability. In part, this is due to the convergence of financial, social, and political tensions on-campus resulting from

increased market-like behaviors (i.e., neoliberalism), changing demographics of higher education, and the impact of a polarizing presidential election in 2016. Thus, we hope that concerned stakeholders will see these realities as opportunities to improve the sociopolitical climate of colleges and universities as well as broader society. Hence, this book is for students, student affairs educators, faculty, institutional leaders, policymakers, and other individuals committed to aid and assist postsecondary institutions in materially improving the lives of everyday people. A second assertion of this volume is that nuance and criticality are all too often missing from contemporary discourses about postsecondary institutions, college students, and politics. Hence the intention of our collective work is to interject complexity and subvert traditional and dominant narratives about students as political actors, however narrowly defined, and the myriad political practices currently unfolding on campuses. With this in mind, we encourage readers to approach this work in one of two ways. Authors wrote each chapter in a self-contained way that invites readers to engage each chapter and its implications on their own. If there are specific populations of interest or issues on campus you are navigating, we welcome you to find the relevant chapter and jump in there. Or, if reading the volume as a collective, such as a group of concerned practitioners within the division of student affairs or in a graduate student affairs course, consider the following questions as you probe the interconnectedness of activism, politics, and campus climate:

- What sociopolitical issues cut across the chapters and manifest themselves on your campus or in your research?
- Who holds power and influence over particular populations and how did they amass that power?
- How has the advent of social media influenced the political activity of students and institutional responses?
- What new lines of inquiry or interventions are necessary to continue to prepare students for involvement in a diverse democracy?

We close with a final word of encouragement for the difficult but imperative labor ahead. We reflect on Audre Lorde's (1984) often cited reminder that "the master's tools will never dismantle the master's house" and the reality that this exhortation compels us to continually build new tools—devise new ways of thinking and engaging in our work and research, to realize the true potential of a diverse democracy. We submit that this work marks an important evolution in our collective understanding of students as political actors and postsecondary institutions as sites for political possibility. Though neither singularly nor alone, colleges and universities have and will continue to measurably impact the trajectory of broader U.S. society. Therefore, we invite further collaboration as we devise new tools, strategies, and resources that will help redress the most intractable challenges facing U.S. society and thereby its institutions of higher education.

References

Altbach, P. G. (1989). Perspectives on student political activism. *Comparative Education*, *25*(1), 97–110.

Biddix, J. P. (2014). Development through dissent: Campus activism as civic learning. *New Directions for Higher Education*, *2014*(167), 73–85.

Cabrera, N. L., Matias, C. E., & Montoya, R. (2017). Activism or slacktivism? The potential and pitfalls of social media in contemporary student activism. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *10*(4), 400–415.

Davis III, C. H. F., Ishimoto, M., Bishop, J., & Stokes, S. C. (2017). *Black on-Campus: Contemporary Black student activism and demands for institutional change. Association for the Study of Higher Education Annual Conference*. Houston, TX.

Golash-Boza, T., & Valdez, Z. (2018). Nested contexts of reception: Undocumented students at the University of California, Central. *Sociological Perspectives*, 1–18.

Hurtado, S., Alvarez, C. L., Guillermo-Wann, C., Cuellar, M., & Arellano, L. (2012). A model for diverse learning environments: The scholarship on creating and assessing conditions for student success. In J. C. Smart & M. B. Paulsen (Eds.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. 27, pp. 41–122). Dordrecht: Springer.

Hurtado, S., Milem, J., Clayton-Pedersen, A., & Allen, W. (1998). Enhancing campus climates for racial/ethnic diversity: Educational policy and practice. *The Review of Higher Education*, *21*(3), 279–302.

Hurtado, S., Milem, J., Clayton-Pedersen, A., & Allen, W. (1999). Enacting diverse learning environments: Improving climate for racial/ethnic diversity in higher education. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report*, *26*(8). Washington, DC: The George Washington University, Graduate School of Education and Human Development.

Kezar, A. J. (2010). Faculty and staff partnering with student activists: Unexplored terrains of interaction and development. *Journal of College Student Development*, *51*(5), 451–480.

Lorde, A. (1984 [2007]). The master's tools will never dismantle the master's house. In *Sister outsider: Essays and speeches* (pp. 110–114). Berkeley, CA: Crossing Press.

Rhoads, R. A. (1998). Student protest and multicultural reform: Making sense of campus unrest in the 1990s. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *69*(6), 621–646.

Verba, S., Schlozman, K. L., & Brady, H. E. (1995). *Voice and equality: Civic voluntarism in American politics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In the development of this book, our first as co-editors, we learned an extraordinary amount about ourselves, our colleagues and the field of higher education, and the publishing process. As education school faculty, both of whom teach in higher education programs, we were challenged to navigate our day-to-day responsibilities of teaching and service with our desire to develop an important and timely book. It required of us to be thoughtful, honest, forgiving, and deeply committed to the collaborative process we were undertaking. Although having a solid relationship from our previous years together in Philadelphia, we became fortified by the fire of this process in ways that have helped our friendship and intellectual partnership deepen and grow. And so, we are thankful for the opportunity to have moved once conference table debates and dialogues to actionable work at the intersection of our complementary interests.

That said, there are also several constituencies of support we would like to thank for aiding in this book coming to fruition. Without the following people, our vision for this intellectual project would have remained unrealized. Therefore, we offer our appreciation to the following stakeholders of our collaborative work.

First, we are deeply grateful to all those whom contributed to its contents (and all those who desired to contribute but were unable). We do not take for granted the requests we made of your time, intellectual labor, and emotional energy to write critically of this current sociopolitical moment. For some, we also want to extend our appreciation to those contributors whom joined the project relatively late due to our own editorial challenges. We know our perhaps untimely request was anything but easy, and yet you made the commitment to turn around high-quality work in a short time. To all, we know that your contributions are what make this such an important, useful text for higher education researchers and practitioners.

Second, we would like to thank the senior scholars whom supported us in the early and latter stages of developing and producing this book. As first-time book editors, we are especially thankful to Lori Patton Davis, Shaun Harper, David Slavsky, Bridget Turner Kelly, and the anonymous reviewers for their advice and mentorship in navigating the publishing process. Each of these scholars gave of their time and experience to ensure we would be successful in our efforts to secure contributors, identify the appropriate publisher, and negotiate contract details, all things with which we were largely unfamiliar. We are also thankful to Gary Rhoades for thoughtfully writing the Foreword for this volume. Gary's willingness to lend his expertise, well-deserved professional respect, and demonstrated commitment to the book's topics to advance its readership by our field is invaluable. Furthermore, we want to recognize the gracious assistance of Hilary Zimmerman, Quortne Hutchings, and Norma López with the many time-consuming minutiae that often exceeded our capacity to manage. We would also like to extend our appreciation to the innumerable colleagues with whom we had discussions and engaged ideas, and from whom we received feedback regarding the book's initial direction.

Third, we would like to thank the readers of this text for engaging its central arguments, theoretical and conceptual ideas, and case examples for understanding political engagement in higher education. Whether graduate students in higher education and student affairs programs, faculty developing research programs, or practitioners engaged in the often thankless work of supporting and developing students as political actors, we appreciate this opportunity to serve as a collective of interlocutors in your own praxis.

Finally, we would like to thank Heather Jarrow and Rebecca Collazo, our editorial team, for their patience and understanding as we attempted to navigate the challenges of editing such an expansive volume in a relatively short period. When we needed advice, direction, or deadline extensions, you all remained focused on helping us make this book a reality rather than any barriers or shortcomings we experienced along the way. We appreciate you both for advocating for its publishing and standing by us as we did everything we could to make it happen.

Historical and Contemporary Foundations for Student Political Engagement as Activism

1

HISTORICAL AND CONTEMPORARY CONTEXTS OF STUDENT ACTIVISM IN U.S. HIGHER EDUCATION

Christopher J. Broadhurst and Angel L. Velez

Introduction

Students engaging in activism to express their concerns, about both local campus issues and broader sociopolitical problems, has a long historical tradition in higher education in the United States. Although the 1960s are most commonly at the center of public memory when thinking about student protest, activism long-preceded the oft regarded 'golden era' of activism on-campus. For example, in burgeoning colonial colleges of the 17th and 18th centuries, students expressed their outrage against restrictive doctrines of *in loco parentis*, the classical curriculum, and substandard food and lodging (Burton, 2007; Moore, 1976). While demonstrations to national issues could be found on colonial colleges, such as students boycotting British goods and burning effigies of pro-British leaders in the colonies as part of the protests prior to the Revolutionary War, most campus activism in the late 18th and 19th centuries focused on policies and practices that affected them daily (Rudolph, 1990). Often it was the harsh punishment of students for a minor incident, such the suspension of students for loudly scraping their feet during morning prayers, that would spark a student revolt that was actually more reflective of an undercurrent of dissatisfaction with lack of control over the curriculum or unpopular campus doctrines. In response to student revolts, which sometimes turned violent, administrators would enact stricter rules and expel the rebelling students (Novak, 1977).

At the beginning of the 20th century, though campus-based policies still drew the attention of activists, students began to slowly shift their focus to issues outside of campus. With socialism gaining ground as a political movement in the period, concerns over social reform and the plight of the working class prompted the creation the Intercollegiate Socialist Society (ISS) in 1905,

which had chapters on 70 campuses by 1915 (Altbach, 1974). Peace activism also evolved in the early 20th century, with students protesting American militarism and the compulsory Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC). The Fellowship of Youth for Peace, created in 1922, was the first student group to dedicate itself exclusively to the peace movement and sponsored national speaking tours touting peace activism and organized strikes against the ROTC. Such sentiment exploded in the 1930s, when nations begin to rapidly arm themselves and the threat of war seemed imminent. During one strike in 1935, 18% of American college students walked out of classes to denounce the rising militarism (Altbach, 1974; Holden, 2008). Additionally, in the 1930s, students began challenging the separate but equal doctrine that had been dictated by *Plessy v. Ferguson* in 1896. Black students used the courts to protest the policy, arguing that not only was the doctrine unconstitutional, but that Black students had an undue financial burden as there were no equal regional facilities they could attend, forcing them to move away (Wallenstein, 2008).

In the mid-1940s, the G.I. Bill became an unprecedented piece of legislation in the history of higher education. This federal law provided ex-soldiers with comprehensive benefits that included an array of welfare services, low-interest loans, and 4 years of college (Loss, 2011). Millions of veterans took advantage of their education and training benefits and entered higher education. Yet, Black veterans and women that were otherwise qualified were systematically excluded from receiving these benefits. Despite these challenges, a small number of Black veterans were able to pursue higher education at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) and vocational training (Williamson, 2013). Then, in the 1950s, the Civil Rights Movement (CRM) ushered in mass mobilizations and non-violent direct action across the American South. As a direct result of the CRM, an unprecedented era of federal legislation aimed at redressing historical disenfranchisement of African Americans (and others) took shape in the 1960s. Landmark legislation included, but were not limited to, the Civil Rights Acts of 1964, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and the Higher Education Act of 1965 (Loss, 2011). In April 1965, to comply with the Civil Rights Act, most colleges and universities opened their doors to enroll Black students for the very first time. By the Fall of 1965, enrollment of Black students increased by 70% at traditionally White institutions (TWIs), reaching a total of 200,000 (Rogers, 2012). To address the demographic shifts and resulting changes to campus climates, many postsecondary institutions responded by implementing affirmative action plans to expand recruitment efforts of racially minoritized groups, especially Black students. However, despite the implementing of these initiatives, few institutions had taken decisive action toward the elimination of educational violence in higher education (Ballard, 2004; Bishop, 2017). To redress these and other concerns, campus activism of the mid-to-late 1960s increased in intensity and chartered new tactical territory that 'radically reconstituted' U.S. colleges and universities (Rogers, 2012).

This chapter chronologically explores the development of student activism from 1968 to the present. Beginning with a historical focus on the radical shift occurring in the 1960s, this chapter deconstructs student resistance of the era and situates it within broader sociopolitical climate of the period. Next, the prevailing discourses alleging apathy among college students in the late 1970s and early 1980s are interrogated and reframed to understand differences in students' activism from the preceding decades. Then, activism and identity politics of student organized resistance of the 1990s and early 2000s is recounted in historical detail. Finally, the chapter concludes with an overview of contemporary student activism, which is further explored by additional scholarship presented in the forthcoming chapters of this text.

The New Radicalism and 'The Sixties'

By the mid-1960s, student activism had secured a strong foothold on American campuses. As the decade unfolded, the flowering of collegiate protest blossomed as an unparalleled number of students joined national quests to end discriminatory practices against the racially minoritized, women, and the burgeoning gay communities on–campus (Rhoads, 2016). New Left[1] ideologies, a vibrant counterculture, and a rising youth movement converged and contributed to more students demanding their rights on campus. By 1968, it was not uncommon to witness thousands of students demonstrating on universities historically untouched by campus activism (Broadhurst, 2014).

However, with such broad participation on–campus came a growing desire for a more accelerated pace for measurable change. And, between 1968 and 1973, campus unrest became increasingly volatile as the New Radicalism swept organized resistance efforts within broader U.S. society. Though activism in this period built upon earlier movements, new rhetoric and tactics emerged. The influence of countercultural ideas swept through the various movements and spawned an innovative, and sometimes entertaining, tactic: the street theater popularized by the Youth International Party (Yippies). The movements also began to display what was negatively termed 'radicalism' or 'militancy.' Essentially, students had grown tired of the slow pace of transformation and wanted sweeping and rapid changes. Students began to shift their discourse from wanting equality within the system to eliminating systemic injustices entirely. Their demands were not met favorably by those in power, which the violent repression of activism at Kent State and Jackson State we discuss further illustrates.

Confronting Campus Racism and Sexism

Racial Justice and Reconstituting Higher Education

The history of the United States has been marked by periods of mass protest and political struggle against class exploitation, unpopular wars, and racial

and gender inequality (Horowitz, 1986). Throughout these histories, youth culture led to the creation of student movements that helped shape broader struggles for social and political justice. For the most part, the student organization has been the central vehicle for the mobilization of students of color on- and off-campus. For instance, Black students formed Black Student Unions (BSUs); Chicana/o students formed El Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlán or the Chicana/o Student Movement (MEChA); Puerto Rican students created Puerto Rican Student Unions (PRSUs). Fundamentally, youth of color were influenced by the radical movements of the mid-1960s, which included the Black Power Movement, the Chicana/o Movement, and the Puerto Rican Nationalist Movement. Furthermore, Asian American and Native American students, although less visible, established similar movements. White students formed the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), which emphasized the demonstrations against the Vietnam War. In 1968, When Martin Luther King, Jr. was assassinated, a force majeure took place, thus adding fuel to the already politicized environment and accelerating the radicalization of many youths of color. As Muñoz (1989) points out, the radical school of thought engaged by students of color "were not irrational or anti-democratic nature, but rather political forces aiming to make society more just and more democratic" (p. 26). As students of color entered these traditionally White spaces, they formed student organizations to help them efficiently mobilize and create unity.

Federal legislation and affirmative action programs had, as Williamson (2003) writes, "a tangential influence on the rise of Black Power on college campuses by expanding educational opportunities and access to African Americans in the 1960s" (p. 26). Once students of color began entering TWIs through affirmative action programs, they experienced a system that was inherently racist and condescending. The rising consciousness in communities of color coupled with experiences of racism and discrimination on campus assisted the formation of a new wave of students of color engaged in radical and action-oriented politics. As Ballard (2004) states, "Reinforced by the National Guard and police encounters in American ghettos and by police murders of Black protesters like Fred Hampton in Chicago, young Blacks inevitably responded, their racial memories awakened to the present and the past of oppression" (p. 69). During the late 1960s, student radicals lost optimism and anger ensued. As Horowitz (1986) details, "Radicals lost their early hope of reforming the system and committed themselves to its overthrow" (p. 21). The increases in the enrollment of students of color at TWIs resulted in coordinated protests and community-building on college campuses.

With a rising consciousness and critical mass, Black students created Black student unions and began organizing on White college campuses (Williamson, 2003). The BSU, as Exum (1985) asserts, provided a "setting that is not White and in which, therefore, relaxation, security, and escape from the pressures of

the university are ostensibly possible" (p. 43). The first known BSU emerged in San Francisco State University (SFSU) in March 1966 and spread to other colleges in California. The founders of the BSU articulated several points for the organization, which included Black student unity and survival at TWIs (Rogers, 2012). Similar to the Black Panthers, the BSU put forward 10 demands to the campus community, which included the hiring of Black professors and recruitment of students of color. The organization and leadership of the BSU in SFSU became an instant national model that could unify the experiences of Black students vis-à-vis the racialized conditions they confronted (Barlow & Shapiro, 1971). From the most selective institutions to community colleges, hundreds of Black student organizations developed their structure using the BSU model.

Not only did other Black organizations modeled their structure like SFSU's BSU, but non-Black students of color also developed similar types of student organizations (Muñoz, 1989; Serrano, 1998). The increase of radical student organizations (RSOs) resulted in the creation of coalition-building as a strategy to collectively organize against what the students perceived to be a racist system of higher education. In SFSU, for example, frustrated Black, Chicana/o, and Asian-American students created the Third World Liberation Front (TWLF) to form a broader coalition to present a series of demands (Serrano, 1998). In New York City, Puerto Ricans and Black students pushed for open admissions policies at the City University of New York (CUNY). Collectively, these RSOs created the backbone to what Rogers (2012) calls the 'radical reconstitution of higher education,' which demanded a series of sweeping reforms that sought to transform the White-centered inner workings of higher education.

In higher education, students of color experienced a plethora of racist policies and violence. For example, Black students were often harassed by police officers and sometimes demeaned by White students (Rogers, 2012). These violent encounters coupled with Black Power ideologies engendered a new quest for Black studies programs. In Fall 1968, campuses were blitzed by a wave of protests and demands for reform. At the height of the movement, hundreds of demonstrations were occurring on HBCU and TWI campuses nationwide (Rogers, 2012). Not only were students organizing in TWIs, but Black students at HBCUs were also pushing back against Eurocentric perspectives (Exum, 1985). By the following academic year, hundreds of new initiatives and programs were initiated, which included Black studies, cultural centers, and diversity offices (Rogers, 2012). Other students of color, which included Chicanas/os, Puerto Ricans, Asian Americans, and Native Americans, demanded their own programs as well (Muñoz, 1989; Biondi, 2012; Barlow and Shapiro, 1971).

When these demands were not met, students of color would engage in protests as a last resort. These students deployed a variety of strategies to accomplish their goals to radically restructure higher education. For example, RSOs regularly requested excessive demands with the understanding that institutions

would only respond to a few of their claims (Bradley, 2012). However, when these demands were not being positively considered, RSOs would take direct action. From building takeovers to campus sit-ins, students of color used several non-violent tactics to implement the radical restructuring of higher education. For instance, at CUNY, Puerto Rican and Black students took over the main administration building to dispute and contest financial aid cuts and increases in tuition, which resulted in several arrests and charges (Exum, 1985). However, as these takeovers became increasingly ineffective, some students of color introduced more violent approaches.

Moving away from the non-violent tradition of the CRM, this new generation of Black students and other students of color were not afraid of using violence to achieve their goals. While this is an important point, Biondi (2012) reminds us that the notion of Black student activists as violent has often been exaggerated. In most campuses, the practice of nonviolence remained theory rather than practice. In order to reform higher education, Black students faced the courts, expulsions, arrests, and other forms of violence (Rogers, 2012). In regard to other student allies, Rogers (2012) writes, "White, Latino/a, Chicano/a, Asian, and Native Americans supporters and spectators were sometimes arrested, expelled and brutalized by police seeking to end a Black student protest" (p. 30). However, one of the most significant sources of violence against activists came from the police. In many cases, the police presence and actions increased campus tension and escalated the violence. These rare, violent events were picked up by the media and became the ubiquitous image of the student movement to restructure higher education. The imagery presented to the American public resulted in harsher punishment for students of color, even when their demands had merit (Biondi, 2012).

Gender and Women's Liberation On-Campus

As the Black movement for higher education access and opportunity raged in the late 1960s, an invigorated women's consciousness developed to pursue new demands for fairness, equality, and opportunity. In particular, women of color were fully aware of the patriarchy and sexism in their lives and constantly questioned their circumstances. As Solomon (1985) asserts, "Black women were the first to rebel against their subordinate roles in the civil rights movement, in 1964; soon white women protested against similar treatment" (p. 202). Furthermore, Horowitz (1986) reminds us that women who joined social movements in the 1960s "found themselves more camp followers than full participants. As they graduated and committed their lives to the struggle, these women realized their own subordination both within the Movement and in the broader society" (p. 31). This resulted in a new rediscovery of feminism and the questioning of power structures and gender dynamics in society.

The nationalism of the mid-1960s incubated existing power structures and particularly those related patriarchy. As Biondi (2012) fittingly points out, Black nationalism and the rhetoric of violence reinforced existing patriarchal and hyper-masculine gender roles and performances. Yet, the centering of male leaders and their perspectives encountered substantial resistance and was repeatedly contested by Black women. For example, in late 1966, several Black women and men from Rutgers met with Columbia University's Student Afro-American Society (SAS). In December, Black students at Rutgers established a co-ed SAS chapter. By March 1968, the student group had become an all-male organization (McCormick, 1990). In MEChA, a few male leaders openly criticized Chicanas who "demanded that women's rights be respected, arguing that they were playing into the dominant culture's attempt to divide the movement" (Blackwell, 2016, p. 77). Ironically, it was the sexual harassment, chauvinism, and discrimination from male leaders that contributed to the rise of feminism perspectives.

Throughout history, women of color have often been written off the historical record and have not been given a central status in the social movements era. As Blackwell (2016) asserted:

> Adding on feminism after the movement reflects the politics of periodization, a historiographic device that denies Chicanas or women of color historical agency in social transformation by consistently depicting their role or importance as occurring after the 'real revolution' or period of social change.
>
> *(p. 30)*

Women of color were often called 'sellouts' for adding feminism and gender perspectives to RSOs. Such sexist interpretations, diminishment, and dismissal of women of color's issues further marginalized both the individuals as well as their intersecting gender analysis within the broader movements for racial justice.

The questioning about the place of women in social reform came from every corner of society. In 1970, the Women's Equity Action League filed class-action lawsuits against institutions known for discriminating against women (Orlans, 1992). The strength of the women's movement resulted in the inclusion in the 1972 education amendment of Title IX, which prohibits sexual discrimination by institutions receiving federal financial aid (Solomon, 1985). Starting in the late 1960s, women's studies courses began to appear in higher education. From 1970 to 1980, over 300 women's studies programs were founded in institutions of higher education (Boxer, 1982). Influenced by the feminist movement, in 1977, the National Women's Studies Association (NWSA) was created. Unfortunately, the women's movement often focused primarily on the concerns of middle-class, White women, and not those of Black women (Zamani, 2003).

As Boxer (1982) states, "The NWSA as an organization has acknowledged widespread neglect of women of color in women's studies courses, materials, programs, and conferences" (p. 677). From 1968 to 1980, students of color and women forced the doors of higher education open in their quest for a more inclusive and democratic system.

Against Militarization: The Antiwar Movement

One of the most publicized movements from 1968 to 1973 were the protests against the Vietnam War. Though demonstrations against the conflict began before 1968, the intensity of the movement escalated in that year. The roots of the student peace movement in the 1960s could be traced to the formation of the Student Peace Union (SPU) in 1959 by University of Chicago graduate student Kenneth Calkins. Influenced by the success of the Gandhi-inspired tactics of nonviolence used by Civil Rights activists in the South, Calkins provided the early leadership of the SPU, which grew into a national organization by early 1963 with 3,500 members in dozens of local chapters (DeBenedetti & Chatfield, 1990). The demonstrations in the early 1960s focused on nuclear disarmament, but as tensions began to escalate in Vietnam, peace activists in the SPU and SDS slowly diverted their attention to this new pressing issue. With the growing American military involvement in Southeast Asia in late 1964, students began to actively express their concerns about the impending war: over 20% of four-year campuses experiences anti-war protests in the 1964/1965 academic year (Heineman, 1993). Inspired by Freedom Schools of the Mississippi Freedom Summer of 1964, faculty began to teach-ins to educate others the war and its consequences. The tactic would soon become a common method of dissent in higher education. Despite the growing concerns about the war, the majority of college students supported American military policies in the early years of the war and most demonstrations were small by comparison to the larger rallies after 1968. The SDS's march on Washington in 1965 was the largest antiwar demonstration to date: nearly 25,000 students took part (DeBenedetti & Chatfield, 1990). Two principal reasons contributed to this relative apathy. In the early 1960s, America was experiencing a thriving economy, which contributed to less questioning of national policies. More importantly, draft deferments for college students existed that favored those who were White (DeBenedetti & Chatfield, 1990). Blacks accounted for 20% of draftees, while comprising only 10% of the population and, in 1967, 64% of eligible Blacks were drafted compared to only 31% of Whites. By the late 1960s, both Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and long-time organizer with the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, Stokely Carmichael, openly questioned if Blacks should fight in Vietnam when still subjected to racial inequalities in the United States (Hall, 2005).

Thought the levels of participation in anti-war protests slowly increased, it was 1968 that proved to be a pivotal year for the student peace movement.

The economic prosperity of the earlier 1960s was beginning to wane as the war was beginning to affect the economy. As inflation and unemployment began to increase in 1968, there was a growing discontentment among Americans about the state of the nation. More importantly, plans to severely minimize draft deferments for college students were beginning. By 1969, students from White middle-class families were being drafted (Heineman, 1993). As the casualties began to mount, national support for the Vietnam War began to wane. Capitalizing on this shift, and coupled with increase media attention to demonstrations, younger (and more radical) student leadership within national organizations began to plan larger protests. The anti-war demonstration at the Democratic National Convention of 1968 not only placed a spotlight on the student peace movement, but helped increase the SDS's membership to over 100,000 students in 500 chapters (DeBenedetti & Chatfield, 1990). Partially spurred by the popularity of the Yippies' confrontational tactics, violence became more prevalent in the student anti-war movement (Gosse, 2005). Four hundred colleges witnessed protests in the Spring of 1969, often with escalating violence. Over 4,000 students were arrested and 7% of the country's campuses experienced demonstrations that either damaged property or injured individuals. The rising sentiment among student activists was that if the nation did not take notice of the need to end the conflict in Vietnam, then they would 'bring the war home.' Despite this growing urgency to end the war, the majority of student anti-war demonstrations were peaceful (DeBenedetti & Chatfield, 1990). The growing student unrest against the Vietnam War culminated with the Vietnam Moratorium, a decentralized protest against the war on October 15, 1969, that allowed people across the nation to participate in the movement without having to leave their local area. In some cities, tens of thousands voiced their concerns about the war. Campuses played an integral part of the protest, as large teach-ins occurred at a number of colleges and universities. At UCLA, for example, 20,000 attended Moratorium programs while 9,00 students marched at the University of Illinois. Even students on traditionally conservative campuses such as Iowa State University and Ball State University protested. By the end of the day, an estimated 2 million people in over 200 locations took part in the Moratorium activities (Heineman, 1993). Building upon this success, antiwar leadership planned a massive demonstration in Washington on November 15, 1969. As many as 500,000 protesters, primarily college-aged youth, gathered at the Washington Mall in the then largest single demonstration in American history (DeBenedetti & Chatfield, 1990). Student activism was thriving and would reach its pinnacle the following May.

On April 30, 1970, following Richard Nixon's announcement that he was sending American troops into Cambodia, students activists launched a series of campus demonstrations the following weekend, including those at Kent State University. Students on the Ohio campus protested throughout the weekend and, during a rally on May 4, 1970, the National Guard opened fire on

the students. The barrage of 67 bullets the soldiers dispersed in 13 seconds wounded nine and killed four (DeBenedetti & Chatfield, 1990). As news of the killings spread, the national outrage that followed sparked the large student protest in American history. This outrage was fueled when police killed 2 students and wounded 12 others during a protest for racial justice at Jackson State University in Mississippi. An estimated 1 million students on over 1,000 campuses engaged in rallies, sit-ins, marches, picketing, and student strikes (Heineman, 1993). Fifty-seven percent of campuses experienced significant impact to campus operations during the period, while 14% witnessed strikes by student and faculty. Twenty-one percent experienced a shutdown of regular academic activities for at least one day, 26 campuses shut down for 1 to 2 weeks, and 51 shut down for the remainder of the semester (Broadhurst, 2010, 2015). Such an outpouring of student activism not only drew the attention the entire nation, but prompted Nixon to appoint Alexander Heard, the chancellor of Vanderbilt, as a special advisor to help him understand the sentiments of college students. More importantly, under pressure from Congress, Nixon began to slowly withdraw troops from Vietnam (DeBenedetti & Chatfield, 1990; Heineman, 1993).

Decades of Conservative Backlash and Issues of Globalization

The popular perception that students were less engaged in activism and largely apathetic in the two decades between 1970s and 1990s is misleading. While myriad factors contributed to the lessening of activism, such as employment concerns during a massive recession or the ascendancy of conservative ideology, some expressions of student activism (e.g., the Anti–Apartheid Divestment Movement) may actually have been larger in scale than witnessed in most periods in U.S. higher education history (Altbach & Cohen, 1990). The popular characterization of students in the 1970s and 1980s as the Me-generation, a group driven by greed and self-interest, is also untrue. Students continued to display social concerns as causes such as ending world hunger and combating human rights violations became popular (Loeb, 1994; Rhoads, 1998). Volunteerism increased in popularity and students in this period had two new avenues to express their concerns: the increased inclusion of students in campus governance and the passage of the 26th Amendment in 1971 allowed students to work for change within the system (Altbach & Cohen, 1990).

Starting in the 1970s, as a result of the demands of students of color, many programs and services were institutionalized in higher education. In 1970, about one thousand postsecondary institutions had adopted open admission policies, created programs to admit Black students, recruited Black professors and staff, and implemented an assortment of transformations to improve diversity relations on campus (Rogers, 2012). For example, when Black and Puerto Rican students achieved open admissions at CUNY, the results were unparalleled in American history. To put it in perspective, in 1964, Black undergraduates at

senior colleges made up less than 2% of the college population. By 1980, 50% of the senior college enrollment were students of color and 70% of the community college population (Dyer, 1990). Similarly, Chicanas/os and Puerto Ricans have requested similar programs and initiatives and were often institutionalized in their respective campuses.

In the mid–1970s, however, the institutionalization of these programs resulted in the decaying of the radical student movement era of the late 1960s. During this time frame, many ethnic studies programs experienced massive cutbacks. At SFSU, for example, Hayakawa, the university president and a hard-liner, criticized the progressive change. As Biondi asserts, "He fired about twenty-five professors; battled the Black studies department; used financial aid to intimidate students; deprived student organizations of funds; attacked student government, and barred many students and teachers from involvement with the Educational Opportunity Program" (Biondi, 2012, p. 61). In New York City, massive budget cuts, instructional staff layoffs, the elimination of free tuition, and changes to the open admissions policy affected student of color access to higher education. These changes had a monumental impact on the Puerto Rican population. As a case in point, from 1975 to 1986, the enrollment of Puerto Ricans declined, and faculty was reduced by more than 45% (Cabán, 2009).

The overall cuts coupled with a declined in student activism led to a massive conservative backlash. As Muñoz writes, "By 1971, the student activism had already declined dramatically, especially since many of the founders of MEChA had graduated and others entered graduate school" (Muñoz, 1989, p. 105). Many students of color were also expelled or arrested, which also complicated the student activism of the early 1970s. By the 1980s, the conservative period in higher education signified a racial backlash to the nationalist movements of the late 1960s and early 1970s. Despite the conservative efforts to quell the gains harvested by these various student movements, the reconstitution of higher education was already in full effect.

The Globalization of Activism

American foreign policy continued to be a focal point for student activists. The U.S. support of dictatorships with atrocious human rights records and its continued practice of colonialism in Central America prompted demonstrations on campuses, particularly against CIA recruitment. While most demonstrations were small, some yielded hundreds of students (Altbach & Cohen, 1990; Rhoads, 1998; Vellela, 1988). Though the Vietnam War had ended, the continued rhetoric of the Cold War and the greater militancy of Reagan's policies spurred campus activism against American military policy. In April 1983, the Freeze, a campaign to halt the arms race between the Soviets and the United States, sponsored a series of nationwide protest about the threat of nuclear war. That month, nearly 650 communities and 350 campuses took part as heightened concerned over increased militaristic rhetoric between Moscow

and Washington reemerged. When the American military invaded the island nation of Grenada in late October 1983, 250 Michigan students marched from the Federal Building in Ann Arbor to the campus ROTC building in protest. The following month, 20,000 gathered in Washington to protest the invasion of the small Caribbean island (Howlett & Lieberman, 2008). In an early display of the role of technology in activism, protesters created computer networks between campuses to help coordinate demonstrations (Altbach & Cohen, 1990).

During the Gulf War, student protests against the conflict sometimes reached the levels observed during the late 1960s. Following President George H.W. Bush's November 1990 announcement that he was sending nearly 200,000 troops to the Gulf, a wave of activism struck American campuses. Demonstrations at Michigan, Minnesota, San Francisco State, Massachusetts, Stanford, Amherst, Montana, and Berkeley witnessed between 500 and 2,000 student participants. At Western Washington University, 3,000 students marched while comparable numbers were seen at the University of Colorado (2,500) and at the University of Cincinnati (3,000). Students on some campuses, such as Georgia and Indiana, erected tents and manned them until the end of the war. As with antiwar protests during the 1960s, students faced questions of patriotism and verbal and physical attacks. On February 21, 1991, 250 campuses in 37 states conducted a coordinated national protest (Loeb, 1994).

The Divestment Movement emerged as the most publicized student protest during the 1980s. Opposition to apartheid did not begin in the decade, as Civil Rights activists challenged the institution during the 1960s. In the early 1970s, faculty and students on such campuses as Princeton and Cornell began calls for the divestment of higher education from South Africa. Protests against apartheid intensified following the murder and torture of South African activist Stephen Biko in 1977, which drew national attention and outrage. That year, 700 students were arrested during anti–apartheid demonstrations. The methods worked and by the end of the decade, over three dozen campuses had begun enacting divestment policies (Martin, 2007).

Following Desmond Tutu's Nobel Peace Prize in 1984 and intensified uprisings in South Africa that year, campus attention to apartheid was renewed. On the 17th anniversary of Martin Luther King's death, on April 4, 1985, nearly 60 campuses took part in a National Anti-Apartheid Day (Martin, 2007). Divestment protests reached high levels for single demonstrations, with some campuses having hundreds of students take part: several hundred students at Columbia protested for 3 weeks and the protests at Berkeley drew support of some 10,000 students (Altbach & Cohen, 1990). While students cited the injustices of apartheid as a cause for protest, they primarily attacked higher education's financial support of an abhorrent institution (Martin, 2007). The protests increased in the 1985/86 school year and students built shanties on campuses "to symbolize the poverty and oppression of South African Blacks" (Altbach & Cohen, 1990, p. 44). By end of academic year, more than 120 campuses at least

partially divested in companies that did business in South Africa, including the University of California removing its $3.1 billion in investments (Altbach & Cohen, 1990). The Divestment Movement proved extremely successful: 60% of campuses that experienced protests divested compared to only 3% of those with no protests (Martin, 2007).

Student Activism, Identity Politics, and the Age of Multiculturalism

From the early 1990s into the first decade of the 21st century, students continued to display a thriving social conscience. In fact, more students in the 1990s reported that they took part in protesting that in the 1960s, often described as the peak of period of campus unrest. According to date from the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI), 40% of students in 1992 stated they were involved in activism compared to only 16% in 1967 (Rhoads, 1998). A generational impact perhaps influenced this increase: just as those who protested in the 1960s were sometimes the children of 1930s activists, termed Red-Diaper Babies, the college students in the 1990s were the children of those that attended college in the 1960s. Volunteerism continued to increase and rising concerns over the rights of workers and the environment prompted activism reminiscent of causes in the early 20th century. Building on the decades-long push for civil rights for various marginalized groups, the push for diversity was often at the center of student activism in the period.

Identity Politics and Student Activism

Perhaps the most prevalent cause for student activists in the 1990s centered on issues of multiculturalism, group identity, and promoting diversity. As with the various Civil Rights movements in the 1960s, when the national movements garnered more media attention, it was local issues that drew the attention of student activists in the 1990s. At Mills College in 1990, students protested a leadership decision to allow male students into the women's college, stressing that the campus was both a place that women felt comfortable and promoted women's achievements. During the early 1990s, the Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Student Alliance (LGBSA) at Penn State used rallies, marches, and teach-ins to push the campus administration to add sexual orientation to its nondiscrimination clause, for the greater visibility of the LGBT community on campus, and for increased support for the partners of LGBT staff and faculty. On three different campuses, students fought to improve the racial climates and end marginalizing policies: Mexican American students at UCLA advocated for a Chicana/o program promoted their cultural heritage, Black students at Rutgers rallied against racist remarks by the campus's president, and at Michigan State, Native American students rallied against the governor's attempts the eliminate a program that

provided them with free tuition (Rhoads, 1998). While each of these five cases are unique, they reflect the localized battles that were occurring on many campuses during the period. Additionally, as in each of the five cases, the marginalized groups fighting for change were often joined by other marginalized groups.

Despite the often-localized focus of identity activism in the period, students did organize nationally in joint efforts for social change. In one instance, college students joined together on March 14, 1996, for a National Day of Action (Rhoads, 1998). On dozens of campuses nationwide, student activists expressed their concerns over such causes as increased access to education, the rights of immigrants, affirmative action, and better campus climates for students of color and the LGBT community. The Center for Campus Organizing, in Cambridge, Massachusetts, used a new technology to help spread word of the event: electronic mail. As their predecessors did in the 1960s, students used rallies, teach-ins, picketing, and marches to engage in activism. Building on the success of the event, students later organized a National Week of Action from March 27 to April 2, 1996. The focus of the protests were often local issues, such as students at the University of New Mexico demonstrating to express their concerns that tuition hikes would hinder college access for low income families, but the week showed that students could collectively organize.

The Rights of Workers

Activism for the rights of workers experienced a resurgence in the 1990s and early 21st century. The broader movement initially began in the early 20th century and had never truly disappeared. As part of a broader social movement against corporate globalization, in the mid-1990s, students began to push their various campus administrations to force companies that manufactured collegiate-licensed apparel to become more worker friendly (Barnhardt, 2014). A collective of student anti-sweatshop groups formed the United Students Against Sweatshops (USAS) in 1998, using sit-ins, educational workshops, puppet shows, and street theater to raise awareness for the need for better wages and conditions for workers and their right to organize. At Indiana University alone, in 1999/2000, student activists provided workshops to several thousand people on the connection between human rights abuses, sweatshop labor, and the global economy (Bose, 2008). Beyond the anti-sweatshop movement, graduate students unionized as they fought for improved conditions as workers on campus (Whitford, 2014).

Toward Contemporary Student Activism and the 21st Century

The past decade has experienced a resurgence of student activism that is reminiscent of the peak periods of campus protests in the 1960s. The great recession

and debt crisis, high unemployment rates, volatile political rhetoric, and the retrenchment of previous victories has helped spur students to increased efforts to end social injustices (Weiland, Guzman, & O'Meara, 2013). This is especially true since the election of Donald Trump in 2016, as hostile sociopolitical climates have heightened concerns for students from historically marginalized backgrounds (Logan, Lightfoot, & Contreras, 2017). Using old methods, such as sit-ins and marches, and innovative tactics employing social media, these mis-termed 'slacktivists' are once again bringing student social movements to the national stage (Jacoby, 2017; Linder, Myers, Riggle, & Lacy, 2016).

Still, despite the changes in time, age-old injustices continue to at the forefront of movement work. The Black Lives Matter movement, for example, is a continuation of the longstanding struggle for racial equity and evidences the prevalence of hostile, anti-Black racial climates in America (Hope, Keels, & Durkee, 2016). On campuses, these hostile climates can include not only racially biased incidents, but feelings that administrators are doing little to stop the occurrences (Logan et al., 2017). In addition, immigration reform has been a central concern in recent years as the unjust policies—under the guise of national security—have sought to deport undocumented students as well as ban others from Muslim nations (Corrunker, 2012; Logan et al., 2017; Weiland et al., 2013). Undocumented students have engaged in sit-ins of congressional offices, pressed legislators to enact immigration reform, and openly declared their status to bring awareness to stories and issues (Corrunker, 2012).

Students have also joined together to express outrage over rising tuition and increasing student debt, sometimes as part of the broader Occupy movement (Weiland et al., 2013). Over the past decade, campuses have accelerated the increases in tuition and fees to offset declines in state funding. This has forced students, particularly those from lower-income families, to rely more heavily on student loans to fund their education (Ozymy, 2012). Students have fought against the public defunding of higher education and the correlated increase in tuition and fees, sometimes with the violent repression. In one instance at UC Davis in 2011, police officers pepper sprayed 10 seated student protesters that were part of an Occupy UC Davis demonstration against proposed fee increase of, nearly 81% and continuing cutbacks (Maira & Sze, 2012).

Recalling the Divestment Movement in the 1980s, growing concerns over Israeli apartheid and Palestinian genocide has spawned a movement calling for the campus divestment from companies that have supported the government in Israel (Hallward & Shaver, 2012; Maira & Sze, 2012). The battles for gender equity and the rights of LGBTQ populations have continued the past 50 years, with amplified attention of raising awareness for sexual assaults on campus and the needs of transgender students (Biddix, 2010; Linder et al., 2016; Messinger, 2009). That activism is thriving in the 21st century is important for higher education, as working for social change helps develop critically conscious and democratically engaged students (Kezar, 2010).

Note

1. Originally, the New Left was an all-encompassing term to describe the various movements in the 60s. Later, in the 80s and 90s, scholars used the term more to describe organizations dominated by young white students, such as the SDS. Historian Van Gosse finds this definition lacking, as some of those involved in the New Left were not young, not white, nor were they students. Gosse prefers the original designation, as, for him the New Left is "a movement of movements" that incorporated all challenges to the existing society and American culture in the 50s and 60s. Politically, the New Left confronted Cold War liberalism, a bipartisan effort by Democrats and moderate Republicans to thwart communism, both at home and abroad. It also questioned the historic inequalities faced by those who were not white, male, heterosexual, and from a higher SES.

References

Altbach, P. G. (1974). *Student politics in America: A historical analysis*. New York City, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Altbach, P. G., & Cohen, R. (1990). American student activism. *Journal of Higher Education*, *61*(1), 32–49.

Ballard, A. B. (2004). *The education of Black folk: The Afro-American struggle for knowledge in White America*. Lincoln, NE: iUniverse.

Barlow, W., & Shapiro, P. (1971). *An end to silence: The San Francisco State College student movement in the '60s*. New York: Pegasus.

Barnhardt, C. L. (2014). Campus-based organizing: Tactical repertoires of a contemporary student movement. *New Directions for Higher Education*, *167*, 43–58.

Biddix, J. P. (2010). Relational leadership and technology: A study of Activist College Women Leaders. *Journal about Women in Higher Education*, *3*(1), 25–47.

Biondi, M. (2012). *The Black revolution on campus*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Bishop, J. M. (2017). Mapping violence, naming life: A history of anti–Black oppression in the higher education system. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *30*(8), 711–727.

Blackwell, M. (2016). *¡Chicana power! Contested histories of feminism in the Chicano movement*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Bose, P. (2008). From agitation to institutionalization: The student anti–sweatshop movement in the new millennium. *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies*, *15*(1), 213–240.

Boxer, M. J. (1982). For and about women: The theory and practice of women's studies in the United States. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 7(3), 661–695.

Bradley, S. M. (2012). *Harlem vs. Columbia University: Black student power in the late 1960s*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Broadhurst, C. (2010). "We didn't fire a shot, we didn't burn a building": The student reaction at North Carolina State University to the Kent State shootings, May 1970. *North Carolina Historical Review*, *87*(3), 283–309.

Broadhurst, C. (2014). Campus activism in the 21st century: A historical framing. *New Directions for Higher Education*, *167*, 3–15.

Broadhurst, C. (2015). "There can be no business as usual": The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and the student strike of May 1970. *Southern Cultures*, *21*(2), 84–101.

Burton, J. D. (2007). Collegiate living and Cambridge justice: Regulating the colonial Harvard student community in the eighteenth century. In H. S. Wechsler, L. F.

Goodchild, & L. Eisenmann (Eds.), *The history of higher education, ASHE reader* (3rd ed., pp. 126–138). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Cabán, P. (2009). Puerto Rican studies: Changing islands of knowledge. *Centro Journal*, *21*(2), 257–281.

Corrunker, L. (2012). "Coming out of the shadows": DREAM Act activism in the context of global anti-deportation activism. *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies*, *19*(1), 143–168.

DeBenedetti, C., & Chatfield, C. (1990). *An American ordeal: The antiwar movement of the Vietnam Era*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Dyer, C. M. (1990). *Protest and the politics of open admissions: The impact of the Black and Puerto Rican students' community (of city college)* (Doctoral dissertation). City University of New York.

Exum, W. H. (1985). *Paradoxes of protest: Black student activism in a White university*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Gosse, V. (2005). *Rethinking the new left: An interpretive history*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hall, S. (2005). *Peace and freedom: The civil rights and antiwar movement of the 1960's*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Hallward, M. C., & Shaver, P. (2012). "War by other means" or nonviolent resistance? Examining the discourses surrounding Berkeley's divestment bill. *Peace & Change*, *37*(3), 389–412.

Heineman, K. (1993). *Campus wars: The peace movement at American state universities in the Vietnam era*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Holden, C. (2008). "Patriotism does not mean stupidity": Student antiwar activism at UNC in the 1930s. *North Carolina Historical Review*, *85*(1), 29–56.

Hope, E. C., Keels, M., & Durkee, M. I. (2016). Participation in Black Lives Matter and Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals: Modern activism among Black and Latino college students. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *9*(3), 203–215.

Horowitz, H. L. (1986). The 1960s and the transformation of campus cultures. *History of Education Quarterly*, *26*(1), 1–38.

Howlett, C., & Lieberman, R. (2008). *A history of the American peace movement from colonial times to the present*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press.

Jacoby, B. (2017). The new student activism: Supporting students as agents of social change. *Journal of College and Character*, *18*(1), 1–8.

Kezar, A. (2010). Faculty and staff partnering with student activists: Unexplored terrains of interaction and development. *Journal of College Student Development*, *51*(5), 451–480.

Linder, C., Myers, J. S., Riggle, C., & Lacy, M. (2016). From margins to mainstream: Social media as a tool for campus sexual violence activism. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *9*(3), 231–244.

Loeb, P. (1994). *Generation at the crossroads: Apathy and action on the American campus*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Logan, G., Lightfoot, B., & Contreras, A. (2017). Black and Brown Millennial activism on a PWI campus in the era of Trump. *The Journal of Negro Education*, *86*(3), 252–268.

Loss, C. P. (2011). *Between citizens and the state: The politics of American higher education in the 20th century*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Maira, S., & Sze, J. (2012). Dispatches from pepper spray university: Privatization, repression, and revolts. *American Quarterly*, *64*(2), 315–330.

Martin, B. (2007). "Unsightly huts": Shanties and the divestment movement of the 1980s. *Peace and Change*, *32*(3), 329–360.

McCormick, R. P. (1990). *The Black student protest movement at Rutgers*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Messinger, L. (2009). Creating LGBTQ-friendly campuses. *Academe*, *95*(5), 39–42.

Moore, K. (1976). Freedom and constraint in eighteenth century Harvard. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *47*(6), 649–659.

Muñoz, C. (1989). *Youth, identity, power: The Chicano movement*. New York, NY: Verso.

Novak, S. (1977). *The rights of youth: American colleges and student revolt, 1798–1815*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Orlans, H. (1992). Affirmative action in higher education. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *523*(1), 144–158.

Ozymy, J. (2012). The poverty of participation: Self-interest, student loans, and student activism. *Political Behavior*, *34*(1), 103–116.

Rhoads, R. (1998). *Freedom's web: Student activism in the age of cultural diversity*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Rhoads, R. (2016). Student activism, diversity, and the struggle for a just society. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *9*(3), 189–202.

Rogers, I. (2012). *The Black campus movement: Black students and the racial reconstitution of higher education, 1965–1972*. New York, NY: Springer.

Rudolph, F. (1990). *The American college and university: A history*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.

Serrano, B. (1998). Rifle, Canon, y Escopeta: A chronicle of the Puerto Rican student union. In A. Torres & J. E. Velazquez (Eds.), *The Puerto Rican movement: Voices from the diaspora* (pp. 124–143). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Solomon, B. M. (1985). *In the company of educated women: A history of women and higher education in America*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Vellela, T. (1988). *New voices: Student activism in the '80s and '90s*. Boston, MA: South End Press.

Wallenstein, P. (2008). Black southerners and nonblack universities: The process of desegregating southern higher education. In P. Wallenstein (Ed.), *Higher education and the civil rights movement: White supremacy, Black southerners, and college campuses* (pp. 17–59). Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida.

Weiland, K. L., Guzman, A., & O'Meara, K. (2013). Politics, identity, and college protest: Then and now. *About Campus*, *18*(2), 2–9.

Whitford, H. (2014). The role of graduate student unions in the higher education landscape. *New Directions for Higher Education*, *167*, 17–29.

Williamson, J. A. (2013). *Black power on campus: The University of Illinois, 1965–75*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Zamani, E. M. (2003). African American women in higher education. *New Directions for Student Services*, *2003*(104), 5–18.

2

ACTIVISM, FREE SPEECH, AND POWER

Nancy Thomas

Introduction

The right to assemble, organize, and protest seems so firmly established in U.S. society that it is difficult to imagine that activism's core enabler, free expression, is periodically questioned and reinterpreted. The right to free speech allows those with dissenting viewpoints, rejected ideas, or little positional or social power to express their views to influence policies and community norms. The right to free speech is also regularly appropriated as a cultural or ideological wedge. Exacerbating tensions, the unwritten rules of politics and disagreement in the public square have changed. More than 20 years ago, political scientist Benjamin Barber noted in an interview with the *New York Times* that partisan politics have always had a healthy level of "conflict and disagreement," but he warned of the emergence of a new kind of politics. Barber said, "divisive rhetoric has become not only disagreement between parties but a rejection of the legitimacy of the other side, validating a position that your opponents are immoral, un-American, and possibly worthy of being subjected to violence" (as cited in James, 1997). Today, extremism and vitriol dominate the discourse not just among political leaders but among everyday Americans themselves.

American colleges and universities have long been the sites, if not origins, of political activism about pressing controversial issues (see Chapter 1 of this volume). Conflict and disagreement belong on campus because they provide learning opportunities. I have long argued that academic freedom is a privilege established to ensure that colleges and universities can serve as independent venues for examining public concerns without political interference (Thomas, 2015). Despite this privilege, when political controversies foment passion on campus, people with power and positional authority—often university boards

and senior administrators, state legislatures, and federal officials—sometimes try to censor or punish speech or activities. Consequently, when students who feel targeted or disadvantaged—women, students of color, members of the LGBTQ community, members of religious groups, immigrants, and political conservatives—by public policies or the content of some speech on campus, they mobilize to protest and, sometimes, try to stop speech that negatively affects their lives and experiences on campus. These swirling dynamics render the state of free expression on college campuses unsettled, implicating college student voice and activism. Speech and activism are both symbiotic and contradictory.

What follows is a brief history of speech on campus, followed by more detailed summary of the current situation. Then, based on research conducted by the Institute for Democracy and Higher Education (IDHE) on campus climates for political learning and engagement, recent findings about speech, inclusion, and activism are presented. The chapter concludes with some suggestions for student learning, discussion, and practice, but leaves unanswered the question of which perspectives should prevail because there are no permanent solutions in this work. When speech becomes part of a 'winner take all' debate, no one wins. Instead, the solution is to discuss and reach some common ground about shared norms and responsibilities on campus so that issue activism and learning for all students can thrive.

The Evolution of Free Speech on Campus

Enacted in 1791, the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution says, "Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech." Free expression was largely ignored and unenforced until the early part of the 20th century. In his *Story of American Freedom*, Columbia University historian Eric Foner (1998) noted that prior to 1920, "Free speech claims rarely came to court, and when they did, judges generally allowed authorities wide latitude in determining which speech had a 'bad tendency' and therefore could be suppressed" (p. 163).

Early cases involving speech on campus concerned faculty and their rights to academic freedom. In the 1920s, professors drew ire for expressing their viewpoints on labor, unions, and economic systems. In the 1930s, scientists faced pressure and threats of censorship over scientific research and conclusions, and students raised fears for embracing communism and socialism during the Great Depression. In the 1950s, the dispute was over the right of faculty members to resist McCarthy-era inquisitions and demands for loyalty.

In the 1960s, the focus of expressive rights on campus shifted from faculty to students. Described as an era of "unforgettable change" (Oakland Museum of California, n.d.), in the mid-1960s, the University of California Berkeley became "an epicenter of 1960s protests with its Free Speech Movement" (Ransby, 2015, p. 13). Facing growing student activism advocating for civil

rights and opposing McCarthyism and U.S. involvement in the Vietnam War, the UC Board of Regents and Berkeley administration banned political activity on campus. When the administration responded by suspending five students, hundreds of people marched to the administration building, and three more were suspended. Two days later, another student was arrested for distributing flyers and placed in a police cruiser; hundreds of protesters surrounded the car, deflated the tires, and prevented it from moving for 32 hours while students climbed on top of the car to give speeches. The administration released the arrested student.

Over the next two months, students, faculty, teaching assistants sparred with the administration and Regents. Beloved folk singer Joan Baez gave a concert on the day of a Board of Regents meeting, drawing thousands of people (Jashinsky, 2017). When the Regents doubled down, graduate student teachers went on strike. Thousands of people surrounded the main administration building. When 1,500 students occupied the building, police moved in and arrested more than 700 students for trespassing. The images of students being arrested prompted the faculty senate to meet and craft a list of recommendations, including that all actions against students be dropped. Within hours, FSM called off the strike. Although the Regents originally refused to adopt the faculty senate's resolutions, the administration eventually replaced a key administrator with a faculty member who supported FSM. New rules were enacted permitting political activity on campus. Student organizations could distribute leaflets and take positions on issues. By the end of December, the students' rights to free expression had prevailed. Noting the significance of these efforts, in their book *Free Speech on Campus*, Chemerinsky and Gillman (2017) write:

> As a result of the movement, student groups could use campus spaces to organize and advocate for political causes—a very different environment than existed in the 1950s. These precedents were especially consequential as students and others across the country asserted their right to protest the Vietnam War.
>
> *(p. 76)*

In the 1970s, student activists demanded that traditional fields of study expand to be more inclusive. This led to the establishment of women's studies, Black studies, Chicano studies, Native American and indigenous studies, and other areas of cultural studies. These new programs "collectively changed the intellectual landscape of American higher education," (Ransby, 2015, p. 13). At the same time, affirmative action increased access to new student populations. The U.S. Department of Education created actively enforced federal Civil Rights laws mandating that institutions ensure equal and nondiscriminatory learning environments. Throughout the 1980s, campuses enacted free speech

codes that regulated student conduct (e.g., harassment) and speech (e.g., banning "offensive speech") in the interest of creating welcoming campus climates for all students. These prompted accusations of "political correctness" and curtailed speech. When judicially challenged, speech codes were routinely struck down.

Famously, *Doe v. University of Michigan* (1989) led to the demise of many speech codes. In the late 1980s, the University of Michigan faced many racist incidents, including anonymous fliers containing offensive racial epithets regarding Black students, a radio station that allowed racist jokes, and a student hanging a Ku Klux Klan uniform from a dormitory window. The university responded with formal statement condemning these behaviors. Dozens of people testified at hearings before Michigan's higher education regents about the racist campus climate. Pressured to act, the University developed a plan that included a policy against racial harassment. Crafting the policy took nearly a year, and while some raised concerns over free speech, the president expressed the view that individuals within a campus community could not make "discriminatory remarks" that "detract from the necessary educational climate of the campus," (Niehoff, 2017, p. 368). The final version of the policy designated physical spaces on campus where people could not engage in speech that "stigmatized" or "victimized" someone based on their race, ethnicity, gender or sexual orientation (Niehoff, 2017, p. 369). Although the court commended the university's commitment and effort, the opinion opens with, "It is an unfortunate fact of our constitutional system that the ideals of freedom and equality are often in conflict" (Doe v. University of Michigan, 1989, p. 853), concluding that the well-intentioned policy was unconstitutional.

The Current Debate over Free Speech on Campus

Today, college and universities face many debates about speech. Perhaps the most widely publicized debate concerns controversial speakers and consequences for student activists who prevent those speakers from speaking—a battle over whose free speech rights prevail.

Beyond challenges to speakers, campuses also face a mix of praise and criticism for "free speech walls" or "zones." Defined by some campuses as "an outlet for discussing civic issues, increasing communication across diverse audiences, encouraging thoughtful reflection, and increasing participation in the democracy process," their purpose is to encourage discourse, not limit it (Kennesaw State University Dean of Students, n.d.). As long as expressive freedom is not relegated exclusively to walls and zones, they can spur debate and expressive activity (University of Maine at Presque Isle Inclusion and Civility Task Force, n.d.). Yet they can also attract hateful posts (Pringle, 2017).

So-called safe spaces are also under attack, partly because there seems to be a lack of understanding of what they are. To some, "safe spaces" are physical

locations, often classrooms, where multiple and even unpopular viewpoints are welcome but rules of professionalism and standards of evidence and truth prevail. To others, "safe spaces" are physical locations set aside, often for affinity groups—women, students of color, LGBTQ students, international students, commuters—to ensure their sense of belonging and well-being. Critics argue that safe spaces are an example of "coddling" of students, reducing their confidence and resiliency (Lukianoff & Haidt, 2015). Some now advocate for "brave spaces," to suggest a commitment to courageous conversations and openness to dissent. Palfrey (2017) proposes that "brave spaces" refer to learning spaces on campus (e.g., classrooms, lecture halls) in which free expression is encouraged, but the primary goal is the search for truth, not advocacy for a particular group or perspective on an issue (p. 21).

According to organizations that keep track like the Southern Policy Law Center and the Anti-Defamation League, activism by hate groups on campuses is increasing (Moon, 2018). Campuses want to prevent White nationalist groups from recruiting members. Yet they do not want to prevent activism concerning, for example, environmental protection or animal rights. To avoid claims of censorship based on content, some institutions create blanket policies against handing out any flyers or hanging all posters, reminiscent of the origins of the Berkeley Free Speech Movement.

The debate over whether "hate speech" is "free speech" is particularly challenging. In our research at Tufts University's Institute for Democracy and Higher Education, we found that students support free speech as a normative value on campus, but they want to prevent or punish hate speech (Thomas & Brower, 2017). This finding was affirmed in a March 2018 Gallup/Knight Foundation poll of U.S. college and university students. More than half of the poll respondents supported limiting hate speech on campus, and around one third approved of efforts to stop speakers viewed as racist, sexist, homophobic, or xenophobic. Brookings also published survey findings indicating that 44% of students believe that the First Amendment does *not* protect hate speech (Villasenor, 2017). The Brookings author concluded that "many college students have an overly narrow view of the extent of expressive freedom" on campus.[1]

In August of 2017, White nationalists and alt-right advocates organized the "Unite the Right" march in Charlottesville, Virginia, which resulted in violence and the death of one woman and injuries to 19 more people. When that same group reorganized several weeks later in Boston, they rebranded the event as a "free speech rally." Since then, extreme-right groups have coopted the call for free speech to ensure access to college campuses for both rallies and recruiting opportunities. In October 2018, Clark Community College in Washington State called off classes and campus activities because a far-right group, Patriot Prayer, whose activities have turned violent, will be holding a rally (Jaschik, 2018).

Legislative Responses

In January 2017, the Goldwater Institute, which is dedicated to "advancing the principles of limited government, economic freedom, and individual liberty," published model legislation seeking to guide regulation about expression on college campuses (Kurtz, Manley, & Butcher, 2017). Since then, 11 states (AZ, CO, FL, GA, KY, LA, MI, NC, TN, UT, VA) have passed legislation and 10 more (CA, IL, MI, NE, NH, NY, SD, TX, WA, WY) have proposed legislation. Similar efforts failed in Iowa, Kansas, and Wisconsin, although in Wisconsin, the university's Board of Regents passed a policy, circumventing the need for legislative action (for an updated tracking map and links to the text of different legislation, see here: www.democracyandhighered.org/maps). Not all laws follow the Goldwater Institute model, but they all nullify any existing speech codes on campuses. Some mandate that institutions discipline students who interfere with speakers. Some allow speakers whose free speech rights have been "improperly infringed" to seek money damages. Several states prevent institutions from "shield[ing] students, staff, or individuals on campus from speech . . . including ideas and opinions which such students, staff, or individuals on campus find unwelcoming, disagreeable, or even deeply offensive." Many contain language requiring universities to remain neutral on issues of public controversy. Former U.S. Attorney General Jeff Sessions has already intervened in at least three cases involving speech on campuses. Because they are punitive and intimidating, these laws will likely have a chilling effect on speech and student activism.

Institutional Reports

In addition to the passage of state laws, some private universities have examined and issued statements about the state of free speech. The University of Chicago's Report of the Committee on Freedom of Expression (2015) declares:

> [T]he University's fundamental commitment is to the principle that debate or deliberation may not be suppressed because the ideas put forth are thought by some or even by most members of the University community to be offensive, unwise, immoral, or wrong-headed. It is for the individual members of the University community, not for the University as an institution, to make those judgments for themselves, and to act on those judgments not by seeking to suppress speech, but by openly and vigorously contesting the ideas that they oppose.
>
> *(p. 2)*

The policy also prohibits students and others to interfere with the freedom of others, including unpopular speakers, to express their views, no matter how

loathsome they may be. Chicago's statement has served as a model for other institutions, such as Princeton University, Purdue University, and Winston–Salem State University (American Association of University Professors, 2018).

In October 2018, Colgate University issued a report from its Task Force on Academic Freedom and Freedom of Expression that *Inside Higher Ed* characterized as "both a reiteration and counterpoint" to the University of Chicago statement (Flaherty, 2018). The Task Force consisted of faculty, student government leaders, and trustees. While the report offers a "strong defense of the free exchange of ideas and of its necessity," it also points to "the values of humility and empathy and the practice of careful listening" (Flaherty, 2018). The report advocates for a culture and community that will inspire people to "pursue knowledge with rigor and curiosity, speak and listen with care, and work so that even the quietest or most underrepresented voices among us are heard" (Task Force on Academic Freedom and Freedom of Expression, 2018).

These kinds of reports and statements help members of a campus community predict how institutional leaders are likely to respond to activism that interrupts unpopular speakers (e.g., activists may not deny speakers the right to speak, but they will be afforded alternate venues for expression). But they do not adequately address speech that pollutes the campus climate and denies equal learning opportunities to students who are on the receiving end of repeated insults, ignorant statements, or other forms of microaggressions. They also do not address Benjamin Barber's warning that Americans reject the legitimacy of the other side, view them as immoral or un-American, and even worthy of violence. The election devolved into a place of extreme polarization and hateful rhetoric aimed at people of color, immigrants, women, and other historically marginalized groups. When selected by politicians, these language choices incite anger and deepen resentment. When speech is objectively abhorrent, inaccurate or uninformed, or threatening, is it appropriate for a college or university to censor the speaker? These are difficult lines to draw.

Linking Campus Climates, Free Speech, and Activism

From 2014 through 2016, the research team at the Institute for Democracy and Higher Education visited nine colleges and universities with exceptionally high or low levels of electoral engagement. These qualitative case studies examined the institutions' campus climates for political learning and engagement in democracy. Seven of the nine campuses were "high outliers," meaning their actual voting rates exceeded the rate predicted using data from the National Study of Learning, Voting, and Engagement (Institute for Democracy and Higher Education, n.d.). Two were "low outliers," meaning their voting rates were significantly lower than predicted. Drawing from Bolman and

Deal's (2017) approach to analyzing organizations, we developed a conceptual framework for examining political climates by examining four frames: structural (organizational functions such as the policies, curricular and co-curricular programming, and physical spaces), human (composition, relationships, attitudes, and behaviors), political (how decisions are made, the status of shared governance, and both internal and external influences such as a legislature or local communities), and cultural (norms, values, traditions, and relevant historic events). We found that campus climates reflect a complicated ecosystem of interconnected structural, human, political, and cultural attributes that provide the foundation for political engagement.

Specifically, we identified five institutional characteristics that are critical to promoting vibrant climates for political learning and engagement in democracy. We collectively call these practices "Politics 365" to highlight the need for intentional and sustained action throughout the year, regardless of whether there is a national election. Table 2.1 presents a summary of the attributes (Thomas & Brower, 2018, p. 25):

TABLE 2.1 Politics 365

Attribute	Definition
Social Cohesion	How an institution builds among students, faculty, and staff a sense of shared responsibility for the institution and for the campus community, student well-being, strong interpersonal relationships (particularly between faculty and students), and social networks for personal and collective engagement.
Diversity, Inclusion, and Equity as Realized Practice	How an institution uses diversity and equity—particularly based on social identity, political ideology, and lived experiences—as educational goals and assets. Social cohesion and inclusion intersect; highly engaged institutions seem able to cultivate interpersonal relationships across difference of identity, ideology, and lived experiences.
Pervasive, High-Quality Political Discussions	How an institution embeds controversial issue discussions across the curriculum and student experience, including promoting respect for the open exchange of ideas and consideration of dissenting or unpopular views.
Activism, Agency, and Decision-Making	How an institution responds to students as leaders and strong voices in addressing institutional and local community problems through collaborative governance and decision-making; this includes responsiveness to student activism about institutional or public policy matters.
Active Electoral Engagement	How an institution removes the technical barriers to voting, uses elections as teachable moments, encourages students to see themselves as voters (as opposed to voting as a one-time act), and creates a "buzz" over elections.

The data from these case studies offer insight into the complicated relationship between free speech and student leadership through activism. At the positive outlier campuses, we observed students actively taking responsibility for institutional policies and campus climate. Free speech and inclusion presented a more complicated picture. On the campuses we visited, students emerged as significant forces in shaping the climate for both speech and inclusion. We observed a common theme: students supported free speech, in theory, but drew the line at hateful or degrading speech, whether it came from their peers, their professors, or outside speakers.

Student Activism, Voice, and Leadership

Sometimes, student power and voice stemmed from formal organizations such as a strong student government association or ad hoc or standing committees. An administrator at a Southern public state university said:

> I think we always wanted students' input, everything from class evaluations . . . [to] committees throughout the college. All of our committees have student seats in them, so students are involved in that respect. . . . It's kind of part of our culture. We're here because of them, so we want them to have some input. Like I said we don't always agree [but] at least they have a chance to have their voice heard and sit at the table to do so.

A student there confirmed this viewpoint, explaining, "It's not a dictatorship, whether they tell us what to do and 'this is what you have to do.' We have a voice. We have representation. [The new president] came in, and he was all about student voices, student opinions, and working with students, just changing things." Another student confirmed, saying, "If there's something, one thing that our school is big for, I'm pretty sure [all students] here have sat on one board, a task force, something, a committee. If something's not working, they're going to pull us together."

Students at the positive outlier campuses also organized without authority to effectuate change. While most colleges and universities aspire to cultivate student leadership skills, on these campuses, student activists received full hearings and respect. At a public state university in the northeast, we were actually on campus when a student protest erupted over an unpopular personnel decision. The president canceled her appointments and met with the protesting students for two hours. Because personnel decisions are not open to public disclosure, the students and the president discussed issues of government transparency and how institutional leaders could maximize transparency while still protecting an employee's rights. The students agreed to study the personnel processes and return with suggestions for improving communications around sensitive matters.

At other times, student leaders had positional authority on campus and used it for activism on political issues off campus. An administrator at a Southwestern urban public university gave an example:

> Our student leaders are in suit and tie or for females, business attire, at all times, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, because they never know who it is they're going to meet. One day, I get a call, again, it was like an average Tuesday, I get a call at 9 a.m. "Four of your students are testifying at city council for a $500,000 upgrade of parking downtown, are you aware?" No, I am not aware. So immediately I have to go to Public Affairs . . . because some of the statements that they're making were a little outlandish and needed to be pulled back a little bit, but [it] wound up on the floor with the city council making a proclamation unanimously to fund a half a million-dollar parking project.

On this campus, student government leaders were described by other students as "political animals," an identity that other students admired, but also found a little intimidating. For example, at the time of South Africa's former president Nelson Mandela's health decline immediately before he passed away in 2013, members of the student government organized a candlelight vigil. They invited and gathered hundreds of students on short notice in a common area on campus—one known as a place for political discussion and convening. While the students held lit candles, the student SGA leaders contacted local and state politicians, inviting them to come hold a candle for Nelson Mandela, advising that "the media will be here." Simultaneously, other student leaders contacted the media, inviting newspapers and television stations to cover the event, and adding "politicians will be here." The event was, indeed, attended by both politicians and reporters.

An administrator summarized the student government at this institution:

> From seeing a student on the senate floor on C-SPAN, literally two weeks ago, addressing Barack Obama, to contacting every local media outlet to discuss gender neutral restrooms on our campus, it's nothing for our SGA meetings to take place and for the student leaders to say, "I phoned my contacts." And I'll say, "Okay, who are your contacts?" ABC, CBS, NBC, CW. I'm like, no, no, no. . . . These are the largest media outlets that exist and those are your contacts? "Yeah, yeah, those are my contacts." So literally, it's nothing for me to walk into an SGA meeting and have the camera crew from ABC streaming live because they're discussing gender neutral restrooms for campus.

Political activism emerged from student clubs, cultural centers, Greek houses, athletic teams, and disciplinary clubs.

Academic departments can provide students with opportunities for issue activism. At a west coast community college, a political science professor is working with students to cultivate observance for the United Nation's (n.d.) World Peace Day. At a Midwest community college, students studied and then organized against their discovery that local landlords discriminated by leasing property to prospective White tenants over Black tenants. At a Midwest research university, the chemistry department hosts biannual blood drives. When concerns around blood safety and blood-transmitted diseases were raised, the chemistry club organized campus-wide dialogues on blood shortages, safety, and stigmatizing that can sometimes accompany blood drives. Students in political science often took the lead around voter engagement, registering voters, organizing issue forums, planning debate watches and parties, and creating a celebratory spirit at election time. Students at the positive outlier campuses mentioned many institutional concerns that provoked activism: tuition hikes, the sexual assault policy, LGBTQ rights, opposing anti-abortion activists setting up displays, speakers opposing marriage equality, and free speech.

The pattern among the high outlier campuses was that administrations provided opportunities for students to play a role in influencing institutional policies or they listened to (and even got out of the way of) student political activism. That wasn't always the case, however, when it came to student efforts to curtail speech on campus.

Attitudes About Speech and Inclusion

At most of the positive outlier institutions, free speech was described as a widely accepted cultural norm and "the way things are done around here." Capturing a view expressed by faculty, administrators, and students, a dean at an Eastern liberal arts college told us, "We recognize that this is a place of freedom of expression. This is a place of acceptance. This is a place where we allow students to openly, honestly, candidly express their views." At a Southwestern public research university, a student said, "Anywhere on campus is a safe space to speak about politics. You'll never get someone to tell you that you can't talk about that here or anything like that." Similarly, a student leader at northeast state college explained, "I think everyone just kind of pushes for openness," and an administrator at a West Coast community college said, "I definitely don't think people have a problem sharing their opinions and viewpoints. Everyone is heard."

As noted previously, another key finding from these qualitative case studies concerned the significant role social cohesion seems to play a role in fostering campus conditions for political learning and engagement. Students cared about each other. On some of the positive outlier campuses, they learned in orientation that they were responsible not only for their own well-being and success but for the well-being and success of their peers. Faculty reinforced a norm

of caring by going the extra mile for students—staying late, adjusting assignments, and discussing personal problems. These norms of caring and concern carried over to affect speech on campus.

On both the positive and the negative outlier campuses, what was often described as unwritten community principles of kindness, respect, and inclusion provided unwritten parameters to speech and action. When asked about whether the institution had a free speech code, one administrator at an Eastern liberal arts college said, "There are no codes other than our community principles and those include respect and inclusion." A student at West Coast community college said, "I feel like people are really respectful and try to be correct when they speak to different groups. . . . Freedom of speech, like yeah we have it, but I feel like it's a little more, you know?"

Students were vocal about their disapproval of speech that demeans historically marginalized or nontraditional groups. According to a dean at a Southeastern public university, when the speech "makes someone feel unwelcomed" or "like they're not part of the campus community," it is normatively unacceptable. Expressing a view we heard repeatedly at the positive outlier campuses, one student said:

> I just feel like people here at [the Eastern liberal arts college] will not tolerate certain things. You can't go around wearing KKK masks . . . that's not going to work. That shit isn't gonna work anywhere, but it's definitely not going to work [at this campus], you know what I mean? It's just not going to happen.

At the Southeastern public university, students complained about other students "using the shield of free speech to express racist views." A student described a class in which a White student "kept throwing free speech out and saying unnecessary things about race . . . they were really offensive things. That kind of taints my view about free speech." In this case, the students felt that the faculty member failed to intervene and correct the student making the racialized statements. After class, White class members rallied around students of color to express their disapproval and disagreement with the offensive comments and the lack of faculty intervention. Expressing agreement, another student explained,

> When people overstep . . . it's not free speech anymore because it's costing someone's feelings. It's causing disrespect. It's at a price. I wouldn't even call it free speech. I would call it degradation. You can't degrade what I believe because you don't believe that.

Many of the positive outlier campuses served an ideologically diverse student population, and on those campuses, efforts were made to build intergroup relationships and trust, despite political differences. On the campuses that seemed

to serve more left-leaning students, several conservative students complained that they felt unable to express their opinions or that they were "picked on" for their right-leaning perspectives. One explained that he "keeps his head down" to avoid being "eaten up" by other students. A faculty member at an Eastern liberal arts college agreed that some students, particularly religiously conservative students were "shut down." An administrator at the same institution said that religiously conservative students complain because "the liberal students do not get challenged or asked to provide facts in same way that our conservative students do." Some students, however, disagreed. The problem, they explained, was in how the conservatives expressed themselves, in ways that made people, "feel worthless—whether it's their race is worthless, their religion is worthless, their sexual orientation is worthless. There's a fine line between freedom and speech and shoving your idea down someone's throat so they feel it's futile to even talk." They also noted that when students express opinions, it's appropriate to require them to back up those opinions with facts. Faculty members and administrators at many of the outlier campuses expressed the view that students come to college to learn and discuss "what we know." Faculty have the responsibility to present and require evidence-driven viewpoints.

One limitation to these case studies is that the data collection occurred before the 2016 presidential election. Many students reacted negatively to the election results, and they have continued to mobilize against the Trump administration's policies and actions (e.g., immigration policy). The 2016 presidential election season revealed the depths of the current social and political conditions—widening political polarization; more entrenched racial, class, and geographic tribalism; growing economic inequality; proliferating incidents of hate speech and crimes; campaign rhetoric attacking ethnic groups, immigrants, disabled Americans, and women; and the alignment of White nationalist groups with one of the major political parties. The speech laws summarized earlier and rhetoric from some elected officials threaten to mainstream racist, sexist, homophobic, and xenophobic speech. White nationalist groups seem to be targeting college campuses. These factors influence student activism and speech. Colleges and universities need to be proactive and decide how they are going to treat student speech and activism along the political spectrum.

The Future of Activism and Free Speech: Balancing Competing Interests

Activism and speech intersect in complicated ways on college campuses. Students want to play a leadership role in institutional policy and practices, and they seem to take for granted their right to speak and organize over campus policies or public injustices. Many also care deeply about welcoming diverse populations of students, so they have little tolerance for speakers (including their peers) whom they see as denigrating historically marginalized groups.

Free expression on campus is a nuanced challenge, and students and administrators need to remain cognizant of the ways in which their advocacy in this era may result in unintended consequences in future years. For instance, if speech is codified on campus in a broad new policy so that White nationalists are prevented from speaking, these same rules could pose restrictions on student activists with whom students may agree, such as students for Palestine or Israel, or Black Lives Matter and Me Too organizers. Unfortunately, who decides what speech is acceptable often boils down to who has power at the time. What campuses can and should do, however, is discuss this challenge openly, bring in a diversity of voices, and raise awareness about how hateful speech is being received and how it affects campus climate and learning for all students. The unsettled nature of free expression on college campuses is likely to stay this way for the near future, due in large part to our polarized national political climate and uncertainty about the limits of our laws. Leaders in higher education should take the long view and consider this political reality as an impetus to build long-term, systemic change, and they should work purposefully to create campus climates that foster student political learning.

Political Learning

Political controversy, particularly in this hyper-partisan era, provides an ideal opportunity for students to learn the history of and perspectives on free speech in the public square and on campus and approaches to social change and leadership.

Campus-Wide Conversations on Speech and Inclusion

When it comes to speech on campus, educate and create opportunities for campus-wide reflection, but do not regulate. It is impossible to write a code of conduct for every possible controversy over speech. How a campus treats unpopular viewpoints or speech that denigrates historically disadvantaged groups will boil down to a matter of campus climate, not laws and rules. It is also important to remember that colleges and universities have the academic freedom to create learning experiences and environments most conducive to student learning.

One place to start is with forums, courses, teach-ins about the history and application of the First Amendment right to free speech in the public square and on campus, followed by facilitated, campus-wide discussions about perspectives on free speech and inclusion. These discussions can help institutions identify core values and develop approaches to managing controversial speech. One good way to approach this is by presenting students with various perspectives on the issues and letting them weigh the pros and cons of each. The goal would be to raise awareness and help students on both sides of the controversy reconsider their positions and seek common ground. The Institute for

Democracy and Higher Education (2018) has published a guide for facilitating conversations about the First Amendment. The guide offers six "viewpoints" for discussion. Two of them are here:

Viewpoint #1: Colleges and universities should fully honor freedom of expression

> Established more than two hundred years ago to prevent oppression and encourage civic engagement, the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution says, "Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech." . . . Even hateful, abhorrent, and demeaning speech is protected by the First Amendment at public institutions and as a critical normative value at private institutions. Picking and choosing when speech should be censored results in arbitrary censorship, which in turn, makes it hard for people to talk through their differences. The response to "bad" speech should be more speech, not censorship.

Viewpoint #2: Restrict toxic speech to reinforce institutional goals and values of providing equality learning conditions for all students

> Existing rules and principles worked when the nation was founded but no longer work for an increasingly pluralistic society. The slow pace of social justice and economic equality call for changes in the rules. When words are hateful or insulting toward disadvantaged populations of students, their hard outweighs the individual's right to use them. By allowing speech that is antithetical to our values, we normalize it. Doing so not only creates ad toxic and unequal learning environment for some students, it also prevents the institution from achieving its educational goals.

Questions to pose include the following:

* Which viewpoint(s) are closest to your own?
* Why do you hold the viewpoint you hold?
* What viewpoints are missing?
* Choose a viewpoint that you do not hold and discuss why someone might hold that perspective.

The goal of a series of discussions like this would be to move the institution toward a set of commonly norms and behaviors, but not a written code of conduct.

Social Movements, Change, and Leadership

Attributes of exemplary leaders have evolved over the past 30 years. Historically, the dominant model was one of the charismatic and/or "command and

control" leader at the helm of a hierarchical structure or system. In the 1980s, the notion of "transformational leadership" took hold, as leaders came to be seen as effective if primarily motivated by a desire to serve others or employing a social change model (Dugan, 2017). These approaches to change focused on leadership as a process rather than a position. Benjamin Barber (1980, 1998) argued that the United States needs strong *citizens*, not strong leaders. Ron Heifetz, founder of Harvard's Center for Public Leadership at the Kennedy School of Government, envisioned leadership as distinct from authority— leaders can be individuals with or without positional authority. Effective leaders mobilize the talents of many who represent diverse perspectives to work collaboratively. They are skilled in convening, inquiring, engaging in dialogue and deliberation, mobilizing coalitions, and collaborating to solve community problems. This kind of leadership requires political savvy and strong negotiation and conflict management skills.

Approaches to social or institutional change include petitioning, lobbying, community organizing, protesting, boycotting and "buycotting," and using positional authority to work from within a system (e.g., as a member of the student government and, in public life, as an elected official). U.S. society needs a new generation of public leaders and change agents who know how to design, build, and maintain collaborative processes that foster systemic social and political change, and to do so in ways that reflect shared perceptions of what the campus community or society ought to value and behave.

How can colleges and universities provide this kind of learning experience for students across disciplines? At the Southwestern public university that IDHE researchers visited, the student government worked with a center on campus that organized dialogues in the local community designed to facilitate change. Student government leaders studied and practiced how to form diverse coalitions, to frame issues for discussion, to participate in active listening, to identify and discuss all perspectives on a problem, to identify possible solutions, and to form smaller coalitions responsible for action. These student leaders broadened the number of students on campus with the same skills by training incoming members of the student government and leaders of clubs and groups receiving funding through the student government.

Several of the positive outlier institutions required students to take a common course that used political controversies and current events as course content. While the courses varied, they shared common features. Students learning to engage in dialogue, learning similar skills as those employed by the student government at the Southwestern university. Some were English or rhetoric courses in which students also learned to present their positions on issues through writing, advocacy, and public speaking.[2]

Establishing ground rules or agreements prior to discussing controversial topics helps ensure that everyone will have an opportunity to share their perspective. Agreements also help prevent speech that, as Benjamin Barber

warned, rejects the legitimacy of people or suggests that people are "immoral, un-American, and possibly worthy of being subjected to violence" (as cited in James, 1997) Agreements to consider include the following: "Disagree without personalizing" and "Assume good will." Students at the positive outlier campuses who had been taught to engage in productive discussions commented that, even after vehement disagreement in a class, they could leave the classroom "still friends."

Finally, colleges and universities can be proactive about strengthening student well-being and social cohesion on campus. By focusing on fostering more trusting interpersonal relationships among students, institutional leaders may create enough good will and shared norms that people learn to talk with each other across ideological differences.

Notes

1. Of the 1,500 participants in the survey, 70%, or 1,040, were women. Only 261 identified themselves as Republicans. The remaining students were Democrats (697), Independents (431) or unsure of their political affiliation (111) (Villasenor, 2017).
2. Much more can and should be said about the benefits and limitations to deliberative democracy. Some believe that respectful, inclusive discussion and collaborative action is the solution to populism and the expansion of authoritarianism globally and among some populations in the United States. Others believe that growing inequality and undemocratic governance cannot be solved through deliberation. For an overview of these arguments, see the Summer 2017 issue of *Daedalus* (Fishkin & Mansbridge, 2017) and Fung (2005).

References

American Association of University Professors. (2018). *Campus free-speech legislation: History, progress, and problems*. Washington, DC. Retrieved from www.aaup.org/file/Campus_Free_Speech_2018.pdf

Barber, B. R. (1980). The undemocratic party system: Citizenship in an elite/mass society, pp. 34–49 in R.A. Goldwin (ed.), *Political parties in the eighties*. Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute.

Barber, B. R. (1988). *The conquest of politics: Liberal philosophy in democratic times*. Princeton University Press.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2017). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice and leadership* (6th ed.). Hoobken, NJ: Jossey-Bass.

Chemerinsky, E., & Gillman, H. (2017). *Free speech on campus*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Committee on Freedom of Expression. (2015). *Report of the Committee on Freedom of Expression*. Chicago, IL. Retrieved from https://provost.uchicago.edu/sites/default/files/documents/reports/FOECommitteeReport.pdf

Doe v. University of Michigan, 721 F. Supp. 852 (E.D. Mich. 1989).

Dugan, J. P. (2017). *Leadership theory: Cultivating critical perspectives*. John Wiley & Sons.

Fishkin, J. S., & Mansbridge, J. (Eds.). (2017). The prospects and limits of deliberative democracy. *Dædalus*, (Summer). Retrieved from www.amacad.org/content/publications/publication.aspx?d=22877

Flaherty, C. (2018, October 5). Rigorous inquiry and respectful debate. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from www.insidehighered.com/news/2018/10/05/colgate-offers-statement-campus-speech-arguing-its-not-just-what-you-say-its-how-you

Foner, E. (1998). *The story of American freedom*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company.

Fung, A. (2005). Deliberation before the revolution: Toward an ethics of deliberative democracy in an unjust world. *Political Theory*, *33*(3), 397–419.

Institute for Democracy and Higher Education. (n.d.). *Creating and maintaining the NSLVE database*. Retrieved from https://idhe.tufts.edu/research/creating-and-maintaining-nslve-database

Institute for Democracy and Higher Education. (2018). *Free speech & inclusion on campus: A discussion guide*. Medford, MA. Retrieved from https://idhe.tufts.edu/resource/free-speech-inclusion-campus-discussion-guide

James, G. (1997). The venerable history of incivility. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from www.nytimes.com/1997/02/16/nyregion/the-venerable-history-of-incivility.html

Jaschik, S. (2018, October 19). College will close on day of protest by far right. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from www.insidehighered.com/quicktakes/2018/10/19/college-will-close-day-protest-far-right?utm_source=Inside+Higher+Ed&utm_campaign=ae80687060-20181016_PREV_COPY_02&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_1fcbc04421-ae80687060–197535253&mc_cid=ae80687060&mc_eid=3a

Jashinsky, E. (2017, May 1). Joan Baez protested for free speech at Berkeley in 1964: Now she's standing up for Ann Coulter. *Washington Examiner*. Retrieved from www.washingtonexaminer.com/joan-baez-protested-for-free-speech-at-berkeley-in-1964-now-shes-standing-up-for-ann-coulter

Kennesaw State University Dean of Students. (n.d.). *Democracy wall*. Retrieved from http://deanofstudents.kennesaw.edu/resources/democracywall.php

Kurtz, S., Manley, J., & Butcher, J. (2017). *Campus free speech: A legislative proposal*. Phoenix, AZ. Retrieved from https://goldwaterinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/cms_page_media/2017/2/2/X_CampusFreeSpeechPaper.pdf

Lukianoff, G., & Haidt, J. (2015, September). The coddling of the American mind. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved from www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2015/09/the-coddling-of-the-american-mind/399356/

Moon, E. (2018, August). How has white nationalism changed in the year since Charlottesville? *Pacific Standard*. Retrieved from https://psmag.com/social-justice/how-has-white-nationalism-changed-in-the-year-since-charlottesville

Niehoff, L. (2017). Doe v. University of Michigan: Free speech on campus 25 years later. *University of Miami Law Review*, *71*(2), 365–376.

Oakland Museum of California. (n.d.). *Picture this: California's perspectives on American history*. Retrieved from http://picturethis.museumca.org/timeline/unforgettable-change-1960s/free-speech-movement/info

Palfrey, J. G. (2017). *Safe spaces, brave spaces: Diversity and free expression in education*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Pringle, B. (2017, November 9). Students find "Free Speech Wall" non-inclusive. *Washington Examiner*. Retrieved from www.washingtonexaminer.com/students-find-free-speech-wall-non-inclusive

Ransby, B. (2015). Students as moral teachers: A survey of student activism and institutional responses. *Diversity & Democracy*, *18*(4), 12–14.

Task Force on Academic Freedom and Freedom of Expression. (2018). *Report of colgate university's task force on academic freedom and freedom of expression*. Hamilton, NY. Retrieved from www.colgate.edu/offices-and-services/deanoffacultyoffice/currentfaculty/intellectual-property/academic-freedom-and-freedom-of-expression

Thomas, N. (2015). The politics of learning for democracy. *Diversity & Democracy*, *18*(4), 4–7. Retrieved from www.aacu.org/diversitydemocracy/2015/fall/thomas

Thomas, N., & Brower, M. (2017). *Politics 365: Fostering campus climates for student political learning & engagement*. Medford, MA. Retrieved from https://tischcollege.tufts.edu/sites/default/files/Politics 365.pdf

Thomas, N. & Brower, M. (2018). Promising practices to facilitate politically robust campus climates. *Change*, *50*(6), November–December 2018. pp. 24–29.

United Nations. (n.d.). *International day of peace 21 September*. Retrieved from www.un.org/peaceday/

University of Maine at Presque Isle Inclusion and Civility Task Force. (n.d.). *Democracy wall*. Retrieved from www.umpi.edu/owlstandbyyou/democracy-wall/

Villasenor, J. (2017). *Views among college students regarding the First Amendment: Results from a new survey*. Washington, DC. Retrieved from www.brookings.edu/blog/fixgov/2017/09/18/views-among-college-students-regarding-the-first-amendment-results-from-a-new-survey/

Students as Political Actors

Diverse Strategies and Tactics

3

UNDERSTANDING AMERICAN CONSERVATISM AND ITS ROLE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Garrett H. Gowen, Kevin M. Hemer, and Robert D. Reason

Introduction

Over the past 70 years, the conservative movement has exerted enormous influence on the trajectory of American society. This statement is perhaps trite, especially in the wake of recent Republican victories from the 2010 takeover of the House of Representatives to the 2016 election of Donald Trump as president. However, American conservatism as an object of study is largely absent from higher education scholarship. In a comprehensive review of the literature on the topic, Gross, Medvetz, and Russell (2011) noted that scholars (sociologists in particular) have dismissed conservatism as anti-intellectual, resistant to change, and religiously fanatical. As a result, conservatism has suffered from a lack of definition that belies its contested political reality and fragments research agendas. This gap in scholarship further mirrors the *empathy walls* that exist between people and communities of opposed political persuasions (Hochschild, 2016, p. 5; cf. Graham, Nosek, & Haidt, 2012). Empathy walls are obstacles to deep understanding of another person and can make individuals feel indifferent or hostile to those who hold different beliefs (Hochschild, 2016). It is difficult to pursue empathetic lines of research, which seek understanding without pre-existing assumptions and judgments, amidst an environment of increasingly antagonistic political polarization and isolation (Pew Research Center, 2014). This task is uniquely challenging without a well-conceptualized approach to how conservatism is embodied and enacted (Gross et al., 2011).

Understanding conservatism is especially important for higher education scholars and campus educators, who are at risk of marginalizing the topic as well. College campuses are regularly accused of restricting the constitutional rights of outspoken conservatives and maintaining a hostile environment toward

deviant worldviews (e.g., Buckley, 1951; D'Souza, 1998). Moreover, the institution of higher education was central to the formation of the contemporary conservative movement: in his foundational tract criticizing overt liberalism in college, Buckley (1951) opined that, "after each side has had its say, we are right and they are wrong; and my greatest anguish is . . . the knowledge that they are winning and we are losing" (p. lx). The assurance that the conservative worldview is "correct" and is successfully repressed by the liberal bias of higher education formed the basis for Buckley's early conservative activism. Higher education thus performs a dual role in conservatism—as a villainous boogeyman and as an essential site for the construction of new conservatives (Binder & Wood, 2013; Gross, 2013; Kidder, 2016).

Accordingly, this chapter explores the enactment of conservatism on campus. First, we will synthesize multiple approaches to understanding conservatism. We conceptualize conservatism as a relational identity rooted in symbolic claims, interaction, and abstract logics. Second, we will situate conservatism within higher education. Finally, we will turn to the politically charged debates over free speech on campus, providing a brief context for these debates and conceptualizing the different uses of free speech. Ultimately, we understand free speech as an important signifier of conservative identity that is used as a weapon against the liberal *façade* of higher education. This chapter integrates several disciplinary approaches to conservatism and provides context for educators and researchers to contextualize and engage with conservatism on campus.

Conceptualizing Conservatism

The history of conservatism as a political movement stretches back to the late 18th century. European aristocrats, the parliamentarian Edmund Burke chief among them, viewed the French Revolution as a dangerous threat to the prevailing social order—the *ancien régime*. Robin (2018) argued that this reactionary origin remained a potent force within the conservatism of the proceeding centuries: "From its inception, conservatism has relied upon some mix of [reactionary] elements to build a broad-based movement of elites and masses against the emancipation of the lower orders" (p. xi). For political theorists like Robin, conservatism as a reactionary ideology comprises predispositions to war, capitalism, and aristocracy. Gross and colleagues (2011), however, argued that this theoretical perspective overlooks the social elements of conservatism in favor of more intrinsic social attitudes.

Since WWII, American conservatism has been largely characterized by a fractious coalition amongst multiple, potentially contradictory wings of the movement (Deutsch & Fishman, 2010). Figures like William F. Buckley and his *National Review* colleagues sought to unite the various factions of right-leaning intellectuals in the United States, but differences still abounded: after meeting Buckley, a devout Catholic, for the first time, Ayn Rand, author of the atheistic,

market-capitalist manifesto *Atlas Shrugged*, reportedly remarked, "You are too intelligent to believe in God!" Buckley argued the path to conservative victory was through "fusionism," an effort to reconcile tensions between the traditionalists (i.e., social and evangelical conservatives), the anti-communist neo-conservatives, and the libertarians (Gross et al., 2011). As part of their fusionist aims, conservatives associated with the *National Review* magazine emphasized what they believed all permutations of American conservatism shared in common: patriotism, opposition to communism, individualism, a concern with states' rights, and moral objectivity (Adler, 2004; Nash, 1976; see Kirk, 1953 for a contemporary outline of fusionist conservatism). Higher education, which stereotypically stands in opposition to all of these values (see Buckley, 1951), exists at the nexus of unified conservatism and marks a continued point of consensus among disparate wings of conservatism.

Framing Conservatism

Despite coalescence among conservatives, scholars from multiple disciplines have pursued isolated definitions and conceptualizations as part of attempts to identify the core *essence* of conservatism. As part of their review of the literature on conservatism, Gross and colleagues (2011) highlighted three common ways to understanding conservatism: 1) a series of semi-aligned, issue-based countermovement's that arise in reaction to progressive social movements, 2) a movement seeking the wholesale installation of contemporary free-market capitalism, and 3) a commonly shared view of human nature and a conception of moral order rooted in Christian theology. These approaches are not strongly bounded—Buckley (1951), for instance, evinced a synthesis of the anti-communism and pro-Christian faith that defined the Cold War era; however, the promise and promotion of free-market capitalism and suspicion of socialist values remained paramount. Thus, it is not necessarily productive to search for a single true essence of conservatism, but rather to focus on the "social relations through which particular meanings come to be defined as conservative" as well as "the processes through which individuals, groups, and movements come to adopt these meanings and mobilize around them" (Gross et al., 2011).

Ultimately, Gross and colleagues (2011) understood conservatism as a "collective identity" that is embedded in a relational web of meaning. Conservatism is not a fixed category of belief or practice, but rather a symbolic activity that is adapted according to context and proximal relationships (Binder & Wood, 2013). The evolution of fusionist conservatism, for instance, marked a historically situated process of group-making and mobilization that presaged a national conservative movement—by emphasizing a series of commonalities among the disparate factions, Buckley and others began redefining what and who could be considered *conservative* (Gross et al., 2011). Moreover, the conservative movement benefitted from a vast institutional infrastructure, beginning with the

National Review and including organizations such as the Young Americans for Freedom (YAF),[1] Liberty University, and the wide array of right-leaning think tanks. These institutions spanned the conservative factions and were vital outlets for disseminating conservative ideas (Pierson & Skocpol, 2007). American conservatism was thus instantiated as a defined logic, replete with meanings that could be understood and negotiated on a national scale.

Conservative Identity

As a macro-level logic, conservatism prescribes a series of scripts and behaviors, or 'strategies of action,' that are conservatively typed (Swidler, 1986). These strategies of action are employed locally in response to emergent problems (e.g., 'coddling snowflakes') and are guided by cultural knowledge, language, and skills. However, conservative students are not 'cultural dopes' who bend to the abstract whims of conservatism writ large (Giddens, 1984); rather, broader conservative logics are constantly contested, negotiated, and reformed to suit the local context (Fine & Hallett, 2014; Hallett & Ventresca, 2006). Binder and Wood (2013), for example, identified how similar conservative logics were enacted differently according to the campus environment. Colleges and universities boast unique contexts with a series of shared understandings about acceptable behaviors. These shared understandings, or 'cultural repertoires,' are durable, local strategies of action that define the scope of legitimate conservative action on campus (Binder & Wood, 2013; Kidder, 2016). Thus, college-going does not necessarily influence political identity development so much as identity negotiation and enactment.

Further, the introduction of identity as a constituent element of understanding conservatism complicates prior research that claimed party identification as a marker of political orientation, a practice which obscured nuance and complexity (Green, Palmquist, & Schickler, 2002; Gross, 2013). This chapter thus approaches conservatism as a symbolic arena in which individuals make claims to markers of conservatism that must be validated by others (i.e., either fellow conservatives or oppositional liberals; Goffman, 1967; Kidder, 2016). Validation by others is an essential component of maintaining the interaction order and is likewise a necessary part of identity construction (Goffman, 1967; Stryker, 2007).

Conservatism and Higher Education

College campuses are an ideal setting to investigate the social mechanisms of conservative experience and socialization (Stevens, Armstrong, & Arum, 2008). The liberal monolith of higher education is simultaneously is a foundational trope of conservative messaging[2] and an important site for "constructing" new conservatives. According to conservative activists, liberal professors

and student activists indoctrinate students into a hegemonic, progressive philosophy; those whom they cannot convert are shamed and treated with hostility[3] (Woessner & Kelly-Woessner, 2009). Fosse and Gross (2012) and Gross (2013) investigated these claims, finding that, although college professors are indeed more liberal than the general population, they are not dramatically so. Moreover, the common explanations for why the professoriate is so liberal (e.g., conservatives are less intelligent, sociodemographic characteristics) do not hold up under scrutiny.[4] Gross (2013) advanced the argument that the liberal reputation of higher education itself is a powerful force for shaping who persists throughout postsecondary and graduate education (cf. Woessner & Kelly-Woessner, 2015). The professoriate is thus *politically typed*, a result of the long-standing popular conceptions of higher education that produce institutional logics about which students are supposed to seek graduate degrees (Fine & Hallett, 2014).

Conceptualizing this liberal reputation as a relevant construct is a new direction in research on political engagement in higher education. Previously, higher education researchers assiduously investigated whether college attendance made students more liberal (e.g., Bobo & Licari, 1989; Dey, 1996, 1997; Phelan, Link, Stueve, & Moore, 1995). As research on the effects of college developed, particularly within quantitative traditions (e.g., longitudinal designs, propensity score matching), scholars began to question how college experiences interact with preexisting demographic characteristics (Kam & Palmer, 2008; Jennings & Stoker, 2008). Although positions on policy or social issues (e.g., abortion, health care) may change, such stances are largely decoupled from claiming a political identity (Kidder, 2016). Commitment to a particular identity likely occurs before coming to college and, contrary to popular political messaging about indoctrination, it is unlikely that such identities will change as a result of college attendance (Campbell & Horowitz, 2016).

Yet this line of research masks the nuances of identity construction and enactment, especially considering the relational and symbolic elements of conservatism in practice (Goffman, 1967; Swidler, 1986). Dodson (2014) argued that "different aspects of the college environment operate either to reinforce and strengthen [preexisting beliefs] or to undermine and diminish them" (p. 139). Time spent in classes led to more moderate beliefs as compared with time spent in social settings, which led to more extreme beliefs for both liberals and conservatives (Dodson, 2014). Similarly, Binder and Wood (2013) and Kidder (2016) described the social links among campus conservatives as a major source of reinforcement and symbolic validation. College conservatives viewed themselves as combatants against a perceived liberal consensus, underscoring the relational approach advanced by Gross and colleagues (2011). Although Dodson highlighted several important conceptual relationships, the ethnographic approaches advanced by Kidder and Binder and Wood elucidated the unique environment of college and how it interacted with the symbolic claims made by conservative students.

Binder and Wood (2013) further highlighted the role played by external conservative organizations, who supplied talking points, organizational tactics, and merchandise to distribute and use to display their affiliations. *Sponsored conservatism*, a term which refers to the vast network of organizations specifically established to advance the cause of young conservative activists, strongly conveyed the message that conservative students on campus are ideologically at odds with the political and social commitments of faculty, administrators, staff, and other students, "not by their own choosing but by the very nature of America's liberally-skewed higher education system" (Binder & Wood, 2013, p. 78). Colleges and universities thus exist at the nexus of interlocking institutions of American conservatism and are important sites for understanding the reproduction of conservatism, both physically and symbolically.

Free Speech, Higher Education, and Conservatism

Free speech as a political freedom is essential to the construction of democratic society in the Western world. As James Madison (1788/2008) famously argued, a core problem with representative democracy was the potential for the rule of the majority to silence the will of the minority. A necessary check, therefore, was a broad guarantee that individual expression could not be subject to official sanction. The freedom of speech also extended to a number of constituent and corollary rights, including the freedom of thought, assembly, and the press, such that citizens of a republic could counteract tyrannical government. Yet the political freedoms designed to secure liberty were complicated, even for Madison and his contemporaries—protecting all speech short of treason and the incitation of violence creates space for a host of vile, inaccurate, or dangerous opinions as well. Reflecting on the state of American democracy in the early 19th century, Tocqueville (trans. 2003) observed that political freedoms "can, if carried to excess, damage peace, property, and the lives of individuals" (p. 585). More recently, Foucault (2001) noted that the constitutional conditions that enable democracies also give voice to "the worst citizens, the overwhelming influence of bad, immoral, or ignorant speakers" who "may lead the citizenry into tyranny, or may otherwise endanger the [polity]" (p. 77).

The antimony of democracy and free speech troubled many scholars in the 20th century. Hofstadter (1963) argued that the lack of constraints on what can qualify as free speech sustained a tradition of anti-intellectualism in the United States. Likewise, Habermas (1985) worried the enactment of free speech by individuals did not guarantee that reason and validity would serve as guiding frameworks for communication—instead, power would alter the balance of speech, harming or repressing those on the losing side of the speech act. Accordingly, people with marginalized identities could easily be "humiliated" by "socially-acceptable forms of sadism" (Rorty, 1998, p. 80). The "marketplace of ideals" described by John Stuart Mills, Oliver Wendell Holmes, and

others, a metaphor where ideas are able to compete on their own merits, thus fails to account for the influence of power. Efforts to correct this power imbalance, particularly by the political left, have consistently been decried as *political correctness* or an attempt to control the speech of others. This criticism, in turn, functions to bar the speech of those who are victimized by the vagaries of free speech. In essence, free speech is a paradox—it simultaneously creates and inhibits the potential for the free exchange of ideas.

This paradox is often laid bare on college campuses, where free speech is generally considered to be an essential component of proper higher education— exposure to diversity of opinion and engaging in perspective taking are key civic outcomes of college (Ehrlich & Colby, 2004; National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement, 2012; Reason, 2011). Historically, however, the sanctity of free speech within higher education evolved as a corollary of academic freedom, which emphasizes that "the common good depends upon the free search for truth and its free exposition" (AAUP, 1940). Free speech and academic freedom in the contemporary context are typically conflated—both embody the aims and ideals of the university as a space "where we can go wherever the issue leads without worrying about utility or orthodoxy or politics" (Labaree, 2014, p. 3). Yet free speech merely enables academic freedom as a foundational precept; academic freedom is appropriately more stringent (Scott, 2018). Moreover, conservatives frequently leverage academic freedom as the negation of free speech, which cultivates the narrative of liberal spaces for indoctrination and the repression of conservative voices and research (Gross, 2013; Sultana, 2018).

There is frequent debate on higher education news sites as to the nature of the *free speech crisis* (cf. Goldstein, 2017; Quintana, 2018; Traldi, 2018). Moreover, conservative organizations, Turning Point USA chief among them, are currently mobilizing local chapters to contest student government elections as a way of "fixing" oppressive speech policies (Vasquez, 2018). Conservative critics frequently point to high-profile incidents (e.g., Charles Murray at the University of Vermont, Milo Yiannopoulos at UC Berkeley) and common campus policies (e.g., free speech zones, protest policies) as evidence that colleges do not truly value a diversity of opinions. We do not think that a liberal-conservative lens on free speech examining who favors free speech and who does not is particularly useful in illuminating how the politics of free speech inform higher education research (Knight Foundation, 2017). Free speech is a contested concept—as a result, its meaning varies depending upon its context and content. Thus, the invocation of *free speech*, on college campuses or otherwise, does not always have a clear meaning—such speech ranges from brave efforts to speak truth to power to the general exposition of opinions, informed or otherwise. Understanding the meaning behind a speech act is an important way to interrogate the motivations of the speaker and the implications of their immanent environment. In this section, we will disentangle three different

types of free speech that occur on campus: 1) actual free speech, 2) academic freedom, and 3) free speech as an institutional logic. Although these three typifications undoubtedly overlap, it is useful to disentangle them before investigating how free speech is employed as part of conservative identity.

Ultimately, we understand free speech as a constituent logic of conservatism, the source of various strategies of action that can be used to 1) make symbolic claims to a conservative identity and 2) signal opposition and challenge the legitimacy of liberal higher education. We will explore this aspect of free speech in action through an examination of recent controversy at the University of Texas at Austin.

Disentangling Free Speech

In a series of lectures on the topic of free speech in democratic society, Foucault (2001) elaborated on the ancient Greek concept of *parrhesia*, meaning *frankness of speech* or even *freedom of speech*. Individuals who use *parrhesia* are supposed to give a "complete and exact account of what he has in mind so that the audience is able to comprehend exactly what the speaker thinks" (Foucault, 2001, p. 12). Completeness necessitates truthfulness, which can be bolstered by evidence (emotional or otherwise) and subjected to validity checks. The speech act is dependent upon the relationship between the speaker, what they says, and the audience. Through *parrhesia*, the speaker "acts on other people's minds by showing them as directly as possible what he actually believes" (Foucault, 2001, p. 12). The speaker must further engender some amount of risk in performing *parrhesia*, through voicing truth to an audience of higher social or political class or by voluntarily speaking truth under the potential threat of punishment. Speech is thus a relational act, and free speech is a verbal activity where the speaker "has a specific relation to truth through frankness, a certain relationship to his own life through danger, a certain type of relation to himself or other people through criticism, and a specific relation to moral law through freedom and duty" (Foucault, 2001, p. 19). The speaker is obligated to consider these positions relative to his/her speech act.

Yet free speech is much broader, both legally and constitutionally. The *worst* speech, including lying, hate speech, and speech which cannot be classified as *parrhesia*, is protected. Moreover, Foucault (2001) argued that *parrhesia* cannot truly be possible in democracies for this reason. Both Foucault and Hofstadter (1963) contended that democracies embolden a strain of anti-intellectualism that is seductive and compelling to swaths of the polity. Anti-intellectualism, which Hofstadter defined as "resentment and suspicion of the life of the mind and those who are considered to represent it" (Hofstadter, p. 7), is arguably analogous to the dark side of protected speech when compared with the principles of academic freedom. Like *parrhesia*, academic freedom is more rigorous than general freedoms of speech, thought, or research, as "only those who carry on

their work in the temper of the scientific inquirer" may "justly assert" a claim to academic freedom (AAUP, 1915). Free speech thus enables and constrains academic freedom—in the words of historian Joan Scott (2018), academic freedom functions as "a voice given to reasoned argument. That voice can be angry, insistent, condemnatory; there is no contradiction between reason and outrage."

In many cases, conservative individuals or groups who perceive their speech to be unjustly limited will claim that they are protected by one of these preceding types of speech—that they are subject to illegal censorship by the government rather than legal censure by societal norm or collective action. We argue that this type of speech act functions as an identity claim that is embedded within a vast web of institutional logics signaling membership and belonging with other conservatives. Claims about free speech are symbolic tools drawn from prevalent conservative strategies of action (Kidder, 2016; Swidler, 1986). Conservative students are primed to perceive higher education as overwhelmingly liberal—as mentioned before, the reputation of higher education is a foundational element of contemporary conservatism. Once they are enmeshed within the college environment, conservative students are likely to feel "outnumbered by their classmates and outgunned by their professors" (Kidder, 2016, p. 179). Feelings of isolation and resentment are common—signifying conservative membership allows students to push against the liberal consensus and to build relationships with other conservative students (Binder & Wood, 2013; Kidder, 2016). External conservative organizations encourage this mindset, providing strategy guides and recruitment materials to mobilize against perceived liberal bias and in favor of conservative priorities (Binder & Wood, 2013). Decrying a lack of free speech is thus a common way of laying claim to a conservative identity.

Case: University of Texas Austin "Affirmative Action Bake Sale"

In October 2016, the University of Texas (UT) chapter of Young Conservatives of Texas (YCT) held an "Affirmative Action Bake Sale," wherein they charged different prices to individuals based upon their apparent racial or ethnic identities (Lewis, 2016). The organizers stated that the bake sale was a way of demonstrating the YCT's discontent with a 2003 decision by the U.S. Supreme Court (*Grutter v. Bollinger*) to allow for affirmative action in college admission practices. The YCT characterized the event as starting a "dialogue" on affirmative action at UT: "It is insane that institutional racism, such as affirmative action, continues to allow for universities to judge me by the color of my skin rather than my actions" (YCT Statement, 2016). Dialogue seemed improbable, however, as any actual attempt at conversation was impossible in the ensuing reaction.

Crowds of students arrived on the scene to vigorously protest the event and the university administration called YCT's actions "inflammatory and demeaning"

(Lewis, 2016). Many students, particularly students of color, felt targeted by the event, which implied that their presence on campus was not academically legitimate (Hamze, 2016). However, YCT students were undeterred by the backlash—they relished it:

> The First Amendment to the US Constitution guarantees our organiza-tion freedom of speech and expression. . . . YCT–UT will not be deterred by liberal elites that would love nothing more than to silence conserva-tive, common sense voices on campus. We will continue to speak out against policies that are harmful or give preferential treatment based on nothing more than immutable characteristics.
>
> *(YCT Statement, 2016)*

The bake sale organizers anticipated the impact of their event. The UT group had already held a similar bake sale in 2013 following the first *Fisher v. University of Texas* decision (Kingkade, 2013). The 2016 event followed a simi-lar trajectory as the 2013 sale, even drawing a nearly identical statement in response from the university administration (cf. Vincent, 2013, 2016).

Affirmative action bake sales have since become archetypical components of what Buckley (1951) termed "the battle of educational theory" (p. lx). Such events are flashy, provocative, and nearly guaranteed to receive national news attention. They are intensely public platforms for conservative students to "repudiate the values" of their institutions, to demonstrate individual choice in the face of the "coercion" and "bullying" of hypocritical academic freedom (Buckley, 1951, p. 181). Bake sales and other events, such as "Catch an Ille-gal Immigrant" days, are becoming part of conservative student organization playbooks: a September 2017 bake sale at the University of New Mexico was sponsored by Turning Point USA and organized by a regional director for the organization (James, 2017). With increased legitimacy among sponsored con-servatism along with consistent media attention, the affirmative action bake sale and other similarly provocative events are likely to become mainstays of conservative student activism.

Conservative Identity in Practice

The affirmative action bake sale is an extreme case. Conservative identity is enacted every day in routine social interactions, from casual jokes in class to scheduled club meetings. Moreover, these mundane instantiations have the same capacity to evoke feelings of harm or lack of safety in others who do not share the identity. Yet extreme cases typically dominate the narrative surrounding con-servatives and free speech on college campuses. Extreme cases also present oppor-tunities to examine a process in its starkest terms (Chen, 2016). In the UT case, conservative students reacted against a widely held belief that affirmative action rewards individuals on the basis of skin color and not merit or achievement.

This statement engages a core logic of American conservatism: individualism (Gross et al., 2011). Individuals should be rewarded for individual achievement; any qualifications that diminish this absolute are a "short step to the subservience of the individual to the society" (i.e., socialism; Buckley, 1951, p. 92). The university, a site of liberal dominance, rejects the individual rights of conservative students and stokes further resentment and retrenchment. Thus, the conservative students invoked the strategies of action related to free speech, staging an open display of conservative principles that built solidarity with other conservatives and depicted the university as a liberal bastion.

A bake sale, however, is not the only way to respond to the situation. The YCT students acted within a historical context where provocative, headline-grabbing events were successful and normative. Moreover, the campus environment itself potentially encouraged the aggressive tactics of conservative students: Binder and Wood (2013) argued that local, shared understandings, called *cultural repertories*, shape the styles of conservative activism by defining particular actions as legitimate conservative behaviors within the context. For instance, larger campuses with weak, inconsistent cultures or engrained reputations for fun, partying, and other social activity communicate a wider array of normatively acceptable behaviors than a more reserved institution. These cultural repertoires are durable and transmitted over time, both locally and across institutions. At UT, the YCT had previously engaged in similar behaviors, holding a bake sale just three years earlier. Yet the engagement of cultural repertoires does not occur in a vacuum: the involvement of external groups like Turning Point USA leverages the strength of the conservative network to instantiate a range of potential conservative actions, such as the event at University of New Mexico.

We can see, then, the process of negotiation between local and macro contexts that comprises conservative identity. The logic of free speech offers multiple potential strategies of action for activism, ranging from op-eds in the school newspaper to inflammatory events designed to evoke outrage from non-conservatives. Choosing a strategy and making it work in practice is not a matter of following prescriptive conservative norms; rather, it involves an interplay among the individual students, their relationships as conservatives, and the history and culture of the institution. By claiming a conservative identity through events like the bake sale, student activists are actively defining what is and is not conservative, both through the stated purposes of the event itself and through the reaction they achieve. The act is reciprocal, simultaneously drawing from and altering a larger cultural repertoire.

Implications for Research and Practice

We do not need to examine more specific cases to know that American conservatism intersects the everyday life of higher education. *The free speech crisis* on campuses is one instantiation in a historical trajectory of conservative logics

that center on the lives and activities of students, professors, and administrators. We argue that understanding the nuances of conservative identity, both in terms of its content and its enactment, can be a useful approach for scholars and campus educators to grapple with complicated issues on campus.

Most relevant to practice, conservative students negotiate larger conservative logics within local contexts, which means that the manner in which conservative students enact their identity can be influenced by the campus as much as by the broader movement. Cultural repertoires are ultimately local phenomena that influence and are influenced by the prevailing institutional culture and climate as well as by institutional inhabitants (Binder & Wood, 2013; Hallett & Ventresca, 2006; Morgan, 2019). These strategies of action are durable, identifiable, and are tied to the ability of institutional cultures to set and enforce behavioral norms. In the case of affirmative action bake sales and other provocative events, there are likely to be weaker cultures that accommodate cultural repertoires with a border range of acceptable actions (Binder & Wood, 2013). This insight means that campus educators can influence how such strategies of action are shaped moving forward—multiple studies have shown the malleability of the perceived campus environment and its potential for influencing how students understand their civic obligations in college (e.g., Barnhardt, Sheets, & Pasquesi, 2015; Mitchell, Gillon, Reason, & Ryder, 2016; Ryder, Reason, Mitchell, Gillon, & Hemer, 2016). Campus educators can work with students to develop different shared understandings about how they enact conservative logics and potentially mediate the influence of organized external groups. By altering the local understanding for what constitutes legitimate conservative action, students may enact conservative logics in more productive ways that are conducive to dialogue and debate within the larger community.

There is also ample room for further research on conservativism in higher education. As Gross (2013) made clear in his work on the prevalence of liberal professors, the liberal reputation of higher education is a cultural force in American life that transcends evidence and practice. Conservative students, who largely form their political identities before going to college, arrive on campus with a clearly defined understanding and expectation of a liberal consensus that will not tolerate conservative dissent. In essence, the identity of *college student*, which encompasses the appropriate behaviors, values, and attitudes required to be a college student, is politically typed within conservative narratives. This messaging is reinforced by the growing prevalence of organized conservative groups that exist primarily to distribute appropriate strategies of action and mobilize young conservatives along acceptable lines. Just as conservative students negotiate local- and macro-level meanings of conservatism, they also must also negotiate their preexisting perceptions of higher education and their actual experiences. Exploring how conservative students navigate the complex environment that exists at the nexus of conservatism and higher

education will yield better insight into conservative student experience as well as the processes by which American conservatism is enacted, challenged, and sustained.

Conclusion

It is vital for higher education scholars to reckon with the role of conservatism on campus. Although college-going may not necessarily influence students' party or ideological identifications, colleges and universities provide a unique cultural context where conservative students assemble, engage in activism, and enact a more complete symbolic worldview. Moreover, the manner through which conservative students interpret and act out their identity is complicated given the diversity of identities on college campuses and the increased likelihood of causing harm to others. Therefore, it is important to understand the experiences of conservative students, the institutions that structure their experiences, and the broader conservative movement that attempts to shape both. By situating colleges and universities within a relational approach to understanding conservatism, we advanced a conceptualization of conservatism on campus that moves beyond previous approaches in higher education. We believe that this approach allows for a more nuanced evaluation of conservative students and provides new avenues for research and practice that better prepares campus educators for our role in an uncertain political reality.

Notes

1. The Young Americans for Freedom were founded in 1960 by William F. Buckley as a coalition between traditionalist conservatives and libertarians on college campuses. The organization waned by the 1990s and officially merged with the Young Americans Foundation in 2011. Currently, the national organization is known as the Young Americans Foundation and individual campus or high school chapters are known as Young Americans for Freedom.
2. Condemning liberal bias in higher education is among the most expedient paths to becoming a leader within American conservatism—Buckley (1951), D'Souza (1998), and Shapiro (2014), and others entered into conservative organizing through perceptions and experiences of bias during their college educations. Moreover, decrying the excesses of youth, anti-establishment protest, and academic elitism is a trenchant component of historical conservatism (Gross, 2013; Robin, 2018).
3. In many ways, this perspective is ironic. Higher education institutions are among the most conservative in the Western world, a characteristic which is key to their survival across centuries (see DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Labaree, 2014). In the United States, colleges and universities are institutions that span multiple fields, meaning they must appease disparate constituents (Kraatz & Block, 2008; Weick, 1976). The resultant pressures lead higher education institutions to concomitantly adopt, for instance, neoliberal patent policies and socially just diversity and inclusion practices. Symbolic or not, both examples aid the survival efforts of higher education institutions.
4. This finding is tempered by field or discipline. For instance, economics and business departments are generally considered to be more conservative than others.

References

Adler, J. H. (2004). Frank Meyer: The fusionist as federalist. *Publius*, *34*, 51–67.

American Association of University Professors. (1915). *1915 statement of principles*. Retrieved from www.aaup.org/NR/rdonlyres/A6520A9D-0A9A-47B3.../1915Declaration.pdf

American Association of University Professors. (1940). *1940 statement of principles on academic freedom and tenure with 1970 interpretive comments*. Retrieved from www.aaup.org/statements/Redbook/1940stat.htm

Barnhardt, C. L., Sheets, J. E., & Pasquesi, K. (2015). You expect what? Students' perceptions as resources in acquiring commitments and capacities for civic engagement. *Research in Higher Education*, *56*, 622–644.

Binder, A. J., & Wood, K. (2013). *Becoming right: How campuses shape young conservatives*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bobo, L., & Licari, F. C. (1989). Education and political tolerance: Testing the effects of cognitive sophistication and target group affect. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *53*(3), 285–308.

Buckley, W. F., Jr. (1951). *God and man at Yale: The superstitions of "academic freedom"*. Washington, DC: Regnery Publishing.

Campbell, C., & Horowitz, J. (2016). Does college influence sociopolitical attitudes? *Sociology of Education*, *89*(1), 40–58.

Chen, K. K. (2016). Using extreme cases to understand organizations. In K. D. Elsbach & R. M. Kramer (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative organizational research: Innovative pathways and models* (pp. 33–44). New York, NY: Routledge.

Deutsch, K. L., & Fishman, E. (Eds.). (2010). *The dilemmas of American conservatism*. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky.

Dey, E. L. (1996). Undergraduate political attitudes: An examination of peer, faculty, and social influences. *Research in Higher Education*, *37*(5), 535–554.

Dey, E. L. (1997). Undergraduate political attitudes: Peer influence in changing social contexts. *Journal of Higher Education*, *68*(4), 398–413.

DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, *48*(2), 147–160.

Dodson, K. (2014). The effect of college on social and political attitudes and civic participation. In N. Gross & S. Simmons (Eds.), *Professors and their politics* (pp. 135–157). Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

D'Souza, D. (1998). *Illiberal education: The politics of race and sex on campus*. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Ehrlich, T., & Colby, A. (2004). Political bias in undergraduate education. *Liberal Education*, *36*, 36–39.

Fine, G. A., & Hallett, T. (2014). Group cultures and the everyday life of organizations: Interaction orders and meso–analysis. *Organization Studies*, *35*(12), 1773–1792.

Fosse, E., & Gross, N. (2012). Why are professors liberal? *Theory and Society*, *41*, 127–168.

Foucault, M. (2001). *Fearless speech* (J. Pearson, Ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Semiotext(e).

Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior*. New York, NY: Pantheon.

Goldstein, E. R. (2017, June 11). Can Jonathan Haidt calm the culture wars? *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from www.chronicle.com/article/The-Gadfly/240311

Graham, J., Nosek, B. A., & Haidt, J. (2012). The moral stereotypes of liberals and conservatives: Exaggeration of differences across the political spectrum. *PLoS One*, 7(12), 1–13.

Green, D., Palmquist, B., & Schickler, E. (2002). *Partisan hearts and minds: Political parties and the social identities of voters*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Gross, N. (2013). *Why are professors liberal and why do conservatives care?* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gross, N., Medvetz, T., & Russell, R. (2011). The contemporary American conservative movement. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 37, 325–354.

Habermas, J. (1985). *The theory of communicative action, volume 2: Life world and system: A critique of functionalist reason*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Hallett, T., & Ventresca, M. J. (2006). Inhabited institutions: Social interactions and organizational forms in Gouldner's *Patterns of industrial bureaucracy. Theory and Society*, 35, 213–236.

Hamze, A. (2016, October 26). "Affirmative action bake sale" prompts outrage at the University of Texas. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved from www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/affirmative-action-bakesale_us_58111afbe4b0390e69ce147c

Hochschild, A. R. (2016). *Strangers in their own land: Anger and mourning on the American right*. New York, NY: The New Press.

Hofstadter, R. (1963). *Anti-intellectualism in American life*. New York, NY: Alfred Knopf.

James, C. (2017, September 22). "Affirmative action bake sale" on UNM campus draws ire. *KOB-TV*. Retrieved from www.kob.com/albuquerque-news/affirmative-action-bake-sale-unm-campus-university-of-new-mexico-turning-point-usa/4610608/

Jennings, M. K., & Stoker, L. (2008). *Another and longer look at the impact of higher education on political involvement and attitudes*. Paper presented at the Midwest Political Science Association Convention, Chicago, IL.

Kam, C. D., & Palmer, C. L. (2008). Reconsidering the effects of education on political participation. *Journal of Politics*, 70(3), 612–631.

Kidder, J. L. (2016). College republicans and conservative social identity. *Sociological Perspectives*, 59(1), 177–200.

Kingkade, T. (2013, October 1). University of Texas conservative students hold affirmative action bake sale. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved from www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/10/01/affirmative-action-bake-sale_n_4025362.html

Kirk, R. (1953). *The conservative mind, from Burke to Santayana*. Chicago, IL: Regnery Publishing.

Knight Foundation. (2017). *Free expression on campus: What college students think about first amendment issues*. Retrieved from https://knightfoundation.org/reports/free-speech-campus

Kraatz, M. S., & Block, E. S. (2008). Organizational implications of institutional pluralism. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin, & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp. 243–275). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Labaree, D. F. (2014). College: What is it good for? *Education and Culture*, 30(1), 3–15.

Lewis, S. (2016, October 28). UT young conservatives host affirmative action bake sale. *CNN*. Retrieved from www.cnn.com/2016/10/28/us/university-bake-sale-trnd/index.html

Madison, J. (1788 [2008]). The federalist, 10. In L. Goldman (Ed.), *The federalist papers* (pp. 48–55). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Mitchell, J. J., Gillon, K. E., Reason, R. D., & Ryder, A. J. (2016). Improving student outcomes of community-based programs through peer-to-peer conversation. *Journal of College Student Development*, 57, 316–320.

Morgan, D. L. (2019). Making a "political contribution" to campus climate: Returning to a political pedagogy on college campuses. In D. L. Morgan & C. H. F. Davis III (Eds.), *Student Activism, Politics, and Campus Climate in Higher Education* (pp. 201–218). New York, NY: Routledge.

Nash, G. H. (1976). *The conservative intellectual movement in America, since 1945*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement. (2012). *A crucible moment: College learning and democracy's future*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Pew Research Center. (2014). *Political polarization in the American public*. Retrieved from www.people-press.org/2014/06/12/political-polarization-in-the-american-public/

Phelan, J., Link, B. G., Stueve, A., & Moore, R. E. (1995). Education, social liberalism, and economic conservatism: Attitudes toward homeless people. *American Sociological Review*, *60*(1), 126–140.

Pierson, P., & Skocpol, T. (Eds.). (2007). *The transformation of American politics: Activist government and the rise of conservatism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Quintana, C. (2018, April 30). The real free-speech crisis is professors being disciplined for liberal views, a scholar finds. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from www.chronicle.com/article/The-Real-Free-Speech-Crisis-Is/243284

Reason, R. D. (2011). Expanding the conversation: Perspective taking as a civic outcome of college. *Journal of College and Character*, *12*(2), 1–6.

Robin, C. (2018). *The reactionary mind: Conservatism from Edmund Burke to Donald Trump* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Rorty, R. (1998). *Achieving our country: Leftist thought in twentieth-century America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Ryder, A. J., Reason, R. D., Mitchell, J. J., Gillon, K. E., & Hemer, K. M. (2016). Climate for learning and students' openness to diversity and challenge. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *9*, 339–352.

Scott, J. W. (2018, January 7). How the right weaponized free speech. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from www.chronicle.com/article/How-the-Right-Weaponized-Free/242142

Shapiro, B. (2014). *Bullies: How the left's culture of fear and intimidation silences Americans*. New York, NY: Threshold Editions.

Stevens, M. L., Armstrong, E. A., & Arum, R. (2008). Sieve, incubator, temple, hub: Empirical and theoretical advances in the sociology of higher education. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *34*, 127–151.

Stryker, S. (2007). Identity theory and personality theory: Mutual relevance. *Journal of Personality*, *75*(6), 1083–1102.

Sultana, F. (2018). The false equivalence of academic freedom and free speech. *ACME: An International Journal for Critical Geographies*, *17*(2), 228–257.

Swidler, A. (1986). Culture in action: Symbols and strategies. *American Sociological Review*, *51*(2), 273–286.

Tocqueville, A. (2003). *Democracy in America* (G. E. Bevan, Trans.). New York, NY: Penguin. (Original work published 1835).

Traldi, O. (2018, April 23). Don't be fooled: There is a free-speech crisis. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from www.chronicle.com/article/Don-t-Be-Fooled-There-Is-a/243206

Vasquez, M. (2018, April 6). 5 takeaways from turning point's plan to "commandeer" campus elections. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from www.chronicle.com/article/5-Takeaways-From-Turning/243064

Vincent, G. J. (2013, September 27). *Statement from Dr. Gregory Vincent about the Young Conservatives of Texas's bake sale*. Retrieved from http://diversity.utexas.edu/news/2013/09/27/statement-from-dr-gregory-vincent-about-the-young-conservatives-of-texass-bake-sale/

Vincent, G. J. (2016, October 26). *Statement from Dr. Gregory J. Vincent, vice president for diversity and community engagement at the University of Texas at Austin*. Retrieved from http://utnews.tumblr.com/post/152352178668/statement-from-dr-gregory-j-vincent-vice?utm_source=twitter&utm_medium=referral&utm_campaign=UTAustinNews

Weick, K. E. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *21*(1), 1–19.

Woessner, M. C., & Kelly-Woessner, A. (2009). I think my professor is a Democrat: Considering whether students recognize and react to faculty politics. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, *42*(2), 343–352.

Woessner, M. C., & Kelly-Woessner, A. (2015). Reflections on academic liberalism and conservative criticism. *Society*, *52*, 35–41.

Young Conservatives of Texas: University of Texas. (2016, October 26). *YCT-UT starts dialogue on affirmative action*. Retrieved from http://freepdfhosting.com/ffee8fa01c.pdf

4

UNDOCUMENTED AND AFRAID

Expanding the Definition of Student Activism

Júlia Mendes and Aurora Chang

Introduction

Undocumented students *hyperdocument* (Chang, 2011) in an attempt to compensate for their undocumented status (a person who entered the United States without official authorization and documents, or who entered the United States with documents and has since overstayed the terms of his or her visa) and feelings of unworthiness. By collecting an inordinate amount of papers in the form of achievement awards, pristine report cards, personal statements, applications, and the like—undocumented students amass a trove of documents that often serve as an invisible and often mythological forcefield against state-sanctioned forms of violence (e.g., deportation, detainment, arrest, police brutality, family separation, etc.). The process of hyperdocumentation becomes an agentic act of survival, protection, and, as we introduce in this chapter, a form of activism. If we define activism as sacrificial acts that lead to individual and collective liberation in the pursuit of social justice, certainly, the collection of academic documents falls into that definition. Hyperdocumentation illustrates one powerful, yet often silent and private way that undocumented students manifest their activism; it is activism that remains below what may be observable by others. Put differently, because activism has primarily been depicted as a public act, taking the forms of street protests, workers' strikes, and public speeches in front of large crowds (see Chapter 1 in this volume), undocumented students who are out, unafraid, and unapologetic fit that depiction (Muñoz, 2015). However, most undocumented students are not out, and even those that are, may not necessarily be particularly public about it. Their lack of publicness though does not equate to a lack of activism. In fact, while silent, afraid, and anxious activism can seem counter to the common "definition" of activism, in

this chapter, we focus on the ways in which undocumented students manifest their activism in less obvious ways.

In this chapter, we argue that through hyperdocumentation, undocumented students enact a series of undocumented and silent acts of resistance in their everyday lives and through decisions that initially seem to contradict the typical demonstrations of activism. We push back against the notion that unapologetic, unafraid, and public activism is the primary or sole way in which social activism manifests itself within the undocumented student movement, and very particularly among students with undocumented status. Indeed, such fierce activists who take the very real risk of courageously "coming out of the shadows" likely represent only a small albeit invaluable fraction of the kind of activism that many undocumented and afraid students engage with on a daily basis. We focus here on two undocumented and afraid activist cases who do not fit the trope of the unapologetic and unafraid undocumented activists—they are closeted, fearful, and agentic. They may also provide a window into the ways in which other undocumented students silently and powerfully embody activism. Through their written reflections and dialogue with one another, we analyze their narratives and discourse to get at the ways in which they define, envision, and engender a kind of undocumented and afraid activism that is seemingly silent but impactful nonetheless.

Undocumented Campus Activism in the 21st Century

According to Broadhurst (2014), students engaging in activism in the 21st century continue to build on the tactics and traditions that have existed throughout history of American higher education. Broadhurst implicitly frames activism as a very public, collective form of activity citing "traditional forms of protest" such as marches, sit-ins, teach-ins, and street theater. He also acknowledges that new forms of protest through technology (Biddix, 2010), such as social media, have also contributed to what he calls "performative forms of activism" (p. 12). With regards to undocumented students' activism, this performativity is usually depicted as their "coming out" stories. Muñoz (2015, p. 57) states that "research on undocumented student activists frames the 'coming out' process as a political act, as strategic, and as a way to resist and fight for recognition and visibility" (Corrunker, 2012; Nicholls, 2013; Negrón-Gonzales, 2014). She claims that "critical disclosure is part of social activism as participants attempt to show their whole selves in everyday conversations, inside the classroom, and with individuals who have influence and power to change institutional policy and discourse" (p. 67). And while she also asserts that "the act of concealment can be viewed as a coping strategy against negative consequences and emotional stress" (p. 58; Cox, Dewaele, van Houtte, & Vincke, 2011), we believe that the act of concealing one's undocumented status is also a form of activism in its own right. Accordingly, we extend the view of activism to include those

undocumented students who are afraid to disclose, remain "in the shadows," and have found ways to "bring consciousness, resources, and resolution to change policies that exclude this segment of the population from fully participating in U.S. society" (Muñoz, 2015, p. 78).

Defining Activism in Higher Education

Student activism in higher education is a commonly cited topic yet as Cabrera, Matias, and Montoya (2017) note, "while many have written about college student activism, few have actually defined it" (p. 3). What most writings regarding activism assume, however, is its public nature. Public acts are seen as "action"—the key word here is public. Among the 10 points of reflection that Cabrera et al. outline in answering the question "Am I engaging in activism or slacktivism?" there is one premise that undocumented students seem to trouble, *Premise 9: Very Few People Actually Engage in Student Activism*. Cabrera et al. (2017) "begin with the premise that only a small proportion of those involved in movement-based politics can be considered activists" (p. 10). They draw a line between those that are authentically activists and those that are simply part of the "activist" strategy. However, activism has often been framed as civic participation on a public platform. Yet, what happens when one's "illegality" inherently prevents, in fact, criminalizes such civic engagement? Certainly, out, unafraid, and unapologetic undocumented students should be commended for taking the ultimate risk in outing themselves for the collective cause of immigrant rights, but what of those undocumented students who are also taking daily risks for the collective in private ways? Are they just part of the activist strategy? Are they slacktivists? Cabrera et al. (2017) clarify that they did not offer their premises as "10 essential components, but rather a guideline to support student activists self-reflect[ion] given frequent uncertainty" (p. 12). This is a critical disclaimer as creating a hierarchy of who is considered a "true" activist seems to serve little purpose except that of the narcissistic project that Matias and Urrieta repudiate—"public narcissism under the guise of promoting social justice" (p. 8). Cabrera et al. (2017) argue that narcissism and ineffectiveness are the cornerstones of activism. In this chapter, we situate undocumented students who are closeted and active as generous and effective as social justice advocates that are intentionally connected to their larger undocumented communities. We align ourselves with Cabrera et al.'s (2017) conclusion that

> campus activism is ripe with potential for creating democratic space and engagement (Biddix, 2010; Pasque & Vargas, 2014), albeit in less than orthodox ways. Student activism is indeed an untapped area of student development (Kezar, 2010) and particularly when it comes to the ways in which undocumented students manifest such activism. Student activism offers the possibility of activists and institutional actors to work together

to promote progressive social change (Rhoads, Saénz, & Carducci, 2005; Weiland, Guzman, & O'Meara, 2013)

(p. 11)

In order for this change to be realized, we must first understand the diverse ways in which students view and enact activism and agency.

Undocumented and Afraid Activism

Much has been written in this edited volume and elsewhere regarding activism in general and specific to higher education. However, we have made an intentional decision here to take up more space with student voices (see student vignettes and discussion) than breaking down the wider scope of literature. We highlight this literature as a tribute to these warriors and also use this as a frame to push back against the notion that unapologetic, unafraid, and public activism is the primary or sole way in which social activism manifests itself among undocumented students. In contrast, we focus here on two undocumented and afraid "activists" who do not fit the trope of the unapologetic and unafraid undocumented activists.

Methods

We used the method of counterstorytelling (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002) to ground the participants' narratives in real-life experiences through real-time conversation. Counterstories are constructed through research data (in this case, conversation), existing literature (both traditional and nontraditional texts), and the researcher's professional and personal experiences. Counterstorytelling allows participants to engage in "naming one's own reality" (Delgado, 1995), rather than having it designated as 'other.' Counterstories privilege the participants' intersectional experiences of oppression (including various social identities such as race, socioeconomic class, language, sexuality, immigrant status, etc.). For this chapter, we relied on document analysis (participants' written self-reflections) and conversation analysis (real-time conversation with one another about those self-reflections) of two undocumented Latina women students, Emilia and Stephanie (pseudonyms). Both identify as Latinas, are currently in their mid to late 20s, immigrated to the United States as children, and are private/closeted in regards to their undocumented status—each having only disclosed their status to a few people they trust. Emilia is 24 years old and in her second year of graduate school and Stephanie is in her first year of graduate school. Stephanie is 28 years old and spent a few years working full time before starting graduate school.

Emilia and Stephanie each wrote a self-reflection ruminating on their identities as 'activists,' considering questions around if and how they identified

as activists and the implications they perceive activism to have on their lives given their undocumented status. Additionally, they also reflected on their own backgrounds, fears, and relationships. After reading one another's reflections, Emilia and Stephanie recorded a 1-hour conversation on the topic. We approached the data analysis through a loose interpretation of ethnomethodological conversation analysis (CA) as originated by Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) and Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977). The primary goal of CA is to explicate and interpret how participants achieve everyday courses of action through talk-in-interaction or naturally occurring talk. In this analysis, we sought to name the realities of these undocumented and afraid Latina students. We coded the written reflections and the conversation and the themes and subthemes that emerged are outlined in the following section.

Findings

Precursor to Activism: Undocumented, With Reason to Be Afraid

Emilia's and Stephanie's reflections and conversation on activism embodied several themes. The following sections are organized based on those themes. We discuss how the women view, perceive, and define activism in others and in themselves. We then analyze the multitude of emotions (predominantly guilt and fear) the women associate and experience in relation to their experiences and their reasoning for both engaging and disengaging in what they perceive as activism. The most substantial analysis is spent on the implications and identities of the women as undocumented Latinas and the intersection of immigrant status, nationality, and gendered roles. Two subthemes relating to undocumented status were family relationships (which both women considered a priority to maintain and respect) and (negative) experiences with law enforcement (which was a primary reason behind the women's fear of arrest should they participate in acts of public activism or civil disobedience). Finally, we discuss the legitimizing silent activism that these women engage in on a daily basis and the impact this activism (among others) is impactful and valuable to undocumented communities.

Undocumented and Afraid Activism: Validating Silent Activism

It is evident early on that both Stephanie and Emilia are hesitant in calling themselves activists. Emilia begins her written reflection by stating:

> I have never considered myself an activist. I am shy, I have social anxiety, and I am too scared to attend any sort of public protest. When I think of

activists I think of anyone *but* myself. I think of people who risk their safety and security and put themselves out in the public for the benefit of others. They are selfless. They are unafraid and unapologetic. But I am afraid.

Emilia immediately defines activists as those who are "out there" fighting for the rights of others, out in the streets, in the public, and, in turn, risking their safety for others. Stephanie and Emilia make the distinction between this kind of activism and themselves, noting that they are not out in the public and therefore not deserving of the title of "activist." Stephanie specifically states calling herself an activist would be an "undeserving title" and Emilia adds, "it doesn't feel right to consider myself an activist."

Despite being hesitant in their written reflections, the conversation between the two women became more about validating one another's experiences. Interestingly, they continued to display doubt and, in some instances, guilt and shame when reflecting on their own actions and involvement within the undocumented community. But whenever one would exhibit such behavior, the other would be quick to validate and counter those negative feelings. Emilia, for example, is hesitant in accepting Stephanie's praise in regards to her writing. Emilia asks "who am I writing for?," suggesting that writing papers for school does not make her an activist because of the limited audience who will read her papers. Stephanie pushes back and states "I'm probably gonna read your work . . . and get inspired by the things you're doing. And that's a huge deal, because it might be me, or it might be so many other people." Stephanie believes Emilia's work is a form of activism because it may inspire others and motivate their actions. Emilia, on the other hand, believes Stephanie's work is of more impact, as she says to her "you are working with families and that's a form of activism. I mean you're changing people's lives right there and participating in their day–to–day activities." Stephanie is hesitant in accepting Emilia's compliments, too.

Emilia is in graduate school and is conflicted on how writing in academia is a form of activism, because she does not believe that impacts the community enough. Emilia sees Stephanie's work as much more active, because Stephanie (while also starting graduate school) works in social services and is in direct contact with families. Stephanie on the other hand, sees Emilia's research as activism as she tells people's stories and calls for social change on a larger scale. Stephanie struggles in calling her daily interactions for work activism. Thus, throughout their conversation, the women engage in this back–and–forth, recognizing each other's actions as powerful moves in activism while hesitating to do the same for themselves. However, it is clear that both women value in one another the ability to impact others through their own daily (albeit private) work: Emilia's writing and Stephanie's interactions with families. Whether intentionally or not, the conversation between the two women challenge the traditional notion of activism where one needs to be "out" in the streets to be

considered an activist. Such public actions are impactful and meaningful, but Emilia's and Stephanie's everyday actions carry a large impact on their communities just the same.

Tensions Within Silent Activism: Fear, Guilt, and Emotional Toll

Stephanie and Emilia associate traditional activism with being public about their immigration status, and they associate being public with fear. On top of fear, both women admit to feeling both guilty and, at times, even shame about not being public. Their feelings and perceptions about activism create a cycle of negative and tolling emotions. It is important to note, however, that these women's feelings should not be viewed solely as individualistic. Their emotions and reactions are rooted in various social, familial, and educational structures (among others) that they have been exposed to and immersed in. Such structures (such as school systems, family relationships, and immigration laws and policies) have had a real and detrimental consequence on the two women's individual emotional well-being as it relates to the world of activism and their perceptions of themselves within it. Thus, it is important to understand how much of activism is self-defined and how much of it is imposed by others. After all, the exercise of identity formation, including activist identity, is a socially constructed production "which is never complete, always in process, and always constituted within, not outside, representation" (Hall, 1990, p. 222). In other words, activist identity formation is not a fixed essence, lying unchanged outside historical and cultural contexts (Hall, 1990). Aspects of what once represented activism may very well remain the same in the present day and certain aspects and performances have also changed; they must change. The question becomes whether or not we have acknowledged, supported, and valued such change.

Stephanie and Emilia discuss their feelings towards attending public protests and the implications that would have for themselves given their undocumented status. Emilia has never attended (what she defines as) a protest, and in her written reflection and conversation with Stephanie, discloses that she feels an "overwhelming" sense of guilt and selfishness for not participating in public protests. Emilia, a recipient of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) (as is Stephanie), reflects on the realization that DACA was made possible by undocumented activists:

> I saw photos of undocumented youth—like me—out in the streets, blocking traffic, and getting arrested just to send a message. I realized that with DACA I reaped the benefits of the courage and work of others—and I felt guilty. Every triumphant and heartbreaking story I hear of undocumented activists comes with an overwhelming sense of guilt that I have done nothing to deserve my place in the undocumented community.

In this excerpt, Emilia exhibits not only guilt, but also a deep sense of unworthiness for not contributing to the undocumented community, and for "reaping the benefits" of the work of others by benefiting from DACA. This sense of unworthiness comes up frequently in Emilia's dialogue. She again brings up guilt when admitting to Stephanie that she did not attend a family separation protest because of a hot summer day. She displays signs of feeling unworthy for letting the weather get in the way of attending a protest, but (as discussed in the previous section) Stephanie is quick to counter that sentiment. "But that's important because you know your body," she tells Emilia, "you're being mindful of your body. There are other ways you're contributing and things that you're doing."

Stephanie validates Emilia's reasoning for not attending the protest and reminds her that she shouldn't feel this guilt because, on the day of the protest, it was indeed a very hot Summer day, and not everyone can handle that heat. Emilia then asks Stephanie how she feels when she attends protests. Stephanie has attended some protests, but also exhibits a sense of guilt for not attending *more*. But there is more than just guilt involved. "Every time I go, I feel anxious," Stephanie says. For both women, there is a fear of "what could happen" if they put themselves out in the public; they may encounter hate speech, they may get hurt, or they may even get arrested. And those are not consequences to take lightly for two undocumented young women. So while we see that both women clearly feel guilty for not being more active, as they define it, it is important to understand that their reasons for not being out in the public are very much real, rational, and validated.

Another key distinction to address is that while Emilia and Stephanie do not publicly participate in all protests, this does not mean that they do not care or are not affected by the social justice issues that evoke protest. One example the two women discuss is family separation at the border. Stephanie states, "to think about all those kids and the trauma they're going to have as adults, it breaks my heart. It's just horrible." Knowing of these injustices, especially as it relates to families at the border, seems to push Stephanie to dedicate herself even further into her work. Likewise for Emilia, awareness of injustices pushes her to continue writing and researching. Thus, Stephanie's and Emilia's engagement in "silent" activism holds an important, albeit nuanced from public protest, influence on their communities.

In addition to the emotional burden these two women navigate in regards to their feelings about traditional activism, they also face a tremendous emotional toll simply from being undocumented. If we consider that being undocumented requires emotional, mental, and physical survival, then we should also consider that such determination (and actions) to survive to constitute as a form of activism, too. Audre Lorde's words particularly resonate here, "Caring for myself is not self-indulgence, it is self-preservation, and that is an act of political warfare" (1988, p. 131).

Before even realizing what "undocumented" meant, Emilia and Stephanie shared the emotionally scarring experience of immigrating to the United States as young children. Emilia recalls that at the airport, "something seemed off." Stephanie, on the other hand, endured physically gruesome challenges in crossing the U.S.–Mexico border: "To cross, we ran, we swam a river, we went into trailers." From the moment they entered the United States, then, they were immediately confronted with intense emotional (and in Stephanie's case, physical) circumstances that would permanently mark their childhoods and their identities as adults.

Emilia knew she was undocumented, or that her family didn't have "papers," from the moment she arrived. "I knew all about immigration policy by the time I was nine," she recalls. Emilia's experience wasn't just about *knowing* about her undocumented status, it was about knowing what could happen should someone find out. "Fear was embedded in me from the moment we arrived in the United States," she writes. She touches upon the consequences of having to carry such a heavy burden as a child, stating "it's not something that needed to be in my brain at the time. It was a very raw knowledge." As discussed in the previous section, this fear stayed with Emilia well into adulthood and continues to affect how she perceives herself and (what she defines as) activism.

Stephanie had a much different experience in not finding out she was undocumented until she was a teenager and tried to get a job. It was only then she began to fully understand what being undocumented meant and the implications of undocumented status. While Emilia learned to be fearful of certain things over time (like law enforcement), Stephanie received both the knowledge of undocumented status and the fears all at once. Shortly after finding out about her own status, Stephanie's uncle was deported, evoking deep emotional scars and trauma. She quickly learned firsthand what could happen should she be discovered, too. Despite only learning of her status as a teen, this did not spare Stephanie from emotional burdens as a child. The trauma of physically crossing the border left its mark. Stephanie experienced several memory lapses, and does not remember her first year of school in the United States at all. "It's so repressed that I don't even remember my teacher's name. I don't even remember what she looked like." Again, it is important to understand that the fear, guilt, and many other emotions the two women associate with activism are not just rooted in their current perceptions of activism; the consequences of being undocumented were deeply embedded in their childhood experiences and the consequences are irreversible.

Challenges to Silent Activism: Family Relationships

The undocumented experience is not individualistic; it is collective. A defining aspect of this collective experience is family and familial relationships. Stephanie and Emilia feel strongly about prioritizing their families. A major theme

in the women's dialogue were the dynamics of navigating familial relationship and how that inevitably became one of the biggest obstacles to their desired actions of activism. The women feared that engaging in activism might sacrifice family responsibilities, relationships, and promises.

Emilia and Stephanie both hold roles of caregivers in their families, which intersected with immigration status and gendered family norms. Both stated that in their decision to not be public activists, they recognize their responsibilities in the family and feel it would be "selfish" to put themselves at risk because it would also mean putting their families at risk. Stephanie states:

> In my situation, I can't just go to a protest and get arrested, My whole entire family depends on me and you know my mom, and everybody. I'm the person that everybody comes to and I can't just . . . leave.

Stephanie had recently been taking care of both her mother and grandmother due to illnesses. Thus, her sense of responsibility for her family has only intensified. Stephanie worries that if something happens to her, her family would suffer. Thus, putting herself at risk through public activism is simply not an option. Stephanie realizes that while on the surface it may seem selfish to refrain from activism, it would be even more selfish to abandon her family. "We're looking out for our families," she says to Emilia as they discuss this situation, "it's because of those who depend on us." In her reflection, Stephanie writes:

> My mom has kidney failure, my grandmother has cancer, and often times I am my family's resources. I know that my family will not fall apart without me, but it brings me comfort to know that I am able to help and I am able to provide some type of security.

Another complicated dynamic in the women's family relationship that was a central theme in their discussion was the feeling of being misunderstood, or even judged, by their families for the work they do. Both women claimed it was hard to convey to their families how important and fulfilling their jobs and work as students were to them. Their families came from simple (and financially strenuous) backgrounds, and for Emilia and Stephanie to simply make it to college was a major achievement. But the educational and generational gap, along with gendered family roles, make it difficult for the women to connect and bond with their families over their work. "If I'm writing something, my family doesn't see that as work. Unless I'm physically at a job or physically at a meeting, they don't see me as working," Emilia shared. This dynamic has resulted in the women feeling like they have to be "two different people;" they are one person at home (a caregiver, a daughter), and another at school or work (a student, a researcher, an activist). "It's all these hats that you wear, and it's exhausting," Stephanie says.

Emilia keeps her work a secret from her family. In fact, Emilia had to promise her family she would no longer write about "controversial" issues to avoid exposing herself and her family in regards to their immigration status. Emilia described this situation as "heartbreaking," because she is unable to share with her family the work she is so passionate about. Adding to the guilt she already feels for not being "active" enough in the undocumented community, Emilia is also overwhelmed by the guilt she feels in keeping this secret from her family. Interestingly, she adds, "Going against my mother's wishes is perhaps my biggest act of resistance." One may argue resistance, especially in response to an institution as powerful as family, may be a defining characteristic of an activist.

A lot of the family dynamics and conflicts Emilia and Stephanie experience are unique because of their undocumented status and cultural background (both identify as Latinas) and gender. However, being so family-oriented in an American society that is predominantly individualistic has had its own emotional tolls on Stephanie's and Emilia's lives. They have both tried to seek help from peers, mentors, and even therapists, but struggle to convey why it is they must stick to their family obligations above any individual need. "It's hard to get other people to understand," Emilia says, referring to her friends at her graduate program. Emilia tells Stephanie how the other students in her program don't understand why Emilia gives up so many weekends to visit her family. Similarly, Stephanie is trying to start a graduate program while moving back to her parent's house to be able to help out more at home. She adds that in addition to friendships being difficult, so is dating, for the same reason that romantic partners "just don't get it."

Even seeking professional help has been difficult for these two. Emilia saw a therapist at her university and became increasingly frustrated that every time she attempted to talk about the strained relationship with her mother at home, the therapist would simply tell her to "take an Uber" and "just leave." For the reasons previously discussed, neither Emilia nor Stephanie see it as an option for them to "just leave" their families, despite having complicated relationships with them. They honor their families by fulfilling the roles expected of them.

Barriers to Silent Activism: Experiences With Law Enforcement

A major factor that keeps Emilia and Stephanie away from acts of public activism is the possibility of arrest. As previously discussed, being arrested would carry severe consequences for the women's families, jobs, and roles as students. However, in addition to fearing arrest, both women demonstrate fear and apprehension toward law enforcement in general. Encounters with law enforcement can have detrimental consequences for undocumented immigrants as such encounters put them at risk for detention and deportation. Stephanie and Emilia both experienced and witnessed such negative encounters, so their fears are not without good reason.

Both women have family members who had negative encounters with law enforcement, in addition to having these negative experiences themselves. This included traffic stops where police threatened to turn them or their relatives into immigration, airport searches, detainment, and, as mentioned before with Stephanie, the deportation of a family member. Stephanie had a firsthand experience when a police officer pulled her over and threatened to deport her:

> He pulled me over and then there were two more cops that came. It was like, "oh my God, I'm getting sent back to Mexico." That's what it felt like . . . all because of a speeding ticket. [The police officer] said "you know I can deport you right now." He was so mean. That was probably my worst experience with the police. So that definitely put fear in me. Never wanted to see another cop in my life.

Since that day, Stephanie can no longer feel at ease when she sees police officers, and is extremely self-conscious about her driving. At the airport one day, Stephanie saw Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) agents, and just the sight of them was significantly triggering: "I freaked out because you never know if they're coming for you."

Emilia also experienced a traumatizing event with law enforcement, specifically with immigration agents at the airport. Upon returning from a trip, she was detained and interrogated at the airport for nearly three hours. She recalled the painful experience in her conversation with Stephanie: "They detained me . . . why? What have I ever done? I was starving and I was so tired." Eventually Emilia was let go, but this incident left a permanent mark of trauma. The fear of deportation is real, as Emilia adds, "I was at their mercy, and they could send me back."

Clearly, Emilia's and Stephanie's fears and trauma in response to their experiences with law enforcement are well-validated. They have both come to the realization that simply being a "good" immigrant does not spare them from the structural and racist injustices that inform immigration policy and the abuse of power from law enforcement agents. In Stephanie's example, there was no need for the police officer to call for backup or to threaten her with deportation. Though Stephanie does not remember speeding ("I think it was just my little car in this neighborhood"), even if she *had* been speeding all the officer needed to have done was to give her a ticket. And in Emilia's example, she was well within her rights to travel and had the proper documentation to do so. The detainment and interrogation session were not at all necessary. As a consequence, both women now feel a disturbingly entrenched fear and mistrust for law enforcement. This sentiment is echoed in this excerpt from their exchange:

S: I feel like, even if you know some of your rights, you're still so scared because you don't know what could happen.

E: Yeah, they intimidate you.

S: Oh yeah, definitely.

E: And in that moment, all that logic in your brain, it's not there. Because you realize they can do whatever they want with you.

Emilia repeatedly states that after such negative experiences, there is no "coming back." The implications of undocumented status are complex, dangerous, and very much real. Understanding these implications help us better understand why Emilia and Stephanie choose to not take the risk of engaging in public activism that may result in arrest. However, choosing to not take this risk does not make one any less of an activist; it just means that their involvement with activism will look different than others.

Legitimatizing Silent Activism: Validation and Acceptance

Though we've chronicled the valid reasons and stories behind Emilia's and Stephanie's hesitation to become public activists, this does not mean that we should not view them as activists at all. On the contrary, we believe that both women thoroughly engage in various acts of activism that require much time, work, dedication, and a mental toll. Therefore, Emilia and Stephanie *should* be considered as activists for all that they've done and continue to do. We call the activism Emilia and Stephanie engage in *silent activism*, and believe that it is just as legitimate and exemplary as any other type of activism. Traditional narratives about undocumented and unafraid activists can render invisible other narratives. Hence, we name the activism Emilia and Stephanie engage in to better illuminate how they fit into the larger conception of activism.

Stephanie and Emilia struggle in legitimizing their own work, as was previously discussed. Evidently, they are both caught in systems that devalue and de-legitimize their work as young undocumented Latinas. Emilia addresses this issue with Stephanie:

> There's nothing wrong with researching your own identity but it's stigmatized in a way. If you're a woman, if you're a woman of color, if you're an immigrant woman, it's stigmatizing to do your own research—or to do any research to do with yourself.

Emilia is self-conscious in divulging and promoting her work because she believes it is stigmatizing to research aspects of her own identity. Stephanie echoed similar sentiments about pursuing a graduate degree in a Latino Studies program when she identifies as Latina herself. Both women have had the opportunity to speak in public spaces and display a sense of undeservingness for having such opportunities. Stephanie once came out with her undocumented status at an event for educators in her undergraduate institution. She claimed

she felt nervous and anxious, but that she did not see what she was doing as activism. Emilia frequently gives presentations on her research. She recalled an event where she gave a speech about trauma in the undocumented community and received a lot of positive feedback from the audience. A lot of people became emotional and thanked Emilia for her work. But Emilia still felt undeserving of such recognition:

> People came up to me afterwards and some gave me hugs, some were crying. I felt so touched and humbled, but I still didn't feel worthy of that. Because that was still not me, that was other people's stories. I didn't tell my story. And I think that's what always hits me.

The theme of guilt for not sharing her own story comes up again with Emilia. But Stephanie is quick to counter those negative sentiments and validate Emilia once again:

> But you do tell your story through other people's stories. And I think that's something you don't take credit for, but you should! Because that's amazing. That's another way to do things. Or project how you feel. And how you did it, you were touching other people's lives and making them feel comfortable and safe.

The validation, pride, and friendship Emilia and Stephanie hold for one another is powerful. Towards the end of their conversation, each seemed more and more comfortable in embracing and validating themselves and their own acts of activism, which marked a pivotal transition. Stephanie reminds Emilia how Emilia helped her in the process of applying to graduate school. "Your activism projected onto me!" she exclaims. Emilia is finally more comfortable in accepting that validation: "It feels good to be in the position where I can share things, too, and be there for somebody." Stephanie realizes, too, that her work is important, and that while it may not be "out there" she is still able to impact her community meaningfully: "We give back in our own ways." Activism is not always equated with fearlessness. "For now," Emilia writes, "I remain anxious, undocumented, and afraid."

Implications for Practice and Future Research

Stephanie and Emilia force us to consider two consequential points. First, we must examine how we, as educators, can support anxious, undocumented, and afraid students. Relatedly, we must reevaluate our notions of activism to include unorthodox manifestations of agency. Both of these points are connected because as we change our conceptions of student agency, we become increasingly open to nuanced ways of identifying, nurturing, and rewarding

otherwise invisible or low-visibility students. Generally, the students who self-select to walk into our offices, take our classes, initiate meetings, attend workshops, or lead events have managed to garner the necessary motivation, resourcefulness, or capital to seek out institutional actors. We value this kind of initiative—it makes our jobs easier—but what of those undocumented students who are too anxious or too afraid to take that step, precisely because they fail to fit the trope of unafraid, unapologetic, activist student?

We can begin to value afraid and anxious undocumented students by first understanding the reasons why students may be afraid or reticent to make their status known, seek out personal and academic assistance, or participate in traditional activism. First, while we should not pretend to be lawyers or legislators, the onus is on us as educators and institutions to have as firm an understanding as possible regarding the realities of undocumented students. This requires research and diligence. It also requires honesty. If we do not possess this firm understanding or have gaps in our knowledge, particularly at the moment of student interaction, we must be humble and responsible in admitting our ignorance and either engage in seeking the information they need or refer them to appropriate resources. We offer some suggestions (not exhaustive) here for further engaging undocumented and afraid students and encourage educators to be mindful of their specific institutional contexts as they develop appropriate strategies. To start, here are some action items that educators can take:

1. Keep abreast of daily news related to legislation, incidents, and resources related to immigration. This can take the form of subscribing to an organizational listserv, website, or newsletter that focuses on immigrant justice issues. Hold forums on immigration issues that invite different levels and types of participation thereby allowing students to be as anonymous or as vocal as they wish.
2. Be literate regarding your institution's admissions and financial aid policies relevant to undocumented students. If already relatively literate in these policies, form a diverse task force or committee of faculty, staff, and students that serves to advise institutional leaders regarding undocumented student issues. Include immigrant students in the group's composition that vary in their levels of immigration status disclosure.
3. Identify the human capital within your institution that possess the resources to effectively work with undocumented students. Examples include faculty whose research and teaching focus on immigration issues, staff who are particularly astute regarding undocumented student issues because of their professional role or their personal experience, and student advocates who, for whatever reason, are equipped with knowledge, resources, or dispositions that are especially attuned to the issues that undocumented students face. Convene meetings with appropriate stakeholders to share best practices in engaging undocumented students.

4. Validate silent activism by not privileging the most vocal or physically present students but rather by weighing differing manifestations of activism equitably. Drawing from culturally relevant pedagogical practices, rethink the importance of multimodal forms of participation that can include, but are not limited to, using writing exercises in classes and programming, developing activities that attract introverted students, providing anonymous opportunities to connect or seek resources virtually, or forming research teams about undocumented student issues that are open to all students who are willing to participate. Such examples invite participation without the pressures of outing themselves or adopting a kind of performativity that misaligns with their sense of safety and self.
5. Expand your definition of student activism. Ask students both informally and through programming about their definitions of engaged participation. Model and highlight diverse manifestations of agency by pointing them out and encouraging students to be active in ways that they deem meaningful and authentic.

The fifth suggestion gets to the heart of this chapter: what do we think of when we hear the word "activism?" This is a question that we need to ponder especially as educators working with undocumented students. Because activism evokes a public, vocal, and highly visible concerted effort to further social justice, its depiction can become problematic when we situate it in the context of undocumented students' lives. Given undocumented students' complex circumstances around self-disclosure, safety, and trauma with regards to their undocumented status, we urge an expansion of the ways in which we typically define student activism. In this chapter, we heard from two women activists that struggled to fit in within the traditional trope of undocumented and unafraid activists—so much so that they hesitated to take on any sort of activist identification. By pushing up against the normalized standards of what we typically imagine student activism to be, these women pushed beyond the boundaries of such standards and reimagined their own roles as activists in often private, quiet ways. In affirming their identities as social activists, we expand the vision for activism, and, in this way, hope to expand our own views regarding how we identify, support, and nurture student activism. By not limiting our definition of student activism, we push the parameters of the definition of student activism which could be keeping us from reaching out and supporting students who are active in ways which we have either not imagined or failed to value.

References

Biddix, J. P. (2010). Technology uses in campus activism from 2000 to 2008: Implications for civic learning. *Journal of College Student Development*, *51*, 679–693. http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/csd.2010.0019

Broadhurst, C. J. (2014). Campus activism in the 21st century: A historical framing. *New Directions for Higher Education*, *167*, 3–15. doi:10.1002/he.20101

Cabrera, N. L., Matias, C. E., & Montoya, R. (2017). Activism or slacktivism? The potential and pitfalls of social media in contemporary student activism. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *10*(4), 400–415. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000061

Chang, A. (2011). Undocumented to hyperdocumented: A jornada of protection, papers and PhD status. *Harvard Educational Review*, *81*(3), 508–520.

Corrunker, L. (2012). "Coming out of the shadows": DREAM Act activism in the context of global anti-deportation activism. *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies*, *19*(1), 143–168.

Cox, N., DeWaele, A., Van Houtte, M., & Vincke, J. (2011). Stress-related growth, coming out, and internalized homonegativity in lesbian, gay, and bisexual youth: An examination of stress-related growth within the minority stress model. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *58*, 117–137. doi:10.1080/00918369.2011.533631

Delgado, R. (1995). *Critical race theory: The cutting edge*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Hall, S. (1990). Cultural identity and diaspora. In J. Rutherford (Ed.), *Identity, community, culture, difference* (pp. 222–237). London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Kezar, A. (2010). Faculty and staff partnering with student activists: Unexplored terrains of interaction and development. *Journal of College Student Development*, *51*, 451–480. http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/csd.2010.0001

Lorde, A. (1988). *A burst of light: Essays*. Ann Arbor, MI: Firebrand Books.

Muñoz, S. (2015). *Identity, social activism, and the pursuit of higher education: The journey stories of undocumented and unafraid community activists* (Critical Studies of Latinos/as in the Americas, Vol. 4). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Negrón-Gonzales, G. (2014). Undocumented, unafraid and unapologetic: Re-articulatory practices and migrant youth "illegality." *Latino Studies*, *12*(2), 259–278.

Nicholls, W. (2013). *The DREAMers how the undocumented youth movement transformed the immigrant rights debate*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Pasque, P., & Vargas, J. G. (2014). Performances of student activism: Sound, silence, gender, and dis/ability. *New Directions for Higher Education*, *2014*, 59–71. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/he.20105

Rhoads, R. A., Saénz, V. B., & Carducci, R. (2005). Higher education reform as a movement: The case of affirmative action. *Review of Higher Education*, *28*, 191–220. http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2004.0039

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking in conversation. *Language*, *50*, 696–735.

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, *53*, 361–382.

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

Weiland, K. L., Guzman, A., & O'Meara, K. (2013). Politics, Identity, and College Protest: Then and Now. *About Campus*, *18*(2), 2–9.

5

LABOR, RESOURCES, AND INTEREST CONVERGENCE IN THE ORGANIZED RESISTANCE OF BLACK MALE STUDENT-ATHLETES

Tomika L. Ferguson and Charles H.F. Davis III

Introduction

Activism by Black athletes is not at all a new phenomenon. Rather, Black professional and intercollegiate athletes have used their athletic platforms to express their sociopolitical stances regarding issues of racism, gender discrimination, and economic oppression since the early 1900s. Nonetheless, the increased visibility of Black athletes' current involvement in various forms of social protest denotes the urgency and importance of taking public stands against injustice. What is more, in addition to broader social issues, their participation further illuminates the ways oppressive relationships of power in sport, politics, and higher education impact Black athletes directly. For example, whether media pundits are telling Black athletes to "shut up and dribble"[1] or university regents are negating Black student-athletes' right to protest, both exemplify disunion within sociopolitical and structural domains of power. Similar to the Black Power Movement of the 1960s, and the Movement for Black Lives of today, Black athletes, particularly millennial student-athletes, are garnering attention through exercising the power of their platforms to both amplify and engage in protest and organized resistance.

Sport competitions have served as a vehicle to not only demonstrate Black athletes' athletic prowess, but to establish the national reputations of higher education institutions. Championship victories and athletic scholarships, however, have not erased the racial inequality that Black student-athletes face on and off campus because of their race (Spivey, 1983). When Black student-athletes challenge inequality, they face resistance in the form of public shaming, team dismissal, or public rejection. Thus, acts of protest by Black athletes serve as a form of active (and organized) resistance *within* athletic and non-athletic environments. Their labor, particularly among unpaid participants in

revenue–generating intercollegiate sports, further represents the often com-pounded subjugation embedded within the collegiate experiences of Black athletes. Activism is one response to racism and has served as a way to resist master narratives in which Black people have routinely been silenced, forced out, excluded, and ignored (Edwards, 1969).

This chapter focuses on organized resistance within intercollegiate athlet-ics with a particular focus on student-athlete labor, resource mobilization, and the converging interests of postsecondary institutions and student-athletes. We begin by engaging the historical and contemporary contexts for Black student-athlete participation in protests. In doing so, we draw parallels and distinc-tions between former and current examples of Black student-athletes generally and Black football players in National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I programs. Then we offer a case analysis of arguably the most note-worthy demonstration of activism by Black male student-athletes in recent years, focusing on organized student resistance at the University of Missouri during the 2015–2016 academic year. To analyze our case, we draw from social movement and critical race theories and concepts to explain *how* and *why* the mobilization of student-athletes resulted in movement success.

Literature Review

Sociohistorical Context for Black Student-Athlete Protest in Intercollegiate Sports

Sport serves as a microcosm of society, a reflection of how the influence of soci-etal issues cannot be contained within political arenas. Thus, societal issues such as racism can be experienced within college sport; the level of influence pro-vided in sport can be leveraged by student-athletes, in particular Black players in revenue-generating sports, to challenge discrimination within college environ-ments. Since at least as early as the 1940s, Black student-athletes have served as leaders within campus protest (Spivey, 1983; Wiggins, 1988). In particular, Black football players have used their influence to draw attention to inequities faced by Black athletes within and outside of their college environments. In 1940, Leon-ard Bates of the New York University (NYU) football team was held back from traveling to the South to play against the University of Missouri (Spivey, 1983). This protest bought together over 2000 student peers and other supporters from religious-based organizations, women's groups, and other social groups to rally against this decision. Despite the protest, Bates was not allowed to travel. This protest was a catalyst for further fights against Jim Crow laws for student-athletes who wanted to compete in Southern states; these protests "served notice on the intercollegiate sports world that this form of discrimination would no longer be tolerated" (Spivey, 1983, p. 120).

The late 1960s and 1970s were a heightened time of athlete activism as they used their voice and athletic influence as tools to fight against racism

and discrimination, especially athletes on college campuses (Epstein & Kisska-Schulze, 2016). Within the broader Black Campus Movement (Rogers, 2012), Black student–athletes were organizing around issues of representation at the coach's level as well as more equitable treatment among their White peers. In 1967, nearly three dozen Black players at the University of California, Berkeley, birthplace of the Free Speech Movement in 1964, boycotted spring practice until Black coaches were hired. Players at Michigan State University, threatening a boycott in Spring 1968, issued a series of demands for increasing the number of Black coaches, athletic trainers, and cheerleaders to athletic director Biggie Munn. Unwilling to take their demands to the university president, two does players walked out of spring practice.

But drawing attention to racial inequities within the sport also had its consequences for Black student–athletes, often facing retaliation and retribution to include suspension and dismissal from competition (Epstein & Kisska-Schulze, 2016; Wiggins, 1988; Zirin, 2015). For example, in 1969 at the University of Wyoming, 14 Black football players were dismissed from the team for wearing black armbands in protest of the racist policies and teachings about the African Diaspora by the Mormon church the night before a game against Brigham Young University (BYU). Just two weeks later, during another BYU contest, the entire San Jose State University football team wore black armbands in support of the dismissed Wyoming players. That same year, at Indiana University, 14 Black football players were kicked off the team after boycotting practices due to the coaches' treatment towards Black players.

As but a few examples, these instances help situate the structural relationship of power, which was also racialized, as White coaches were in complete control over the collegiate careers of Black student–athletes. This relationship not only allowed coaches to retain both the rights of ownership of and exclusion (i.e., whiteness as property, see Harris, 1993) from the game, but also control over the sociopolitical involvements of Black student–athletes in which *how* they existed as agentic beings. Essentially, the subaltern racial and structural position of Black student–athletes imbued White coaches with an unassailable right to force players into compliance. By failing to comply, be it boycotting football operations or utilizing the platform afforded student-athletes, Black student–athletes risked early career termination without significant recourse.

A more complete illustration of this relationship of power occurred during the late 1960s at Syracuse University. There, the "Syracuse 8," nine Black football players miscounted and given the name by the media, had been organizing to gain access to qualified tutors, academic advisors, and the right to pursue rigorous academic majors, away from which they were routinely persuaded. By 1970, when coach Ben Schwartzwalder continued to fail in addressing the Black players' grievances, particularly after reneging on his agreement to hire a Black coach, the Syracuse 8 boycotted spring practice. As requests for the dismissal of these students from the University poured in from White alumni, the Chancellor had ordered Schwartzwalder to hire a Black coach, which he

did but reportedly kept excluded from being an officially recognized or active member of the staff. Thus, the Syracuse 8 continued with their boycott of the entire 1970 season and, as result, collectively forewent most any opportunities to play professionally despite ultimately being permitted to keep their scholar-ships and graduate from the university.

Facing public backlash after participating in activism was not just a challenge among intercollegiate athletics during this period. Professional and semiprofes-sional athletes such as Muhammad Ali, Tommie Smith, and John Carlos faced both national criticism and loss of career and financial opportunities as result of their respective protests (Agyemang, Singer, & DeLorme, 2010; Cunningham & Regan Jr., 2012). Muhammad Ali, of course, was stripped of his World Heavyweight Championship title as a punitive measure for his public refusal to enlist in the mili-tary to fight in the Vietnam War. Of Smith and Carlos, after their historic protest in October 1968 during the Olympic Games in Mexico City,[2] the pair of world-class sprinters were also enrolled students at San Jose State College (now University), which they later led to an NCAA Track & Field Championship the following spring. Nonetheless, as Smith (2008) recounts in his memoir *Silent Gesture*, the demonstration left much uncertainty about their future given the impending back-lash. In addition to being booed off the podium by Games attendees, the duo were ordered to be suspended from the U.S. team and banned from the Olympic Village. When the U.S. Olympic Committee refused, International Olympic Committee president Avery Brundage threated to ban the entire U.S. team, which led to Smith and Carlos's ultimate expulsion from the Olympic Games. Despite their continued success at the collegiate level, Smith and Carlos struggled after the Games incident to find success professionally, at least within the context of their primary sport.

These aforementioned markers, among other signifiers, illustrate the his-torical legacies of racism and campus racial climate (Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Hurtado, 1992) from which protests by Black student-athletes broadly, and Black football players specifically, emerged. In particular, a clear encapsula-tion of college and university life as nested within the broader sociopolitical context of athlete activism during the late 1960s and 1970s is noteworthy. For the coaches who dismissed their Black student-athletes, just as society dismissed and disenfranchised others, a clear exercise of power in which the dispensation of White control over Black participation in sport was demonstrated. Such a relationship of power, whether between White coaches or fanatics (i.e., broader White society) and Black players, has continued under similar but different racial and economic configurations in contemporary times.

Contemporary Contexts for Black Student-Athletes and Activism

According to data from the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), more than 490,000 student-athletes participated in all divisional intercollegiate

sports during the 2017–2018 academic year, with Division I football having the largest concentration of participants of any sport. In total, NCAA Division I football accounted for 29,029 athletes, of which 14,069 (48%) were Black, the largest of all racial subgroups. Additionally, Division I football players (as well as NCAA Division I men's basketball players) lay at the foundation of sport-related revenues acquired by the NCAA, which was more than $1 billion in 2017 (NCAA, 2017). The exorbitant amount of revenue acquired by the NCAA is demonstrative of their economic and political power. This power is often evidenced by intercollegiate athletics' influence on higher education institutions' admissions application numbers (Chung, 2013) and relationships with apparel companies (Tracy & Ruiz, 2017).

The contemporary economic reality of Black student-athlete participation in intercollegiate sports has far exceeded any limitations of profit-generation from previous decades in college sport. For example, according to 2017 Department of Education Statistics data collected from 127 Football Bowl Subdivision (i.e., NCAA Division I) schools, football and men's basketball generated an average annual revenue of more than $40 million per institution. At the University of Texas, the highest grossing intercollegiate athletics program in the country at $214 million in 2017, with $100 million coming from football and another $6.5 million from men's basketball revenues alone. According to an annual report from the USC Race and Equity Center, the University of Texas, Black male students comprise 68% of the football and basketball teams despite being on 1.6% of all students enrolled at the institution (Harper, 2018). Texas is not alone in this particular disparity of (over)representation in revenue-generating sports, sports in which Black student-athlete labor produces significant financial profits for anyone but themselves.

More to the point, however, is the common justification for amateurism policies adopted by the NCAA, in which revenues may *only* return to student-athletes in the form of athletic scholarships. Such scholarships are mostly awarded to top athletic prospects out of high school (and junior college), largely in recognition of their prowess on the field (or the court). As such, Black student-athletes are consistently targeted by NCAA Division I schools due to their primary potential to win games and thereby increase revenues (Beamon, 2008); academics are routinely an afterthought. Richard Sherman, a Stanford University graduate and an All-Pro defensive back with the Seattle Seahawks, whom has been critical of the NCAA, shared his perspectives on athletic scholarships in a pre-Super Bowl press conference:

> People think, "oh you're on scholarship. They pay for your room and board, they pay for your education, but to their knowledge, you're there to play football. You're not on scholarship for school, and it sounds crazy when a student-athlete says that, but those are the things coaches tell [football players] every day: "You're not on scholarship for school."
>
> *(Volk, 2015, para. 5)*

The common assumption that Black student-athletes 'have it made' when it comes to experiencing college and university life by comparison to non-athlete peers is analytically shallow and largely erroneous. In particular, Black student-athletes' everyday campus experiences have mirrored what has been largely understood about the racialized experiences of minoritized students at predominantly White institutions. Black student-athletes have reported issues of abuse and racism (Ganim, 2015), racial discrimination, and sexual harassment (Kaplan, 2017), and have even levied a lawsuit against the NCAA on violations of trust based on their academic experiences (Solomon, 2015). Recognition of these racialized, experiential differences are important as we also consider that scholarships can represent more than an acknowledgement of one's athletic prowess; they are an opportunity to receive a quality education and advance their future careers. Still, as Beamon (2008) and Meggyesy (2000) note, athletic scholarships have also served as an insidious tool for colleges and universities to exploit Black student-athletes' talents, limit their post-college career pursuits (e.g., dissuading and restricting enrollments in academically rigorous concentrations), and restrict their access to a comprehensive college student experience beyond athletics (to include participation in student activism). In essence, the athletic scholarship remains effectively wielded as both lock and key for most Black student-athletes academic and athletic futures.

Given the serious material and financial implications, the presumed return on investment for Black student-athletes' commitments to sport(s) in exchange for scholarships can complicate their desire and ability to use their platform for social justice. Almost at once must they consider the structural repercussions and interpersonal backlash they may face for their activism, whether the potential ends dissuade from the present means to address important issues. For example, Agyeman, Singer, and DeLorme (2010) explored the perceptions of Black male college athletes' perceptions of race and student-athlete activism. Their findings elude to the prominence of race within Black male college athletes' campus experiences, that race permeates their identities and worldviews. However, Agyeman and colleagues (2010) also found that, although Black male student-athletes are aware of past protests by other Black athletes, their primary focus is on their career trajectory and financial mobility versus participation in activism. Some scholars suggest this denotes a shift in Black male student-athlete activism since the 1970s, in contemporary times, Black student-athletes have relied mostly on legacies and victories offered by former movements around issues of race within college sport (Rhoden, 2006).

Nonetheless, protests and contestations by student-athletes broadly have ushered in serious discussions within intercollegiate athletics in recent years, demanding transformative action by the NCAA and postsecondary institutions. Among the notable shifts in discourse derived from student-athletes' collective action are these issues: whether to pay student-athletes for their labor (Hawkins, 2013; Mondello, Piquero, Piquero, Gertz, & Bratton, 2013; Sanderson & Siegfried,

2015); legitimacy of student–athletes' academic experiences at Division I institutions (Comeaux, 2013; Smith & Willingham, 2015); LGBTQ rights and inclusion within intercollegiate sport (Fynes & Fisher, 2016; Klein, Krane, & Paule-Koba, 2018); and the politics of racial and gender equity (Agyemang & DeLorme, 2010; Lapchick, 2017; Pickett, Dawkins, & Braddock, 2012). What stands out most from these shifts in discourse is the presence of student–athlete voices on extra-athletic issues that affect their and others' postsecondary experiences on campus. As we consider the specific movements becoming visible within the last several years (i.e., marriage equality, gender justice, and police accountability and mass incarceration), close alignment of issues raised by student–athlete activists is evident. That is to say, student–athletes' activism as a response to the conditions that exist within broader college environments remains in concert with larger social movement actors, organizations, and collectives.

Building upon this framing, we use the next section of our chapter to engage in a case example in which the aforementioned considerations converge, seemingly across time and space. More specifically, we present as our point of analytical departure the case (and criticism) of Black male student–athletes' activism at the University of Missouri (Mizzou) in 2015. In discussing this case, we excavate the relationship between members of Mizzou's football team and broader student activism on-campus. We particularly focus on framing how their participation in a campus-wide accountability efforts (against racism and the failure of university leadership to respond to racist incidents on their campus) were a considerable resource to achieving the movement goals of Concerned Student 1950, a predominantly Black organizing collective of Mizzou students.

Case Analysis

In this section we offer a case analysis of the 2015 protests at University of Missouri in which the Mizzou football team declared public support for student organizers demands for institutional accountability for its racist campus climate. We begin with a descriptive account of the events occurring during the Fall 2015 semester, including the football team's threat to conduct a labor strike (i.e., refusal to play in an upcoming game) if student demands were unmet. Then, using a resource mobilization framework (McCarthy & Zald, 1977; Jenkins, 1983; Fuchs, 2006; Davis, 2015) and the concept of interest convergence (Bell, 1980), we offer analytical sense-making with regard to the role and resource of student-athletes and college athletics in campus-based movements. The former is used to engage the *how* student-athletes and college athletics were mobilized to achieve broader student movement goals at Mizzou. The latter, however, is utilized to further understand *why* their mobilization was an effective strategy and tactic.

Concerned Student 1950 and Black Student-Athlete Activism at the University of Missouri

In the semesters leading up to the 2015–2016 academic year, compounding racist incidents had taken a serious toll on the campus community at the University of Missouri, Columbia (Mizzou) (Izadi, 2015). Following social unrest off-campus in nearby Ferguson, Missouri, in August 2014,[3] Black Mizzou students and others developed a heightened awareness and responsiveness to racial incivility on campus. Among the incidents were various overt acts of anti-Black racism. For example, a White freshman student drew a swastika using human feces in a residence hall bathroom. In September, Missouri Students Association president Payton Head, who is Black, pinned a public Facebook post detailing his experience of being called "nigger." In his post, Head wrote, "For those of you who wonder why I'm always talking about the importance of inclusion and respect, it's because I've experienced moments like this multiple times at THIS university, making me not feel included here" (Serven, 2015, para 9). Chancellor R. Bowen Loftin publicly condemned the incident, demonstrating his support for Head and rejection of racist incidents on campus. Then, in November, 19-year-old Hunter Mark, a different White male student at nearby Missouri University of Science and Technology, was arrested by University of Missouri police for posting online threats to shoot Black Mizzou students and faculty (CBS News, 2015). As result, campus leaders responded with demands for mandatory online diversity trainings for all Mizzou freshmen, which the Chancellor announced would commence the following January.

However, Loftin's comments and the mandatory online training were insufficient for already exhausted Black students demanding stronger action and effort from Mizzou administrators. In response, Black students organized a public act of resistance during the 2015 homecoming parade. Their focus was to force Mizzou senior administrative leaders to acknowledge their presence, listen to their concerns, and provide a substantive response within a public arena. Concerned Student 1950, an activist student group, rallied protestors who attempted to stop the car of University of Missouri System President Tim Wolfe. Wolfe did not immediately respond, and, instead, Wolfe's parade car bumped into Jonathan Butler, a Mizzou graduate student, while attempting to maneuver around the concerned students. It would be another week before Wolfe would meet with Concerned Student 1950 members, which was later reported as unproductive.

The incident with Butler became the point of departure in the efforts of Concerned Student 1950 and other student activists, which also contributed to Butler's undertaking of a week-long hunger strike (Merrill, 2015). From November 3–9, Butler put his body and health on the line as he consumed only water in protest. Butler's actions, which were substantively related to the racial incidents at Mizzou, were also to call attention to the University's failure to

properly inform graduate students that they would lose access to health insurance earlier that fall. Concerned Student 1950 and other students drew attention to Butler's strike, and other demands, by pitching tents near the student recreation center. Night after night, student protestors and supporters gathered in order to pray, speak, and share their demands with campus community members. And, as support continued to grow for student activists, a few Black Mizzou football players began becoming more engaged to learn about the students' demands and Butler's hunger strike. Moved and in agreement with the protests, Black players later shared their plan of action with head coach Gary Pinkel. On November 7, a seasonal bye week just prior to an upcoming game against Brigham Young University, Mizzou safety Anthony Sherrils tweeted:

> The athletes of color on the University of Missouri football team truly believe "Injustice Anywhere is a threat to Justice Everywhere" We will no longer participate in any football related activities until Tim Wolfe resigns or is removed due to his negligence toward marginalized students' experiences. WE ARE UNITED!!!!!!
>
> *(Merrill, 2015)*

This tweet was coupled with a picture of several Black Mizzou football players locking arms, visually declaring their political commitment and solidarity. The Legions of Black Collegians—a caucus of Black student government leaders at Mizzou—then shared the same images with the hashtag #ConcernedStudent1950. Immediately, these tweets became a leveraging tool for Concerned Student 1950 and Butler's demands for Wolfe's resignation. In particular, the players announcement to cease and desist participating in football activities, including a forfeiture of their upcoming contest, forced the university's and System's hand for decisive action. Within hours of the announcement, Mizzou's student protests and months-long battles gained international attention; there was no longer an opportunity for senior leaders to avoid a response to the students' pleas for institutional accountability.

Following the players' announcement, Mizzou's head football coach, Gary Pinkel, demonstrated public support for the players' decision to stop participation in football activities. In doing so, Coach Pinkel joined the chorus of social media posts, tweeting a picture of a large number of Mizzou football coaches and players of all races with the statement, "The Mizzou Family stands as one. We are united. We are behind our players. #ConcernedStudent1950 GP" (Landsbaum & Weber, 2015). This gesture was not insignificant, especially considering the potential loss of nearly $1 million if the team were to maintain their strike and forfeit the game. Shortly after, the Mizzou athletics department as well as University of Missouri administration released statements confirming the intentions of the football team in response to the gravity of Butler's health and the safety of the campus. Then, on Monday, November 9,

Wolfe announced his resignation as University of Missouri System president, stating to "Please use my resignation to heal, not to hate" (Merrill, 2015). Just a few short hours later, Loftin also announced his intentions to step down from his position as university chancellor. In addition to the student protests, deans of nine different academic schools at the university authored a letter to the Mizzou Board of Curators in which they requested Loftin's dismissal:

> "The issues we raised in those meetings have continued to deteriorate into a campus crisis that demands immediate and decisive action," they wrote. "It is the Chancellor's responsibility as the Chief Executive Officer of the campus to effectively address these campus issues."
>
> *(Kansas City Star, 2015, para.7)*

Immediately following the resignations, Butler was rushed to the hospital for treatment as a result of the length of his hunger strike. Additionally, the football team ended their strike and reengaged in normal activities, ultimately competing in their upcoming game. Student activists, however, continued their organizing efforts into the early spring semester.

Resource Mobilization and Interest Convergence at the University of Missouri

Resource Mobilization Theory

Resource mobilization (also known as resource dependency) perspectives emerge from the social movements literature as an explanation of how movements, which are conceived at an organizational level rather than understood through individual participation, mobilize resources to achieve specific organizing goals (Jenkins, 1983). Unlike other theories, resource mobilization does not focus on ideologies, identities, individual participation, or decentralized movement communities. Instead, resource mobilization argues that the mobilization of material and non-material resources (Fuchs, 2006), in conjunction with emerging political opportunities, determine the success of a movement in achieving its desired outcomes (Flynn, 2011). By material resources we refer to the tangible artifacts needed to undertake movement work, which include people (individuals and organizations), financing, means of communication, media technologies. Conversely, according to Fuchs (2006), non-material resources may include intangible but important resources such as member loyalty and solidarity, relationships and social networks, perceptions of legitimacy, moral commitments, and narrative control.

With regard to the student-led movement at the University of Missouri, the mobilization of several resources were necessary for the success of their campaign for structural change. In particular, the material resource of the Mizzou

football team, which occupied a unique strategic position for leveraging its organized labor, was a key factor in applying pressure to the University of Missouri at Columbia and University of Missouri System administrators. Additionally, the employing of social media technologies as a tool for narrative framing and amplification was another important material resource. And, finally, the non-material resources of legitimacy and authority resulting from demonstrations of political solidarity, which the Mizzou football program substantively provided, were effectively mobilized by movement workers. We further analyze the mobilization of these resources in greater detail in the next subsection.

Mobilizing the Mizzou Football Program

Coach Pinkel's tweet of support for his players was significant as it deviates from previous responses from coaches of Black athletes who protest. Protests at San Jose State University, Indiana University, and the University of Wyoming had no coaching support for the students' protests. Rather, coaches were participants in punishing the players for their activism. Coach Pinkel's tweet and public support of his Black players increased the visibility and impact of their stance. In one tweet, he was able to counter historical perceptions of the role of the coach within student-athlete activism. Frederick, Sanderson, and Schlereth (2017) examined the official University of Missouri Athletic Department's Facebook page to identify the individual responses to the 2015 protest. They found that any structures that promoted Whiteness in sport were supported. For instance, racism at Mizzou was questioned and discredited, there were calls for boycotts, and the action of the student-athletes was minimized and considered unnecessary. Coach Pinkel's participation counters the promotion of Whiteness; the picture of a racially diverse team and coaching staff emphasizes solidarity for the protest and discredits the emphasis on race among the players' demonstration of support.

Leveraging Social Media as a Movement Communications Tool

Epstein and Kisska-Schulze (2016) describe the use of social media within the Mizzou protest as a "mobilized endeavor . . . an unparalleled social media extravaganza" (p. 99). Further the authors question what the future of student-athlete mobilization efforts utilizing social media to broadcast student-athletes' voices for change. Collective action by Black student-athletes has evolved over the past 50 years. In the past, Black student athletes utilized arm bands (San Jose State University), asked for permission (University of Wyoming), and boycotted (Indiana University) to protest. The position of sport as a microcosm of society is further conflated with the tools and mediums at Black student-athletes' disposal in more recent times. The use of social media provides an avenue towards athlete empowerment (Yan, Pegoraro, & Watanabe, 2018). Social media provides

a platform to build and sustain relationships and relate to others due to shared narratives (Kassing & Sanderson, 2015). Shared views against racial injustice resonated with social media users as Mizzou football players leveraged Twitter to garner attention toward larger campus issues. Black players constructed an organized approach in their protest. Aware of the power of their athletic status, they mobilized to garner support from their head coach first and then used a photograph to capture their physical alignment with Butler and their peers. The photograph also centers the Black players' race and athletic status, thereby attracting support related to their athletic status and race. Sherrill's tweet generated solidarity beyond the University of Missouri campus, resulting in national support for student demands and increased pressure for senior leaders to respond swiftly. As a result, the mobilization of social media increased the effectiveness and success of the players' protest.

Legitimizing Student Protests at Mizzou

Further, the manner in which Black players on the Mizzou football team demonstrated support for the larger campus protest against racism was unprecedented based on campus protest within recent decades. Their picture, quote, and public tweet contradicts previous scholars' assertions that Black male student-athletes rely solely on the protests of the 1960s and 1970s. The actions of the Mizzou football team were strategic, evidenced by the organized approach to a collective protest. Black players began conversations with Butler and other student activists days prior to sending the tweet. While the context of their conversations are unknown, the meeting between the Black players, Butler, and other activists triggered a response not only to Wolfe's resignation, but to other demands of Concerned Student 1950. The incidents leading up to the players' protest were not specific to just athletes, but to all Black Mizzou students. As student-athletes, Black players aligned themselves with a larger movement mostly because of their race.

Technology, relationship building, and strategy helped to legitimize the Black players' protest at Mizzou. Butler's commitment to the larger protest was, no doubt, influential to the players; the depth of his commitment required a response from Black players that was similarly impactful. The potential loss of revenue in not playing a game was close to $1 million. Players collectively decided to wager the consequences of that financial loss and national backlash. The significance of not practicing or playing in a game does not equate to the potential loss of Butler's life, but the potential impact to Mizzou would have been momentous. As a result, social media expanded the profundity of the solidarity gained from non–Mizzou supporters. The nation watched the balancing act of Butler's life and potential canceled game against Wolfe's presidency. There was no tangible product to reflect the players' stance against racial injustice and verbal assault on their campus, as with armbands or kneeling. Rather,

Black players on the football team identified a method of protest informed by their millennial experience, using social media to control their introduction to their narrative. In the past, Black athletes lacked the agency to control their narrative: how their stories were told and understood. This protest was presumed authentic and valid because of the public nature and transparency in their tweet, an opportunity afforded by the use of a social media platform.

Interest Convergence as an Explanatory Framework for Understanding Mizzou

According to Bell (1980), when the interests of those in power intersect with the interests of those without or seeking power, the resulting outcome is a product of *interest convergence*. As a concept, interest convergence was originally conceived when Bell, one of the foremost architects of Critical Legal Studies and Critical Race Theory, articulated a new analysis of the landmark 1954 *Brown v. Board* of Education decision. In Bell's (1980) analysis, they argued that the result of *de jure* integration in *Brown* was the product of a momentary alignment of the legal interests of exclusively White federal courts and moral interests of Black Americans opposed to Jim Crow. In effect, Bell argues that the federal courts' desire to retrench its legal power and integrity, which was so clearly being defied by local school boards as to fundamentally obfuscate their compliance with "separate but equal" doctrine, made the *Brown* decision largely inevitable.

Within college sports, interest convergence is apparent in innumerable ways, which could be broadly understood in regard to various advancements in facilities, staffing, student support services, and other resources germane to student-athlete's success, particularly and primarily as players. That is, the interests of top recruits and high performers with regard to the aforementioned resources quite easily align with postsecondary institutions' investments in prestige and financial profit. Therefore, the ostensible arms race for resources to maintain competitiveness in intercollegiate athletics, although somewhat driven by student–athlete demand, ultimately serves the interests of colleges and universities. In part, this conceptual framing of the strike undertaken by the Mizzou football program, including a threatened forfeiture of their upcoming game against Brigham Young University, helps us understand how the financial interest of the university converged with the team's interest in institutional accountability. Rather than possibly foregoing the associated revenues as well as incur the $1 million financial penalty associated with the team's forfeiture, which were directly tied not only to the team's decision to strike but to the collective demands of students for resignations of System and university leadership informing their strike, both the Mizzou chancellor and System president became expendable casualties with no other choice but to resign.

However, the limits of interest convergence as a strategy, although it has been and may continue to be useful, are evident in the aftermath of the protests

at Mizzou. For example, when the interests of those who are in structural positions of power (i.e., Missouri legislature) are misaligned and counter to the interests of those seeking the power of self-determination (i.e., Mizzou football players), those with power may identify and enact ways to suppress, oppress, and disempower those whose interests do not match their own. In the Mizzou case, this was almost immediately evident as Missouri State Representatives Rick Brattin and Kurt Bahr introduced legislation to revoke student-athletes' scholarships if they refused to play "for a reason unrelated to health" in December 2015. This suppressive tactic by the legislature mirrors earlier and ongoing attempts by varsity coaches to control primarily Black student-athletes engagement in sociopolitical activities through sport. It also makes visible the broader relationship of power (i.e., the state legislature's control of state resources and resources needed to support public institutions within their jurisdiction), which in this case existed beyond the original parties' converging interests at a micro-level. Nevertheless, and fortunately, the sponsoring legislators withdrew the bill in response to public outcry of the legislature's attempt to control the free speech of college student-athletes.

Additionally, a substantive amount of press coverage of college student-athletes focuses on their negative and deviant behaviors rather than the productive actions they may perform within their campus and surrounding communities (Turick, Bopp, & Darvin, 2017). The Mizzou case demonstrates that even positive acts can be considered as deviant when they fail to align with the interests of those in power. Further, the racial dimensions embedded within this case (i.e., Black student-led resistance and mobilizing a majority Black football team against a predominantly White university system), obscures the circumstantial reality that Black student-athletes exercising their constitutionally protected rights can be erroneously challenged.

Furthermore, when the interests of those in power (e.g., athletic departments, police departments, and lawyers) intersect with college student-athletes' interests, which is to play games and win, there are ways that shared interests are protected. For example, Lavigne's (2015) article suggests that there is preferential treatment or access to influential resources provided to college student-athletes involved in crime-related incidents. Athletic departments and police departments may identify ways they can protect and aid student-athletes who are in legal trouble. Revenue-generating college sports (football and men's basketball) are held in high regard by institutions and their surrounding communities, fans, and entities who benefit financially from team success. College student-athletes, who may be able to lead their teams to victory and thereby increase the prestige and capacity of certain entities to benefit from their success, may be protected from the negative outcomes of facing a criminal charges.

Nevertheless, in the case of the Mizzou football players, who determines what actions are deviant for college student-athletes? And, who determines which actions college student-athletes are protected from? On the surface, it would

appear that criminal activity would incur the most negative backlash and desire for college student-athletes to face the repercussions of their actions. Yet, we posit that when the behavior of college student-athletes align with the interests of those who may be in power, they have a higher chance of being protected from facing punishment for their behavior. In contrast, the Mizzou football players exercised their freedom of speech, stood in solidarity with their peers, and posed a potential obstruction for Mizzou to forfeit their game and incur the $1 million penalty. The result of their actions was backlash, planned attempts to teach them about the limitations of their roles as student-athletes, and the use of legal means to construct boundaries on similar behavior in the future. If the players had not posed a threat to the interests of those in power, they would not have faced backlash from the state representatives. The defunct legislative response is noteworthy as it sustains 1) the historical use of legal oppression against Black men who rise up against racial injustice, and 2) how an institution's financial gain and prestige supersede the interests of marginalized persons. Black football players' labor on the field was not significant enough to protect them from attempts of correction and punishment.

Conclusion and Implications

This chapter has illuminated the layered complexities of Black male student-athlete activism. There is a lingered history of activism by Black athletes in higher education, particularly focused on resistance against racial discrimination and inequity. Their activism has often coincided with larger national conversations regarding race, their stance in support of issues that exist beyond the campus. The adoption of organized resistance and mobilization of accessible resources produced success for Black Mizzou players. They were able to control their point of entry and impact of their voice into existing campus protests to accumulate national attention to a protest primarily associated with their racialized experiences at the University of Missouri.

The implications for political protest in intercollegiate athletics are intersectional. The majority of the Mizzou football players will not continue to be professional athletes. Their reputations as activists and participation in a memorable protest follows them beyond their college education. The players received an outpouring of support from a vast number of supporters across the country. However, they faced backlash from Missouri state legislators and are considered participants in the fall out of the institution after the protest. The use of acts of organized resistance evidenced knowledge of peaceful protest and awareness of how to leverage accessible resources. The historical legacy of Black student-athlete protest and the leveraging of their athletic platform was not lost on the Mizzou players.

The manner in which the football players enacted their response demonstrates their capacity to and preparation for a successful protest. What then

is Mizzou's institutional responsibility to develop the Black student–athletes holistically? Part of Mizzou's mission is to advance the social interests of Missouri citizens; to provide opportunities and support all students to apply the knowledge gained in their educational experiences (University of Missouri, 2018). Ultimately, Mizzou administrators demonstrated support for the Black male student-athletes' actions. Coach Pinkel tweeted his support, the athletic department shared their concern and did not impede the students-athletes' decision. Yet, this lack of institutional blockage is not always common, but necessary. Mizzou had limited agency once Sherril's tweet went viral, they had to act in the midst of public scrutiny. This highlights a change in Black male student protest, that they are not limited to their athletic labor, that they can be change agents. The student-athletes' entry point into the larger campus protest was optimized by the mounting pressure that Mizzou administrators were facing due to Butler's declining health and the severity of their lack of response. Black student-athletes proved themselves to be effective and a necessary partner in fighting against race and racism on their campus

While Mizzou leaders did not point blame for consequences they have faced since the protest, it is doubtful that the Black student-athletes' leadership is not considered a catalyst for the result of the protest. Mizzou has been rebuilding since November 2015. As a result of the protest, they have faced decreased enrollment, revenue, and a tarnished institutional reputation (Canon & Williams, 2017). Their reputation has been aligned with racial inequality and questionable safety for Black students on campus. To rebuild their image, Mizzou has invested in rebranding efforts, creating and strengthening partnerships that support Missouri residents and recruitment pipelines, and a chief diversity and inclusion officer. Yet, there is still a decline in the number of Black students, and all students, attending the school. Unpublicized or unknown institutional efforts to address concerns about race and racism on campus could cloud accurate conclusions about the institution's response to issues raised during the protest. One thing is certain, future student concerns regarding race and racism cannot be faced with silence and lackadaisical responses from University of Missouri senior leaders. Rather, they are in a position to be responsive and, somewhat, proactive in reconstructing their reputation and provision of safe learning environment.

Intercollegiate athletics is a venue that can be leveraged for broader campus change. As with aforementioned protests in the 1960s and 1970s, Black male student-athletes are fully aware of the power of their positions, especially at large Division I institutions. Their athletic platforms are dexterous, they can increase institutional enrollment numbers or decrease public support for an institution. Mizzou Black student-athletes proved their agility to utilize their platforms beyond the athletic space and harness intangible resources for political and social gain. On the other hand, how will the removal of their athletic platforms after graduation position them for successful professional and personal

lives? The Mizzou protest was life-altering for many Black student-athletes and activists involved. How higher education responds to the students involved in protest illustrates their commitment to long-term inclusion efforts and sustainment of safe institutional climates. There is little to no information regarding the lives of Black football players since the protest. Or, even all of the names of the players pictured in Sherril's iconic tweet. What does remain is the continued legacy of Black male student-athlete protest against racial injustice.

Notes

1. After National Basketball Association (NBA) four-time Most Valuable Player (MVP) Lebron James shared his distrust and lack of support for President Donald Trump, FOX News journalist Laura Ingraham stated that James should "shut up and dribble" instead of sharing his political opinion. Her reference chastised and shamed James for using his athletic platform to share his voice. Ingraham later apologized for her remarks.
2. Tommie Smith and John Carlos, who finished first and third place respectively in the 200 meter sprint event during the 1968 Olympic Games, led a protest during the medal ceremony. Smith and Carlos arrived at the podium wearing black socks instead of their shoes in recognition of the poverty affecting Black communities in the United States. Most significantly, however, were the now iconic raised fists in black gloves during the playing of the "The Star-Spangled Banner," which invoked the imagery of the growing Black Power Movement in the United States as a salute of solidarity for human rights (Smith, 2008).
3. Following the killing of Michael Brown, an unarmed Black teenager in Ferguson, Missouri, by White Ferguson Police Department officer Darren Wilson, the Ferguson Uprising consisted of community-wide and month-long protests against the ongoing injustices experienced by Black residents. The protests were met with a militarized police response including the deployment of tanks, tear gas, and shooting of rubber bullets against the overwhelmingly peaceful assembly of protestors. After subsiding temporarily at the end of August, the insurrection continued as a grand jury failed to indict Officer Wilson for Brown's murder.

References

Agyemang, K., & DeLorme, J. (2010). Examining the dearth of black head coaches at the NCAA football bowl subdivision level: A critical race theory and social dominance theory analysis. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, *3*, 35–52.

Agyemang, K., Singer, J. N., & DeLorme, J. (2010). An exploratory study of black male college athletes' perceptions on race and athlete activism. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, *45*(4), 419–435.

Beamon, K. K. (2008). "Used goods": Former African American college student-athletes' perception of exploitation by Division I universities. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 352–364.

Bell, D. A. (1980). Brown v. Board of Education and the interest convergence dilemma. *Harvard Law Review*, *93*, 518–533.

Canon, S., & Williams, M. R. (2017, May). University of Missouri struggles to rebuild image after hits to reputation, enrollment. *The Kansas City Star*.

Chung, D. J. (2013). The dynamic advertising effect of collegiate athletics. *Marketing Science*, *32*(5), 679–698.

Comeaux, E. (2013). Faculty perceptions of high-achieving male collegians: A critical race theory analysis. *Journal of College Student Development*, *54*(5), 453–465.

Cunningham, G. B., & Regan, M. R., Jr. (2012). Political activism, racial identity and the commercial endorsement of athletes. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, *47*(6), 657–669.

Davis III, C.H.F. (2015). *Dream defending, on-campus and beyond: A multi-sited ethnography of contemporary student organizing, the social movement repertoire, and social movement organization in college.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ.

Edwards, H. (1969). *The revolt of the black athlete* (Vol. 69). New York, NY: Free Press.

Epstein, A., & Kisska-Schulze, K. (2016). Northwestern University, the University of Missouri, and the "Student-Athlete": Mobilization efforts and the future. *Journal of Legal Aspects of Sport*, *26*(2), 71–105.

Flynn, S. I. (2011). Resource mobilization theory. In Salem Press' (Eds.), *Theories off social movements*, pp. 26–36. Pasadena, CA: Salem Press.

Frederick, E., Sanderson, J., & Schlereth, N. (2017). Kick these kids off the team and take away their scholarships: Facebook and perceptions of athlete activism at the University of Missouri. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, *10*, 17–34.

Fuchs, C. (2006). The self-organization of social movements. *Systemic Practice and Action Research*, *19*(1), 101–137.

Fynes, J. M., & Fisher, L. A. (2016). Is authenticity and integrity possible for sexual minority athletes? Lesbian student-athlete experiences of US NCAA Division I Sport. *Women in Sport and Physical Activity Journal*, *24*(1), 60–69.

Ganim, S. (2015, March 20). *Opinion: When fans turn vile we all lose.* Retrieved from www.cnn.com/2015/03/19/opinions/ganim-fear-fan-base/

Harper, S. R. (2018). *Black male student-athletes and racial inequities in NCAA Division I college sports: 2018 edition.* Los Angeles: University of Southern California, Race and Equity Center.

Harper, S. R., & Hurtado, S. (2007). Nine themes in campus racial climates and implications for institutional transformation. *New Directions for Student Services*, 2007(120), 7–24.

Harper, S. R., & Hurtado, S. (2011). Nine themes in campus racial climates and implications for institutional transformation. In S. R. Harper & S. Hurtado (Eds.), *Racial and ethnic diversity in higher education* (ASHE Reader Series) (3rd ed., pp. 204–216). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Harris, C. (1993). Whiteness as property. *Harvard Law Review*, *106*(8), 1707–1791.

Hawkins, B. (2013). *The new plantation: Black athletes, college sports, and predominantly white NCAA institutions.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hurtado, S. (1992). The campus racial climate: Contexts and conflict. *Journal of Higher Education*, *63*(5), 539–567.

Izadi, E. (2015, November). The incidents that led to the University of Missouri president's resignation. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from www.washingtonpost.com/news/grade-point/wp/2015/11/09/the-incidents-that-led-to-the-university-of-missouri-presidents-resignation/?utm_term=.f95cd4ff81fc

Jenkins, C. (1983). Resource mobilization theory and the study of social movements. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *9*(1), 527–554.

Kansas City Star. (2015, November 9). *MU Chancellor R. Bowen Loftin to step down at end of this year.* Retrieved from www.kansascity.com/news/local/article43827399.html

Kaplan, T. (2017, September 26). Basketball player alleges discrimination in lawsuit against San Jose State coaches. *The Mercury News*.

Kassing, J. W., & Sanderson, J. (2015). Playing in the new media game or riding the virtual bench: Confirming and disconfirming membership in the community of sport. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, *39*(1), 3–18.

Klein, A., Krane, V., & Paule-Koba, A. L. (2018). Bodily changes and performance effects in a transitioning transgender college athlete. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, 1–15.

Landsbaum, C., & Weber, G. (2015, November 9). What happened at the University of Missouri? *Slate*. Retrieved from www.slate.com/blogs/the_slatest/2015/11/09/timeline_of_u_of_missouri_protests_and_president_resignation.html

Lapchick, R. (2017). The 2017 college sport racial & gender report card. *Institute for Diversity and Ethics in Sport*.

Lavigne, P. (2015, June 15). Lawyers, status, public backlash aid college athletes accused of crimes." ESPN. Retrieved from http://espn.go.com/espn/otl/story/_/id/13065247/college-athletes-major-programs-benefit-confluence-factors-somes-avoid-criminal-charges.

McCarthy, J., & Zald, M. (1977). Resource mobilization and social movements: A partial theory. *American Journal of Sociology*, *82*(6), 1212–1241.

Meggyesy, D. (2000). Athletes in big-time college sport. *Society*, *37*(3), 24–28.

Merrill, E. (2015). Timeline: How one student started a protest, stopped a football team and rocked Missouri. *ESPN*. Retrieved from https://abcnews.go.com/Sports/timeline-student-started-protest-stopped-football-team-rocked/story?id=35138105

Mondello, M., Piquero, A. R., Piquero, N. L., Gertz, M., & Bratton, J. (2013). Public perceptions on paying student athletes. *Sport in Society*, *16*(1), 106–119.

National Collegiate Athletic Association. (2017). *National collegiate athletic association and subsidiaries: Independent auditors' report*. Retrieved from www.ncaa.org/sites/default/files/2016-17NCAAFin_FinancialStatement_20180129.pdf

National Collegiate Athletic Association. (2018). *Sport sponsorship, participation and demographics search* [Data file]. Retrieved from http://web1.ncaa.org/rgdSearch/exec/main

Pickett, M. W., Dawkins, M. P., & Braddock, J. H. (2012). Race and gender equity in sports: Have White and African American females benefited equally from Title IX? *American Behavioral Scientist*, *56*(11), 1581–1603.

Reese, R. (2017). The Lack of Political Activism Among Today's Black Student-Athlete. *Journal of Higher Education Athletics & Innovation*, *1*(2), 123–131.

Rhoden, W. C. (2006). Forty Million Dollar Slaves. New York: Three Rivers Press.

Rhoden, W. C. (2010). Forty million dollar slaves: The rise, fall, and redemption of the Black athlete. New York: NY: Crown Publishers.

Rogers, I. (2012). *The Black campus movement: Black students and the racial reconstitution of higher education*, 1965–1972. New York, NY: Palgrave-Macmillan.

Sanderson, A. R., & Siegfried, J. J. (2015). The case for paying college athletes. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, *29*(1), 115–138.

Serven, R. (2015, September). MSA president speaks out about racist incident. *The Missourian*. Retrieved from www.columbiamissourian.com/news/higher_education/msa-president-speaks-out-about-racist-incident/article_ac4ebc2c-5b3e-11e5-b4bd-af55f13bae45.html

Smith, J. M., & Willingham, M. (2015). *Cheated: The UNC scandal, the education of athletes, and the future of big-time college sports*. Dulles, NE: Potomac Books, University of Nebraska Press.

Smith, T. (2008). *Silent gesture: The autobiography of Tommie Smith*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Solomon, J. (2015, January 22). *Ex-North Carolina athletes sue NCAA, UNC over academic scandal*. Retrieved from www.cbssports.com/college-football/news/ex-north-carolina-athletes-sue-ncaa-unc-over-academic-scandal/

Spivey, D. (1983). The black athlete in big-time intercollegiate sports, 1941–1968. *Phylon (1960–)*, *44*(2), 116–125.

Tracy, M., & Ruiz, R. (2017, September 27). In college basketball scandal, follow the money . . . and the shoes. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from www.nytimes.com/2017/09/27/sports/ncaabasketball/adidas-pitino-louisville.html

Turick, R., Bopp, T., & Darvin, L. (2017, September). Criminal behavior and college football. *Engaging Sports*.

University of Missouri. (2018). *Mission*. Retrieved from www.kansascity.com/news/state/missouri/article152939139.html

Volk, P. (2015, January 30). Richard Shermon on the NCAA: "You're not on scholarship for school." *SB Nation*. Retrieved from www.sbnation.com/college-football/2015/1/30/7951529/seahawks-richard-sherman-michael-bennett-slam-ncaa

Wiggins, D. K. (1988). "The future of college athletics is at stake": Black athletes and racial turmoil on three predominantly white university campuses, 1968–1972. *Journal of Sport History*, *15*(3), 304–333.

Wiggins, D. K. (1991). Prized performers, but frequently overlooked students: The involvement of Black athletes in intercollegiate sports on predominantly White university campuses, 1890–1972. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, *62*(2), 164–177.

Yan, G., Pegoraro, A., & Watanabe, N. M. (2018). Student-athletes' organization of activism at the University of Missouri: Resource mobilization on Twitter. *Journal of Sport Management*, *32*(1), 24–37.

Zirin, D. (2015, November 12). The Missouri Tigers and hidden history of Black college football activists. *The Nation*. Retrieved from www.thenation.com/article/the-missouri-tigers-and-the-hidden-history-of-black-college-football-activists/

6

PROTECTING MUSLIM STUDENTS' SPEECH AND EXPRESSION AND RESISTING ISLAMOPHOBIA

Shafiqa Ahmadi, Mabel Sanchez, and Darnell Cole

Introduction

In 2011, a Southern California jury reached a guilty verdict against 10 Muslim students who were charged with conspiring to disrupt a speech by the Israeli ambassador, Michael Oren. Oren was scheduled to speak at the University of California, Irvine (UCI), and some students were upset due to his involvement in the Israeli–Palestinian conflict and planned to protest his speech. By the end of Oren's speech, 11 students were arrested. In an attempt to exercise their free speech rights, these students found themselves criminally charged for disrupting Oren's speech.

The students in this case became widely known as the UCI 11; this case caused concern among the Muslim community about their safety and constitutional rights. Student activism and the exercise of free speech became redefined as criminal defiance punishable by law. In an attempt to better understand Muslim students' constitutional as well as institutional rights to free speech and expression this chapter will 1) present individual right and responsibilities under the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States, 2) provide an overview of student activism in college, 3) illustrate the diversity of the Muslim community and how the Muslim community has been racialized, 4) cover policies that negatively impact Muslim students, and 5) describe Muslim student engagement in college. The chapter concludes with a set of recommendations for college administrators and student affairs professionals as they support this marginalized community of students.

First Amendment

The First Amendment to the United States Constitution provides that Congress shall "make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech" (U.S. Const.

Amend. I.). This protection includes oral, written, pictoral, and other expressive means that convey an idea. 'Symbolic speech,' such as burning the flag at a protest rally, is also protected, so long as it is not disruptive conduct. Generally, speech is protected even when it is hateful. While the U.S. Supreme Court often has struggled to determine what exactly constitutes protected speech, it has however, placed some limitations on speech. For instance, speech is not protected when it incites violence or incites actions that would harm others (Schenck v. United States, 1919).

Political speech is illustrated in *Tinker v. Des Moines* (1969) where three students wore black armbands to school to protest U.S. policy in Vietnam and were suspended. *Tinker* argued that the First Amendment guarantees freedom of expression and that they were covered by the First Amendment. Restricting their political speech, i.e., the armband, was discriminatory because other political symbols had been allowed in school in the past. *Tinker* argued that schools have to maintain a safe and orderly learning environment and the armbands were a potential threat to the school environment. Therefore, prohibiting the armbands was reasonable. The Supreme Court ruled seven to two that student speech is protected as long as it is not disruptive. This landmark case confirmed that students have the right to free speech and expression as long as they do not violate the rights of other students or create a disruption to the daily operations of the institution.

Free Speech Zones

In order to allow free speech and expression, ensure the safety of other students, and limit disruption both public as well as private postsecondary institutions, have set up different speech zones also known as forums for speech. Public forums or free speech zones are designated areas where students are allowed to protest and distribute flyers. Institutions can place restrictions regarding the "time, place, and manner" of the speech, but not the content or the speaker unless the regulation is "necessary to serve a compelling state interest" (Arkansas Educational Television Commission v. Forbes, 1998). Restrictions can be placed when the speaker or the content of the speech incites violence or actions that would harm others (Schenck v. United States, 1919). Otherwise, in these zones, speakers can speak freely even when the content is controversial.

Nonpublic forums are all other areas of campus where protest and distribution of flyers are restricted. In these spaces, only certain speakers are permitted and are not intended for general access (Arkansas Educational Television Commission v. Forbes, 1998). All who wish to use this space must receive prior approval from the institution. Without prior approval, anyone speaking out, protesting, or passing out flyers would be acting against the law or institutional policy and subject to sanctions.

Speakers

Postsecondary institution are free to invite whomever they like to speak at commencement ceremonies or other events, and students who object to the speaker's speech are free to protest the speakers (ACLU, n.d.). Public institutions cannot dictate which speakers students may invite to campus on their own initiative (ACLU, n.d.). If campus resources are usually used for speakers, the institution cannot withdraw those resources simply because students have invited a controversial speaker to campus. In *Brandenburg v. Ohio* (1969), the Supreme Court held that the government cannot punish inflammatory or controversial speech unless it intentionally and effectively provokes a crowd to immediately carry out violent and unlawful action. This is a very high burden of proof in order to restrict speech or speakers.

Speech that incites, or the 'fighting words' doctrine, applies only to intimidating speech directed at a specific individual in a face-to-face confrontation that is likely to provoke a violent reaction. For example, if a White student confronts a student of color on campus and starts shouting racial slurs in a one-on-one confrontation, that student may be subject to discipline.

Over the past 50 years, the Supreme Court has not found the 'fighting words' doctrine applicable in any of the cases that have come before it, because the circumstances did not meet the narrow criteria outlined. The 'fighting words' doctrine does not apply to speakers addressing a large crowd on campus, no matter how much discomfort, offense, or emotional pain their speech may cause.

Student Activism

Activism exists as a way to "transform systems of oppression for comprehensive social change" (Linder, Myers, Riggle, & Lacy, 2016, p. 232). Student activism has been a part of the college campuses since their founding as students have attempted to create pressure for change on their campuses, in their communities, and in the nation (Altbach & Peterson, 1971; Linder et al., 2016). Throughout the 1900s students engaged in activism related to wars, capitalism, academic freedom, civil liberties, peace, disarmament, and communism (Altbach & Peterson, 1971).

The Berkeley revolt of 1964 for free speech is seen as one of the most memorable instances of student activism because it sparked a national movement across institutions (Altbach & Peterson, 1971). Students protested across the nation through public demonstrations and sit-ins. Today's student activism and protests may not always look like they did in the 1960s and 1970s, but it does not mean that today's students are indifferent to social issues or unwilling to push for social change (Quaye, 2007; Rhoads, 2016). Hirsch (1993) stated that

students in the 1990s were turning ever so slightly towards community service activities than in prior decades as a way to enact social change within their local communities. Therefore student activism does not always draw large crowds and attention through protest, but it rather sometimes seeks to create social change on a local level taking on various forms civic engagement. Setting the 1960s and 1970s as the exemplar for student activism dismisses other forms of activism and engagement that may also challenge systems of oppression to create social change for the community.

In 2016, the *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education* published a special issue dedicated to student activism in light of recent trends in student activism related to racial inequities, sexual violence, immigration reforms, and economic issues, amongst others. Rhoads (2016) starts the issue by providing a historical overview of student activism in American colleges. Since the 1960s, much of student activism has been sparked due to racial inequities in the nation and within colleges (Rhoads, 2016). Through these demonstrations, students sought to create change within their colleges and the nation for unequal treatment of various groups. Although this publication attempted to address issues related to diversity and social justice, none of the articles addressed religious diversity on college campuses.

Students often engage in activism to create positive social change. Student activists face a wide range of risks and consequences such as losing or threatening their life and limb, emotional and psychological strain, and decreased attention to their academics as a result of the time they devote to organizing other students for social movements and demonstrations (Rhoads, 2016). Despite the personal costs, students still engage in activism and favor the collective struggle to advance a just cause (Rhoads, 2016; Hirsch, 1990).

Becoming involved with activism can place students at odds with their university administration and others who have differing opinions. Administrators might view student activists as troublemakers that need to face legal or conduct-related consequences (Linder et al., 2016). However, students from marginalized and minoritized communities face harsher consequences compared to their White cis-male peers in both the legal system and the campus based conduct hearings (Linder et al., 2016). These unequal ramifications can have detrimental effects on marginalized and minoritized students' academic and life experience (Linder et al., 2016).

Moreover, viewing activism and student activists negatively fails to capture the benefits that their involvement may bring. Student activism in college can serve as a form of leadership and development (Chamber & Phelps, 1993). Regardless of the risks and personal costs, Rhoads (2016) argued that students learn valuable lessons through their involvement with activism that they do not learn in the classroom. Through their involvement in social movements, students are better able to understand how "social identities influence lived experience and interpretations of various events" (Rhoads, 2016, p. 199). Rhoads

(2016) stressed that it is important that scholars of higher education pay more attention to student activism and student movements "in fostering the conditions for higher education reform" (p. 190).

In order to understand student activism better, the definition and understanding of 'activism' needs to broaden (Rhoads, 2016). Often, the words 'activism' and 'activist' allude to protests and civil unrest, which are seen negatively or challenging on college campuses. However, Quaye (2007) explained that when students are asked to define activism they may include volunteer work in local organizations and participation in campus organizations as forms of activism. In addition, in the digital era of social media and the Internet, student activism and social movements often take shape online and through social media platforms (Rhoads, 2016). Students use these tools to connect with other students all over the country to enact social change and create awareness through hashtags and other forms of sharing important information.

Amin (2009–2010) used the word 'cyberactivism' to describe the ways in which people in the digital age use the Internet to enact and engage social and political change in different spaces. However, some scholars have argued that cyberactivism is not activism because this type of engagement is only about constructing and reconstructing knowledge and information, and not about taking action (Glenn, 2015). Despite the definitions and narrow understanding of activism, student activists find that social media plays an important role in raising awareness, calling others to action, building community with others, and providing a counter space for marginalized communities (Linder et al., 2016). One marginalized community that is in need of counter space is the Muslim community.

Diversity of the Muslim Community

In 2017, Pew estimated that about 1% of the U.S. population is made up by Muslims. In 2018, Pew estimated that 58% of Muslim adults in the United States are immigrants from different countries and 42% are U.S.-born Muslims. Muslims are one of the most racially and ethnically diverse communities in the United States. Pew found that Muslims originate from at least 77 countries. Among Muslim immigrants in the United States, no single ethnic group has a majority. Among U.S.-born Muslims, no single race has a majority. Although the Muslim community is one the most diverse communities in the United States, they are constantly portrayed as a monolithic community from the Middle East. It is important to note that the term 'Middle East' is a made up term, the meaning and geographical locations of which shifts depending on the social, political, or economic gains that it may bring to those using the term 'Middle East.' Pew estimates that a large portion of foreign-born Muslims are Asian and a large portion of U.S.-born Muslims are Black or Latino. Forty-five percent of Muslim immigrants identified as White, a category that includes

people who identify as Arab, Middle Eastern, Afghan, or Persian. This homogenization of Muslims is problematic and it ignores the vast diversity within the community and erases social, historical, cultural, and political differences and experiences.

Media Portrayal of Muslims

Muslims in the United States have been negatively portrayed in images, cartoons, film, and television long before 9/11 (Zaal, 2012). Shaheen (2003) reviewed more than 900 Hollywood films on their portrayal of Arabs and Muslims and found that 95% of these films depicted Arabs and Muslims as heartless, brutal, violent, uncivilized, religious fanatics, and lovers of wealth and power. In the media, the words Arab and Muslim are often used interchangeably, further conflating diverse communities. While Muslims come from almost every country in the world, films and the media create the idea that all Muslims are Arab, they all speak Arabic, and that they all look and all dress the same, therefore ignoring the vast diversity within this religious group (Shaheen, 2003). These depictions create a sense of otherness and foreignness that does not fit within perceived American society and culture.

Prior to, and certainly after, 9/11, television shows framed Muslims as a foreign and monolithic group that threatened American stability. Rivera (2014) described that, after 9/11, Muslims became a part of the 'Brown Threat,' threatening the social and economic well-being of American society. In addition, television shows, cartoons, and comics portray Muslims as Brown and speaking English with an accent, therefore heightening their foreignness (Rivera, 2014). Shaheen (2003) explained that the repetitive nature of negative portrayals of Muslims acts as a teaching tool that leads society to believe that Muslims are in fact dangerous to American society and safety.

Racialization of Muslims

Conversations about race and racism within the United States are often held in the Black–White racial binary. This racial binary has allowed society to group people and understand the experiences of African Americans within the United States. against those of Whites in the United States. (Selod, 2015). As the U.S. demographics have changed, new groups have been added, formed, or racialized. Omi and Winant (1986) defined racialization as "the extension of racial meaning to a previously racially unclassified relationship, social practice, or group" (p. 64). Selod (2015) explains that racializing groups allows society to attach meaning and a simplistic way of understanding a population because they can fit nicely into a category. Political and social contexts allow for the creation and attachment of meaning to skin tone, cultures, and bodies (Selod, 2015).

Under the U.S. Census, many Muslims are considered White, yet they still experience various forms of racism (Ahmadi, 2011; Geis, 2012; Selod, 2015). Muslims experience racialization when they are de-Americanized, culturally excluded, denied a national identity, and instead ascribed the identity of "Arab terrorist," the "other." (Ahmadi, 2011; Selod, 2015). Selod (2015) interviewed 48 Muslims Americans and found that racialized Muslim men are treated as a threat to national security while racialized Muslim women are treated as a threat to Western cultural values due to their modest way of dressing and use of a veil.

The racialization of the Muslim community is largely due to the portrayal of Muslims in the media and in politics. 'White' or 'Whiteness' in the United States has become a symbol of Americanness. Despite the fact that Muslims have been in the United States since the days of slavery, Muslims are largely viewed as foreign born. Since the terrorist attacks of 9/11, those who are or look Arab or Middle Eastern are not considered 'American enough' (Ahmadi, 2011; Selod, 2015) and are denied the privileges associated with Whiteness or access to the full benefits of citizenship (Ahmadi, 2011; Selod, 2015). Under the guise of national security, Islam has become synonymous with terrorism and anti-American sentiments, which seemingly threatens American safety and cultural values (Ahmadi, 2011; Selod, 2015). Thus, those who are Muslim or 'look' Muslim have become the target of discrimination and in some cases violent, life-threatening attacks.

Governmental Policies

After the attack on the World Trade Center, there was a bigger push for national security from the government. The USA PATRIOT Act (Patriot Act) was drafted as a response to the terrorist attacks and signed into law on October 26, 2001, by President George W. Bush, roughly a month after the attacks. During this time of heightened fear, Americans were willing to expand the government's policing and surveillance powers, knowingly exchanging their civil rights for perceived safety (Ahmadi, 2011; United States, 2001). With the adoption of the Patriot Act, Muslims and Middle Easterners were disproportionately targeted and racialized as the other and un-American, with their rights and privileges curtailed (Ahmadi, 2011; Selod, 2015). The Muslim community in the United States was closely surveilled, which resulted in many avoiding attending mosques and participating in Muslim organizations for the fear that their actions could be interpreted as support or involvement with terrorist-related activities (Ahmadi, 2011).

In 2005, the government passed the Border Protection, Anti-Terrorism, and Illegal Immigration Control Act to address "border security vulnerabilities on land directly adjacent to the international land border of the United States under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior related to the

prevention of the entry of terrorists, other unlawful aliens, narcotics, and other contraband into the United States" (United States, 2005, section 302a). The deputy secretary of Homeland Security admiral James Loy spoke before the U.S. Congress and stated that it was believed that al-Qaeda, an Islamic terrorist group, was considering using the southwest border as an entry point, but that there was no evidence that al-Qaeda had actually used this method as an entry point (U.S. Congress Report, 2005). Such policies encouraged even further policing of those that appeared to fit the Muslim terrorist stereotype.

The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) implemented the Visa Waiver Program Improvement and Terrorist Travel Prevention Act of 2015, restricting visas for Iran, Iraq, Sudan, and Syria. These countries were identified as 'countries of concern.' In 2016, Libya, Somalia, and Yemen were also added to the list of 'countries of concern.' These seven Muslim majority countries in the Middle East and Africa were identified as 'concerning' and its nationals needed extra screenings in order to keep Americans safe (United States, 2016). Such policies fuel the notion that Muslims are immigrants from the East and Africa who come to America to threaten the stability of this nation.

Trump Era

Throughout the 2016 presidential campaign, Donald Trump made several comments regarding his distrust of the Muslim community and that Americans should take steps to make sure that "we were safe." After Trump's election, Muslims across the nation and across different colleges and universities were subject to discrimination, hate crimes, and harassment. The Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR) (2018) estimated a 17% increase in anti-Muslim bias incidents in 2017, when compared to those reported in 2016. In addition, they also estimated a 15% increase in hate crimes against Muslims over the same period (CAIR, 2018).

The Southern Poverty Law Center reported close to 900 incidents of hate or bias in the 10 days after the 2016 election (Southern Poverty Law Center, 2016a): 1,094 incidents in the first month after the election, and 1,863 between November 9 and March 31 of 2017 (Southern Poverty Law Center, 2016b; Southern Poverty Law Center, 2017). Schools were a particularly common location for hate incidents with 284 at primary and secondary schools, 330 on college campuses, and 178 incidents involving the posting of White supremacist flyers. The flyers were posted in two bursts, one the week after the election and one during the month of February, and the majority of flyers were posted at colleges.

According to the FBI, Muslim, Arab, and South Asian communities have been facing higher levels of hate crime, hate speech, and incidents of bias and discrimination, particularly in 2016 and after the presidential election. In 2015, FBI data shows that hate crimes against Muslims surged 67% since 2014. At the same time, a 2013 government study shows that only one in three hate crimes is actually reported to law enforcement (Sandholtz, Langton, & Planty, 2013).

President Trump's rhetoric has directly impacted Muslims and furthered the already negative and stereotypical image of Muslims. Trump has ignored the vast diversity of the Muslim community, therefore essentializing a whole religious community and reducing it to stereotypes. For instance, in an interview in March 2016, Trump stated, "I think Islam hates us," personifying a religion. Trump's advisors have said that Islam is a "political ideology," "a malignant cancer," and "the most radical religion in the world." While the racialization of the Muslim religious identity is not unique to the Trump administration, Trump's legal policies and speeches have further targeted the Muslim community, which has prompted several responses, protests, and demonstrations across the nation. These demonstrations, on and off college and university campuses, have not always been exclusively led or attended by Muslims.

On January 27, 2017, Trump signed Executive Order 13769, titled "Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry Into the United States," but more commonly known as the 'Muslim Ban.' (White House, 2017). The Muslim Ban restricted nationals from Iraq, Syria, Iran, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, and Yemen from entering the United States for at least the 90 days following the issue date. These seven Muslim majority countries were identified as 'countries of concern' in the 2016 immigration law concerning visas by DHS, under the Obama administration. Moreover, the Muslim Ban also restricted all refugees from entering the country for 120 days following its issuance. The entry of refugees from war-torn Syria was suspended indefinitely.

The Muslim Ban was challenged by different states who considered it unconstitutional. In March 2017, Muslim Ban 2.0 was released and was once again blocked for being unconstitutional. In May 2017, the Fourth Circuit ruled against the ban, stating that it espoused anti-Muslim ideology, and therefore was discriminatory based on protected status, i.e., religion. In June 2017, the Ninth Circuit also ruled against the ban. However, later that month, the Supreme Court upheld part of the ban stating that those intended to immigrate to the United States from six majority-Muslim countries needed to have a 'bona fide' relationship with someone within the country. After the ruling, President Trump tweeted multiple times regarding the ruling. One tweet said, "People, the lawyers and the courts can call it whatever they want, but I am calling it what we need and what it is, a TRAVEL BAN!" (Trump, June 5, 2017). In September 2017, a new iteration, Muslim Ban 3.0, was released with two non-Muslim majority countries added as an attempt to illustrate that it was not a ban on Muslims coming to the United States. Ultimately, the Supreme Court upheld the ban in December 2017.

Muslim Student Engagement in College

The continued racialization of Muslims and political rhetoric coupled with policies that are now codified into law has had a chilling effect on how Muslim students on college campuses engage in free speech and free exercise of their

constitutional rights. For some, the response to the Irvine 11 was a form of rac-
ist suppression of the Muslim community. In that, while the students and their
families believed that they were protected by the First Amendment rights of
free speech, the legal debate became whose free speech was protected, Oren's or
the students' (Santa Cruz, Williams, & Anton, 2011). The students did disrupt
Oren's speech and should have only proceeded under UCI institutional policies
and not under state law charged with misdemeanor for conspiring and inter-
rupting a public meeting (Medina, 2011): 10 out of the 11 students were later
sentenced to three years of informal probation and no jail time (Santa Cruz
et al., 2011).

Some deans and faculty members at UCI signed a protest letter and insisted
that criminal justice system should not be involved in the case because it
would set a dangerous precedent for non-violent protests on college campuses
(Medina, 2011; Geis, 2012). After the Irvine 11 case, students and their families
are more cautious about becoming involved with the MSU or expressing their
free speech, expression, or religious beliefs out of fear of repercussions from
both institutions of higher education as well as the state and federal government
(Medina, 2011).

When college students have engaged in protests for greater inclusion, they
have typically focused on race and not Islamophobia (Bishop, 2015). In order
to address Islamophobia on college campuses, Muslim students have had to first
convince others that they are not dangerous and that their "values are rooted in
love and kindness," all while juggling the demands of college (Bishop, 2015).
The racialization of Muslims, governmental policies directed at the Muslim
community, as well as the current negative and stereotypical rhetoric by Trump
and his administration have had a chilling effect on Muslim students' free
speech and expression and civil rights and civil liberties. The chilling effect is
most notable in postsecondary institutions where students are discouraged from
exercising their legal rights due to the fear of unnecessary or unfair sanctions
that could criminalize them.

Although there were various responses and forms of engagement following
Trump's anti-Muslim policies, it has been harder to identify how Muslim col-
lege students responded. Many Muslim college students feel uneasy and fearful
about participating in protests and outing themselves as Muslims. Generally,
campuses have not been the safest places for Muslims student to engage in dia-
logue. Various campuses across the nation have hosted right-wing speakers such
as Milo Yiannopoulos, who, under the guise of free speech, spew Islamophobic
and hate speech, creating a hostile campus environment and division among
college students (Dajani, 2017). On September 24, 2017, Yiannopoulos was
scheduled to speak at the University of California, Berkeley (UC Berkeley); he
was greeted by dozens of counter-protesters and was only able to speak for
15 minutes (Dajani, 2017). These student protesters are not exclusively Muslim.
At other institutions, similar responses have occurred when right-wing speak-
ers who spew hate against the Muslim community were scheduled to speak.

Overall, a small number of Muslim college students have engaged in activism in the same ways as other groups have recently. It appears that the types of activism that Muslim college students are engaged in are more inward and in service to their own community as a form of awareness and protection of each other due to their experiences of racialization, restriction of civil rights and liberties and constitutional rights to free speech and protest. Perhaps Muslim college students understand that activism and speaking against Islamophobia, even when it is a protected activity, is perceived as creating a hostile educational environment and could jeopardize their educational careers (Figueroa, 2012). Interestingly, a different form of activism, not on college campuses but from the general Muslim American community is emerging. During and after the 2016 presidential elections, several activists, such as Linda Sarsour, have spoken out about the negative portrayal of the Muslims as well as related laws and policies, such as the Muslim Ban.

Moreover, the 2016 presidential elections and the current Trump presidency have motivated several Muslims candidates to run for political office. For example, Ilhan Omar became the country's first Somali–American state legislator in 2016 and Deedra Abboud ran for the U.S. Senate representing Arizona. In Michigan, at least seven Muslim Americans ran in the August 7, 2018, primary, including Abdul El-Sayed, who could have become the first Muslim governor elected in the country, but received only a small percentage of the votes. Saima Farooqui ran to be the first Muslim representative in the Florida statehouse.

Conclusion and Policy Recommendations

The Muslim community and Muslim college students' diverse racial, ethnic, cultural, and religious identities have been replaced with a monolithic racialized identity, the other, the Muslim terrorist. Political rhetoric coupled with policies that are now codified into law has had a chilling effect on Muslim students' engagement in free speech and free exercise of their constitutional rights. For college students in particular, free speech and activism are not merely about the law, but about learning how to be civically engaged citizens (ACLU, n.d.; Castellanos & Cole, 2015). Students should be taught about their First Amendment rights and responsibilities when engaging in activism. For instance, in the case of the Irvine 11, students exercised their right to free speech but were unaware that there were limitations to their free speech. These students did not know that there could be legal ramifications to their actions outside of the institution. The implications for improved practice should be that institutional agents like student affairs administrators and faculty should help students understand these rights and responsibilities as part of their civic–related development.

Moreover, not all students are aware that most speech is protected, even when it is controversial and hateful. Postsecondary institutions are dubbed as the marketplace of ideas where free and open dialogue are encouraged and

considered the cornerstone of a quality educational experience. Placing restrictions on whose speech is allowed would likely be deemed as restrictions based on the content of speech, which the Supreme Court has ruled illegal. The resultant effect of such restrictions on the content of speech would probably be much more severe for marginalized and minoritized communities, such as the Muslim college community. While postsecondary institutions and student affairs professionals have to allow controversial topics and speakers on campus, they must also provide counter speech, space for counter protest, and resources and support for those students who are negatively impacted. The implication for improving practice is that institutional agents should be proactive in communicating its responsibility to allow controversial topic and speakers, as well as the support for counter speech. More importantly, institutions have a responsibility to help students understand that allowing a controversial speaker on campus is not necessarily reflective of the values or views of the institution; yet, it is more endemic of its role in the marketplace of ideas where free and open dialogue are engaged in the deliberative and scholarly milieu of today's colleges and universities.

Postsecondary staff and educators need to take into account the role of social media and the Internet in activism. Although Muslim students have not always engaged in protest, there have been hashtags and trending topics that have raised awareness. For example, a flyer circulated the Internet encouraging people to participate in "Punish a Muslim Day" on April 3, 2018. Participants would gain 'points' for committing a range of insensitive acts against Muslims. On social media, the hashtag #PunishAMuslim informed others about the deplorable flyer and connected the Muslim community. It created dialogue about the issue among multiple accounts, across news outlets, and politicians. It called the attention of many worldwide, ultimately forcing authorities and other leaders to be extra attentive that day for hate crimes.

In sum, this chapter provides five recommendations: 1) diversity classes should be inclusive of religion and religious practices to combat Islamophobia, 2) resources and personnel should be dedicated to bringing diverse Muslim speakers and provide a safe space for Muslim students, 3) students should be taught about their First Amendment rights and responsibilities within the context of their respective institutions and any legal ramification on- and off-campus, 4) postsecondary staff and educators should also take into account the role of social media and other online spaces where students are likely to engage is activism, and 5) engaging in activism as a form of protected speech and expression is a civic duty and responsibility for all citizen because we stand on the shoulders of giants who fought for these rights before and after the Civil Rights era. Conflict and tension will always arise on college campuses and student organizations are going to want to respond. Those working with student organizations should better inform groups about activism, not as a deterrent,

but as a way to encourage engagement. Informing students about the risks and consequences on campus and with law enforcement is helpful. However, it is also important that the language used does not discourage activism or silence students' voices.

References

ACLU. (n.d.). *Speech on campus*. Retrieved from www.aclu.org/other/speech-campus

Ahmadi, S. (2011). The erosion of civil rights: Exploring the effects of the Patriot Act on Muslims in American higher education. *Rutgers Race & Law Review*, *12*, 1.

Altbach, P. G., & Peterson, P. (1971). Before Berkeley: Historical perspectives on American student activism. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *395*(1), 1–14.

Amin, R. (2009–2010). The empire strikes back: Social media uprisings and the future of cyber activism. *Harvard Kennedy School Review*, *10*, 64–66.

Arkansas Educational Television Commission v. Forbes. (1998.). U.S. Supreme Court.

Bishop, T. (2015). Being Muslim on campus: In the wake of terrorism, the burdens of Islamophobia fall especially hard on students. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved from www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2015/11/muslim-studentsuniversity/416994/

Castellanos, M., & Cole, D. (2015). Disentangling the impact of diversity courses: Examining the influence of diversity course content on students' civic engagement. *Journal of College Student Development*, *56*(8), 794–811.

Chambers, T., & Phelps, C. E. (1993). Student activism as a form of leadership and student development. *NASPA Journal*, *31*(1), 19–29.

Council on American-Islamic Relations. (2018). Targeted: 2018 civil rights report.

Dajani, J. (2017). Islamophobia at home at San Francisco State University. *Huffpost*. Retrieved from www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/islamophobia-at-home-at-san-franciscostate-university_us_59c83c0be4b0b7022a646bb0

FBI. (2015). *2015 hate crime statistics*. Retrieved from https://ucr.fbi.gov/hate-crime/2015

Figueroa, T. B. (2012). All Muslims are like that: How Islamophobia is diminishing Americans' right to receive information. *Hofstra Law Review*, *41*, 467.

Geis, G. (2012). An analysis and recommendations concerning an incident in which Muslim students interrupted an Israel official speaking on a college campus. *Race and Justice*, *2*(2), 138–147.

Glenn, C. L. (2015). Activism or "slacktivism?": Digital media and organizing for social change. *Communication Teacher*, *29*, 81–85.

Hirsch, D. J. (1993). Politics through action: Student service and activism in the 90s. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, *25*(5), 32–36.

Hirsch, E. L. (1990). Sacrifice for the cause: Group process, recruitment, and commitment in a student social movement. *American Sociological Review*, *55*, 243–254.

Linder, C., Myers, J. S., Riggle, C., & Lacy, M. (2016). From margins to mainstream: Social media as a tool for campus sexual violence activism. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *9*(3), 231.

Medina. (2011). Retrieved from www.nytimes.com/2011/02/10/education/10irvine.html

Omi, M., & Winant, H. (1986). *Racial formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1980s*. New York City, NY: Routledge.

Pew Research Center. (2017). U.S. Muslims concerned about their place in society, but continue to believe in the American dream. *Pew Research Center: Religion and Public Life*. Retrieved from www.pewforum.org/2017/07/26/demographic-portrait-of-muslim americans/

Pew Research Center. (2018). Muslims in America: Immigrants and those in U.S. see life differently in many ways. *Pew Research Center: Religion and Public Life*. Retrieved from www.pewforum.org/essay/muslims-in-america-immigrants-and-those-bornin-u-s-see-life-differently-in-many-ways/

Quaye, S. J. (2007). Hope and learning: The outcomes of contemporary student activism. *About Campus*, *12*(2), 2–9.

Rhoads, R. A. (2016). Student activism, diversity, and the struggle for a just society. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *9*(3), 189.

Rivera, C. (2014). The brown threat: Post-9/11 conflations of Latina/os and Middle Eastern Muslims in the US American imagination. *Latino Studies*, *12*(1), 44–64.

Sandholtz, N., Langton, L., & Planty, M. (2013). Special report: Hate crime victimization, 2003–2011. *U.S. Department of Justice*. Retrieved from www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/hcv0311.pdf

Santa Cruz, N., Williams, L., & Anton, M. (2011). Retrieved from http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/lanow/2011/09/irvine-11-sentenced-probation-no-jail-time.html

Schenck v. United States. 249 U.S. 47. U.S. Supreme Court.

Selod, S. (2015). Citizenship denied: The racialization of Muslim American men and women post-9/11. *Critical Sociology*, *41*(1), 77–95.

Shaheen, J. (2003). Reel Bad Arabs: How Hollywood vilifies a people. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *588*, 171–193.

Southern Poverty Law Center. (2016a). *Ten days after: Harassment and intimidation in the aftermath of the election*. Retrieved from www.splcenter.org/sites/default/files/com_hate_incidents_report_2017_update.pdf

Southern Poverty Law Center. (2016b). *Update: 1,094 bias-related incidents in the month following the election*. Retrieved from www.splcenter.org/hatewatch/2016/12/16/update-1094-bias-related-incidentsmonth-following-election

Southern Poverty Law Center. (2017). *Frequency of noose hate crimes incidents surge*. Retrieved from www.splcenter.org/hatewatch/2017/06/05/frequency-noose-hate-crimeincidents-surges

Tinker v. Des Moines. 393 U.S. 503. U.S. Supreme Court, 1969.

Trump, D. (2017, June 5). *Twitter*. Retrieved from https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/871674214356484096

United States. (2001). *The USA Patriot Act: Preserving life and liberty: Uniting and strengthening America by providing appropriate tools required to intercept and obstruct terrorism*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

United States. (2005). *Border protection, anti-terrorism, and illegal immigration control act*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

United States. (2016). *DHS announces further travel restrictions for the visa waiver program*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Homeland Security.

US Congress Report. (2005). *Current and projected threats to the United States: Hearing before the select committee on intelligence*. United States Senate. 109th Congress, 1st session, 15 February. Washington: US Government Printing Office. US Constitution.

White House. (2017). *Executive order 1769: "Protecting the nation from foreign terrorist entry in the United States."* Retrieved from www.whitehouse.gov/presidentialactions/executive-order-protecting-nation-foreign-terrorist-entry-united-states/

Zaal, M. (2012). Islamophobia in classrooms, media, and politics. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, *55*(6), 555–558.

7

STUDENT ACTIVISM, RESOURCE MOBILIZATION, AND NEW TACTICAL REPERTOIRES IN THE 'DIGITAL AGE'

Charles H.F. Davis III

Introduction

For nearly two decades, empirical questions regarding the role of the Internet and other media technologies in student-based movements have emerged for social science investigation. In more recent years, more popular discourses have questioned the legitimacy of such movement work, often arguing activism within digital spheres should be considered a passive and less powerful form of political dissent (Seay, 2014). In part, the framing of *slacktivism* is derived from assumptions regarding 1) the associated risks involved with participation in online forms of protest, and 2) whether such protests are effective means for advancing social change. In both cases, the assumptions surrounding online advocacy and action tend to understate the extent to which targeted forms of violence routinely take place in online venues. This particular point, which perhaps not yet evident when Malcolm Gladwell (2010) penned his infamous deriding of the "Twitter Revolution" in *The New Yorker*, is key in that it is often assumed that there are either zero or only low risks associated with online activism. To be sure, this perspective, however widely shared, is decidedly narrow in its analysis.

Additionally, such assumptions do not consider the ways in which social media, as a battleground for public relations, can be mobilized to apply pressure to individuals and organizations targeted for public accountability. In many respects, what constitutes slacktivism in popular culture are a limited number of performative actions easily undertaken by user communities of single and multiple online platforms. Yet this reduction of digital activism to such actions, many of which are also important to overall social movement goals, fails to account for the longstanding and ongoing ways the Internet and digital media platforms have been adopted for alternative and activist new media projects

(Liverouw, 2011). As are discussed in other chapters of this volume, social media has been especially useful in efforts to raise awareness and continue transforming college and university campuses on issues of systemic and inter-personal racism, gender justice and sexism, and the ongoing disenfranchisement of LGBTQIA student communities. However, greater theoretical understand-ing by higher education scholars with regard to *how* and *why* employing digital media is effective is needed.

In this chapter I explore the theoretical, conceptual, and practical implica-tions of information and communications technologies (ICTs)—to include the Internet, broadly conceived, and evolving social and new media technologies more specifically—for contemporary student activism in postsecondary con-texts. First, I begin by discussing the existing, but limited, study of technologies higher education scholars investigating student activism. Next, I theoretically situate technology and its uses within the established social movement perspec-tive of resource mobilization. Then, I discuss Lievrouw's (2011) alternative and activist new media framework to operationalize how technological resources are tactically employed in social movement work. Finally, I conclude the chap-ter with abridged analyses adapted from a larger ethnographic study, in which the undertaking of two activist new media projects by a collective of Black and Brown college students is explored.

The Study of Technology and Student Activism in College

As perhaps one of the first examinations of college students' use of the Internet as part of their tactical repertoires (Tilly, 2004), Rhoads (1998) introduced the field of higher education to a new frontier in student activism exactly two decades ago. In the final chapter of his seminal text, *Freedom's Web: Student Activism in an Age of Cultural Diversity*, Rhoads concludes with discussing the implications of the Internet on student activism in the then near future. In par-ticular, Rhodes provides a brief case analysis of the role the Internet played in organizing and advancing the Free Burma Coalition (FBC). Founded by grad-uate students at the University of Wisconsin-Madison in 1995, FBC sought to amplify the existing efforts of local Burmese organizers and the work of several single-issue NGOs to bring awareness to human rights violations taking place in Burma (Myanmar). With deliberate intention, the FBC used its web-site and online forums to facilitate the development of networks of empathetic American students, which resulted in the organization of more than 150 local campus-based chapters. Furthermore, the tandem of FBC's website and online forums allowed for the coordination of and reporting on student protests and demonstrations, which demanded economic boycotts, sanctions, and divest-ment from corporations conducting business in Burma.

Nevertheless, despite Rhoads's contribution at the time, higher education researchers largely abandoned the study of social movements in college for more than a decade. And, of the higher education research having investigated

student activism thereafter, very little has focused on continuing to understand role the Internet, broadly conceived, has played in contemporary student organizing. Among the exceptions, Biddix's (2010b) qualitative study examined the use of information and communication technologies (ICTs) for campus activism between the year 2000 and 2008. Although more acutely focused on civic learning outcomes of activist participation, Biddix's study introduced forms and functions for a select group ICTs used by campus activists. In particular, the aforementioned ICTs included student activists' use of email, instant messaging, cell phones, text messaging, Google accounts (i.e., email lists, chatting, profiles, and document archives), Facebook, and the web pages and web blogs to develop online learning environments (DeBlois & Oblinger, 2007; Wilen-Daugenti, 2009) for civic education and engagement.

Although easy to dismiss Biddix's work as outdated, which could be easily attributed to the pace at which technologies 'live and die' among consumers, the aforementioned study makes two important contributions for understanding technology and media within the context of modern postsecondary life. First, the use of ICTs by campus activists presents compelling evidence for expanding how educators understand the boundaries "traditionally imposed by less mobile, less connective, or less relational technologies" (Biddix, 2010b, p. 688) and the broadening postsecondary ecologies (Davis, 2015) within which today's students live, work, and learn. Second, Biddix's findings present new ways in which students build and manage interpersonal relationships, a critical component to effective organizing (Ganz, 2002), within expanded learning environments complete with their own logics, sensibilities, and worldviews as mediated by the use of ICTs.

More recent higher education research has attempted to re-center the use of technology by contemporary student activists in college (Biddix, 2010a; Davis, 2015; Gismondi & Osteen, 2017; Linder, Riggle, Myers, & Lacy, 2016). Others, however, have attempted to explore the relationship between new forms of online activist participation and the more traditional tactics undertaken by students. For example, Hope, Keels, and Durkee's (2016) study revealed that students' participation within Black Lives Matter (BLM) and Deferred Action (DACA) movements occurred both online (i.e., blogging, Facebook, Tumbler, or Twitter) and offline, the former of which remained broadly defined and limited self-reporting to a binary response of "yes" or "no." Gismondi and Osteen's (2017) case study of Fall 2015 protests at the University of Missouri (Mizzou), however, recognized the use of social media technologies by Black students to 1) raise awareness regarding campus racism, and 2) undertake citizen journalism as a method of live-reporting during the protest period. Although certainly important, these two particular findings remain consistent and merely confirm earlier social movement and communications scholarship on the broader use of media as an amplification and storytelling tool. Therefore, many questions with regard to the breadth and complexity of

technologies—and technology uses—by student activists remain. But, before engaging such questions, it is helpful to theoretically and conceptually situate technology and its use(s) within the context of social movement work. In order to do so, I discuss theoretical perspectives on resource mobilization (Jenkins, 1983; McCarthy & Zald, 1977) and Liverouw's (2011) conceptualization of alternative and activist new media.

Technologies as Material and Non-Material Resources

Resource mobilization theory (RMT), in the United States, arose in response to the insufficiencies of classical theories and out of research that concentrated on the ideologies that characterized and animated social movements. More specifically, the often-used social psychological focus on individual movement participation of earlier social movement scholarship required a theoretical shift toward approaches more conducive to integration with structural theories of social process (McCarthy & Zald, 1977). Unlike other theories, resource mobilization does not focus on decentralized social movement communities, collective identities, or movement participation and ideology. Rather, RMT seeks to explain the ways in which social movements, conceived organizationally rather than determined by informal actions of individuals, mobilize resources from within and *outside* the boundaries of the movement to reach their goals (Jenkins, 1983). RMT argues access to and effective mobilization (i.e., user efficacy) of material and non-material resources (Fuchs, 2006), and the development of political opportunities for movement members, determine a movement's ability to succeed (Flynn, 2011). Examples of material resources may include money, organizations, person power, means of communications, and media. Non-material resources may include movement legitimacy, loyalty, social relationships, networks and personal connections, public attention, authority, moral commitment, and solidarity (Fuchs, 2006).

Although fairly under-utilized in recent years, resource mobilization perspectives have recently been reengaged by scholars seeking to explain the role of ICTs in contemporary social movements. For example, Eltantawy and Weis's (2011) case study of the 2011 "Egyptian revolution" (i.e., Arab Spring) offers RMT as an explanatory framework for understanding how social media was used during anti-government protests. In their analyses, the authors recount the growth of Internet access and technology use among an already motivated citizenry within the prior decade. Combine with the increasingly hostile and complex political climate in late 2010 and early 2011, and prior experiments using sites like Facebook to organize a textile workers strike in 2008, numerous Egyptian activists leveraged social media platforms to include blogs, Twitter, and dedicated Facebook pages to disseminate information, garner ideological support, and mobilize protestors on the ground. Ultimately, the collective

efforts organized online (and on the ground) led to the resignation of Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak.

Lastly, two additional points help better situate the implications of technology use, particularly of social media, from the resource mobilization perspective. Specifically, as Joyce's (2011) preliminary theorization suggests, the interconnections afforded protestors by social media, broadly conceived, allows for the mobilization of both new *and* existing collectives of movement participants and organizations (Joyce, 2011). In addition, as communications scholars have suggested (Hemphill, Culotta, & Heston, 2013), social media has already been used to directly frame political issues in public discourses absent news media. Therefore, technologies not only provide sites of possibility to aid social movement organizations in mobilizing preexisting networks—now also online—as well as the mobilization of *new* networks, but also framing (i.e., movement framing/framing processes, Gamson, 1992; Benford & Snow, 2000) the narratives constructed around important movement issues, events, and opportunities. Additionally, and as Joyce (2011) further argues, perhaps the clearest implication of technologic resources is one of scale change. Specifically, technologies like social media enable dramatic increases in mobilization due to their expansive reach within and across social networks and relationships. These are points to which I will later return. For now, however, I find it necessary to provide some binding to the otherwise loose theoretical underpinnings of my argument. Let us turn to Lievrouw (2011), who provides a useful heuristic for making sense of how technology, as a resource, becomes operational in the hands of skilled organizers and activists. While the forthcoming illustrations, at least momentarily, fall outside the traditional contexts associated with higher education, they too will prove useful in the case analysis.

Conceptualizing Alternative and Activist New Media

New Media Defined

New media consists of three elements, which include 1) material artifacts and devices enabling and extending abilities to communicate and share meaning (e.g., social media), 2) communication activities and practices in which people engage as they develop and use devices (e.g., online sharing), and 3) the larger social arrangements and organizational forms created and built around artifacts and practices (Lievrouw, 2011; Lievrouw & Livingstone, 2002, 2006). Although all media share the aforementioned elements, Lievrouw (2011) notes four distinguishing factors differentiating new media from traditional or mass media. First, new media are "hybrid or recombinant technologies," (Lievrouw, 2011, p. 8) resistant to stability and continuously changing as a result of combining existing, older technologies (i.e., hardware) and communication systems (e.g., audio or video recording) with innovations (e.g., software applications

allowing for web-based or mobile uploads, downloads, and sharing of music). New media are also networked as a part of continuously reorganizing systems connecting technologies, organizations, and users. A third distinction of new media is its sense of ubiquity in contemporary society. While this notion has been—and should continue to be—contested (see Morris, 2000, 2001; see also Warshcauer, 2004), the frequent presence of new media nearly everywhere and its effects on people and contemporary society cannot be overstated. Lastly, unlike mass media, new media are interactive, giving users greater control over the information they receive from various sources, with whom they connect and build networks, and individual opportunity to participate and engage.

Alternative and Activist New Media

According to Lievrouw (2011), who has written a definitive work on the subject, "alternative and activist new media employ or modify existing communication artifacts, practices, and social arrangements of new information and communication technologies to challenge or alter dominant, expected, or accepted ways of doing society, culture, and politics" (p. 19). The cultural roots and sensibilities of alternative and activist new media can be traced back to Dadaism, an informal arts movement in Europe and the United States protesting World War I through the manipulation of traditional art and mass media (Dietrich, Doherty, Kriebel, & Dickerman, 2005; Hopkins, 2004). In the 1950s and 1960s, French artists and writers of Situationist International revived Dadaism. Responding to pervasive consumerism, militarism, and ideological spectacle generated by global mass media, Situationists used popular media technologies to interrupt mainstream culture and politics (Lievrouw, 2011). Similarly, alternative and activist new media extend the Situationists' tradition to modern practices, of which Lievrouw (2011) contends there are five basic genres (see also Table 7.1): *alternative computing, commons knowledge, culture jamming, mediated mobilization, and participatory journalism* (italics in original, p. 23). This chapter, however, only further explores two genres, which are discussed briefly in the next subsection.

Mediated Mobilization and Culture Jamming

Mediated mobilization uses new media as means to mobilize toward collective action in which active participants in processes of social change can organize and work together (Lievrouw, 2011). It is principally concerned with the nature and distribution of power in society, and radically promotes participatory forms of democracy in which widespread, direct involvement of citizens—rather than elected officials—actively contribute to political processes and governance. As mobilization theorists have centralized the importance of interpersonal social networks (i.e., mobilization structures), the mediated mobilization perspective

TABLE 7.1 Alternative and Activist New Media (Lievrouw, 2011)

Genre	Social Domains	Forms	Purposes
Alternative Computing	Popular culture, mainstream media, corporate advertising	Appropriated images, sound, text from popular culture	Cultural critique, political and economic commentary
Common Knowledge	Computing, telecoms, media infrastructure (hardware and software)	Hacking, open source system design, file sharing	Open access to and use of information and IT
Culture Jamming	Reporting, news, commentary, public opinion	Online news services, blogs, indie media	Covering under-reported groups and issues, investigative reporting
Mediated Mobilization	Social movements, identity, cultural politics, lifestyles	Social media, mobs, virtual worlds, blogs	Activist mobilization, lifestyle examples ("prophecy")
Participatory Journalism	Expertise, academic/ technical disciplines and institutions, socially sanctioned knowledges	Tagging, bookmarking, wikis, "crowdsourcing"	Mobilizing "outsiders"

superimposes the importance of communication networks entrenched in inter-connected new media and new media users. Unlike traditional mass media perspectives, which are suited to frame the deployment of consistent, repetitive messaging to large, heterogeneous audiences, new media perspectives challenge such notions with a more dynamic view of a society comprised of constantly reorganizing, interrelated networks of people and information (Castells, 1996). In this way, mediated mobilization, particularly in social and political move-ments, relies on people's ability to develop reciprocity, cultivate relationships, construct shared meanings, and amass and trade "reputational capital" online (Madden, Fox, Smith, & Vitak, 2007; May, 2001) as well as moving people to the streets (Van Aelst & Walgrave, 2002). This goes beyond the action of merely using new media. Rather, Juris (2008) posits mediated mobilization activists and organizers are fully understanding of the "cultural logic[s] of networking" (p. 11) and have incorporated them in various aspects of movement values and action, both online and off.

   In the context of new media, Lievrouw (2011) defines culture jamming as a mode of media activist projects in which images, sounds, and text are

appropriated from popular culture (e.g., entertainment, advertising, art and music, literature, and cinema) for points of social and cultural critique, political commentary, and similar analyses online. Put differently, culture jamming captures and subverts conceptual culture presented by mainstream media in effort to make critical points; a strategy Peretti (2001) says "turns corporate power against itself by co-opting, hacking, mocking, and re-contextualizing meanings" (p. 1). Carducci (2006) notes:

> In terms of media, culture jamming endeavors to achieve transparency, that is, to mitigate the asymmetrical effects of power and other distortions in the communications apparatus, cutting through the clutter as it were to clarify otherwise obscured meaning.
>
> *(p. 118)*

Handelman and Kozinets (2004) define 'culture jamming' as "an organized, social activist effort that aims to counter the bombardment of consumption-oriented messages in the mass media" (n.p.).

Case Analysis: The Dream Defenders

The #TAKEOVERFL Campaign

On June 10, 2013, the murder trial of George Zimmerman in the shooting death of an unarmed, Black Miami Gardens teen, Trayvon Martin, began in Seminole County. On July 13, after 16 hours of deliberating, the Seminole County Court found Zimmerman not guilty of second-degree murder and voluntary manslaughter, a lesser charge, in the February killing of Martin. Immediately following Zimmerman's exoneration, the Dream Defenders initiated #TAKEOVERFL (i.e., The Takeover), a 31-day mediated mobilization campaign to occupy the Florida Capitol building in Tallahassee and strategically agitate Florida's executive and legislative branches of government.

In response to the acquittal of George Zimmerman a day earlier, the Dream Defenders mass-mobilized college students (and recent alumni) from around the state—and the nation—to take residence in the office of the incumbent Republican governor, Rick Scott. They solicited participation online (i.e., mediated mobilization), using Twitter, Facebook, and Instagram to inform college students and citizens (near established Dream Defenders chapters at colleges and universities throughout the state) of their intentions to "take Tallahassee" on July 16, and to join in their demand for "justice" for Trayvon Martin. At this time, justice was in the form of advancing a three-part legislation entitled *Trayvon's Law*, which proposed reformative policy to remediate the conditions the Dream Defenders believed contributed to Martin's untimely

death (i.e., prognostic framing). This included 1) dismantling of the school-to-prison pipeline (e.g., zero-tolerance discipline in schools leading to juvenile incarceration), 2) ending racial and bias-based profiling, and 3) repealing of Florida's "Stand Your Ground" law(s).[1]

Throughout the occupation, the Dream Defenders engaged the act mobilization as a recursive, mediated practice, which is to say frequent online efforts to mobilize participants, legitimacy, and solidarity were undertaken. For example, after the initial launch of "The Takeover," the collective established #TakeoverTuesday, a weekly mass mobilization for outsiders to join the Dream Defenders in the Capitol building. In part, this specific mediated mobilization practice was for purposes of defusing the organizing labor of constant occupation over an extended period of time. Furthermore, it was also an opportunity for others to learn more about their issues and demands, participate in occupation activities (e.g., civil disobedience trainings, political education workshops, and healing spaces), or provide various forms of support. In both cases, the Dream Defenders had harnessed new media to mobilize human resources to the Capitol and, as result, develop greater legitimacy and solidarity through the purposeful facilitation of relational organizing activities.

The #NEVERLOVEDUS Campaign

On February 15, 2014, the same day on which Michael Dunn was granted a mistrial for first-degree murder charges in the November 23, 2012, killing of unarmed Black teen Jordan Davis, the Dream Defenders launched an activist new media project/campaign entitled "#NEVERLOVEDUS." As a hashtag, #NEVERLOVEDUS was used to aggregate stories, pictures, and videos produced by Dream Defenders (and others) describing or alluding to the ways in which the United States—as a nation-state—has historically engaged in systemic and institutional racism—ultimately to the criminalization, incarceration, and death—extrajudicial and judicial—of Black and Brown people. More specifically, however, #NEVERLOVEDUS was predominantly a gallery of digital artwork first released by the Dream Defenders on Instagram, a web and mobile photo sharing application. From a period of February 15 until March 4, 51 different graphics were released as part of the #NEVERLOVEDUS gallery, which was made digitally available in its entirety via the organization's website (http://dreamdenders.org/goodkidsmadcities).

The campaign hashtag and language framing the emic conceptualization were sampled from a hook (i.e., refrain or chorus) in Canadian-born actor turned Grammy Award-winning rapper Drake's (full name, Aubrey Drake Graham) song "Worst Behavior." On February 14, 2014, in a nationally televised interview with MSNBC's Chris Hayes, the former executive director of

Dream Defenders, Umi Selah (formerly Phillip Agnew), deconstructed what was meant by invoking "never loved us" in their campaign:

> When we say Florida never loved us, when we say America never loved us, it's quite clear to us . . . that we live in a state that doesn't care about us. And so, it's important that when we lay out our case against a state of Florida that the state of Florida understands that we have a common understanding: that we live in a state that has caused our education system to hemorrhage; we arrest more kids and put them in adult prisons than any other state. And so, when tourists come here and they go to Disney World and see a place where dreams come true, that's basically the only place in Florida where that happens. And so, Florida never loved us. "America never loved us" is our clear proclamation that we have an understanding that we live in a state that shows no care for young people of color.
>
> *(Hayes & Agnew, 2014)*

Ultimately, the #NEVERLOVEDUS artwork illustrated Selah's aforementioned remarks through subversively employing three artistic expressions, which I have defined as *the personal*, *the political*, and *the historical*. *The personal* refers to images sampling the likenesses of Black and Brown youth killed by police or citizen vigilantism, but also, as will be discussed separately, the prospective youth victims of future state violence and criminalization. The second category, *the political*, refers to images in which likenesses of Florida political figures deemed culpable and complicit in the aforementioned diagnoses, have been sampled in the construction of the graphic. The third and last category to which I refer is *the historical*, which samples photographs from the Jim Crow South to draw connections to a historical legacy of violent harassment and racial discrimination. In particular, monochrome black and white archival photos depicting the use of dogs and water hoses against Black civilians were used as watermark images, in front of which the #NEVERLOVEDUS text helps situate the longstanding historical use of state power and anti-Black violence as a counter-protest tactic.

Conclusion

The study of student activism has been essential to understanding important issues within higher education, the least of which include complex dimensions of campus climate for racially minoritized and other historically marginalized groups. Furthermore, student activism as a symptom of campus climate has often reflected the existing sociopolitical climate off and away from campus. And, although greater attention has been given to the study of student activism

and social movements more recently (Broadhurst & Martin, 2014; Worthington & Rhoads, 2016), greater understanding of protest phenomena and organizing practices within the current sociopolitical moment is needed. The Dream Defenders are but one contemporary example of the ways in which student activists and social justice organizers are skillfully using technologies as a part of their tactical repertoire. In particular, the above case demonstrates the role social media plays in the mobilization of resources, especially on-the-ground person power, as well as serving as a resource itself utilized to frame issue narratives and garner broader legitimacy. However, as technologies continue to develop and new tools are introduced into the market—and are utilized by student activists—greater empirical evidence will be required to determine their tactical viability for achieving movement goals. This is especially important given the extent to which students are able to access and experience, albeit voyeuristically, potential tactics from student organizations at colleges and universities across the nation and perhaps the world.

Note

1. Florida's "Stand Your Ground" law was first introduced in 2005 as Senate Bill 436, an amendment to existing chapter 776, Florida Statute, "to create presumptions relating to the Castle Doctrine and to remove one's duty to retreat before using force in certain instances outside one's home" (Cunningham, 2013, p. 1).

References

Benford, R. D., & Snow, D. A. (2000). Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *26*(1), 611–39.

Biddix, J. P. (2010a). Relational leadership and technology: A study of Activist College Women Leaders (ACLWs). *Journal about Women in Higher Education*, *3*(1), 2547.

Biddix, J. P. (2010b). Technology uses in campus activism from 2000 to 2008: Implications for civic learning. *Journal of College Student Development*, *51*(6), 679–693.

Broadhurst, C., & Martin, G. (Eds.). (2014). *Radical academia? Understanding campus climates for campus activists*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Carducci, V. (2006). Culture jamming: A sociological perspective. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, *6*, 116–138.

Castells, M. (1996). *The rise of the network society: The information age: Economy, society, and culture* (Vol. 1). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Cunningham, R. (2013). *House of representatives staff analysis HB4003 use of deadly force in defense of a person*. Retrieved from http://www.flsenate.gov/Session/Bill/2014/4003/Analyses/h4003a.CRJS.PDF.

Davis III, C.H.F. (2015). *Dream defending, on-campus and beyond: A multi-sited ethnography of contemporary student organizing, the social movement repertoire, and social movement organization in college*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ.

DeBlois, P. B., & Oblinger, D. G. (2007). Learning technologies that serve students. In G. L. Kramer & J. N. Gardner (Eds.), *Fostering student success in the campus community* (pp. 145–170). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Dietrich, D., Doherty, B., Kriebel, S., & Dickerman, L. (2005). *Dada: Zurick, Berlin, Hannover, Cologne, New York, Paris*. New York, NY: National Gallery of Art in association with D.A.P./Distributed Art Publishers.

Eltantawy, N., & Weis, J. (2011). Social media in the Egyptian revolution: Reconsidering resource mobilization. *International Journal of Communication*, *5*, 1207–1224.

Flynn, S.I. (2011). Resource mobilization theory. In Salem Press' (Eds.), *Theories off social movements*, pp. 26–36. Pasadena, CA: Salem Press.

Fuchs, C. (2006). The self-organization of social movements. *Systemic Practice and Action Research*, *19*(1), 101–137.

Gamson, W. A. (1992). *Talking politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ganz, M. (2002). What is organizing? *Social Policy*, *32*(1), 16–18.

Gismondi, A., & Osteen, L. (2017). Student activism in the technology age. In J. Ahlquist & L. Endersby (Eds.), *New directions for student leadership* (Vol. 153, pp. 63–73). New York, NY: Wiley-Blackwell.

Gladwell, M. (2010, October 4). Small change: Why the revolution will not be tweeted. *The New Yorker*. Retrieved from www.newyorker.com/magazine/2010/10/04/small-change-malcolm-gladwell

Handelman, J. M., & Kozinets, R. V. (2004). *Proposed encyclopedia of sociology entry on "culture jamming."* Unpublished manuscript.

Hayes, C. (Interviewer) & Agnew, P. (Interviewee). (2014). *All In with Chris Hayes* [Interview transcript]. Retrieved from NBC New Website: http://www.nbcnews.com/id/54428650/ns/msnbc-all_in_with_chris_hayes/t/all-chris-hayes-monday-february/#.VFvlfVPF-1A.

Hemphill, L., Culotta, A., & Heston, M. (2013). *Framing in social media: How the US congress uses twitter hashtags to frame political issues*. Retrieved from SSRN http://ssrn.com/abstract=2317335

Hope, E.C., Keels, M., & Durkee, M.I. (2016). Participation in Black Lives Matter and Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals: Modern activism among Black and Latino college students. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *9*(3), 203–15.

Hopkins, D. (2004). *Dada and surrealism: A very short introduction*. Oxford and New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, C. (1983). Resource mobilization theory and the study of social movements. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *9*(1), 527–554.

Joyce, M. (2011, April 6). *Mobilization structures and a dig at Gladwell* [Web log post]. Retrieved from www.meta-activism.org/2011/04/mobilizing-structures-and-a-dig-at-gladwell/

Juris, J. S. (2008). *Networking futures: The movements against corporate globalization*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Lievrouw, L.A. (2011). *Alternative and activist new media*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Lievrouw, L., & Livingstone, S. (Eds.). (2002). *Handbook of new media: Social shaping and consequences of ICTs*. London, UK: Sage Publications.

Lievrouw, L., & Livingstone, S. (Eds.). (2006). *Handbook of new media: Social shaping and consequences of ICTs* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Sage Publications.

Linder, C., Myers, J. S., Riggle, C., & Lacy, M. (2016). From margins to mainstream: Social media as a tool for campus sexual violence activism. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *9*(3), 231–244.

Madden, M., Fox, S., Smith, A., & Vitak, J. (2007). *Digital footprints: Online identity management and search in the age of transparency*. Washington, DC: Pew Internet and American Life Project.

May, T. C. (2001). Crypto anarchy and virtual communities. In P. Ludlow (Ed.), *Crypto anarchy, cyberstates, and private utopias* (pp. 65–79). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

McCarthy, J., & Zald, M. (1977). Resource mobilization and social movements: A partial theory. *American Journal of Sociology*, *82*(6), 1212–1241.

Morris, A. (2000). Reflections on social movement theory: Criticisms and proposals. *Contemporary Sociology*, *29*(3), 445–454.

Morris, M. (2001). Contradictions of postmodern consumerism and resistance. *Studies in Political Economy*, *64*, 7–29.

Peretti, J. (2001, April 9). My Nike media adventure. *The Nation*. Retrieved October 4, 2014 from www.thenation.com/article/my-nike-media-adventure

Rhoads, R. A. (1998). *Freedom's web: Student activism in an age of cultural diversity*. Baltimore, MD: J. Hopkins University Press.

Seay, L. (2014, March 12). Does slacktivism work? *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2014/03/12/does-slacktivism-work/?utm_term=.bd437915a745

Tilly, C. (2004). *Social movements*: 1768–2004. London, UK: Paradigm Publishers.

Van Aelst, P., & Walgrave, S. (2002). New media, new movements? The role of the internet in shaping the "anti-globalization" movement. *Information, Communication & Society*, *5*(4), 465–493.

Warshcauer, M. (2004). *Technology and social inclusion: Rethinking the digital divide*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Wilen-Daugenti, T. (2009). *Edu: Technology and learning environments in higher education*. New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing.

Worthington, R., & Rhoads, R. (Eds.). (2016). Student activism [Special issue]. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *9*(3).

The Role of Non-Student Campus Actors

8

POLITICS AND PEDAGOGY IN THE CLASSROOM

From Rehearsal to Performance

Amy Wilkinson

Introduction

Colleges and universities are increasingly called upon to prepare students for the demands of a diverse democracy. Additionally, students' ability to rise to the inherent challenges of informed civic action depends, in part, on the development of what Morgan (2016) has termed *political fluency*. Political fluency refers to one's "self-awareness of political understanding, resources, and outcomes that constitute the development of political identity" (p. 179). A college is a place where students' political identity development is influenced by exposure to peers with differing social identities and experience with coursework that challenges belief systems (Morgan & Orphan, 2016). As hooks (1994) notes, "the classroom remains the most radical space of possibility in the academy" (p. 12). When colleges and universities use curricula and pedagogical approaches to facilitate students' political identity development, they provide a rehearsal of citizenship in the "roiling context of pedagogic inquiry and hands-on experiences" (The National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement, 2012, p. 2). Given the significance of the classroom as a site at which students engage with politics, the purpose of this chapter is to illuminate connections between pedagogical structures and the development of students' political identity. More specifically, this chapter explores dancemaking and provides a creative lens through which to understand teaching methodologies common to other disciplines.

Dance is an appropriate metaphor for practicing democracy for numerous reasons. Art-making is widely acknowledged to be intensely personal and inherently requiring of risk (Young, 2012). For example, dance students are encouraged to own the physical spaces their bodies occupy. They are invited to hold physical positions that create discomfort as well as to collaborate with others

in the navigation of complex movement phrases. Furthermore, rehearsal and performance are fundamental aspects of the choreographic process. Rehearsal, like many learning processes, is a fraught exercise and one that requires vulnerability. Occurring within semi-private spaces, rehearsal is generally low stakes. Performance, however, occurs in the public sphere for *everyone* to witness and can, therefore, raise the stakes quite considerably.

Consequently, when viewing classrooms through a creative lens, they have the potential to be locations where identity politics are acknowledged, tribalism is transcended, and where challenges to habitual ways of thinking are embraced. The classroom should be a place where diverse artists and scholars are encouraged to be innovative, to collaborate, and to make meaning out of learning experiences. Put differently, more college classes should rehearse students to 1) rhetorically defend the *intellectual* spaces they occupy, 2) consider the value of positions that create discomfort, and 3) collaborate with others to navigate complex social issues. By doing this, we are preparing students to engage more effectively when they are faced with high stakes public performances of political identity and democratic engagement.

The Pedagogy and Practice of Politics in Higher Education

Although dance is the entry point, this chapter endeavors to expand knowledge about pedagogical scaffolding that can be utilized beyond arts programs in any postsecondary classroom space. The next section will introduce the concept of political identity as a social construct and will provide framing for political learning in college. The chapter will continue with a discussion of feminist teaching and will give background on notable elements of dance training and curricula at the college level. The closing case study investigates feminist approaches to education that contribute to students' political identity development. Dance may be uniquely positioned within the university, but it offers a window through which to observe the transformative experiences that shape students' political sense-making.

Center Stage: Political Identity as a Social Construct

Identity development is regularly conceptualized as a three-dimensional structure, comprising of one's meaning-making capabilities (epistemology), sense of self (the intrapersonal), and relationships to others (the interpersonal) (Baxter Magolda, 2001; Johnson, 2017). Furthermore, the multiple dimensions of identities model depicts how college students' social identities emerge, suggesting that they are not enduring, but fluid and performed variably within different contexts (Abes, Jones, & McEwen's, 2007; Morgan, 2016). Despite these theories, Morgan (2016) contends that no formal or comprehensive theory exists to explain how a sense of one's political self is formed during college. Until

recently, research has focused on political engagement outcomes such as knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors, rather than political identity as an underlying construct that is as integral to the totality of one's identity as race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, or nationality (Johnson, 2017; Morgan, 2016). The classroom, or in this case the dance studio, is one context where we can observe 'rehearsal' linked to students' 'performances' of political identity.

Raising the Curtain on Political Learning in College

A report issued from The National Task Force on Civic Learning and Engagement (2012) notes that parties outside higher education demand curricula that is driven by "labor market needs" (p. 9). Simultaneously, the pressure to increase graduation rates can erroneously force administrators into a choice between emphasizing degree completion and education for citizenship (The National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement, 2012). Training students to be politically engaged means recognizing the false argument of sacrificing civic pedagogy for jobs or graduation rates.

Another issue is that wholly integrated civic learning has been relegated to the periphery of postsecondary education and has been replaced by a single element: service learning. It is notable that the language around service learning is often focused on *community* rather than *democracy* (Musil, 2017). Teaching for political learning means moving curricula beyond the relative safety of apolitical volunteerism and service. Classroom instruction must be shifted to engage students in the messy "problems of democracy" (Thomas, 2015, para. 13). Civic pedagogies boldly move current events and controversial subjects to the center of class discussions, allowing students to enact simulations of democratic processes much like a dancer rehearses steps in the studio before performing them onstage (Thomas, 2015, para. 13; The National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement, 2012).

As Musil (2017) notes, despite some investment in engaged pedagogies, partnerships, and problem solving, focus on teaching for civic impact remains "scarce in one of the most fertile, yet fallow, arenas for civic learning: a student's major area of specialized study" (para. 11). Students who encounter political learning in lower level courses may discover an abandonment of that emphasis as they move into major courses of study, like dance, where they will spend up to 35% of their time in college (Musil, 2017). If, as Thomas (2015) argues, democracy is a culture, a "set of principles and practices that guide American life" (para. 13), it is incumbent upon departmental leaders to embed civic learning outcomes in majors' curricula that progress as students make their way towards their degrees.

While a body of research has begun to address factors such as the role of student affairs professionals (Hoffman, Domagal-Goldman, King, & Robinson, 2018), campus climate (Morgan & Davis, forthcoming), and institutional

missions (Morphew & Hartley, 2006) that influence college students' political identity development, very little of this research centers on how political fluency might be linked to creative processes found within fine and performing arts programs. Of particular interest is the representation of women's voices in this literature. Research is especially thin on college dance curricula that overwhelmingly serve female students (Ross, 2002; Risner, 2010; Risner & Musil, 2017). These considerations warrant a look at feminist pedagogy as an approach to educating for socially responsible and informed citizenship.

The Main Role of Feminist Pedagogy in Political Learning

Feminist pedagogy runs counter to traditional modes of teaching and is driven by values that center nonhierarchical social arrangements, interpersonal connections, collaboration, uncertainty in the learning process, and challenges to unquestioned norms and injustices in society (Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, & Tarule, 1986; hooks, 1994; Shue & Beck, 2001; Conrad, Dortch, & DeNoon, 2012). hooks (1994) contends that feminist teaching transgresses boundaries confining pupils to a "rote, assembly-line approach to teaching" (p. 13) that echoes the Freirean concept of educational banking (Freire, 1970). Additional writing on feminist pedagogy within artistic processes encourages playfulness and risk-taking (Juhl, 2007; Cole, 2008; Young, 2012). In addition to allowing for creativity, liberatory pedagogy aligns with feminist practices in a classroom that emphasizes a democratic orientation (Barr & Oliver, 2016; hooks, 1994). In dance, since the body is the site at which "institutional contracts between society and its citizens are enacted" pedagogy might be linked directly to issues around social justice including the value and control of bodies and their physical autonomy in society (Ross, 2002, p. 115). It is these foundational values, that must lead to an examination of traditional models of dance curriculum in particular and pedagogy more broadly.

A Backstage View of Dance Curriculum and Pedagogy

Female dance students constitute the majority of artists in major programs at 86% (Risner & Musil, 2017). Furthermore, dance in higher education has provided women opportunities for leadership, a place to have agency and control over their bodies, and the experience of developing their artistic voices. At the same time, authoritarian approaches to dance pedagogy coupled with narrow curricula have often served to force adherence to rigid aesthetic parameters, thereby "disciplining the very bodies it [sets] in motion" and ultimately diminishing women's agency within creative processes (Ross, 2002, p. 115). The same can be said for dancers of color and other marginalized groups. Inclusivity is demonstrated by the faculty hiring of professionals who challenge boundaries of gender, sexuality, class, and race; yet many curricular structures serve to

normalize the values of a European-derived movement vocabulary that privileges a White Western aesthetic, devalues other movement perspectives, and perpetuates inequity (Nur Amin, 2016).

Criticism of the professional approach from some scholars has sparked questions about whether or not dance in higher education has moved away from practices that are "individually liberating, conceptually based, and creatively focused" (Hagood, 2000, p. 21). Perhaps the crux of the issue is that despite the fact that the establishment of curricular and pedagogical traditions associated with the professional model has allowed dance programs to thrive within university settings, those very traditions stand in opposition to a conceptualization of creativity that embraces experiment, novelty, and change.

Dance, like other disciplines, in higher education illuminates a marriage between narrow curricula and pedagogical practice that has given rise to the professional model of training (Bonbright, 2000; Hagood, 2000; Ross, 2002; Risner, 2010), which continues to prioritize rote performance over the development of creative capacity (Smith-Autard, 2002; Watson, Nordin-Bates, & Chappell, 2012). In dance, the pedagogical emphasis remains on kinesthetic knowledge and students are built into technicians who often value product over process (Kerr-Berry, 2005). In the same way that traditional models of education focus on students' ability to demonstrate learning by a regurgitation of facts and figures, dancers are expected to "regurgitate" movement phrases without creative preparation (Kerr-Berry, 2005).

Case Study: Razor Burn

Thus far I have argued that the body is socio-politically inscribed and therefore manifests political values. To further this notion, it is useful to focus more narrowly on pedagogical structures that facilitate students' performance of their political identities. Dance offers an ideal window into this phenomenon as rehearsal and performance are intrinsically linked to the discipline. In addition, by virtue of the choreographic process, dancers are regularly asked to inhabit roles or to *embody* characters whose salient identities differ from their own.

This case study investigated the rehearsal and performance of an original student-choreographed dancework entitled *Razor Burn* that explores themes such as the role of the 'unapologetic woman' in American society, conventional standards of femininity in popular culture, and intersectional feminism. Specific research questions investigated via qualitative data collection methods were as follows: 1) What is the process of political identity development for women dance majors involved in a dance performance with a political message? 2) How does dance performance as political engagement intersect more broadly with dance curriculum and pedagogy?

An abridged version of *Razor Burn* premiered in the Spring of 2017 at a mid-size private institution's annual Dance Composition Showcase and was fully

produced the following fall at the school's Mainstage Dance Concert. The piece was subsequently performed at several additional venues including a men's basketball half-time event, a regional convening of the American College Dance Association Conference (ACDA), and an undergraduate research symposium. For a video link to *Razor Burn* as well as a full description of how the work was created, please see here: www.amywilkinsondance.com/writing/.

Research Approach

I utilized a qualitative inquiry approach and design for this study, drawing a purposive sample of 12 dancers (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003). All the participants identified as women and, of the 12, five identified as White, two as White/Hispanic, two as Black, one as Bi-racial Black/Asian (Japanese), and one as Bi-racial Black/White. Included in this sample were eight dancers who identified as Democrat, one Republican, one Independent, and two who identified as apolitical. The participants also ranged from rising sophomores to graduating seniors and were mostly from the Midwest, except for one who grew up primarily in Japan and one who was born and raised in Puerto Rico. Participant demographics are summarized in Table 8.1.

Participants submitted online surveys that captured basic demographic information as well as metrics on students' political affiliations. Seven dancers were then sampled for unstructured interviews. I utilized inductive coding as a heuristic in order to assign units of meaning to information provided in the interviews (Johnson & Christensen, 2004). This process involved initial and in vivo coding followed by focused coding in order to draw out the most salient codes as a means of synthesizing, integrating, and organizing large amounts of data (Saldana, 2016).

TABLE 8.1 Participants in Razor Burn Study

Pseudonym	Class Standing	Role
Ariana	Senior	Ensemble Member
Beatrice	Junior	Soloist
Jacqueline	Freshman	Ensemble Member
Jane	Junior	Ensemble Member
Lori	Sophomore	Understudy
Maggie	Sophomore	Ensemble Member
Mary	Senior	Choreographer
Shay	Senior	Ensemble Member
Shelby	Sophomore	Ensemble Member
Talia	Sophomore	Rehearsal Assistant
Tina	Junior	Ensemble Member
Veronica	Junior	Understudy

Concerning my positionality in this study, I recognize that my views are directly shaped by my identity as an able-bodied, cis-gendered, heterosexual, White woman, who is working to confront a personal relationship to privilege and power in multiple contexts. In adhering to a post–positivistic mindset (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003), I assume that my role as an educator with relationships to study participants, my experiences training in multiple dance disciplines, and my professional performance career influences my interpretation of data and findings, as does my understanding of the current political climate in the United States and my own responses to the rhetoric of the 2016 presidential campaign, the results of that election, and its aftermath.

Revelations in the Creative Process

The research questions driving this study centered pedagogy within a creative process in order to investigate the rehearsal and performance of college women dancers' political identities. Fundamental to this work was Morgan's (2016) concept of *acquiring an attitude of political fluency* "or the ability to understand, interact with, and operate in a political system consonant with a student's self-perception" (p. 174). The findings present illustrative quotes that focus on feminist pedagogy as an influential factor in students' rehearsal and performance of their political identities. Building on the findings, the final section concludes with broad curricular and pedagogical implications for a wide array of instructors and administrators that interface with academic affairs.

Student's Political Frame of Reference

It is well documented in policy research that context matters when determining the success of applying research to programming (Wise & Shafer, 2015). If this case study is to provide real world applications for teaching, it is important to acknowledge the contextual factors that influenced the *Razor Burn* dancers' perceptions of politics and political engagement. For example, it is clear that the 2016 presidential election provided a prism through which these students viewed the political world. In creating the piece, the cast of *Razor Burn* was well aware that the work existed as a text within broader political discourse, and dancers were asked to navigate conflicting aspects of their political identities via the creative process within a politically complex landscape. While a full discussion of students' political frames of reference is outside the scope of this chapter, a more detailed investigation can be found in Wilkinson and Morgan's (2018) exploration of these findings.

Feminist Pedagogy and Politics in the Classroom

The dancers in *Razor Burn* were prepared for a rehearsal process that challenged them to recognize sexist and racist operational structures because they

experienced a feminist approach to teaching in their general coursework. Despite negative connotations associated with political systems and the visibility of political conflicts over the past year, students regularly voiced an appreciation for engaging with politics in the classroom and emphasized how difficult conversations involving multiple perspectives on race, gender, and privilege were critical to learning and building community. Responding to a question about linking politics to dance curricula, Ariana, a senior ensemble member stated, "I can't express how thankful I am for that—because my strong political and activist identity I discovered here" (Ariana).

On the other hand, while dancers demonstrated a value of centering politics in class discussions, they simultaneously articulated a desire to uncouple dance training from the political. Shelby, a sophomore ensemble member, clarified some of this dissonance by acknowledging:

> I am thankful and grateful that the focus (in the dance curriculum) is on social justice. It's kind difficult because some of the topics are like hot and heavy, so that's difficult to deal with. Also, just different opinions and views are difficult to deal with. There's times I just like—I just wanna be like—I just wanna dance.

These comments surface the tensions students experience in finding congruence as one of the primary endeavors of political identity development. Interestingly, the older the student and further along in dance program coursework, the more comfortable she was with the degree to which politics were embedded within the curriculum. This suggests that a familiarity with feminist pedagogy was a potential factor in students' ability to navigate political dissonance. Furthermore, while tensions created challenges for students and caused discomfort, they also provided opportunities for learning through the development of political identity. As Shelby stated:

> I mean it has made me grow not only as a dancer but intellectually. Like my mom even tells me—like, "Your brother and sister were not where you are like at your age. I feel like you've really matured and like grown," and I think that's—not only is that just like the dance program in general, it's because we have such—we just have so many discussions about things that matter in the world—probably mean more than dancing—Like it's important that we have conversations.

Ultimately, the choreographic process for *Razor Burn* was built on other dance program coursework and incorporated many of elements of feminist teaching with a particular commitment to resisting norms, relationships, collaboration, and self-authorship.

A Feminist Approach to Rehearsal

Resisting Norms

Mary, a senior and the choreographer for *Razor Burn*, stated directly that based on her definition of politics and its relationship to personhood, the piece was intended to be a political statement:

> I mean it reflects my politics and everything that I am—which everything that I am I feel can be qualified as political. . . . I mean it reflects what I feel about men taking responsibility for and being in charge of women's bodies, and what it means for women to take up space.

Furthermore, Mary's choreographic process, which unfolded over 12 months of rehearsal, was rooted in her understanding of political identity in that she drew from traditional concepts of femininity in order to topple them as an act of rebellion:

> I would say we talked a lot about womanhood (in rehearsal) and—I mentioned this before—what women are constantly apologizing for. So, like I remember being like, I feel like I constantly have to apologize for swearing all time, and that I eat all the time, I'm just disgusting, and why am I apologizing to myself for that?

Razor Burn dancers spoke consistently about how the work empowered them to resist hegemony, invoking the 2016 presidential election as well as Donald Trump's misogynistic rhetoric. Talia, a sophomore rehearsal assistant, stated:

> Trump's comments about women—we discussed that in *Razor Burn* rehearsals. And so I know a lot of the girls were channeling that. And just this whole patriarchal idea of what women should be and what they shouldn't be has been magnified in recent years, has definitely been political I'd say, and these ideas—they're in *Razor Burn*.

That the content of the work required an engagement with feminism more broadly meant that dancers were required to navigate their own beliefs about women's political power and agency by embodying the role of the "unapologetic woman."

Relationships and Collaboration

As the choreographer of the piece, Mary communicated an unwillingness to claim that status as an individual and chose instead to focus on the collaborative nature of her artistic process.

> Okay, so if I were to identify my role—it's always so hard . . . I guess
> I would say a leader of the piece. Leader. But it's hard for me to say
> choreographer—"I created that." Because I did create it. I created the idea
> of it, but it was like also like everyone's constant faith in me and faith in
> each other to create it. . . . And honestly—like most of the parts of *Razor
> Burn* that came to life were from like just funny ideas that I actually really
> wanted to do but felt insecure about them. So, I would bring them up as a
> joke and I would try to be like "I have this funny idea of someone eating
> a burger" and they'd be like, "let's do it!" And that's why—once again—I
> owe so much to the women in the piece. It's like they were the ones who
> were like, "why can't you do it?" like you're right! why can't I do it?

Despite the diversity within the group, an agreed upon commitment to
cooperation created a supportive atmosphere in which all voices were valued.
Shared narratives were key as Ariana noted:

> (Mary) allowed us to share our own experiences like as women. Like if we
> had anything to share with the group—like you know we kind of created
> this piece together. The way she did it was she asked us to think about the
> things that as women we were told "no—you can't." And then we shared
> those things. And then we like created gestures for them and someone
> said, I think it was Mary, "like eating in a disgusting way, like opening
> your legs, like cursing, like saying bad words." I said shaving. Some people
> said like doing your hair. So, all those things started to emerge.

It was clear that Mary was not viewed as the sole authority in the room and
the dancers co-constructed the meaning of the piece, a process that is echoed
in the interpersonal aspect of political identity development. The collaborative
nature of the learning process clearly built intimacy and trust within the group
and, as a result, self-authorship as an aspect of embodiment was able to flourish
as well.

Self-Authorship

Self-authorship in creating a role was important for Beatrice, the soloist who
starts onstage alone in the darkness at the beginning of the piece. The perform-
ing artist who played this part was Bi-racial and the choreography required her
to dance to a spoken word poem by Ashlee Haze (*Blood Orange*) that explored
the representation of Black women in American media and culture. Beatrice
spoke at length about how the rehearsal process allowed her to apply her Black
identity for the first time in a way that felt particularly political:

> I was like very hesitant at first, like when I found out what the solo
> was—especially with what the music is saying—what the poem is saying.

Because it talks about Black representation. I felt like my experiences being Black are very different than a lot of other people's. In some ways I feel like my experience being Black can be a choice because I have a lighter complexion and I felt uncomfortable representing Black people when my perspective is so different. And that goes into a whole other thing—but my identity is very unique in that I don't fit into a specific mold on either side of my racial components. I felt almost uncomfortable being biracial and representing what the words were saying, but then I had to kind of check myself and be like, "You are Black! You can't escape that—you are Black." What I kind of feel like I'm saying is, "I am Black." Like, that is what I feel like I'm saying in my solo! And telling people that there is no one definition to being a Black woman.

Beatrice affirmed that *Razor Burn* made a strong political statement and agreed that the work reflected her personal politics. Creating it allowed her to apply her political identity in a 'louder' way than she typically might in other circumstances: "I'm not loud, but (*Razor Burn*) gives me the space to be loud. And I think that's valuable. And I'm not loud by nature but I like being part of things that *are* loud" (Beatrice).

In co-creating the solo, Mary acknowledged that racial identity was a driving force in *Razor Burn*'s politics and was clear that she wanted Beatrice to have a primary voice:

I still to this day feel so skeptical that I created (the solo) because I'm not Black. But the one thing that does make it okay for me is that I never give Beatrice any direction. Of course, we created that choreography together, but after that it's like, "I will no longer give you (corrections) because whatever you do is what you want to do." I probably haven't given Beatrice notes on her solo since maybe like the first time we created it because I don't feel I can do that.

Beatrice's experience of the learning process reflected Mary's intention in that self-authorship was key. According to Beatrice:

Mary asked me to come up with certain things and then it was kind of hands-off. She let me do what I wanted with it for the most part. She would give me notes obviously, but it was definitely an explorative process for me because I got to figure out what I wanted to do with the movement and every time that I do it it's different. Which is interesting. . . . At first, I think I approached it a lot more aggressively, but I think it's adapted a lot throughout the process. It was definitely a 'me' thing. . . . And then as the piece has evolved, I think I'm discovering new components that I want to play with and I think it's gotten softer—a little bit. I started to find my personal groove with it.

Morgan (2016) suggests that social identities are mediating factors in students' application of political identity and the intentional centering of racial identity within the choreographic process is an example of intersectional feminism. Both Mary and Beatrice, who experienced a high degree of dissonance at the beginning of rehearsals, were subsequently able to demonstrate a high degree of congruence by the end, indicating greater levels of political fluency. Ultimately, the dancers' perceptions of the choreographic process illustrate the fundamental necessity of rehearsal as space where students resolve politically dissonant experiences and explore political identity before performing that identity publicly.

Performance

Pedagogical practices embedded within their curricula prepared the *Razor Burn* cast for the rehearsal process and the rehearsal process prepared the dancers for performances of the work. Ultimately, the performances proved integral to the development of political fluency for many of the dancers. The cast was adamant that performing *Razor Burn* was a political act, one that could be seen as a protest, although not all would have described it as such. Furthermore, the group agreed that *Razor Burn* gave the dancers a voice, which indicates an understanding of art as political discourse going beyond the mechanical replication of 'correct' steps in a sequence. The transformative nature of performance was evident in Shelby's comment, "I think that I started (rehearsals) with a little bit more just like fun and like being so excited. And then it turned into like, this is like a voice and a platform—trying to spark conversation and stuff" (Shelby). Lori, a sophomore understudy, indicated that the performance changed the way she viewed herself as an artist and a woman and impacted how she sees political power within those identities:

> (The performance) almost brought me to tears because I loved how it turned out. And what it stood for was very empowering for me as a woman. And it changed the way I view what I do—and not caring what anyone else says. . . . Because in *Razor Burn* we are using a voice without saying anything. We are using our body as a voice and that is a protest because women are viewed as less than men. And so, the unapologetic woman was an example of the strength woman have. And we can push through society norms—push against society.

Regarding political power, one of the most significant performances involved a showing of *Razor Burn* at the regional convening of ACDA. The piece was performed for a panel of adjudicators, all of whom are working professionals and experts in the dance field. After the performance, the piece received feedback akin to a blind peer review. The panelists were aligned in reading

Razor Burn as a challenge to political injustice stating, "*Razor Burn* posits that the Black woman's perspective is a central voice in feminism and can act as a catalyst for change" (Anderson, Burke, & Cox, 2018). This feedback sparked numerous conversations amongst the cast members and led to new insights as Talia, who is herself bi-racial, explained:

> During the rehearsal process I didn't really think of *Razor Burn* as such a piece about Black feminism. I felt like it was more intersectional feminism in general—so just everyone. So, I wasn't like, "It's going to be about Black women making a stand." It was just about *women* making a stand for me. So, hearing that (from the adjudicators) was really interesting because I never thought of it like that during the rehearsal process.

Public performances allowed the dancers to apply their political identities in a very visible way. Intimacy, trust, playfulness, and collaboration within the rehearsal process prepared them for this task and *Razor Burn*'s critical success seemed to empower the cast to articulate more confidence in their political identities. As Shelby stated:

> I realized the thing that matters most is that I'm a woman. I am a powerful woman and if those views go against my original views that's okay because *Razor Burn* has allowed me to realize that (my new) views are more important and I value them more now. . . . I just really enjoyed how it allowed me to open up and be vulnerable and be okay with being a powerful woman while also sparking that conversation for an audience. And when people see it—realizing that there's a change that, you know, can be made from it. . . . I guess that I was brought up to be a little bit more apologetic maybe?? Ha ha! And it's ok to not be like that.

Hagood (2000) suggests that if dance educators support the political, cultural, and intellectual decolonizing of our programs, we must reconsider the traditional means by which we continue to engage with the art form. These quotes demonstrate creative processes' ability to do just that through rehearsal and performance.

Conclusion and Implications for Teaching

In 2011, a think tank, "DANCE 2050: What is the Future of Dance in Higher Education?" was formed by representatives of 26 colleges, universities, and professional organizations to "forge structural change" in dance education (Angeline, Kahlich, Lakes, Nesbit, & Overby, 2014, p. 3). The resulting *Vision Document for Dance 2050: The Future of Dance in Higher Education* (2014) specifically emphasizes that dance programs of the future must "embody values

and practices that position dance as a necessary contributor to our flourishing democratic society" (Angeline et al., 2014, p. 18).

Empowering emerging artists to tackle challenging sociopolitical divisiveness assumes they are equipped with the knowledge and skills to operate effectively within political systems. Given higher education's mission of fostering civic engagement, colleges must answer to the expectation that graduates from all programs possess the right tools for rigorous participation in civic life and the ability to make significant contributions to their communities (Angeline et al., 2014, p. 18). Educators can start by recognizing that students' cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal evolution contributes to political identity as a developmental construct. Acknowledging political identity as such will allow educators to scaffold developmentally sequenced learning opportunities promoting students' acquisition of political fluency.

Implications for Instructors

The goals for *Dance 2050* can easily be translated for other student populations within the university; however, political identity development and the acquiring of political fluency must be central to the achievement of those goals. The *Razor Burn* case study suggests that political identity development can be encouraged through feminist pedagogy with a concentration on rehearsal and performance that serves as a model for other disciplines beyond the arts. To that end, rehearsal and performance should be viewed as both a metaphor for the *process* of political identity development and as a concrete *framework* on which to build curricula. For this to occur, scholars throughout the academy must participate more fully in the creative development and use of pedagogical theory that connects work in the arts to social justice and, ultimately, political engagement.

Curricular sequencing should be based on the rehearsal and performance paradigm in which the first stage establishes pedagogical structures that promote trusting relationships, collaborative co-construction of meaning, a value of multiple voices, and play that allows for risk-taking and failure. Once the environment is set, the goal becomes challenging students' political understanding. One way to do this is by tying current events to institutional missions and institutional missions to course content. With this approach, classes have the opportunities to become 'rehearsals' where students embody or try on salient aspects of political identity in reference to shared experiences.

Critical to the endeavor is educators' ability to embed formal and informal opportunities for dialogue and reflection within curricula. Supporting coursework might include writing assignments that encourage consideration of the political aspects of course content or online discussion forums in which students are expected to reflect on the political implications of subjects covered in class. Periodically scheduled face-to-face debriefs with faculty serve to help students navigate vulnerability within the learning process and achieve deeper

understanding of how discipline-specific concerns relate to broader community issues.

As additional preparation, faculty should embolden students to look for higher stakes opportunities to apply their political identities through 'performance.' This might mean encouraging students to explore activism, to conduct or present research, to practice democracy by participating in governance at home institutions via student groups or student government, to engage with media through social networks or student publications, and—yes—to make art. Lastly, many programs have turned towards portfolios to house artifacts demonstrating student learning. These portfolios often serve as professional development tools, so individual course projects that engage students' political identities should be considered vital to the construction of big picture learning narratives that synthesize coursework and the responsibilities of civic engagement associated with democracy.

References

Abes, E. S., Jones, S. R., & McEwen, M. K. (2007). Reconceptualizing the model of multiple dimensions of identity: The role of meaning-making capacity in the construction of multiple identities. *Journal of College Student Development*, *48*(1), 1–22.

Angeline, B., Kahlich, L., Lakes, R., Nesbit, M., & Overby, L. (2014). *Vision document for dance 2050: The future of dance in higher education*. Denton, TX: National Dance Education Organization. Retrieved from www.ndeo.org/content.aspx?page_id= 22&club_id=893257&module_id=172476

Barr, S., & Oliver, W. (2016). Feminist pedagogy, body image, and the dance technique class. *Research in Dance Education*, *17*(2), 97–112.

Baxter Magolda, M. B. (2001). *Making their own way: Narratives for transforming higher education to promote self-development*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.

Belenky, M., Clinchy, B., Goldberger, N., & Tarule, J. (1986). *Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Bonbright, J. M. (2000). Dance: The discipline. *Arts Education Policy Review*, *102*(2), 31–32.

Cole, J. (2008). Liberatory pedagogy and activated directing: Restructuring the college rehearsal room. *Theatre Topics*, *18*(2), 191–204.

Conrad, S., Dortch, G., & DeNoon, B. (2012). Feminist pedagogy: Theory to practice. *National Forum of Multicultural Issues Journal*, *8*(2), 99–105.

Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (2003). *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum Books.

Hagood, T. (2000). Traditions and experiment/diversity and change: Issues for dance in American education. *Arts Education Policy Review*, *101*(6), 21–26.

Hoffman, D., Domagal-Goldman, J., King, S., & Robinson, V. (2018). Higher education's role in enacting a thriving democracy: Civic learning and democratic engagement theory of change. Washington, D.C.

hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Johnson, B., & Christensen, L. (2004). *Educational research* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Johnson, M. R. (2017). Understanding college students' civic identity development: A grounded theory. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, *21*(3), 31–59.

Juhl, K. (2007). Feminism in the acting classroom: Playful practice as process. In E. A. Armstrong & K. Juhl (Eds.), *Radical acts: Theatre and feminist pedagogies of change* (pp. 153–169). San Francisco, CA: Aunt Lute Books.

Kerr-Berry, J. A. (2005). The application of national dance standards in higher education dance programs. *Journal of Dance Education*, *5*(3), 80–81.

Morgan, D. L., & Davis III, C. H. F. (Eds.). (2019). *Student activism, politics, and campus climate in higher education*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Morphew, C. C., & Hartley, M. (2006). Mission statements: A thematic analysis of rhetoric across institutional type. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77(3), 456–471.

Morgan, D. (2016). *Revealing the role of higher education in a diverse democracy: A theory of college student political identity development* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA.

Morgan, D., & Orphan, C. (2016). Student political engagement in the co-curriculum: Understanding the role of senior student affairs officers. *ejournal of Public Affairs*, *5*(2). Retrieved from www.ejournalofpublicaffairs.org

Musil, C. (2017). Departmental designs for civic impact. *Association for American Colleges and Universities*, *19*(4). Retrieved from www.aacu.org/peerreview/2017/Fall/Musil

The National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement. (2012). *A crucible moment: College learning and democracy's future*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities. Retrieved from www.aacu.org/crucible

Nur Amin, T. (2016). Beyond hierarchy: Reimagining African diaspora dance in higher education curricula. *The Black Scholar*, *46*(1), 15–26.

Risner, D. (2010). Dance education matters: Rebuilding postsecondary dance education for twenty-first century relevance and resonance. *Arts Education Policy Review*, *111*(4), 123–125.

Risner, D., & Musil, P. (2017). Leadership narratives in postsecondary dance administration: Voices, values and gender variations. *Journal of Dance Education*, *17*(2), 53–65.

Ross, J. (2002). Institutional forces and the shaping of dance in the American university. *Dance Chronicle*, *25*(1), 115–124.

Saldana, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Shue, L., & Beck, C. (2001). Stepping out of bounds: Performing feminist pedagogy within a dance education community. *Communication Education*, *50*(2), 125–143.

Smith-Autard, J. (2002). *The art of dance in education*. 2nd ed. London: A & C Black.

Thomas, N. (2015). The politics of learning for democracy. *Association of American Colleges and Universities*, *18*(4). Retrieved from www.aacu.org/diversitydemocracy/2015/fall/thomas

Watson, D., Nordin-Bates, S., & Chappell, K. (2012). Facilitating and nurturing creativity in pre-vocational dancers: Findings from the UK centres for advanced training. *Research in Dance Education*, *13*(2), 153–173.

Wilkinson, A., & Morgan, D. (2018). Razor Burn: Teaching for political identity development through feminist pedagogy in undergraduate dance education (Working Paper).

Wise, A., & Shafer, D. (2015). Why theory matters more than ever in the age of big data. *Journal of Learning Analytics*, *2*(2), 5–13.

Young, C. (2012). Feminist pedagogy at play in the University rehearsal room. *Theater Topics*, *22*(2), 137–148.

9

REMEMBERING "THE BLACK BRUINS"

A Case Study of Supporting Student Activists at UCLA

Sy Stokes and Donté Miller

Introduction

Student activism is a micro-level response to the macro-level, super-structural manifestations of systemic inequity within higher education institutions (Ellsworth & Burns, 1970; Brax, 1981; Gomes & Maslach, 1991; Rettig, 2006; Rojas, 2006; Rogers, 2012; Bradley, 2015; Hope, Keels, & Durkee, 2016; Turner, 2016). It is both reactionary, as a mechanistic and strategic response to poor campus climates, and proactive as a preventative measure to combat the perennial shortcomings of institutions that will continue to be conjectured and anticipated until proven otherwise. College and university campuses have historically been at the center of social movements, due in part to the ease with which students are able to organize and mobilize in designated spaces (Altbach, 1970). More importantly, college students are often more politically conscious and critically aware of widespread social issues, a level of consciousness that is often in direct conflict with the stagnant and frustratingly slow pace of institutional change at oppressive institutions (Gomes, 1992; Stewart, Smith, & Denton, 2012). In response to the slow-moving nature of institutions, student activists have been persistent in their efforts to hold colleges and universities accountable for the equitable changes they are claiming to pursue, knowing well that no change will occur unless the institutional status quo is met with tenacious student opposition (Stewart et al., 2012). However, to place the burden upon students—who should be primarily focused on developing their moral, social, and intellectual skills necessary to productively contribute to a diverse society—shifts the focus away from institutional leaders with a professional obligation to provide students with safe and affirming environments in which to live, work, and learn.

As a result of perpetual institutional inadequacies, which are attributable to numerous shifts in the form and function of postsecondary education in the United States, this burden has yet to be lifted from the tired shoulders of student activists. As such, questions regarding the subsequent mental and psychological impacts of students' participation in activism, especially in relation to systemic oppression, remain to be seriously considered by higher education stakeholders. Hence, in this chapter we seek to address these issues by providing a case study analysis of our collective experiences as undergraduate student activists at University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA). And, while what we offer in this chapter is by no means intended to be narrowly prescriptive, we use our case as a microcosmic exemplification of broader systemic issues that impact the lives of student activists nationwide.

To begin our chapter, we explore the literature on student engagement, student services, and activist burn-out to situate our analysis within existing research. Next, we introduce our case analysis of *The Black Bruins* campaign undertaken by the members of the Black Male Institute at UCLA. After a brief case summary, we draw on data derived from a series of interviews with key informants and institutional stakeholders that provide insight into the psychological ramifications of our activist endeavors. Finally, we offer several recommendations for higher education and student affairs professionals to consider in their efforts to engage with and adequately support student activists on their respective campuses.

Literature Review

Student Activism as Engagement

To adequately support student activists, a certain level of commitment is required from university administrators to actively engage with students through various avenues. According to Kuh (2003), student engagement in college is defined as "the time and energy students devote to educationally sound activities inside and outside of the classroom, and the policies and practices that institutions use to induce students to take part in these activities" (p. 25). Students in college hope to have purposefully rich activities that they can partake in outside of the classroom such as studying abroad, extracurricular activities, service learning opportunities, and internships. For example, students with leadership positions in clubs and organizations both value the time and effort given to the organization and also realize that there is an expectation of "service, guidance, and follow-through on important initiatives" from their peers on campus (Harper & Quaye, 2007, p. 4).

Unfortunately, campus environments can often be unwelcoming and exclusionary environments for some students (Allen, 1992; Museus, 2008). In a study examining Asian and African American students at a mid-Atlantic university,

Museus (2008) found that ethnic organizations helped combat a negative campus climate and "facilitated cultural adjustment by serving as sources of cultural familiarity, vehicles for cultural expression and advocacy, and venues for cultural validation" (p. 575). These findings suggest that student organizations should be used as a means to propel students forward and help them build camaraderie with their peers who share similar backgrounds and beliefs.

Student leadership and activism often work hand in hand. Student engagement is not solely a student's time and energy devoted to a co-curricular activity (Kuh, 2003), but it is also transformative and should be inclusive of student activism (Quaye, Shaw, & Hill, 2017; Renn, 2007). Students intentionally establish organizations to address societal needs, establish support networks, and overhaul policies and practices that hinder their position in society (Hamrick, 1998). Student activists' resistance to dominant structures is an important but overlooked aspect of student engagement. For example, in a study of Black LGBTQ activists, Renn (2007) maintains that involvement in LGBTQ-related activities led to increased identity development that reinforced a cycle of leadership and activism, meaning that students hoped for more transformational change by highlighting larger social and political knowledge of the LGBTQ population. Furthermore, some purposefully engaged activities exist as a form of dissent, as students partake in activities to complement their scholarship and further engage democratic processes (Hamrick, 1998). Activism thus becomes engagement more broadly focused to re-shift power structures, sacrifice to larger social issues, and dedication for the improvement of cultural communities.

Student Services and Student Activists

Student services are broadly described as "enhancing students' experience with postsecondary education through the development of student affairs professionals," which commonly consist of programs, policies, and ideas on how to best meet the needs and interests of college students (Komives & Woodard, 2003, p. xvl). On college and university campuses, services range to include, but are not limited to, programming for first-year college students and students' transition, disability student services to support equitable access to learning, and identity-based support within divisions of student affairs (Astin, 1984; Hamrick, 1998). Program-based services, such as the Horizon program at Purdue University, have provided low-income, first generation, and students with disabilities with academically purposeful activities and mentoring relationships between current participants and program alumni and university staff members (Dale & Zych, 1996). According to Dale and Zych's (1996) study, this particular program led to an 85% annual retention rate among students who participated compared to a rate of 47% on similarly identified students not participating in the program. Students said that receiving tutoring services, learning study techniques,

and establishing social networks aided in their successful retention. At a broader level, campus cultural centers are also common sites for the administration of student services. Patton and Hannon (2008) define cultural centers as administrative offices or spaces dedicated to supporting discrete, marginalized identity groups (i.e., racial/ethnic, gender, and sexuality) of students through the activities and programming, advisement, leadership development, and retention. Cultural centers also give students an environment to share common cultural experiences, which can serve as a form of peer support and peer learning.

Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) help comprise a significant portion of student services that are central to understanding student activism. University counseling centers provide "developmental, preventative, and remedial counseling" to support the growth and success of college students (CAS, 1999, p. 67). With heightened student experiences related to mental health, counseling units become more important to student success (Eisenberg, Golberstein, & Hunt, 2009). Unfortunately, despite some colleges and universities investing resources to support students' mental health, many CAPS units on campus are underutilized (Rosenthal & Wilson, 2008), especially for cultural communities where help-seeking is taboo (Nickerson, Helms, & Terrell, 1994).

According to Nickerson et al. (1994), larger distrust and negative presuppositions about White people and their beliefs created cultural mistrust among students of color seeking mental health support from CAPS on their campus. Black students believed that the services rendered by White counselors would be less relevant, impactful, and gratifying (Nickerson et al., 1994). Thus, more focus needs to be allocated toward examining how social class, cultural perspectives of mental illness, and environmental factors contribute to the systemic unwillingness of Black students to seek psychological support.

Additionally, mental health services are often perceived as a financial burden, which is dangerously hindering for low-income students who need long-term support (Nickerson et al., 1994). A study about stigma and help-seeking conducted by Eisenberg, Downs, Golberstein, and Zivin (2009) found that, of the college campuses in their sample, "the financial barriers to mental health services are reduced, with at least some level of free or highly subsidized services available to all students" (p. 17). They concluded that the lower financial barriers encouraged favorable attitudes about mental health services for their participants (Eisenberg et al., 2009). Thus, if student success is directly associated with mental health, and mental health services are only available to those who are financially capable, then this transitively implies that there is an inequitable institutional structure that is specifically designed to marginalize low-income students and impede their academic success. Therefore, if a student is both Black and low-income, the likelihood of seeking psychological support is detrimentally improbable (Nickerson et al., 1994; Eisenberg et al., 2009).

With regard to student activists, they may utilize the aforementioned services as individual students, but also leverage them as resources to support

achieving their movement goals. For instance, students engaged in activism may use the navigational capital (Yosso, 2005) accrued from utilizing student services to better understand the inner workings of the campus environment. Navigational capital describes student's ability to succeed and persist at a higher education institution despite the negative barriers that they may encounter (Yosso, 2005). Within cultural centers, student activists may also strategically utilize empathetic staff members and center resources to grow and improve their movements on-campus. Despite many of the issues related to students help-seeking of mental health services, some student activists may become overwhelmed to the point they are forced to seek help, or they may find counseling valuable to their success in school.

Many programs exist to support the effective matriculation and success of students on campuses (Dale & Zych, 1996; Woodward & Howard, 2015). This review posits that scholarship on student engagement fails to address student activists' endeavors and how to meet their need to transform systems (Renn, 2007). University student services exist primarily to meet student needs, but, in many cases, departments cannot account for the psycho-social toll of the university that can be very exhausting to student activists.

Student Activist 'Burn-Out'

Inadequate support from campus administrators and staff can lead to considerable consequences for student activists. The psychological impact of activism has been referred to by researchers as 'activist burn-out.' The concept of "burn-out" was first introduced in 1974 by psychologist Herbert Freudenberger, referring to the psychological fatigue that occurs in demanding work environments (Freudenberger, 1974). Burn-out can cause physical symptoms such as exhaustion and fatigue, as well as behavioral symptoms like frustration, anger, feelings of impotence, and signs of depression (Freudenberger, 1974; Heinemann & Heinemann, 2017). The concept has since been adopted by social justice researchers to describe the psychological toll that social and political activism takes on activists in particular (Gomes, 1992; Pines, 1994; Glassgold, 2007; Vaccaro & Mena, 2011; Cox, 2011; Chen & Gorski, 2015; Givens, 2016; Santos & VanDaalen, 2018; Hope, Velez, Offidani-Bertrand, Keels, & Durkee, 2017).

Although activist burn-out is similar to what is experienced at any demanding work environment, Gomes and Maslach (1991) describe how social justice work has its own unique characteristics that make activists especially vulnerable to psychological distress. Activist work, by nature, "involves cultivating and maintaining awareness of large and overwhelming social problems, often carrying a burden of knowledge that society as a whole is unable or unwilling to face" (Gomes & Maslach, 1991, p. 43). Activism is inherently selfless. It is not uncommon for activists to invest in their work so strongly that they willingly endure

harsh and punitive treatment for the betterment of the group, rather than submit to the hegemonic, unjust norms of society (Kantorová, 2014). Gomes and Maslach (1991) condense activist burn-out into three key parts: 1) exhaustion, the feelings of lethargy and helplessness that lead to discouragement to proceed with the activist work; 2) cynicism, the detachment from the work as a psychological defense mechanism to protect oneself from further mental trauma; and 3) inefficacy, the feeling of a lack of achievement that leads to doubts about self-worth. More nuanced analyses of activist burn-out have been produced that focus on Black and Latinx student activists at predominantly White institutions (Szymanski & Lewis, 2015; Givens, 2016; Hope et al., 2017), queer student activists of color (Vaccaro & Mena, 2011), managing emotions in professional activist organizations (Rodgers, 2010), and the utilization of feminist liberation psychology as a way to combat the damaging psychological effects of political activism (Moane, 2006). However, "burn-out" research that focuses on student activists in particular is fairly limited.

Additionally, much of the research about how to cope with activist burn-out puts the onus on the activist rather than the organizations and institutions they work for and within (Cox, 2011; Maslach, 2017). For example, some suggestions include formulating one's own personal mission statement to gage what level of sacrifice one is prepared to make as an activist (Rettig, 2006), building resilience by learning how to relax and getting sufficient rest (Gomes & Maslach, 1991), and seeking alternate physical safe spaces to replenish one's emotional sustainability (Brown & Pickerill, 2009). Although these suggestions are vastly important for the psychological well-being of activists, the emphasis on interpersonal improvements consequently pardons organizations and institutions from being held accountable for constructing and maintaining counter-supportive environments.

Thus, this same critique can be applied to higher education research on student activism. Despite significant early scholarship on student activism (Sampson, 1967; Ellsworth & Burns, 1970; Brax, 1981; Gomes & Maslach, 1991; Rettig, 2006; Rojas, 2006; Rogers, 2012), as well as more recent contributions over the last few years (Bradley, 2015; Hope et al., 2016; Turner, 2016; Mustaffa, 2017; Perna, 2018), a considerable void on the psychological and emotional implications of student participation in activism remains, especially in participation in activism dedicated to achieving social justice. Such a void in the literature transitively implies the additional absence of research on how institutions can and should support student activists faced with mental and emotional health challenges resulting from the political engagement. Therefore, this chapter addresses this considerable gap by providing a case analysis of student activism resulting in burn-out and offering recommendations for how higher education practitioners can effectively support student activists on their respective campuses. Specifically, we have conducted an instrumental case study (Stake, 2005) at UCLA, our alma mater, that provides insight into the

psychological toll of our student activism, the transformational leaders (Kezar & Eckel, 2008) and "social gadflies" (Lepeau, 2015) who supported our activist agenda, and the institutional shortcomings that contributed to our experience with "activist burn-out" (Gomes & Maslach, 1991; Chen & Gorski, 2015).

The Black Bruins—A Case Study at UCLA

Using an instrumental case study approach, our case analysis focuses on a digital media campaign undertaken by members of the Black Male Institute at UCLA. More specifically, we use *The Black Bruins* campaign, which made its online debut during the 2013–2014 academic year, to examine the interrelated phenomena of engagement and support services for student activists within the context of a predominantly White institution (PWI). We selected this case purposefully in that it was 1) deeply connected to our research focus, as well as 2) because of our earlier experiences as undergraduate student activists, a part of the campaign uniquely situated us as reflexive instruments for analytical sense-making. Stake (2005) defines instrumental case study as a methodological approach that "provide[s] insight into an issue or to redraw a generalization. The case is of secondary interest, it plays a supportive role, and it facilitates our understanding of something else" (p. 445). The "something else" we are trying to broadly understand is the lack of student engagement, student services, and support for student activists at institutions of higher education. While this particular case is still investigated within an isolated context, it is deliberately designed to illustrate how the results are a byproduct of macro-level, structural inadequacies (Stake, 2005). Additionally, rather than relying simply on our own perspectives, we broadened our case to include a purposeful selection (Maxwell, 2013) of participants. Thus, additional participants in our case included other student activists from the Black Male Institute of UCLA (BMI), UCLA faculty and graduate student liaisons, university administrators, and other student affairs professionals who offered direct experiential knowledge regarding the unique campus racial climate at UCLA.

For additional context, consider the racial/ethnic demographics of our campus, which has remained largely stagnant in recent years since our departure. UCLA is a public research institution within the University of California system and is located in metropolitan Los Angeles, California. According undergraduate admissions data, UCLA serves a student demographic that is 5.2% African American/Black, 0.5% American Indian/Alaska Native, 31.6% Asian/Pacific Islander, 21.3% Hispanic/Latino, 26.1% White, 3.5% domestic (race/ethnicity unknown), and 11.7% international (UCLA Undergraduate Admission, 2017). At present, the undergraduate student population is 31,002, with a graduate student population of 13,025 (UCLA Undergraduate Admission, 2017). These data make evident the serious contrast of racial underrepresentation for Black students on-campus, which also served as an important basis for the campaign we discuss further.

The Black Male Institute at UCLA

Founded in 2009 by UCLA professor Dr. Tyrone Howard, the BMI was designed with the primary goal of addressing concerns around equity and access for Black students in education. Through conducting research and designing practical interventions and effective programs, BMI sought to enrich the educational experiences and life outcomes for Black males in the United States (Black Male Institute, 2010). Undergraduate research through BMI is separated into two different categories: The State of Black Male Education (SBME) and Project Lumina. The SBME project documents the educational outcomes of students in Los Angeles County over the past 15 years (Black Male Institute, 2010). The project analyzes quantitative data related to enrollment, retention, and graduation rates from the California Department of Education (Black Male Institute, 2010). The project has more recently transitioned into a mentorship model, allowing UCLA students to go into local area high schools, and identify and work with high-achieving Black males (Black Male Institute, 2010). Using the data from SBME, students are able to engage in research-based dialogue where they can analyze statistical data as a collective, and foster more clarity and understanding of their experiences. The curriculum is designed to introduce participants to the "hidden curriculum" of UCLA that helps establish a community for empowerment and successful navigation of the institution.

Project Lumina is the qualitative-focused branch of BMI. Project Lumina critically examines Black male retention at UCLA, and provides a venue to unpack the experiences of Black men at UCLA to further scholarly dialogue on African American male retention and engagement in predominantly White institutions of higher education (Black Male Institute, 2010). Within Project Lumina is a course titled "Blacklimated," one of the retention initiatives launched through the division. As an intervention, the class has been designed specifically for first-year (freshmen and transfers) Black men at UCLA (Black Male Institute, 2010; Woodward & Howard, 2015). The class provides a brave space for Black males to vocalize their frustrations and concerns, and establishes a supportive community that helps Black males develop a sense of belonging at a historically White institution. Mustaffa (2017) describes this process as "Black life-making," or the creative spaces of possibility and freedom Black people produce when practicing self-definition, self-care, and resistance. It is within these spaces that BMI members have garnered motivation to remain persistent in the arduous process of achieving academic success.

The Black Bruins *Campaign*

Within BMI, Black male students are able to develop their student activist identities and find an existential purpose behind their academic passions. Tr'Vel Lyons explained how BMI expanded his transformative resistant capital,

defined by Yosso (2005) as the "cultural knowledge of racism and the moti-
vation to transform such oppressive structures" (p. 81). In turn, this form of
capital motivated him to embody a more individualistic and self-empowering
persona.

> [R]esistance should never be comfortable. It should never be over-convenient.
> So I think that as I'm maturing, as I'm going further down this path of
> graduate student and possibly becoming a professor, I think I'm super
> intentional in like, this is what I believe in, and really rejecting certain
> ideas of what I should be, and how I should think. And it's especially in
> a place that spoon feeds you like this is what you should say, this is how
> you should speak, this is how your hair should look even, this is how you
> should carry yourself, these are your thoughts. I've just been very inten-
> tional in rejecting that. So I'm trying to stand on the right side of history.
> *(T. Lyons, personal communication, April 3, 2017)*

This transformative resistance capital that Tr'Vel developed was shared by
all members of the BMI cohort, who subsequently utilized this form of capi-
tal to harvest our activist identities. As a result, in November 2013, our BMI
cohort collaborated in the creation of a YouTube video entitled *The Black Bru-
ins*, which exposed alarming statistics regarding the overt racism and microag-
gressions that Black students endure at UCLA. The video, derived primarily
through our own research into data related to Black male student success and
experiences at UCLA, garnered significant national media attention and more
than 2.3 million views online.

The impact of the video served as a turning point for BMI. BMI went from
struggling for funding and administrative support to garnering institutional
endorsement and a solidified budget. Dr. Howard explained the impact of the
video and how it strengthened the relationship between BMI and UCLA's
administration:

> I think the first thing that comes to mind for me is that they finally
> started to pay attention. I think they finally started to listen. Much of
> what you all talked about, usually would fall on deaf ears. But when the
> *Black Bruins* video came out, because it got so much, not just national, but
> global recognition . . . I think one of the ways it really helped was that
> it kinda forced the university's hand to say, "Alright, we hear you, you
> have our attention, now what can we do. How can we respond?" And
> you know, we met with [the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs] and [the
> Vice Provost of Enrollment Management], and started putting the wheels
> in motion, started putting some resources behind BMI, which we had
> never done before. And so we were able to use those resources to help put

on some more events, programs, and outreach efforts. So it was huge in terms of the university responding, in terms of financial support. Even to this day, I still think the ripple effects are being made because when there are issues that I tend to raise, or something that BMI raises, we get a different type of reaction and attention now post–*Black Bruins* video as opposed to pre–*Black Bruins* video.

(T. Howard, personal communication, March 29, 2017)

The university response was mainly facilitated by two specific administrators, Dr. Angela Jackson and Dr. Mariella Jimenez, both pseudonyms, who were influential advocates that played an integral role in making sure BMI had a voice on an administrative level. With their support, BMI has been able to secure a substantial amount of funding from grants and external contracts, and have officially established BMI as a regular budget item for the university.

Since faculty and graduate students work closely with administrators and policy initiatives, Dr. Howard and his team of graduate students and staff wanted to serve as an intermediary presence between the Black male undergraduates and the university. As intermediary institutional agents, or what LePeau (2015) refers to as "social gadflies," Dr. Howard and colleagues were positioned to actively challenge the status quo and disrupt policies and programs that do not meet the needs of Black male students. More specifically, BMI staff members Samarah Blackmon, Rachel Thomas, and Brian Woodward, who were graduate students at the time, served as social gadflies and thereby helped ensure that our cohort could more effectively balance our commitments to our academics. In addition, Dr. Howard served as our transformational leader (Kezar & Eckel, 2008). According to Kezar and Eckel (2008), transformational leaders motivate and invigorate their followers by appealing to the individual's emotional and spiritual state. Dr. Howard not only ensured that we succeeded academically, but also helped organize and facilitate meetings with administration, news, and other media outlets.

Discussion

There is a dearth in academic literature related to the psychological impact of student activism. Thus, we are attempting to explore a more comprehensive analysis of student activist burn-out that examines how student activists navigate the treacherous emotional terrain of activism while also maintaining their academic performance. Our own definition of *student activist burn-out* is derived from Gomes and Maslach's (1991) foundational work on Social Justice Organizations. We are specifically centering the findings upon examples of 1) feelings of discouragement to pursue activist endeavors, 2) distrust of university leaders, 3) declining sense of belonging on a predominantly White campus, 4) racial battle fatigue, and 5) feelings of exhaustion and helplessness.

Feelings of Discouragement

Within the first 3 weeks, we found that our activist agenda exceeded the capacity of our cohort of 11 undergraduate students. Nearly half of the cohort felt the work became too much of a burden on their personal lives, which led to an overwhelming sense of discouragement to proceed with our activist agenda.

In early November of 2013, Sy Stokes was invited to Reverend Jesse Jackson's birthday party that took place two weeks after the video was released. Rev. Jackson, a prominent African American Civil Rights activist, presented Stokes with the possibility of BMI collaborating with the Rainbow Coalition, a nonprofit social justice–oriented organization that Rev. Jackson founded. A meeting was scheduled the next morning, where all of the members of BMI, along with Dr. Howard and the graduate student liaisons, were also in attendance. During the meeting, we engaged in conversations with Rev. Jackson and his staff about how we could possibly work together. We then agreed that we would develop an official proposal to send to Rev. Jackson and his staff by the end of the month. Our BMI cohort developed the proposal, which had a list of recommendations that were aimed toward tackling issues related to the low rates of Black male retention, nationwide reform of college and university curriculum, and UCLA-specific recommendations related to financial aid resources and community outreach initiatives. However, as the weeks progressed, Rev. Jackson and his staff stopped responding to our emails and phone calls. What was once a sign of hope and progression became yet another cause for disappointment.

After this experience, many of the BMI members decided to return to other campus-related projects that they were working on prior to the release of the video. However, as a last effort to accomplish our activist agenda, our faculty liaisons reached out to the UCLA administration to organize a meeting, though we quickly realized that the meeting would produce unpromising results the moment we walked through the door.

Distrust of University Leaders

In 2012, Dr. Richard Sander, a UCLA law professor, released a report titled "The Consideration of Race in UCLA Undergraduate Admissions." The report was designed to criticize UCLA's admissions practices amidst the proposed removal of Proposition 209, an amendment to the California Constitution that prohibited state, local governments, districts, public universities, colleges, and schools from discriminating against or giving preferential treatment to any individual or group in public employment public education, or public contracting on the basis of race, sex, ethnicity, or national origin (Cal. Const., art. I, § 32). The anti–affirmative action policy caused the number of African-American students admitted to UCLA's freshman class to drop 57% from 1996 to 2006 (Hunt, 2006). As a result, in 2006, UCLA adopted a holistic

admissions process where "an admissions file reader produces a single numerical score that is intended to capture all of an applicant's characteristics" (Sander, 2012, p. 3). In the Fall of 2007, nearly 200 African American students entered UCLA as freshmen, doubling the amount that were admitted the year before (Sander, 2012).

Dr. Sander's reported that UCLA was favoring African American students for enrollment, because a "substantial portion of African-American admissions . . . could not be explained in non-racial terms" (Sander, 2012, p. 5). In Sander's (2012) analysis, he suggests that the holistic admissions process "produced a special consideration of African-Americans with poor holistic scores, who were then preferentially admitted" (9). He continues by suggesting that UCLA's move toward holistic admissions was "an extremely poor policy move from any rational perspective" (Sander, 2012, p. 10).

In the *Black Bruins* video, Stokes refers to this report by stating, "According to Professor Sander, 3.3% is far too many Black kids. On his perfectly paved roads, there are far too many black skids." Stokes's criticism is one shared by UCLA sociology professor Darnell Hunt, who claims that "traditional patterns of disadvantage are hardwired into an admissions process that virtually guarantees African-American underrepresentation" (Hunt, 2006). Sander's (2012) report completely undermines the racialized structural factors that have systematically disadvantaged African Americans economically, politically, and psychologically for centuries (Omi & Winant, 1994; Fredrickson, 2003).

Dr. Sander was not the only one who believed in such rhetoric. Dr. Howard organized a meeting with UCLA administrators where we hoped to discuss a list of demands that we had created along with our BMI cohort. However, when we arrived, we were informed that only two administrators, Dr. Angela Jackson and Dr. Mariella Jimenez, were going to attend. When we asked Dr. Jackson why her fellow administrators were absent, she told us that it was because the other administrators were a part of "Sander's Camp," a collection of university officials who sided with Sander's (2012) report. Thus, since they did not believe the grounds for our demands were legitimate, they refused to sit down with us to have a discussion. From that point on, we realized that garnering any more institutional support would be virtually impossible. They made it clear that they felt we did not belong on their campus.

Declining Sense of Belonging

As members of BMI, we became forcefully aware of the hypervisibility of our presence on campus. In any space we entered, we were immediately placed under a magnifying glass as if we were some sort of spectacle to be examined. We were essentially alone in a crowded room—a room filled with more than 30,000 students—as our already diminished sense of belonging as Black students at a PWI became almost entirely dissolved. Alex Mercier, a member of

BMI and participant in *The Black Bruins* video, spoke about what it felt like to be a Black student on campus during that time.

> You know that you're hypervisible already, but with your face plastered everywhere, it was like all eyes on you. And every time someone approached me, it was like, "Tell me how it is to be a Black man on campus," as if I could speak for everyone. [The video] amplified some of the microaggressions we received already. People just looking at us all crazy, complaining about us. People saying we're only here because of some quota.
>
> *(A. Mercier, personal communication, October 17, 2018)*

To combat these consequences of hypervisibility, we looked to BMI for support. In alignment with Museus's (2008) study, the BMI served as our source of physical and psychological reprieve from a hostile, predominantly White campus environment. The affirming space helped us combat the negative backlash we were receiving on a national level, and provided us with a space to decompress and recuperate. At the beginning of each meeting, we would individually "check-in" with one another. Dr. Howard, and our graduate student liaisons, would then offer support and guidance for how to approach certain issues. These check-ins were extremely valuable for our cohort, as they provided us a space to develop a strong sense of comradery and self-efficacy. However, after leaving the space, we could not avoid the impending assaults on our physical and psychological well-being.

Racial Battle Fatigue

Despite the success of our digital media campaign, it did not come without aggressive, and sometimes violent, resistance. Racially charged attacks were inflicted upon numerous members of BMI. Some of the comments received, both via email and social media, included hateful rhetoric such as, "Why do these niggers need to go to school anyways? You don't need a degree to live off welfare," "Fucking niggers get these free handouts AND affirmative action AND welfare. YET THEY STILL CAN'T FUCKING GRADUATE. Holy shit I never thought niggers were this dumb," "UCLA lowered their admission standards to let these people in, and these affirmative action students are still bitter? Let that be a lesson to you about niggers," and "Who taught these monkeys to talk?" Within the first two weeks, Sy Stokes, the creator of the video, received countless death threats from anonymous sources. Some of the threats promoted suicidal rhetoric such as "Go hang yourself, bitch," while some were more direct threats such as "I'm a student at UCLA. Watch what happens when I find you on campus," and "Kill all niggers." Regardless of the inaccuracy and blatant disregard for factual evidence to back their racist claims, these statements admittedly took a psychological toll on each member of our cohort.

The psychological and mental toll we experienced during that fall was a clear sign of what Smith, Allen, and Danley (2007) describe as "racial battle fatigue." Racial battle fatigue is the psychological and psycho-social emotion that students of color wrestle with when confronted by racial and oppressive slurs on their college campus (Smith et al., 2007). Our activism became a matter of life and death. It may sound like an exaggeration, but there was a general urge amongst our cohort and BMI that all it took was for one of the threats to be legitimate for us to be in imminent danger. In response, and as a necessary safety precaution, Dr. Howard required that at least one member of our cohort accompany Stokes at all times until the threats subsided. We were racially fatigued, emotionally fatigued, and, despite it all, we were still expected to attend classes and maintain our grades. Racial battle fatigue, along with the threats of physical violence, led us all into a state of exhaustion and helplessness.

Feelings of Exhaustion and Helplessness

In line with the three-part definition provided by Gomes and Maslach's (1991) study on activist burn-out, we experienced feelings of insurmountable exhaustion. Many of us developed a level of detachment from the work as a psychological defense mechanism to protect ourselves from further psychological trauma (Gomes & Maslach, 1991). Within the first two weeks of launching the campaign, countless media outlets were reaching out to Stokes for an interview. He appeared on Tamron Hall's MSNBC show *Gut Check*, where he spoke about his motivations and influences for writing the *Black Bruins* poem. After his appearance, he was asked by several other media platforms for an interview, including CNN, Al Jazeera, NPR, and BET, to name a few. However, the large influx of requests left Stokes in a state of exhaustion. There was no way he could balance being a student with all of his new media obligations. Thus, he decided to decline all further interviews for the sake of maintaining his mental health.

Fortunately, he had a supportive group of BMI cohort members who were generously willing to help. Stokes was able allocate certain media requests to the other members, who substituted for Stokes in meetings, interviews, and other similar engagements. Without BMI, Stokes's message would have never been heard by the masses. With their support, the *Black Bruins* media campaign garnered international support that forced UCLA's administration to pay attention. The subsequent impact of *The Black Bruins* resulted in long-term results that will improve the lives of students of color at UCLA for future generations.

The Impact of The Black Bruins

Notwithstanding our experiences with student activist burn-out, our activism inspired a tremendous level of institutional change. The impact of *The Black Bruins* helped influence the faculty and administration to reexamine the racial diversity and equity needs of UCLA. In 2015, UCLA officially implemented

a general education (GE) diversity requirement for all freshmen students. In addition, the board selected a Vice-Chancellor for Diversity and Equity, the first of this position in the university's history.

This success was achieved with the help of two university administrators, Dr. Howard and his BMI staff, and our cohort of 11 BMI undergraduate researchers. One can only imagine the impact our activism could have had on our institution if we were provided with adequate institutional support. Thus, we have provided a list of recommendations for institutions to consider in how to properly engage with student activists on their respective campuses.

Recommendations for Practice

Graduate Students

Graduate students must capitalize on their unique positionality within the institutional framework of a university by serving as an intermediary presence between undergraduate students and faculty, administrators, and student affairs professionals. Similar to how BMI staff members Samarah Blackmon, Rachel Thomas, and Brian Woodward served as our "social gadflies" (LePeau, 2015), graduate students can support undergraduate student activists by leveraging their knowledge of and relationships with institutional shareholders. Graduate students can help undergraduate student activists navigate the complex organizational terrain of higher education institutions, as undergraduate students are largely disassociated with administrative processes. This can come in the form of helping procure financial support, identifying the proper university constituencies to meet with, consulting with undergraduates about their organizational approach to their activist endeavors, and myriad other forms of navigational guidance.

However, graduate students do not necessarily need to remain "behind the scenes." During the Fall 2015 semester, students at the University of Missouri, Columbia (Mizzou), organized a series of demonstrations in response to a number of overtly racist incidents on-campus. Although, these incidents were also a part of more systemic issues for which students like Jonathan Butler, a Black graduate student at Mizzou, and the Concerned Black Student 1950 collective were attempting to address. In the case of Butler, he initiated an indefinite hunger strike (ultimately lasting 7 days) in response to graduate students not being provided adequate health insurance despite the intellectual and administrative labor many of them contribute to the university. Additionally, the Mizzou football team, which was predominantly comprised of Black student-athletes, threatened to strike and forfeit a forthcoming game against Brigham Young University if the demands were not met. The strike, although ultimately being resolved before the game, would have forced the Mizzou to pay a $1 million fine. The collective impact of these demonstrations forced the resignation of Timothy Wolfe, then president of University of Missouri System. This is a perfect example of a collaborative effort between undergraduate and graduate students to achieve a common

goal (see Chapter 5 of this volume for more details). However, the valiant displays of activism partaken by graduate students like Jonathan Butler should not necessarily be perceived as a prescriptive expectation, for we know it is unrealistic to assume everyone is willing to sacrifice themselves in such a physically and psychologically demanding manner. Nonetheless, it is merely an example of how impactful graduate students can be on their respective campuses.

Student Affairs Professionals

Student affairs practitioners (SAPs) jobs are to "create conditions that enhance students learning," so their support of student activists' endeavors must be intentional and purposeful (Calhoun, 1997). Housing and residential life SAPs usually bear the majority of responsibility due to their frequent access to and interaction with students on most institutions across the nation (Calhoun, 1997; Kuh, 2003). Residential Life units can shift the programmatic structure to make it more welcoming for student activists. As a department, SAPs must define student learning outcomes, make a concerted effort to push both employees and students to think about what societal issues they hope to address, and frequently revisit conversations to effectively challenge systems (Colville & Murphy, 2006; Kezar & Eckel, 2008). Many students, both that work for Residence Life and live in university housing, wrestle with how to counteract negative campus climates or how to address larger national political issues (Harper & Quaye, 2007; Strayhorn & Mullins, 2012). SAPs must be equipped to facilitate conversations about these issues in order help student activists conceptualize their experiences and formulate solutions.

Although it may seem that we suggest that SAPs do more than their normal assigned duties—while perhaps being inconsiderate of the time they dedicate to administrative duties or other student concerns—our premise suggests that they have the capacity to further enrich students' experiences and to take their work to the next level. The SAPs who assisted us at UCLA understood that *our* fight was also *theirs*. Helping us improve the campus racial climate at the university was of the best interest for us all. Therefore, we recommend that you connect with your campus leaders and ask how you can be supportive.

College and University Faculty

University faculty must recognize their power and influence on the campus and larger community, and use that to support activists. Although faculty members' primary responsibilities at research institutions, like UCLA, are to conduct research, said research could be used to challenge issues and support student activism. Scholar-activists have been critiqued and challenged to do more to push boundaries that are risky to sustaining careers, encourage angst and student resistance, and move beyond the confines of "publish or perish" to advance society in a transformative way (Collins, 2005; Quaye, Shaw, & Hill, 2017). Early career

professionals may have some difficulty partaking in activism, especially when considering tenure, but activism does not always come in the form of a protest. Instead, it can consist of providing guidance for young student activists, considering and advocating for students on university committees, or providing insight into decisions being made at the university that students should be made aware of. According to Museus (2014), "proactive philosophies" consist of faculty bringing information to students instead of passively waiting for them to seek them out on their own. These philosophies may also include discussions about issues in society, even if they do not pertain to the subject or lesson in class.

Dr. Howard exuded true leadership in the face of adversity by supporting student activists. Instead of passively showing concern or discrediting our agenda, he ensured that we supported one another, were adequately prepared for media inquiries, and, most importantly, that we succeeded academically. Faculty must be willing and able to reach out, advocate, and help dismantle systems of oppression. As faculty, you have an opportunity to connect with students, staff, policymakers, and other officials that can shift societal operations.

College and University Administrators

As mentioned in the Introduction, student activism is a response to systemic inequity within higher education institutions (Ellsworth & Burns, 1970; Brax, 1981; Gomes & Maslach, 1991; Rettig, 2006; Rojas, 2006; Rogers, 2012; Bradley, 2015; Hope et al., 2016; Turner, 2016). Administrators are perceived as leaders who have the institutional ability to eliminate these systemic inequities. Therefore, rather than seeing student activism as a problem, you must first ask yourself why your college or university has a poor enough campus climate for students to feel the need to express themselves in an oftentimes confrontational or disruptive manner. Students are not imagining their collective displeasures; their reactions are simply a byproduct of an unwelcoming living and learning environment. Thus, as administrators who are responsible for providing an inclusive, equitable campus climate for their students, you must focus on the source of the issues rather than the correlational and justifiable responses to them.

Student activists may be perceived as disruptive and "unorderly," which if not addressed properly, can lead to a premature and uneducated response from university leaders. It is understandable for administrators to perceive student activism as a nuisance, rather than a beneficial contribution to campus climate that it has proven to be (Joseph, 2003; Rogers, 2012; Bradley, 2015), since there is an institutional disconnect between students and university leaders. What administrators must remember is that they are largely detached from the realities of student life on campus. While graduate students, faculty, and student affairs professionals have the opportunity to have more personal interactions with students, administrators are often preoccupied with institutional concerns and inevitably lose sight of the students they are obligated to serve.

However, disconnect leads to distrust. College and university administrators own the majority of executive control over institutional decision making, but the students whose lives will be affected by these decisions rarely have their perspectives considered. Consequently, students are left wondering whether or not university leaders have their best interests at heart. Thus, in order to combat these feelings of distrust, there must be a deliberate and organized commitment to institutional transparency. In order to know the issues, and subsequently fix the issues, you must engage with student activists.

What you will find in the process, we presume, is something relatively similar to the results of our case study—a lack of culturally specific student services, students feeling like their voices are not heard, a disproportionate allocation of resources for students of color, and patterns of a hostile campus climate. However, just as Dr. Angela Jackson and Dr. Mariella Jimenez ensured that we at the BMI had a voice on an administrative level, you too can collaboratively improve your institution alongside your student activists.

As administrators, you have the chance to be the hero. You have the chance to hear your students' issues and concerns, and the institutional power to fix them. If your campus is truly equitable, student activism would no longer be a necessity.

Conclusion

There is a considerable void in academic literature concerning the psychological and emotional implications of student participation in activism. This dearth implies that there is also an absence of research on how institutions can and should support student activists facing mental and emotional health challenges resulting from their political engagement. This study suggests that a central analytic focus on institutional engagement with student activists may provide significant theoretical and practical insights into the complexities of building equitable campus environments. By utilizing an instrumental case study approach (Stake, 2005), we hoped to situate our analysis within a broader, macro-level context. Although there are specific factors of our study that should be examined in isolation (i.e., the role of certain faculty members, the virality of *The Black Bruins* video, and the organizational framework of this particular university), there are a variety of circumstantial elements that are correlational byproducts of structural inadequacies that affect all higher education institutions in the United States. Thus, we hope that graduate students, student affairs professionals, faculty, and administrators will identify parallels between our case study and their respective campuses, and subsequently utilize our recommendations to actively engage with student activists at their college or university.

References

Allen, W. R. (1992). The color of success: African-American college student outcomes at predominantly White and historically Black public colleges and universities. *Harvard Educational Review*, *62*(1), 26–45.

Allen, W. R., McLewis, C., Jones, C., & Harris, D. (2018). From Bakke to Fisher: African American students in US higher education over forty years. *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences, 4*(6).

Altbach, P. G. (1970). Student movements in historical perspective: The Asian case. *Youth & Society, 1*(3), 333–357.

Astin, A. W. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of college student personnel, 25*(4), 297–308.

BMI. (2010). Undergraduate research and practice. *Black Male Institute*. Retrieved from http://blackmaleinstitute.org/

Bradley, S. M. (2015). Black power and the big green: Dartmouth college and the Black freedom movement, 1945–75. *Journal of Civil and Human Rights*, *1*(1), 25–55.

Brax, R. S. (1981). *The first student movement*. Port Washington, NY: Kennikat Press Corp.

Brown, G., & Pickerill, J. (2009). Space for emotion in the spaces of activism. *Emotion, Space and Society*, *1*(1), 1–12.

Cal. Const., art. I, § 32.

Calhoun, J. C. (1997). The student learning imperative: Implications for student affairs. *College Student Affairs Administration*, *36*.

Chen, C. W., & Gorski, P. C. (2015). Burnout in social justice and human rights activists: Symptoms, causes and implications. *Journal of Human Rights Practice*, (March), 1–25.

Collins, D. E. (2005). The ivory tower and scholar-activism. *Academe*, *91*(5), 26.

Colville, I. D., & Murphy, A. J. (2006). Leadership as the enabler of strategizing and organizing. *Long Range Planning*, *39*(6), 663–677.

Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS). (1999). *The role of counseling programs: CAS standards contextual statement*. Washington, DC: CAS.

Cox, L. (2011). *How do we keep going? Activist burnout and personal sustainability in social movements*. Fourteenth International Conference on Alternative Futures and Popular Protest.

Dale, P. M., & Zych, T. (1996). A successful college retention program. *College Student Journal*, *30*(3), 354–360.

Eisenberg, D., Downs, M. F., Golberstein, E., & Zivin, K. (2009). Stigma and help seeking for mental health among college students. *Medical Care Research and Review*, *66*(5), 522–541.

Eisenberg, D., Golberstein, E., & Hunt, J. B. (2009). Mental health and academic success in college. *The BE Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy*, *9*(1).

Ellsworth, F. L., & Burns, M. A. (1970). *Student activism in American higher education*. Washington, DC: American College Personnel Association.

Fredrickson, G. M. (2003). *Racism: A short history*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Freudenberger, H. J. (1974). Staff burn-out. *Journal of Social Issues*, *30*(1), 159–165.

Givens, J. R. (2016). The invisible tax: Exploring Black student engagement at historically white institutions. *Berkeley Review of Education*, *6*(1), 55–78.

Glassgold, J. M. (2007). "In dreams begin responsibilities": Psychology, agency, and activism. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Psychotherapy*, *11*(3), 37–57.

Gomes, M. E. (1992). The rewards and stresses of social change: A qualitative study of peace activists. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, *32*(4), 138–146.

Gomes, M. E., & Maslach, C. (1991). *Commitment and burnout among political activists: An in-depth study*. Paper presented at the International Society of Political Psychology, Helsinki.

Hamrick, F. A. (1998). Democratic citizenship and student activism. *Journal of College Student Development*, *39*(5), 449.

Harper, S. R., & Quaye, S. J. (2007). Student organizations as venues for Black identity expression and development among African American male student leaders. *Journal of College Student Development*, *48*(2), 127–144.

Heinemann, L. V., & Heinemann, T. (2017). Burnout research: Emergence and scientific investigation of a contested diagnosis. *Sage Open*, 7(1), 1–12.

Hope, E. C., Keels, M., & Durkee, M. I. (2016). Participation in Black Lives Matter and Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals: Modern activism among Black and Latino college students. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *9*(3), 203–215.

Hope, E. C., Velez, G., Offidani-Bertrand, C., Keels, M., & Durkee, M. I. (2017). Political activism and mental health among Black and Latinx college students. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *24*(1), 26–39.

Howard, T. C. (2013). *Black male (d): Peril and promise in the education of African American males*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Hunt, D. (2006). A crisis in admission of African-American students. *UCLA Newsroom*. Retrieved from http://newsroom.ucla.edu/stories/060509voice_admissions

Joseph, P. E. (2003). Dashikis and democracy: Black studies, student activism, and the black power movement. *The Journal of African American History*, *88*(2), 182–203.

Kantorová, D. (2014). *Prevention through sacrifice: Activists risking trauma in the service of eliminating continuous traumatic stress, a qualitative study*. A dissertation submitted to the Wright Institute Graduate School of Psychology.

Kezar, A., & Eckel, P. (2008). Advancing diversity agendas on campus: Examining transactional and transformational presidential leadership styles. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, *11*(4), 379–405.

Komives, S. R., & Woodard Jr, D. B. (2003). *Student services: A handbook for the profession*. John Wiley & Sons.

Kuh, G. D. (2003). What we're learning about student engagement from NSSE: Benchmarks for effective educational practices. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, *35*(2), 24–32.

LePeau, L. (2015). A grounded theory of academic affairs and student affairs partnerships for diversity and inclusion aims. *The Review of Higher Education*, *39*(1), 97–122.

Maslach, C. (2017). Finding solutions to the problem of burnout. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, *69*(2), 143–152.

Maxwell, J. A. (2013). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.

Moane, G. (2006). Exploring activism and change: Feminist psychology, liberation psychology, and political psychology. *Feminism & Psychology*, *16*(1), 73–78.

Museus, S. D. (2008). The role of ethnic student organizations in fostering African American and Asian American students' cultural adjustment and membership at predominantly White institutions. *Journal of College Student Development*, *49*(6), 568–586.

Museus, S. D. (2014). The culturally engaging campus environments (CECE) model: A new theory of success among racially diverse college student populations. In *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (pp. 189–227). Springer, Dordrecht.

Mustaffa, J. B. (2017). Mapping violence, naming life: A history of anti-Black oppression in the higher education system. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *30*(8), 711–727.

Nickerson, K. J., Helms, J. E., & Terrell, F. (1994). Cultural mistrust, opinions about mental illness, and Black students' attitudes toward seeking psychological help from White counselors. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *41*(3), 378.

Omi, M., & Winant, H. (1994). *Racial formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Patton, L. D., & Hannon, M. D. (2008). Collaboration for cultural programming: Engaging culture centers, multicultural affairs, and student activities offices as partners. *Creating inclusive environments for cross cultural learning and engagement*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Perna, L. W. (2018). *Taking it to the streets: The role of scholarship in advocacy and advocacy in scholarship*. Baltimore, MA: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Pines, A. M. (1994). Burnout in political activism: An existential perspective. *Journal of Health and Human Resources Administration*, *16*(4), 381–394.

Quaye, S. J., Shaw, M. D., & Hill, D. C. (2017). Blending scholar and activist identities: Establishing the need for scholar activism. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *10*(4), 381.

Renn, K. A. (2007). LGBT student leaders and queer activists: Identities of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer identified college student leaders and activists. *Journal of College Student Development*, *48*(3), 311–330. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Rettig, H. (2006). *The lifelong activist: How to change the world without losing your way*. New York, NY: Lantern Books.

Rodgers, K. (2010). "Anger is why we're all here": Mobilizing and managing emotions in a professional activist organization. *Social Movement Studies*, *9*(3), 273–291.

Rogers, I. X. (2012). *Black campus movement: Black students and the radical reconstitution of American higher education, 1965–1972*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rojas, F. (2006). Social movement tactics, organizational change and the spread of African–American studies. *Social Forces*, *84*(4), 2147–2166.

Rosenthal, B., & Wilson, W. C. (2008). Mental health services: Use and disparity among diverse college students. *Journal of American College Health*, *57*(1), 61–68.

Sampson, E. E. (1967). Student activism and the decade of protest. *Journal of Social Issues*, *23*(3), 1–33.

Sander, R. (2012). The consideration of race in UCLA undergraduate admissions. *Project Seaphe*, 1–17.

Santos, C. E., & VanDaalen, R. A. (2018). Associations among psychological distress, high-risk activism, and conflict between ethnic-racial and sexual minority identities in lesbian, gay, bisexual racial/ethnic minority adults. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *65*(2), 194–203.

Smith, W. A., Allen, W. R., & Danley, L. L. (2007). "Assume the position . . . you fit the description" psychosocial experiences and racial battle fatigue among African American male college students. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *51*(4), 551–578.

Stake, R. E. (2005). Qualitative case studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 443–462). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Stewart, C. J., Smith, C. A., & Denton Jr., R. E. (2012). *Persuasion and social movements* (6th ed.). Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.

Strayhorn, T. L., & Mullins, T. G. (2012). Investigating Black Gay Male Undergraduates' Experiences in Campus Residence Halls. *Journal of College & University Student Housing*.

Szymanski, D. M. & Lewis, J. A. (2015). Race-related stress and racial identity as predictors of African American activism. *Journal of Black Psychology*, *41*(2), 170–191.

Turner III, D. C. (2016). How Black students are saving higher education. *Journal of Critical Scholarship on Higher Education and Student Affairs*, *2*(3), 6.

UCLA Undergraduate Admission. (2017). *Quick facts*. Retrieved from www.admission.ucla.edu/campusprofile.htm

Vaccaro, A., & Mena, J. A. (2011). It's not burnout, it's more: Queer college activists of color and mental health. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Mental Health*, *15*(1), 339–367.

Woodward, B., & Howard, T. C. (2015). Creating educational excellence in the pipeline: Undergraduate African American males' perceptions of educational research and participation in the Black male project. *Spectrum: A Journal on Black Men*, *4*(1), 99–125.

Yosso, T. J. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race ethnicity and education*, *8*(1), 69–91.

10

FROM RESISTANCE TO RESILIENCE

Transforming Institutional Racism From the Inside Out

Jade Agua and Sumun L. Pendakur

Introduction

Between increases in student activism on-campus and insufficient institutional responses to student concerns, student affairs professionals often walk a tightrope as they attempt to navigate today's sociopolitical climate. More specifically, without the protection of academic freedom or tenure afforded to most college and university faculty, or the understanding extended to students on their own developmental journeys, staff exist in a liminal space of political and professional tension. What is more, they often bear the burden of adhering to and enforcing institutional policies that compromise their values and integrity. The very real costs and consequences of the following question weigh heavily upon practitioners: am I giving up my own personal values of inclusion, equity, and social justice to fulfill my job responsibility, expectation to obey my supervisor, or loyalty to my institution? In particular, if the practitioners in question also share minoritized or marginalized identities with student organizers and activists, the resulting identity-role conflict can potentially challenge their very sense of personhood and political agency.

Popular academic and news media outlets refer to the concept of 'academic bloat' to describe the increased hiring of staff as managerial employees (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004)—and the perceived increase in bureaucratization—across higher education institutions. And yet, very little attention has been paid by higher education researchers to the increasingly complex and weighty role of staff practitioners. Existing literature highlights the invisibility of staff experiences, struggles, and opportunities. For example, as Bensimon (2007) eloquently describes: "When I say that practitioners are missing, I am referring to the lack of scholarly and practical attention toward understanding how the practitioner—her

knowledge, beliefs, experiences, education, sense of self-efficacy, etc.—affects how students experience their education" (p. 444).

As student affairs practitioners and social justice educators ourselves, we know the stakes are too high to let the scholarly and practical lack of attention continue. For primarily this reason, as well as several others, this chapter engages the challenges of non-student constituent groups (i.e., college and university staff) as political actors and supporters on-campus. We begin by providing a substantive review of the literature that centers on the practitioner's experience, which yielded the following themes: 1) the contentious nature of our positions and choices, 2) racial battle fatigue, and 3) strategies for surviving, but not thriving. Next, we explore essential practitioner skills, institutional strategies, and brief case studies building upon the themes presented in the literature. As a cautionary note, because our research and writing are both deeply personal and sometimes contextually specific, our chapter may offer more questions than answers. Nevertheless, we encourage readers to meaningfully consider our frameworks while grappling with the possibilities they may afford themselves, their institutions, and their campus communities.

Literature Review

As practitioners, we often discuss campus climates in terms of how they affect our students, but we do not always recognize or acknowledge that campus climates can also include toxic work environments for our practitioners. And, in the struggle to find a middle ground where student needs are met by institutional will, practitioners face impossible choices on a regular basis. "Needless to say," Bensimon (2007) writes, "accepting inequality as a permanent condition can affect how practitioners and minority students respond to each other, and it can create a dispiriting organizational culture" (p. 462). For the critically conscious practitioner, the tension presented by competing professional and political choices can seem discouragingly limited and irreconcilable. As at least one example, consider a common paradox facing student affairs professionals amidst instances of campus unrest: to meaningfully engage with increasingly frustrated student organizers and activists—who may have deeply valid claims, but do not always understand systems of shared governance or acknowledge the tenuous positionality of the student affairs practitioner—or to placate inequitable institutional and administrative policies and practices with which we may disagree and thereby maintain necessary job security.

Harrison's (2010) study of practitioners further illuminates this paradox, noting that their "data showed participants wanted to work within systems to advocate for students, but felt pitted against the institutional forces concerned primarily with image and finances" (p. 205). The practitioner must at once construct a relationship based on trust, solidarity, and shared meanings with the minoritized student(s), and build that relationship in the context of

institutional relations that are rooted in societal social structures, which are defined as "hierarchical relations of power, institutionalized dependency, and societal animosities and distrust" (Stanton-Salazar, 2010, p. 21). Additionally, student activists and student affairs staff may find it difficult to connect in a campus milieu that prioritizes, in explicit and implicit ways, status quo repression in the form of its values, ideologies, and behavioral norms. The repressive environment in and of itself may present a barrier to authentic relationship construction. Finally, bureaucratic barriers (e.g., budgetary demands, managerial concerns, prestige-maximization agendas) may limit the empowerment and solidarity-building abilities of even those practitioners highly placed in campus administration (Pendakur, 2014). Ultimately, justice-minded practitioners run the risk of burn-out, pushout, or co-optation.

In addition to tenuous positionality, decidedly anti-racist practitioners commonly struggle with what has been referred to by social scientists as racial battle fatigue (Smith, Hung, & Franklin, 2011). Smith et al. describe racial battle fatigue as the constant and cumulative weight of emotional stressors that can invoke negative psychological, physiological, and behavioral responses in oppressive environments. As practitioners generally, and Asian American women specifically, we know all too well the distinct costs exacted from those of us in the trenches of such work. More specifically, we recognize that "in the battle to maintain dignity, self-respect and legitimacy, many diversity workers experience a fatigue that leads to illness, depression, isolation and exclusion" (Fasching-Varner, Albert, Mitchell, & Allen, 2015, p. xvii). Imagine, for example, the play-by-play leading up to and immediately following an Asian American woman experiencing some form of a racial microaggression:

> First, she walks into a networking reception on campus in which she knows she will only be one of a handful of Asian Americans, and then perhaps one of two Asian American women. Already, her body may be tense as she mentally braces herself for the potential myriad of occurrences based on those two factors alone. After a quick scan of the room and not immediately recognizing anyone, she walks over to make herself a cup of coffee. Somebody cuts in front of her because they did not see her. After that person turns around and finally notices her, he apologizes, and introductions are made. She gives the carefully enunciated, Americanized version of her name to avoid the extra effort of teaching someone how to properly pronounce it for the third time today. And then, after exchanging casual pleasantries, the dreaded question, "So, where are you from?" Unsatisfied with the response of "Los Angeles," he goes on, "But where are you really from?" The question might register on her body as a fleeting pain in the middle of her chest or a conscious effort to keep her eyes from rolling. After all, it's a common question and another subtle reminder that she does not belong. After a quick internal debate

about whether or not to make this a teachable moment or give the quickest answer possible, she simply replies, "My parents immigrated from China." Then, to avoid having to be an ambassador to China, she excuses herself to go find the restroom.

While this may seem like a laborious account of a brief moment, this commonplace scenario aims to demonstrate how quickly the psychological, physiological, and behavioral responses accumulate, and that the residual pain, however coped with, from every interaction like this can be deflating and demoralizing. Beyond interpersonal interactions, practitioners (and particularly practitioners of color) must also reconcile the irony of being agents of change whilst also being agents of institutions founded on implicitly racist ideals of merit and prestige and designed to reproduce White supremacy. Consequently, practitioners bear the weight of managing the emotions that arise from choosing *when* and *how* to engage (or not) when anything from a microaggression to a full-blown racial campus crisis occurs in order to function (Miller et al., 2017). Those last four words, 'in order to function,' are particularly succinct and profound because, typically, there is no value associated with or success attributed to being able to manage racial battle fatigue experienced within institutions. It is simply an unspoken expectation and a matter of professional survival.

Furthermore, racial battle fatigue is often undergirded by the toll of emotional labor, which has also been correlated to adverse health outcomes such as hypertension, heart disease, exhaustion, loss of memory, and depersonalization (Jeung, Kim, & Chang, 2018; Zapf, 2002). Beyond the emotional labor, there is also the expectation that diversity education is an assumed secondary responsibility that may be loosely or completely unrelated to the primary job functions of practitioners of color. As Padilla (1994) describes, "Professionals from marginalized groups often experience 'cultural taxation' that accompanies the expectation to educate [others] about diversity, regardless of interest or expertise in this domain" (p. 26). Therefore, the risks of challenging racism in one's own institution on a systemic level, the cost of the emotional labor to navigate racial microaggressions on the interpersonal level, and the daily cultural tax accumulating over time are all contributing factors to the socioemotional severity of racial battle fatigue.

Given the well-documented challenge of being a change agent in higher education, some strategies and suggestions for navigating institutional racism and coping with racial battle fatigue have been offered in the literature. On the personal level, Collins (2000) describes micro-resistance as being manifested through the daily practice of self-definitions that center affirmation and self-evaluation of intellect and skill. Micro-resistance is a critical strategy for individuals to recognize and utilize, especially on the days when showing up for work can be a challenge. The benefits of positive affirmations can further support other strategies like emotional management, decision-making for

engagement, and self-reflection. Additionally, Evans and Moore (2015) discuss the emotional management required for people of color as they move through the decision-making process of how and when to respond to microaggressions and other forms of racism within their institutions. As a result of this constant emotional management, as described in the above account of racial battle fatigue, it may seem counterintuitive to an activist mindset to choose inaction as an option. For example, Evans and Moore (2015) go on to describe how the decision to disengage or *not* challenge racism can actually be an intentional long-term strategy to be able to effectively navigate White institutions. This is an important perspective to keep in mind when considering one's activism over a lifespan.

Continuous self-reflection is another key personal development strategy for avoiding burn-out. Pendakur (2016) recommends that student affairs practitioners as empowerment agents must expand their interrogation and understanding of their own relationships to power, privilege, and identity, especially as such relations may shift through different institutional contexts and professional stages over time. Also, given the ever-changing nature of our work, it is important for practitioners to periodically evaluate their ability and effectiveness as an empowerment agent using assessment frameworks, tools, and processes (Pendakur, 2016). If self-awareness is the foundation to social justice education, it is important to hold ourselves accountable to this practice, particularly when it is not required, recognized, or applauded by our institutions as critical or necessary to our work.

Beyond our personal capacities, there are also strategies for interpersonal relationship development necessary to build a community of support. Miller et al. (2017) describe the task of practitioners using their own identities, both marginalized and privileged, when facilitating meaningful connections and empowered participant engagement. This on-demand display of vulnerability can be a wearisome but fruitful strategy in building a support network on campus. Or, as Pendakur (2016) describes in further detail, there is a need to continue to develop a "critical network orientation, asset-mindedness, community embeddedness, political worldview, and ability to maintain critical consciousness while embedded in the power structure of your institution" (p. 124). The more vulnerable and transparent we are about our identity and lived experience, the greater the opportunity for others to connect with us and perhaps align themselves with our efforts.

These efforts, of course, do not occur in a vacuum. Considering the nebulous, sometimes shaky ground on which practitioners can walk, it should be noted how our environments, roles, and our work are also ever-evolving and changing. As Gaston-Gayles, Wolf-Wendel, Tuttle, Twombly, and Ward (2005) describe:

> advances made during the civil rights era concerning the student-institution relationship seem to be reversing. Student affairs professionals once again

find themselves controlling student behavior in order to minimize nega-
tive publicity for the institution. Student affairs professionals sometimes
act *in loco parentis* and may not even know the interests and needs of their
students.

(p. 277)

From our perspective, we call for a return to Civil Rights era practices
in how student affairs staff must conscientiously and strategically align them-
selves with movements for social change. Therefore, a strategy for staying well
while working against institutional racism may seem obvious but should not go
unsaid: we must center our work with students intentionally and in life-giving
ways. To do so, we should engage in "empowering actions and relationship
building with students, while also working with them to decode and navigate,
as well as challenge, the educational system" (Pendakur, 2016, p. 124). In the
process of guiding our students through difficult terrains, we must recognize,
role model, and reinforce our confidence and ability to do so for *ourselves*,
which can be incredibly empowering and rewarding.

While we have described skills and strategies here that are extant in the
literature, the following section emerges from our own lived experiences as
practitioners as we attempt to illuminate and crystallize underexplored dynam-
ics that are now more critical and necessary than before, in our increasingly
high pressure, polarized, and volatile academic environments. We wrestle with
the question, how does the student affairs practitioner continue to resist co-
optation while simultaneously fighting burn-out, racial battle fatigue, and the
prescribed liminality of their role? We offer both practitioner skills and institu-
tional strategies, followed by illustrative micro-case studies.

Practitioner Skills

Building on what has been identified in the literature, we now offer our skills
and strategies based on decades of nuanced, practical experience working
on the ground. In particular, we derive these prescriptions from our work
with students as experienced student affairs professionals and executive lead-
ers having navigated several institutions through the major sociopolitical shifts
between the Bush, Obama, and Trump presidencies. To be sure, we are specifi-
cally referring to the observable and measurable impact of shifting public dis-
courses, attitudes, and behaviors made more evident since the 2016 presidential
election, which have been reflected on college and university campuses. In
addition to instances such as the violent clash spurred by the presence of White
supremacists on the campus of the University of Virginia in 2017, we suggest
readers also consider the acute and everyday manifestations of racial violence
(e.g., hate speech, racist vandalism, and increases in White conservative student
groups). Therefore, considering our heightened collective racial awareness, we

believe it is imperative that student affairs professionals and other higher educa-
tion staff further develop five primary skills: 1) emotional resilience, 2) authen-
ticity in performativity, 3) values communication, 4) counter-positioning, and
5) rectifying discriminatory practices and policies. Using illustrative concepts,
metaphors, and concrete examples from the literature, each of the aforemen-
tioned skills are discussed in greater detail in the following subsections.

Emotional Resilience

To understand *emotional resilience*, consider a protective shield as a metaphorical
representation. Internal and amorphous, emotional resilience is a shield that
surrounds your heart, mind, and emotional being. This shield can recognize
your emotional triggers, calm your reactions, swell to match and soothe the
depth of your pain, and create a cushion of space between you and any external
threats to your emotional and mental health. The shield is also porous, letting
in only as much of any crisis or trauma as you can handle, holding it for as long
as you need to, and expelling whatever emotions may have developed so as not
to weigh you down or allow your mind to ruminate on negativity. The Ameri-
can Psychological Association (2014) describes resilience as a process of 'bounc-
ing back' from difficult experiences of adversity, trauma, tragedy, threats, or
significant stress. Resilience is not fixed, but rather a fluid experience that
exists on a continuum. Furthermore, "in defining resilience, it is important to
specify whether resilience is being viewed as a trait, a process, or an outcome"
(Southwick, Bonanno, Masten, Panter-Brick, & Yehuda, 2014, para. 5). For
our purposes, we consider emotional resilience as a process and an outcome as
it can be cultivated and developed over time and experiences.

 Strengthening emotional resilience, or emotional resilience as a process,
requires an acute level of self-awareness and unconditional grace and forgive-
ness to ourselves. The more we can identify and understand our triggers and
how we respond physically, mentally, and emotionally, the better equipped
we will be to manage them in a process separate from, but related to, working
with students attempting to manage their own emotions throughout their own
political engagement. For example, student affairs professionals in identity-
based work (or with diversity-and inclusion-focused responsibilities) may be
targeted by student activists and accused of 'selling out' or 'getting co-opted by
the institution.' Although it may seem counterintuitive internally, our years of
experience and life-long commitment to social justice does not matter to some
students in this moment. In fact, these very accusations can feel like a punch
to the gut—disempowering and deflating. Such claims also raise several practi-
cal and reflective questions worthy of consideration. How do we prepare for
these moments so as not to react defensively? How can we set aside our own
feelings and attend to those of the student in front of us? How do we provide
critical care to our student activists while maintaining our own dignity and

not further marginalizing them? Additional skills are needed to determine our answers, and as one works through each question, emotional resilience may be an outcome.

Authenticity in Performativity

Cultivating and exercising our emotional resilience is the foundation upon which the rest of the skills discussed here are possible. One way to temper our emotional resilience and prevent it from hardening into a solid barrier is by practicing *authenticity in performativity*. Seemingly opposing ideas, much like an actor evokes real emotions understood through lived experiences to perform, student affairs professionals must stay engaged with their missions and passions even as it may be limited by the reality of their roles within the boundaries of an institution or hierarchy. As Meyerson and Tompkins (2007) describe, "Tempered radicals are a special class of actors embedded in multiple institutional contexts—tied both to their workplaces and to identity and/or interest-based communities associated with alternative logics. Simultaneously insiders and outsiders, tempered radicals have been described as "individuals who identify with and are committed to their organizations, and are also committed to a cause, community, or ideology that is fundamentally different from, and possibly at odds with, the dominant culture of their organization[s]" (p. 311). Thinking of themselves as tempered radicals, student affairs professionals can practice authenticity in performativity. But how can we ensure that our constant juxtaposition will not paralyze us or render us ineffective from the perspectives of our students, colleagues, or superiors? The next three skills are ways in which we can continue to maintain our authenticity while strategically navigating political waters and leveraging any power or authority within ourselves or our roles for positive change from within our institutions.

Values Communication

How can we dismantle oppressive institutional structures while simultaneously building up inclusive communities and networks of support in its place? One often touted piece of advice is to stay true to your values or to know what your moral compass is. Beyond that, *values communication*, or the practice of intentionally communicating your values verbally and through actions to key stakeholders, is necessary for students and colleagues to understand the context from which you are operating, clarify potentially harmful perceptions or understandings of you, and signal to them how they can support you (if they want to). For example, if there is a student protest outside of the main administrative building on campus, student affairs professionals may be called upon to help manage, or control, the situation. Some campuses have more explicit policies than others under such circumstances. But if your role or position depends

on developing and establishing trust with students, then it would be prudent to engage with the students directly when you are out there to say, "I see you. I hear you. I'm here to support you." You may want to avoid observing the protest from a distance or standing with uniformed officers if there is any police or campus safety presence. Simultaneously, however, student affairs professionals must be mindful so as not to only co-locate themselves with students.

Counter-Positioning

Positionality with regards to race and gender plus the context of power, authority, and hierarchy is an important factor when considering the act of counter-positioning. For example, a program coordinator-level position will navigate differently from a director-level position will navigate differently from a dean or above level position. A program coordinator may more easily be able to or be expected to align themselves with student activists and experience less repercussion from the institution. At the other end of the spectrum, a vice president or president will likely be perceived to represent the interest of an institution over student needs and potentially be a target for student activists. Positions in between will have varying degrees of power and leverage largely dependent on how one counter-positions himself or herself. Imagine a seesaw balancing student demands on one end and 'the institution' on the other—the likely familiar dilemma of students versus the upper-level administration of your campus. As a go-between, your job is to run from one side to the other either lifting weight or adding weight in an effort to find a balance or compromise between the two. The challenge, of course, is that every time you run to one side, you counter-position yourself against the other and any progress you thought you made may slide backwards. Furthermore, you are only getting more and more fatigued by the whole exercise of running back and forth and eventually, and inevitably, you burn out.

Now imagine again the metaphor of the seesaw, but instead of running back forth between the two sides, you are the fulcrum. While the perception may be that you are constantly counter-positioning yourself between the two sides and not making any progress, you are actually consistently communicating to both sides, not only your values, but your institution's values. Then, through the slow but necessary task of building a common language and understanding, you can begin to reframe the issue from 'students versus the institution' to 'students and administrators versus institutional oppression.' Admittedly, many conditions would have to be perfect in order for this to actually happen. However, continuing to re-conceptualize the same issues as they arise may help us to find new and creative solutions.

Rectifying Discriminatory Policies and Practices

Institutional oppression is reinforced by discriminatory policies and practices, which are expected to be enforced by administrators. Willingness and

follow-through to work around or break policies as they currently exist is perhaps the most difficult skill to exercise of the ones we have discussed here. Depending on the circumstances, doing so may put your own job at risk and, understandably, that is not a risk that everyone can afford (financially, mentally, and/or emotionally) to take. However, the greater the potential risk may be, so is the greater potential positive impact you might have.

A simple example would be creating a culture of time flexibility in an office that may have typically been open from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. Perhaps you have noticed that one woman in the office with small children struggles to make it to work on time. Meanwhile, another younger colleague who has a very long commute often arrives before 9 a.m. or stays later than 5 p.m. to avoid traffic. Would it be possible to shift the office hours from 10 a.m. to 6 p.m.? Would it be possible to implement a 4/10 schedule where each person has the option to work a 10-hour day, 4 days a week? How can you shape a practice within the boundaries of an institutional policy? Or, thinking beyond the norm, are you willing to shape a practice beyond the boundaries of an institutional policy that you have never seen enforced?

A more challenging example might be the ever-changing event policies in the face of increased student activism. Whether an extra form for student organizations to fill out to budgeting for more security at controversial events, administrators are scrambling to be prepared and manage student demonstrations and protests to prevent situations that could very easily go viral. Suppose one of these event policies is more heavily enforced for a particular student group of a certain race—and they know it. How do you decide when and how to enforce a policy so that the impact is not disproportionately detrimental to an already marginalized group on campus? One rationale is that in order to enforce any given policy equitably rather than equally, it may feel unfair to the group that is not receiving any benefit from the extra consideration. Are you prepared to take that stand in the face of emboldened White privilege? Is it even within your authority to do so? Will your superiors uphold your decisions?

Institutional Strategies

Moving from the realm of practitioner skills to institutional strategies, higher education institutions must find ways to affirmatively support their staff practitioners. In doing so, colleges, and universities must discontinue operating 1) from deficit lenses that inevitably place the burden for change upon our students, and 2) in ways that are not blind to the reproduction of oppressive and inequitable institutional policies. How, therefore, does the higher education institution better demonstrate its support of student affairs staff? The following represent four arenas of anti-oppressive practice we recommend, based on our experiences, for institutional decision-makers and policy developers/enforcers.

Staff are often expected to maintain, uphold, and execute *de jure* and *de facto* policies of the institution. Clarity around the differential impact of institutional

policies on marginalized and minoritized communities is an important, justice-based consideration. One specific policy that seems regularly undermined when it comes to staff is the policy around free speech and academic freedom. In recent years especially, we have routinely seen cases in which hegemonic power is upheld through the determination of *whose* speech matters and is protected. Administrations can more clearly and tangibly support their student affairs staff through actively encouraging a clear understanding of the power dynamics and boundaries of free speech, rather than relying on fear and silencing of staff. If and when staff write provocative, but truth-telling, social media posts, for example, and are later vilified and pilloried in alt-right media, the university can take a demonstrative stand in solidarity rather than taking punitive action against the staff member. These situations present opportunities for institutions to *reify* the value and equal protection of free speech, which it often does only when said free speech is engaged by those whose speech many find bigoted, repugnant, and hateful (e.g., conservative White nationalists like Richard Spencer). In doing so, the administration and the institution take not only a stand for free speech, but acknowledge the distinctly structural asymmetries of power in which monied interests are often rallied behind the propagation of hateful ideologies at the base of racial violence. To that point, institutions can also push against the false equivalency and false narrative of the idea of *all* voices carrying the same weight. The voices that run counter to the tide of historic and present oppression do not carry the same systemic weight or power as the voices that seek to further oppression and marginalization. And, institutions that treat them as such simply play into the hands of hegemonic power, taking seemingly politically and power-neutral stances that actually have material consequences for marginalized peoples a part of campus communities.

As described in the earlier sections, staff labor (particularly by staff who are minoritized or also experiencing marginalization) is often under- or devalued. Racial battle fatigue is something to be borne, as a tax paid by many of us simply for choosing to serve in the field of higher education. Therefore, administrations can effectively support their student affairs practitioners who are on the front lines with student organizers and activists with both emotional and fiscal support. At minimum, administrations can simply listen when subordinated staff tell executive institutional leadership that they are hurting, confused, angry, feeling betrayed, and exhausted. More substantively, institutions that recognize the serious and even irrevocable toll such work can take could offer healing opportunities for staff through the provision of fully accessible, culturally relevant, and racially proficient mental health resources. Beyond emotional support, offering financial compensation for work performed above and beyond the job description is essential. For example, minoritized and marginalized staff are almost always already underpaid by the institution. Of course, every campus should perform an equity audit and ensure that their staff members are being paid equitably and commensurate with their work experience, education, and

actual labor performed. As an administrator, consider whether your campus can offer bonuses for extraordinary performance in difficult times. Are there additional professional development dollars that can be applied to staff members' budgets to afford them space to professionally grow and hone their skills?

Connected to emotional and fiscal support is our third institutional recommendation, which involves hiring additional skilled staff into under-resourced areas. We have both served in multiple centers in which we were called upon to do everything from student advising and counseling to fundraising to campus capacity building around diversity and inclusion to programming to assessment to strategic planning and well beyond. Continually doing the work in understaffed areas is a recipe for burn-out. Moreover, it is a recipe for the loss of talent from the institution. We concede that hiring talented staff is not an easy endeavor, but retaining talented staff once hired becomes impossible without an investment of key resources. How can institutional leaders re-direct funds, leverage fundraising campaigns, and secure the resources to hire more talented full-time equivalents (FTEs) into areas that desperately need the human bodies to simply do the work? We often carry the burden of holding our students, figuratively as well as literally holding them, as they weep and rage. We also carry the privilege of educating our students (and faculty and staff!) as innovative thinkers, team members, and leaders who carry the mantle of racial justice and anti-oppressive practices. But being asked to do more with less ensures that retention and flourishing of practitioners on the front lines of engaging with student activists and organizers will inevitably fail. Therefore, we strongly urge institutional leaders to directly confront budgetary practices and hiring decisions that may seem *equal* on their face, but that have inequitable impacts on singularly and multiply minoritized and marginalized staff.

Finally, a clear understanding of hegemony, and our own role in submitting to the dominant order, is vital. We, as practitioners, can engage with students and institutions and fight co-optation. However, consciousness is not enough (Pendakur, 2014). As Bourdieu (2000) notes:

> And another effect of the scholastic illusion is seen when people describe resistance to domination in the language of consciousness (and) expect political liberation to come from the 'raising of consciousness'—ignoring the extraordinary inertia which results from the inscription of social structures in bodies. . . . Only a thoroughgoing process of counter-training, involving repeated exercises, can, like an athlete's training, durably transform habitus.
>
> *(p. 172)*

Unsurprisingly, Bourdieu's (2000) notion of training and countertraining are largely lacking in mainstream educational programs for practitioners, as well as academics. For universities that purport to care about equity, it is imperative

to integrate counter-hegemonic training into educational curriculums. This is a difficult proposition for institutions. It calls for them to actively counter their own reproductive functions and privileging of particular forms of cultural capital. For practitioners interested in counter-exclusionary work, it is crucial to connect with existing empowerment agent mentors from inside or outside the institution. These veteran empowerment agents could teach, guide, and support emerging empowerment agents, in the face of institutional obstacles and inertia (Pendakur, 2014; Stanton-Salazar, 2010).

These are but four anti-oppressive practices that can be leveraged across campus types, so that student affairs practitioners are not isolated, punished, or underresourced because of their support of those who have historically been on the margins of our institutions of higher education. Moving ahead, we will delve into two case studies to illustrate the challenges and opportunities of our roles.

Micro Case Studies

In this final section of our chapter, we explore two vignettes as micro case studies surrounding issues of campus racial climate. The first account engages the scenario of the 'controversial speaker.' The other, per our earlier discussion, engages the matter of free speech protections for newly hired staff. For each, we offer two discussions, one of which focuses on identifying the skills required to navigate the case as a practitioner and the other based on institutional strategies that can be operationalized.

The Controversial Speaker

'Supporter' and 'protester' zones have been marked off outside for the overflow audience to a speaker known to espouse bigoted values invited by the conservative student group, Freedom and Liberty Society. Emotions and tensions are high as the protesters and supporters, a mix of students and community folks, trade offensive chants and antagonize each other. You know that there is a significant police presence both in uniform and in plain clothes. Leading up to this event, offensive posters depicting monkeys hanging from trees were put up anonymously around campus. A couple of students of color were caught on video taking them down from designated free speech zones. You have been asked to help manage the crowd. Suddenly, you recognize one of the students from the video as he hops over a barrier to charge towards a community member who just called him the despicably violent "n-word." You are the closest administrator to the situation. What do you do?

Practitioner Skills

The heat of a moment such as this demonstrates how critical it is to cultivate the skills of emotional resilience, authenticity in performativity, and values communication before such an incident occurs because you might not have time to think about it—you may just react. Emotional resilience will help you to be

shielded from the harm caused by hearing the "n-word" so that you can support the student who obviously has been triggered. Bodily harm may be an immediate concern in this volatile interaction. Are you prepared to intervene verbally or physically if necessary? Does the student recognize you or know what your values are? However you have or have not been able to demonstrate your authenticity in performativity or communicate your values will be revealed in this moment. If you know the student's name, use it! Call out to him or her, distract the student from the community member if possible, try to hold his or her eye contact and repeat simple grounding statements like "Take a deep breath" or "Listen to me—I'm here with you" or "Let's walk away" as you try to create distance between the student and the threat and guide him or her away from the scene. Within a week from the incident, set time aside to process your own feelings about it, identify what else could have been done or what could have been done differently or better, and follow up with the student to see if and how he or she has processed and move on. Refer the student to more resources if needed. If other students or staff also witnessed the account, clarify what happened in a way that doesn't vilify, and use the opportunity to denounce and/or educate about the difference between hate speech and free speech.

Institutional Strategies

What policies at your institution guide a moment like this? This could also be an opportunity to communicate or advocate for a zero tolerance policy for hate speech, for example. Are your stated policies and unstated practices designed to enhance or hinder the staff member's ability to authentically and tactically engage with the students, community members, and other parties involved? Assuming that some of these same student affairs practitioners have been supporting students as they have processed the offensive posters and prepared for the arrival of the controversial speaker, you have an opportunity to bolster your practitioners through emotional support or additional resources. Preparing, in advance, for various scenarios using tabletop exercises is a way to test the efficacy and equity-mindedness of the policies that currently guide your campus in these matters. Finally, ask yourself, as a decision-maker at an institution, why the burden for both counseling and coaching student organizers and activists falls on the shoulders of very few of your staff. This is a chance to take a hard look at how false equivalencies about free speech and the sheer imbalance of power in the academic context has blinded you to the powerful messages being delivered by your student activists and organizers about how the institution perpetuates inequality.

Freedom of Speech for Whom?

As the Vice President of Student Affairs, you recently hired a new director for the Africana Resource Center amid an arduous and highly scrutinized national search process. During his first week, you receive multiple complaints from alumni regarding a tweet that the new

director posted that says, *"White supremacy is alive and well inside our higher educa-tion institutions—masquerading as White fragility and unchecked White privilege."* The mostly White Board of Trustees is 'concerned,' and your boss, the university president, wants you to write the new director up in case he 'becomes a problem' so that there will be a pattern of 'mistakes' on the record. What do you do?

Practitioner Skills

This is another high pressure, politically and racially charged situation with a small benefit of more time than the previous case to be intentional and stra-tegic. The two skills that could be highlighted here are counter-positioning and rectifying discriminatory practices and policies. If your inclination is to uphold freedom of speech for your newly hired staff member, then you may be preparing to counter-position yourself to your superior or to alumni. If it is commonly understood that anything that ruffles alumni feathers must be cor-rected, then this is likely to be a challenge of rectifying a discriminatory prac-tice. While you may risk counter-positioning yourself to your superior, you gain an opportunity to manage up and have a critical conversation to clarify the actual problem. Is the problem that the new director of the Africana Resource Center said something that was untrue, or that the new director of the Africana Resource Center is Black in a predominantly (or historically) White institu-tion making statements about Whiteness that are perceived as offensive? On the other hand, you could also gain the trust and respect of your staff member, even though a critical conversation is also likely required to be had with him about his ability to cultivate authenticity in performativity and communicate his values in a way that doesn't get him in hot water. This could be a difficult conversation that could be easily misunderstood as you 'tone-policing,' but it is your responsibility as a manager to communicate the real implications of per-ceptions, however biased and misplaced they may be. This is an opportunity to serve as a grounded, empowering navigator and guide through the morass of institutional culture for your newest staff member—helping him to continue to cultivate his authentic *and* strategic voice in the organization.

Institutional Strategies

First and foremost, it is imperative for campus leaders to examine the sources of any discomfort the tweet provoked. Without countertraining, it is easy to fall back upon the position of 'representing the institution,' which can also mask status quo practices of respectability politics and silencing. Where are the kernels of truth in what the director said? How, in fact, does the alumni pres-sure represent exactly the forms of White supremacy the director is describing? Cultivating a crucial set of skills for institutional leaders to handle, for example, alumni responses to critical feedback that emerges from within the institution

is a necessary investment, particularly in the age of social media. This moment affords key leaders the opportunity to transform a fraught incident into a teachable moment—educating and informing those who wield traditional forms of power. Finally, events such as these test the institution's abilities to truly engage the boundaries of free speech and ensure that staff receive the same protections as faculty and students.

Conclusion

What we have outlined in this chapter is merely another beginning, for both practitioners and institutions, as they consider what it means to pursue freedom, liberation, and justice in all its forms in our deeply inequitable niche of society. It is another beginning of complex concepts, potent imagery, and probable scenarios routinely faced by student affairs professionals and other higher education staff. And, to be sure, by no means has what we have discussed been limited to the figurative or fictional dimensions of our imaginations. Rather, the tax of emotional labor and the toll of racial battle fatigue have very real and often detrimental consequences on critically conscious and engaged student affairs professionals across the nation. Substantiated by the literature and buttressed by our decades of collective practical experience, we excavated and presented important themes related to the often paradoxical nature of staff positions and the choices and strategies practitioners undertake for professional survival. Yet, the struggles of career sustainability and opportunities for advancement for staff have remained challenged by the current racial and sociopolitical climates of intolerance. This is due, in part, to the preservation of the status quo, often a path of least resistance for institutions, which has largely resulted in measurable harm to minoritized and marginalized members of professional communities on campus.

Building on these realities we offered for consideration several practitioner skills and institutional strategies. Drawing on our own professional knowledge and experiences and further illustrated by two micro case studies, we provided tangible applications of how practitioners and postsecondary institutions can better navigate increasingly complex times, sociopolitical roles, and situations of conflict. As student affairs practitioners, often on the front lines of supporting students in myriad and constantly evolving ways, we can learn and improve the skills necessary to enact resistance, shape our campus cultures, and reform institutional practices. Furthermore, our institutions and their leaders can learn to improve their own skills and strategies in these areas, which can provide staff with the grounded motivation to continue important political work with integrity.

While the aforementioned skills and strategies described in this chapter allow for conscientious political engagement among student affairs professionals on-campus, the ongoing work of transforming ourselves and our colleges

and universities from the inside out is but one part of a larger political project. That is, while we have taken a deep dive into navigating institution-specific politics—and the impacts of the national political climate on our campuses— what we have offered can and should also translate into activism and political engagement beyond the visible boundaries of our institutions. This means finding equally fulfilling ways of engaging and investing in broader sociopolitical change. By doing so, we are able to role model healthy political and civic engagement for our students, which includes organized resistance, and demonstrate care and concern for the world from whence our students come and to which they will inevitably return. This encourages student activists and student affairs practitioners to locate their experiences as a *microcosm* of broader systemic realities and ultimately transform ourselves, our institutions, and our communities from the inside out.

References

American Psychological Association. (2014). *The road to resilience*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. Retrieved from www.apa.org/helpcenter/road-resilience.aspx

Bensimon, E. M. (2007). The underestimated significance of practitioner knowledge in the scholarship of student success. *The Review of Higher Education*, *30*(4), 441–469.

Bourdieu, P. (2000). *Pascalian meditations*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Collins, P. H. (2000). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Evans, L., & Moore, W. L. (2015). Impossible burdens: White institutions, emotional labor, and micro-resistance. *Social Problems*, *62*(3), 439–454. doi:10.1093/socpro/spv009

Fasching-Varner, K. J., Albert, K. A., Mitchell, R. W., & Allen, C. A. (Eds.). (2015). *Racial battle fatigue in higher education: Exposing the myth of post-racial America*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Gaston-Gayles, J. L., Wolf-Wendel, L. E., Tuttle, K. N., Twombly, S. B., & Ward, K. (2005). From disciplinarian to change agent: How the civil rights era changed the roles of student affairs professionals. *NASPA Journal*, *42*(3), 263–282.

Harrison, L. M. (2010). Consequences and strategies student affairs professionals engage in their advocacy roles. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, *47*(2), 197–214.

Jeung, D.-Y., Kim, C., & Chang, S.-J. (2018). Emotional labor and burnout: A review of the literature. *Yonsei Medical Journal*, *59*(2), 187–193.

Meyerson, D., & Tompkins, M. (2007). Tempered radicals as institutional change agents: The case of advancing gender equality at the University of Michigan. *Harvard Journal of Law and Gender*, *30*(2), 303–322.

Miller, R. A., Jones, V. A., Reddick, R. R., Lowe, T., Flunder, B. F., Hogan, K., & Rosal, A. I. (2017). Educating through microaggressions: Self-care for diversity educators. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, *55*(1), 14–26.

Padilla, A. M. (1994). Ethnic minority scholars, research, and mentoring: Current and future issues. *Educational Researcher*, *23*(4), 24–27.

Pendakur, S. L. (2014). Going against the grain: Higher education practitioners countering neoliberalism and postracial ideology. In K. Kumashiro & B. Ngo (Eds.), *Six lenses for anti-oppressive education* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing.

Pendakur, S. L. (2016). Empowerment agents: Developing staff and faculty to support students at the margins. In V. Pendakur (Ed.), *Closing the opportunity gap: Identity-conscious strategies for retention and student success.* Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.

Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state, and higher education.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Smith, W. A., Hung, M., & Franklin, J. D. (2011). Racial battle fatigue and the miseducation of black men: Racial microaggressions, societal problems, and environmental stress. *The Journal of Negro Education, 80*(1), 63–82.

Southwick, S. M., Bonanno, G. A., Masten, A. S., Panter-Brick, C., & Yehuda, R. (2014). Resilience definitions, theory, and challenges: Interdisciplinary perspectives. *European Journal of Psychotraumatology, 5.* http://doi.org/10.3402/ejpt.v5.25338

Stanton-Salazar, R. D. (2010). A social capital framework for the study of institutional agents and their role in the empowerment of low-status students and youth. *Youth & Society, 43*(3), 1066–1109.

Zapf, D. (2002). Emotion work and psychological well-being: A review of the literature and some conceptual considerations. *Human Resource Management Review, 12,* 237–268.

SECTION IV

Integrating Student and Institutional Contexts

11

STUDENT AND ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES TO STUDENT COLLECTIVE ACTION ON CAMPUS

Devon T. Lockard, Dominique J. Baker, and Richard S.L. Blissett

Introduction

The 2015–2016 academic year, for the University of Missouri community, was a year of action. In the fall, undergraduate and graduate students alike participated in and organized a variety of protest activities designed to voice their opposition to a multitude of issues, including (but not limited to) the following: cuts to graduate student health care, racism on campus, and aggressive tactics taken by local law enforcement towards students who are racial or ethnic minorities. Students developed written demands, marched in several 'Racism Lives Here' rallies, staged boycotts of the student center, and attempted to participate in direct communications with university leadership (Weinberg & Blatchford, 2015). Following the threat of a boycott by the football team as well as at least one student's hunger strike, both the president and the chancellor of the university resigned from their positions (Eligon & Perez-Pena, 2015). As of this writing, three years later, it is believed that the University of Missouri is still experiencing challenges, including decreased enrollment, as a result of the issues that were unearthed that year (Flatt, 2017).

The University of Missouri, however, is not the only institution to have seen a significant amount of student activism in recent years (from this volume see Chapters 1 and 9). Students at colleges and universities across the United States, ranging from California Polytechnic State University (Payne, 2018) to St. John's University in New York (Gabbatt, 2018), are joining together to call attention to conditions on campuses that they have deemed to be unacceptable. Indeed, while political engagement and student activism have both long been parts of American higher education, the nation seems to be in the midst of a specific wave of activism that focuses particularly on racism and other types of oppression and discrimination.

In this chapter, we focus on one type of recent student activism that was inspired by a student campaign at Harvard University, named 'I, Too, Am Harvard.' The most famous part of the Harvard organizing involved a photo campaign, shared on social media platforms such as Tumblr and Twitter, where Black Harvard students held up for the camera dry-erase boards with "racially insensitive, often humiliating remarks made by their peers, as well as would-be responses to them" (Butler, 2014, para. 4). The Harvard campaign started in the Spring semester of 2014 and quickly spread across the country. As other movements similar to I, Too, Am Harvard expanded, most campuses took on similar names, such as I, Too, Am NYU or I, Too, Am Berkeley. Students at other campuses employed similar tactics but chose other names: for example, We All Are UVA or Being Black at Michigan State University. To discuss all I, Too, Am Harvard-like campaigns, we will use 'I, Too, Am' as shorthand (abbreviated 'ITA') in this chapter.

What is there for college and university leaders to learn from movements like ITA? There are some assumptions that come with this analysis. The first is that these movements were ostensibly in response to something that the students were experiencing on their campuses. As such, understanding the motivators for collective action serves as an important source of information for decision-makers who are trying to understand how to make campus environments more acceptable for students. Second, student activism is currently a political reality on institutions' campuses. College and university administrators should be aware of how to respond to student protests, while also being proactive with creating campus climates that are inclusive to all students before protests occur. There are a few examples of current resources that address student protests in America, such as the Robinson-Edley report (Edley & Robinson, 2012) and a monograph from the Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education (NASPA) (Axmacher et al., 2014). These are valuable resources for how administrators can react appropriately and ensure that systems are in place to do so, but the focus of these materials is largely on the legal frameworks around civil disobedience and responses to student mobilization. While the legal perspective is critical, understanding how these events are perceived on the ground can provide political, emotional, and moral context for decision-makers. In other words, further research can illuminate, beyond legal recommendations, what appears to be the *right* course of action as conveyed by participants and spectators?

As previously mentioned, this chapter focuses on one specific type of student protest, the ITA movement, which is part of a much larger political climate addressing equity and inclusion issues (including, notably, movements such as Black Lives Matter). Understanding the stories of this movement provides insight into the current push on campuses across the United States for higher education administrators to remain vigilant about creating inclusive campuses, while addressing oppressive environments. What were the motivations behind

students' actions, and what do those motivations help us learn about how to make an inclusive environment? In addition, how have colleges and universities responded, and what lessons are there to gain from students' perceptions of those responses? This chapter elevates and highlights organized students as players in the efforts to make campuses more inclusive and equitable (see Chapters 2 and 12 from this volume).

The next section of this chapter presents a brief review of the motivations for student protests on American campuses and then follows with the history of the ITA movement, highlighting the specific research on the ITA movement. For a review of the history of student protest in general, please see Chapter 1 in this book. Following the discussion of antecedents and motivations to ITA campaigns, we review new research on institutional responses to the ITA campaigns. The chapter ends with implications for higher education stakeholders followed by recommendations for future work to be conducted by researchers.

Research on Motivations for Student Protests on American Campuses

Why do students protest? While the rich tradition of research on the inception of social movements (generally speaking) has developed a substantial amount of theory on how collective action is inspired (e.g., Buechler, 2003; McAdam, 1982; McCarthy & Zald, 1977), researchers have also taken a specific look at the motivations behind student protests, given the long history of student protest in the United States (see Chapter 1). In particular, several studies have used a variety of methods to identify institutional predictors of student collective action and have found some consistent factors, such as size of undergraduate enrollment and selectivity (e.g., Altbach, 1981; Astin, Astin, Bayer, & Bisconti, 1975; Baker & Blissett, 2018; Barnhardt, 2015; Rhoads, 2003). When looking specifically at movements focused on anti-racism, Ndemanu (2017) utilized document analysis to analyze published demands from Black students who attended 73 different institutions in order to determine the motivators of student action. Ndemanu (2017) found two prominent demands: 1) increasing the presence of underrepresented racial/ethnic minority faculty and staff on campus and 2) mandatory cultural sensitivity training for faculty.

The student protest movement we focus on in this chapter, the I, Too, Am movement, exists as part of a long history of college students organizing. We now turn to an overview of the history of the ITA movement.

History of I, Too, Am Movement

Students created the original I, Too, Am Harvard campaign in response to an article in the *Harvard Crimson* in November 2012, written by a White student, entitled "Affirmative dissatisfaction: Affirmative action does more harm than

good" (Siskind, 2012). Affirmative action debates ensued following the release of this article, and despite concerns expressed by students, campus administrators did not respond. Commenting on the climate during this period, Kamiko Matsuda-Lawrence, a Black Harvard student, noted that "there is a feeling a lot of black students share, which is that even though you got a letter of acceptance, you're never fully accepted on this campus" (Vingiano, 2014, para. 16). She then, through an independent study course, conducted 40 interviews with Black students at Harvard and used those interviews as the core of a play she wrote and directed, titled *I, Too, Am Harvard*. This play was named in reference to Langston Hughes's *I, Too, Am America* (Blissett & Baker, 2018). Although there were few mentions of the affirmative action article from Matsuda-Lawrence during the interviews, almost all participants brought the article up. Matsuda-Lawrence developed the play with the intention that it would be "our way of speaking back and saying we belong here" (Vingiano, 2014, para. 14). Matsuda-Lawrence and others had one big demand for Harvard administration: they wanted "the president and administration to issue a public statement in response to the affirmation action article to support students of color, and say why they value diversity on campus" (Vingiano, 2014, para. 25).

As buzz about the play grew around campus, Matsuda-Lawrence worked with another student, Carol Powell, to promote the play. Powell developed the photo campaign that became the primary face of the campaign. After being initially published on Tumblr (a blog-based social media platform) and YouTube (a video hosting platform), BuzzFeed (a social and cultural news and entertainment outlet) published an article about the work called '63 Black Harvard Students Share Their Experiences in a Powerful Photo Project,' which subsequently garnered millions of views (Vingiano, 2014). Through the I, Too, Am Harvard campaign's exposure on social media platforms, as well as in the news, students attending other institutions began to create their own versions of the campaign. In the United States, at least 40 institutions, private Ivy League institutions and public state institutions alike, had ITA campaigns, as did multiple institutions in other countries (Baker & Blissett, 2018). Some of these campaigns tweaked the tactic, but the core focus on diversity and inclusion on campus was consistent. Though these ITA campaigns originally focused on the experiences of Black students on campuses, the experiences of other historically marginalized populations, such as women, students with disabilities, and students identifying as lesbian, gay, bisexual, and/or transgender all were included in various campaigns as well (Blissett & Baker, 2018).

Through social media, the ITA movement became permanent, personal, and shareable. The pictures of the campaigns included faces of students while they shared their writing and their stories. In contrast to other forms of student protest, ITA campaigns were "able to immortalize their voices into a form that was meaningful and could be continually referenced" (Blissett & Baker, 2018, para. 21). Often, these pictures carried provocative statements that served to

tell the true experiences the students faced. A few examples of these include the following:

- "You're dressed like you might shoot me right now—such a thug." (from *I, Too, Am Harvard*, available at http://itooamharvard.tumblr.com/)
- "Asian, Jewish, *and* adopted? Of course Davidson wanted you." (from *I, Too, Am Davidson*, available at http://itooamdavidson.tumblr.com/)
- "You're good at debate for a girl." (from *I, Too, Am Cornell*, available at https://twitter.com/itooamcornell)
- "How do you know you're gay if you haven't had my dick inside you?" (from *I, Too, Am Lehigh*, available at https://twitter.com/itooamlehigh)

It is important to remember, as alluded to at the beginning of this chapter, that the ITA movement was not the exclusive form of student protest during this time. Several other protests were prominent across the United States, such as a series of sit-ins at Colgate University in 2014, where students protested the mistreatment of racial/ethnic minority students on campus (New, 2014). During the same year, students attending the University of Virginia protested the violent arrest of a fellow Black student (Associated Press, 2015). Further, Black Lives Matter campaigns occurred on college campuses across the country (Somashekhar, 2015). These examples do not constitute an exhaustive list of student protests occurring on college campuses in recent years. Still, they show students wanting to increase the visibility of issues of racism and other forms of discrimination that occur on college campuses.

Research on the ITA Movement

In previous work, Baker and Blissett employed both quantitative (Baker & Blissett, 2018) and qualitative (Blissett & Baker, 2018; Blissett, Baker, & Fields, in press) methods to investigate the story of the ITA movement. First, Baker and Blissett (2018) conducted a quantitative study that identified institutional factors that predicted the odds of having an ITA campaign on campus. Because of the limitations of the quantitative design to investigate less measurable factors such as campus climate and current events, Blissett and colleagues (in press) also conducted document analysis of student newspapers at institutions with ITA campaigns, supplemented by qualitative interviews of student leaders of ITA campaigns, in order to gather information from the sources directly. The combined results of these investigations are discussed below.[1]

Characteristics of Institutions That Had ITA Campaigns

With the main idea that the ITA movement is an important source of political information for administrators to understand how to stay vigilant against

oppressive campus environments, Baker and Blissett (2018) sought to understand the institutional characteristics that predicted the mobilization of an I, Too, Am campaign. If campus leaders better understand the kinds of environments that are more or less likely to host these campaigns, perhaps they can design proactive strategies to address the concerns of students, which can often be overlooked.

Baker and Blissett (2018) found that selectivity, size, and percentage of students who are Pell grant recipients were all predictive variables for the presence of a campaign. Initially the campaigns were centered around issues of race; however Baker and Blissett (2018) were not able to find evidence that racial diversity (undergraduate enrollment rates of White, Black, Latino, Asian, and other non-White students) of the institution was associated with the odds of a campaign occurring on campus. Also, when looking at year-to-year or five-year changes in institutional characteristics, such as the change in enrollment of Black students, Baker and Blissett (2018) found no evidence that these variables predicted the odds of a campaign occurring on campus. The idea that institutions may need to focus on more than just numeric diversity in order to create more inclusive campus environments has been suggested by authors in the past, including Chester, Lewis, and Crowfoot (2005) and Garces and Jayakumar (2014), and these results add more evidence to support this idea. Due to the often explicit racial focus of the ITA campaigns, this led to an important question: what else could it be, beyond racial diversity, that is driving mobilization?

Qualitative Motivations for Mobilization

Document analysis of student newspapers, supplemented with interviews of campus student protest leaders, provided information that would allow for the understanding of campus environments and events that might have motivated the students to start a campaign in the first place (Blissett et al., in press). The sources suggested diverse motivations, but common themes emerged that could inform research and practice. The first theme was that students reported a negative campus climate for students of historically marginalized groups (e.g., Black students) and this campus climate existed before the campaigns emerged. This negative campus climate was described as a general feeling of disrespect towards historically marginalized groups of students. One study participant expressed that this negative climate was not exclusive to that of one campus, by saying, "letting people know like, these people on this one campus aren't just making this up, this is happening all over, in universities all over the country and all over the world, and so just kind of adding our contribution to like, kind of corroborate the voice of our, you know, of our classmates on other campuses, as well."

The second theme was that of setting explicit goals to expose microaggressions on campus and to provide a space for historically marginalized groups to

speak out and have solidarity. One participant stated that the purpose of creating an ITA campaign was to "demonstrate to our university and faculty that our community is very visible, it's very active, and it needs the support systems put in place to effectively, essentially go to school." Many students responded that taking the tactic of Harvard students was a way to "shock people into the realization that students were facing negative experiences on campus." The exposure from the campaigns was not just intended to target students, but also campus administration. Students reported feeling that the institution was not responding to their needs adequately and thus wanted to highlight their experiences. Altogether, the students who organized these ITA campaigns wanted to address perceived racist (or otherwise oppressive) campus climates at their institutions. In many instances, institutions had experienced recent racist events that the students expressed had contributed to motivations for mobilization.

Overall, the students reported creating ITA campaigns in order to raise awareness of the negative experiences of historically marginalized groups that would, in turn, hopefully compel others to change their behaviors towards the students. These negative experiences were often in the form of microaggressions that students faced (such as those expressed on the dry-erase boards in the photo campaigns). One study participant, highlighting the power of raising awareness of their negative experiences, shared that they "deserve[d] to be treated like a human being." In general, the campaigns were centered around microaggressions and pushing for others to understand and recognize the prevalence of and harm done by these microaggressions.

Reviewing the quantitative and qualitative research on the antecedents to ITA campaigns, we find that students were focused on raising awareness of their discriminatory campus climates. While prior research has not found evidence of a direct association between having a campaign and the numerical racial/ethnic diversity of institutions, there is evidence that students' experiences with discrimination and oppression (focused on historically disadvantaged student populations) motivated the creation of ITA campaigns. Both student interviews and articles in the student newspapers reflected a concern with the ability of institutional administrators and faculty to recognize the challenges facing students and respond appropriately. We now turn to new research investigating student perceptions of institutional responses to ITA campaigns.

Institutional Responses

With the assumption that the ITA movement is a view into the current political climate on campuses, administrators need to be adamant about creating an environment of inclusivity while also combating negative climates. As expressed by the students who started the I, Too, Am Harvard campaign in reaction to the affirmative action article, the students desired a stronger administrative response to negative suppositions and microaggressions aimed at minority students

(Vingiano, 2014). Administrators and faculty in higher education have faced difficulty in appropriately responding to student mobilization for a number of reasons. We highlight three possible reasons below before presenting new evidence on student perceptions of institutional responses to student–led protest.

Difficulty in Determining Response to Protest

First, the group that determines the response and whether it is appropriate is unclear. Should responses come from the president or a cabinet member who has specific responsibilities related to student experience or diversity and inclusion? Can faculty members and other administrators respond to students' concerns? If it is allowable for faculty members and other administrators to respond, how should those stakeholders respond? Faculty and other administrators could express concerns to the president or a cabinet member, but they could also discuss concerns with the students themselves or with the public via social media. In addition to the confusion about who responds, institutions do not appear to have a clear guide to who determines the appropriateness of the response. Do students have a voice in whether a response is appropriate? Is it solely top-level administrators that weigh in on these types of responses or do faculty and other administrators have the opportunity to contribute their ideas? These questions frame a small window into the (potentially) competing interests on a college campus who could respond or be expected to evaluate the appropriateness of a response to student protest action.

Second, faculty and administrative leaders at institutions are rarely educated on how to respond to student mobilization and protest. This lack of clear resources or training has led to national organizations for administrators, such as NASPA, creating guidance for institutions to navigate student mobilization. The majority of these types of guidance focus on the legal aspects of institutional response. For example, Axmacher and colleagues (2014) outlined a guide for practitioners within higher education for the Education Law Association (ELA) and NASPA. Four of the authors of the guide held terminal legal degrees. The article focused on themes such as "speech and assembly codes," "planning and organizing with our campus police partners," and a question and answer section focused on questions like "what legitimate limitations may colleges place on student protest?" (Axmacher et al., 2014). This guidance included no instructions on how to potentially address the concerns that motivated students to mobilize in the first place or how to address student concerns once the mobilization occurred. It is valuable for institutional leaders to have guidance on how to legally deal with student mobilization. However, the lack of focus on actually dealing with the concerns of students, particularly as it relates to the campus climate, may leave higher education administrators with little ability to be responsive to student needs.

Third, institutional stakeholders must navigate responding to student mobilization within a larger sociopolitical context that does not consistently support

higher education (Johnson & Peifer, 2017). While states previously enacted laws to curtail student protest (Ravitch, 1983), new policies focus on disallowing students from interrupting the speech of others (which is not protected by the First Amendment in the Bill of Rights). For example, the Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System has adopted a new policy based on the idea that "students and employees have the freedom to discuss any problem that presents itself," that intends to "foster the ability of members of the university community to engage in such debate and deliberation in an effective and responsible manner" (University of Wisconsin System, 2017, para. 6). This new policy states that no student or employee is allowed to silence someone else, through "protests and demonstrations that materially and substantially disrupt the rights of others to engage in or listen to expressive activity shall not be permitted" (University of Wisconsin System, 2017, para. 15).

Student Perceptions of Institutional Response to ITA Campaigns

Obstacles highlighted in the previous section led us to investigate how students perceived the responses of the administrations at their institutions after creating ITA campaigns. The results discussed later come from a larger research study, detailed in Blissett et al. (in press). It is important to note that the aim of this study was not to conduct a comprehensive investigation into the kind of policy and/or practice actions that institutions took in response to their respective campaigns. Indeed, several universities, including Harvard, Skidmore, and Vanderbilt, had student newspapers that discussed some concrete actions that the universities were taking. In order to understand the dimensions of responses, we focus only on discussion about direct actions that the campus administrations took towards supporting the campaigns themselves. On this note, newspapers from five different institutions noted important symbolic actions. For example, at Michigan State University, where students primarily spoke out using the hashtag #BBMSU (an abbreviation for 'Being Black at Michigan State University') on Twitter, the official @michiganstateu account posted, "We are listening, and MSU encourages all students to share their experiences. We value diversity at MSU. #BBMSU." At Oregon State University, the university president joined the students in their rally against discrimination, stating that "I'm here because I believe what they believe. . . . It's a wonderful opportunity to be strong in the face of ugly, cowardly acts."

Perceived Lack of Appropriate Responsiveness From Administration

Student opinions about administrative responses (or non-responses) to their campaigns were generally not covered by the campus newspapers, given the

specificity of this particular type of feedback. However, there were critiques of administrative responses, as noted by students in our interviews. Before these campaigns, all study participants noted that their respective institutions had been largely unresponsive towards incidents of marginalization. When negative incidents did happen, students commented on their campus administrations "sweeping it under the rug and kind of, you know, not really doing much about it." After the vandalism of a cultural center on campus, one participant called it "irresponsible" that the administration did not let students know about the vandalism, express condemnation for the action, or host spaces for people to talk about what had happened.

When the ITA campaigns started, none of the participants mentioned pushback from their administrations. Overwhelmingly, there did not seem to be any coherent response from administrations in any direction, positive or negative. Students reported noting this silence on the part of administration.

> I don't really remember like, a formal response from administration. I don't remember even like—like, sometimes when things happen on campus they'll like, send an email acknowledging it. They didn't do anything like that, they didn't—I mean, like I said, there just wasn't a lot of, I think, interaction. Like, I feel like I remember getting the idea that people were listening, but as far as like, actually like, coming to us and trying to like, work towards a response, I don't remember as much of that.

Because of this perceived lack of responsiveness, students took it upon themselves to help heal their communities. One student, with their peers, asked themselves at the time, "What are some things that we can provide to our fellow students to kind of give them the support systems that they need? Because our university is not providing that." All participants felt as though students were shouldering the burden, especially those from marginalized groups.

Perceived Lack of Support From Administration

Across all of the interviews, students mentioned that they would have liked more support and response from their administrations and that, to some extent, they felt owed that support. One study participant shared:

> So it might have been nice to have the known support, concrete support from the institution, given I paid [thousands of] dollars a year to go there, and every student deserves to have the same experience, and I didn't have the same experience as a lot of my peers. So maybe I wish, you know, administration had kind of—not adopted, but said their view was our view. . . . But definitely I would have liked more support, knowing that, you know, my school is going to support me and going to protect me as a student.

In this way, the student was conveying that the administration had a primary responsibility for providing this support, but that it was failing in that respect.

Indeed, this administrative support was one of the main things that the interviewed students mentioned wanting to see come out of the movement. Another study participant mentioned:

> The biggest thing we were looking for was recognition from administration that the way that they had handled the situation wasn't supportive, and that they would take part in our message that racism has no place on our campus, and that there would be direct policy or some sort of action taken from administration to change the environment.

Students also requested that administrative support also include more intentional spaces for students to communicate their needs to administration and for administration to listen to and react to those needs.

Perceived Abdication of Responsibility by Administration

While there were indeed examples of campus administrators validating the campaigns, this was not the majority case. From our student interviews, we gathered that the students generally did not think administrators' responses went far enough, if they went anywhere. The students reported feeling that they were carrying a burden that should have been carried by their institutions' leadership, and they wanted to see more engagement from their campus administrators to both listen to students and support them in their advocacy. The students provided concrete examples of ways that their administrations could improve their responses to the ITA campaigns specifically, and student expressions of concern generally. Next, we discuss the practitioner implications of these results.

Implications for Campus Administrators

Conceptualizing these campaigns as valid views into the political climate on campus, stakeholders are often left wondering how institutions can address student concerns about campus climate? There are two main areas for addressing this question. The first are proactive solutions, which focus on making sure that the campus is inclusive of all students and that there are working support structures in place before the students even get to campus. The second are reactive solutions, which are centered on responding to student mobilization in a constructive manner.

Proactive Solutions

The evidence reviewed in the 'Research on the ITA Movement' section of this chapter supports the notion that students were responding to certain

inhospitable aspects at their institution when creating ITA campaigns. Therefore, proactive solutions may be one way to create changes in the campus climate. These proactive solutions would need to be focused on more than just the numerical diversity, or the share of enrolled students from different identity demographics, of the institution. Numerical diversity is necessary, yet an insufficient step in creating inclusive campus climates. Campus administrators, such as the president, provost, chief diversity officer, and/or the board of trustees, as well as faculty and student affairs staff, need to all also focus on the campus environment that the students from historically marginalized groups are living and learning in. This suggestion is not meant to say that increasing the actual presence of historically disadvantaged students is not still relevant, but instead to urge that concerns for the campus environment could be just as important, an implication also cited by Garces and Jayamkumar's (2014) work on dynamic diversity. Many students voiced concerns of discontent with their current campus environments which suggests that, at the time, there were not already spaces to have healthy and responsive dialogue.

In order to create a positive and healthy space for students to have dialogue, institutions must make two changes to support students voices. First, institutions must reorient the structures of communication and governance that they currently have in order to allow students the opportunity to voice their concerns. Second, institutions must cultivate support networks and spaces for students intentionally that will allow them to share their experiences and learn from each other, possibly using already-established programs such as intergroup dialogue programming (e.g., Zúñiga, 2003). With the assumption that institutions believe that students' voices are important and valid, institutions must then create spaces where students feel that their voices are valued.

Other causes for concern are the specific environmental variables institutions should be vigilant about as they pursue higher prestige and/or selectivity. Neither elite status nor admissions rates are completely malleable, but institutions should be aware of the evidence that has shown some non-desirable correlations associated with environments that work alongside elitism. By establishing and supporting inclusive spaces for historically marginalized groups, institutions have the opportunity to alleviate these concerns. However, an alternative implication could be that students at these more elite intuitions possess some greater dimension of capital that allows them to have the ability to protest, as may be suggested by resource mobilization theories of collective action (McCarthy & Zald, 1977). In other words, administrators at institutions with students who may not have as many resources who are not seeing student protests may still have cause (and, we argue, have inherent cause anyway) to remain vigilant.

Reactive Solutions

There are two major assumptions that are foundational for institutions to respond to student protests. These assumptions are not exhaustive, but these

two should inform direction. The first major assumption is that institutions have a vested interest to create a welcoming and accepting environment for students of all backgrounds, where all students are able to thrive. The second major assumption is that these students' protests and social movements are credible sources for information about the state of these environments at the institution.

First, students suggested that institutions had already been inappropriately nonresponsive to inciting events before the students even mobilized. Second, whether there was a specific event or just a larger, more organic coalescing of student concerns that developed into a student protest, we have not found evidence that institutions took the best steps (at least as interpreted by students) to address student concerns. To the extent that we do not expect these kinds of events or student protest to become completely nonexistent anytime in the near future, institutions should have systems put into place that respond to these sort of issues that are sensitive to not only the deep meaning behind the mobilizations, but also the students themselves. Institutions must be aware and ever vigilant of current student concerns and be able to respond swiftly and comprehensively with any larger incidents. For example, Axmacher and colleagues (2014) suggest that institutions identify answers to a specific set of questions in order to create a Campus Event Response Team, including questions about the command structure and communication. These are a useful start for institutions creating response protocols.

In addition, it may indeed be that case that the same structures that the institution sets up to *proactively* address the campus environment may also work to be centralizing forces in the *reactions*. In particular, our research suggests that students have played, and continue to play, an important role in shaping an agenda for campuses moving forward. As such, it seems only prudent both for the students' sake as well as for the institution's sake to include students in the agenda shaping in such a way that they are not bound by the primary responsibility (as to avoid them feeling unfairly burdened), but are rather partners in the institution's transformation.

Final Thoughts

In this chapter, we have reviewed a brief history of student protest in American higher education and, focusing on the I, Too, Am movement, presented empirical evidence leading to a concrete set of recommendations for campus administrators looking for sources of inspiration to address campus climates. In particular, we highlight both quantitative and qualitative work that emphasizes that the most important motivators for student collective action were not necessarily issues of numerical diversity, but rather a host of campus environment concerns. Specifically, students from historically marginalized backgrounds reported a desire to highlight the negative experiences they have faced on campuses in order to call their community members to account and push for

community change. We also heard from students some dissatisfaction about administrative responses; the general lack of responsiveness was not received well by students. Combining the information from these various research inquiries, we suggest that institutions take proactive steps to establish spaces for communication and community learning, as well as establish structures for appropriate, responsive, and supportive reaction to student concerns.

The investigations conducted and presented in this chapter are not, and should not, be the end of the discussion of ITA campaigns and student protests on American higher education campuses. Indeed, while the previous research only focused on the campaigns that emerged over the course of several years, several other I, Too, Am campaigns have surfaced since the conclusion of that research, including I, Too, Am Whitman (Whitman College) in 2016, I Am Vermont Too (University of Vermont) in 2017, and I, Too, Am JMU (James Madison University) in 2017. The issues raised by the students continue to exist on college campuses, and campus administrators are still called to respond. More research is warranted in order to create a more developed, research-based approach in addressing student issues. The specific research presented in this chapter provides evidence and context for how higher education professionals can understand their students better. Continued research that can elaborate on evidence presented can only add to addressing institutional responses to campaigns.

In many instances, the research community views collective action at institutions through perspectives of financial, social, and political resources available. While these resources are important, the experiences of students, and the voices that elevate them, may be equally important if institutions want to produce sustainable changes. This chapter emphasizes the importance of students and urges a deep understanding of what the students viewed as antecedents for mobilization. Students who participated in the ITA movement expressed specific and concrete negative characteristics of their current campus environments that were their motivations for the campaigns. ITA campaigns are thus valid and important sources of information on the current state of campus environments and provide researchers and practitioners with political information that can be utilized to make higher education institutions more inclusive.

We come back to a question posed in Baker and Blissett (2018): "What can the higher education community do to make institutions of higher education more inclusive and less likely to have students feeling the need to mobilize in criticism of their environments?" (p. 20). We provide some preliminary answers here, and more can still be done to provide comprehensive and compassionate insights. While it may not be the case that we can or should develop a specific 'how to' guide for creating an inclusive campus, the evolution of thinking that can result from practitioners and researchers alike improving their understanding of how to value student voices in their work may indeed lead to positive action. Do we have a full picture of what students want, and once we understand what students want, what do we do? Questions such as this

will be critical for institutional leaders to consider in order to create supportive spaces for historically marginalized groups on American college and university campuses.

Note

1. In all of the prior research on ITA campaigns, researchers operationalized ITA institutions as those institutions that the researchers could find through a Google search using keywords related to the movement (Baker & Blissett, 2018). The researchers conducted an exhaustive search of the first 20 pages of Google search results, but there is still a chance that other ITA institutions existed. This sample definition means that the results of the studies conducted on the ITA movement is limited to campaigns that were likely more successful and saw more social and media coverage (which is why the institutions appeared in the Google search). We acknowledge that cases that were not as publicized could contain many untold stories that were not included in the ITA movement studies, which are also important and relevant. It is important to keep this in mind when generalizing both the findings of the prior research and the findings presented within this chapter.

References

Altbach, P. G. (1981). *Student politics: Perspectives for the eighties*. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, Inc.

Associated Press. (2015, March 19). Hundreds protest bloody arrest of black student at UVA. *New York Post*. Retrieved from http://nypost.com/2015/03/19/hundreds-protest-bloody-arrest-of-black-student-at-uva/

Astin, A. W., Astin, H. S., Bayer, A. E., & Bisconti, A. S. (1975). *The power of protest: A national study of student and faculty disruptions with implications for the future*. San Fransisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Axmacher, R., Banahan, L., Beassie, R., Gomez, F., Hutchens, N. H., Melear, K. B., . . . Sun, J. C. (2014). *Responding to campus protests: A practitioner resource*. Washington, DC: Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education.

Baker, D. J., & Blissett, R. S. L. (2018). Beyond the incident: Institutional predictors of student collective action. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *89*(2), 184–207.

Barnhardt, C. L. (2015). Campus educational contexts and civic participation: Organizational links to collective action. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *86*(1), 38–70.

Blissett, R. S. L., & Baker, D. J. (2018). Seeing is more than believing: Visual media, social media, and anti-racism on college campuses. *Public: Arts, Design, Humanities*, *4*(1).

Blissett, R. S. L., Baker, D. J., & Fields, B. (In press). Making a campus a home: Student perspectives on campus social movement mobilization. *Teachers College Record*.

Buechler, S. M. (2003). The strange career of strain and breakdown theories of collective action. In D. A. Snow, S. A. Soule, & H. Kriesi (Eds.), *The Blackwell companion to social movements* (pp. 1–15). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.

Butler, B. (2014, March 5). "I, too, am Harvard": Black students show they belong. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/she-the-people/wp/2014/03/05/i-too-am-harvard-black-students-show-they-belong/?utm_term=.0e1d4dd4b001

Chester, M., Lewis, A., & Crowfoot, J. (2005). *Challenging racism in higher education*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Edley, C. F., & Robinson, C. F. (2012). *Response to protests on UC Campuses*. Retrieved from http://campusprotestreport.universityofcalifornia.edu/documents/protest-report-091312.pdf

Eligon, J., & Perez-Pena, R. (2015, November 9). University of Missouri protests spur a day of change. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from www.nytimes.com/2015/11/10/us/university-of-missouri-system-president-resigns.html

Flatt, C. R. (2017, September 20). MU's freshmen enrollment continues decline, but more than expected arrived on campus. *The Columbia Missourian*. Retrieved from www.columbiamissourian.com/news/higher_education/mu-s-freshmen-enrollment-continues-decline-but-more-than-expected/article_53bf15e0–9e3d-11e7-b5ff-8b7ba85740cf.html

Gabbatt, A. (2018). How racism allegations shook a New York university known for diversity. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2018/jun/05/st-johns-university-new-york-racism-allegations-protest

Garces, L. M., & Jayakumar, U. M. (2014). Dynamic diversity: Toward a contextual understanding of critical mass. *Educational Researcher*, *43*(3), 115–124.

Johnson, D. R., & Peifer, J. L. (2017). How public confidence in higher education varies by social context. *Journal of Higher Education*, *88*(4), 619–644.

McAdam, D. (1982). *Political process and the development of black insurgency, 1930–1970*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

McCarthy, J. D., & Zald, M. N. (1977). Resource mobilization and social movements: A partial theory. *American Journal of Sociology*, *82*(6), 1212–1241.

Ndemanu, M. T. (2017). Antecedents of college campus protests nationwide: Exploring black student activists' demands. *The Journal of Negro Education*, *86*(3), 238–251.

New, J. (2014, September 24). "Can you hear us now?": Anonymous racist posts on social media network prompt Colgate students to stage sit-in, now entering third day. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from www.insidehighered.com/news/2014/09/24/anonymous-racistposts-social-media-network-prompt-colgate-students-stage-sit-now

Payne, D. (2018, June 13). Protest: Students will refuse to shake university president's hand at graduation. *The College Fix*. Retrieved from www.thecollegefix.com/post/45818/

Ravitch, D. (1983). The proposal in perspective. *Harvard Education Review*, *53*(4), 380–383.

Rhoads, R. A. (2003). Globalization and resistance in the United States and Mexico: The global Potemkin village. *Higher Education*, *45*(2), 223–250.

Siskind, S. R. (2012, November 2). Affirmative dissatisfaction: Affirmative action does more harm than good. *The Harvard Crimson*.

Somashekhar, S. (2015, November 17). How Black Lives Matter, born on the streets, is rising to power on campus. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from www.washingtonpost.com/national/how-black-lives-matter-born-on-the-streets-is-rising-to-power-on-campus/2015/11/17/3c113e96-8959-11e5-be8b-1ae2e4f50f76_story.html?utm_term=.71e398a623e8

University of Wisconsin System. (2017). *Commitment to academic freedom and freedom of expression* (Regent Policy Document 4–21). Madison, WI: Office of the Board of Regents.

Vingiano, A. (2014, March 3). 63 Black Harvard students share their experiences in a powerful photo project. *BuzzFeed News*. Retrieved from www.buzzfeed.com/alisonvingiano/21-black-harvard-students-share-their-experiences-through-a?utm_term=.gv33KJbbGl#.fqN08g22Xr

Weinberg, T., & Blatchford, T. (2015, November 5). A historic fall at MU. *The Maneater*. Retrieved from www.themaneater.com/special-sections/mu-fall-201

Zúñiga, X. (2003). Bridging differences through dialogue. *About Campus*, *6*(7), 816.

12

MAKING A "POLITICAL CONTRIBUTION" TO CAMPUS CLIMATE

Returning to a Political Pedagogy on College Campuses

Demetri L. Morgan

Introduction

This chapter argues that rather than shying away from political tensions and succumbing to the silencing features of political correctness, educators at post-secondary institutions should embrace a 'political pedagogy' or a focus on interrogating, critiquing, and disrupting the distribution of resources and power within a democracy (Giroux, 1988; Thomas, 2015). To advance this assertion, I engage the literature on the political socialization of college students and then employ three different theoretical frameworks to illuminate how the political identity development of students has shifted as institutions have slowly diversified and the campus climate has changed. I then present an emergent spatial typology that captures the different spaces and venues that students operate in that contribute to their political identity development. I conclude with important implications for educators and scholars on how the typology might be employed to embed a political pedagogy within an institution's culture.

The Study of College Student Political Identity Development

The political socialization of college students has been an increasing topic of interest to numerous stakeholders since World War II. The underlying issue has centered on whether and how institutions should assume their roles as influential democratic bodies in society (Doyle & Skinner, 2017; Saltmarsh & Hartley, 2011). One critical response to this inquiry has rallied around the alleged increasing liberal political indoctrination of college students, which has been a consistent critique of higher education from conservative media commentators (Shapiro, 2004) and academics (Fish, 2004). Accordingly, the National

Association of Scholars (2017) report on the shift to "new civics" in higher education argues that higher education is able to accomplish this progressive indoctrination of students because:

> instead of teaching college students the foundations of law, liberty, and self-government, colleges teach students how to organize protests, occupy buildings, and stage demonstrations.
>
> *(p. 9)*

Seizing on the rising tide of these accusations, popular campus speakers such as Richard Spencer, Ben Shapiro, and Milo Yiannopoulos have seen their message of disrupting the progressive bias on college campuses resonate with wider swaths of college students and the American public. Additionally, national organizations such as the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (FIRE) and Young Americans for Freedom (YAF) have worked tirelessly to train and mobilize college students to resist the progressive tilt of many colleges and universities around issues like First Amendment rights and affirmative action in particular (Daily Wire, n.d.; Foundation for Individual Right in Education [FIRE], n.d.). Furthermore, data from the Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA notes that a majority of college seniors hold what would be viewed as liberal or progressive views on a host of social issues (Eagan et al., 2016). Other research demonstrates that a majority of faculty also hold liberal views, save for a few disciplines such as economics (Gross, 2013). The unifying concern is that the purported liberal bias is bad for students, institutions, and democracy because it clouds out politically diverse ideals, shuts down dissent and debate, and weakens the social ties that are important in democratic societies (Gross & Simmons, 2014; Shapiro, 2004).

On the other hand, Henry Giroux (2002, 2010) has levied the consistent critique that institutions of higher education have succumbed to neoliberal forces that undermine the pursuit of democratic ideals. In agreement, other scholars have put forth varying explanations for why institutions are not meeting their full democratic potential, including missing the link between diversity and civic engagement and lacking a focus on increasing civic literacy (Hoffman, Domagal-Goldman, King, & Robinson, 2018; Hurtado, 2007; Saltmarsh & Hartley, 2011; The National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement, 2012). These scholars contend that while no one political ideology should be elevated over another, institutions can and should play an active role in preparing students for active engagement in the civic and political life of their communities.

Despite the at times provocative rhetoric and contentious sides to the debate, there have been few investigations into how the political environment and organizational culture of college campuses shape students' experiences in college. Part of the reason the political socialization of college students has been

overlooked is that political, organizational, and student development theory are rarely tied together to form a suitable and nuanced conceptual framework (Smith, 2004). This leads to unbalanced investigations that marginalize important phenomena that impact the organizational context of institutions and shape students. In addition, a majority of studies that do take up student political engagement focus solely on student level characteristics and are devoid of important contextual factors (Doyle & Skinner, 2017; Johnson, 2015; Weerts, Cabrera, & Mejías, 2014). Yet, Binder and Wood's (2013) exploration of campus conservatives astutely concludes that the campus environment and even the geographical location of an institution inform how students enact their conservative styles. Similarly, Reyes Verduzco's (2015) ethnography of Latinx student organizations found that specific campus cultures: deliberative, divisive, and contentious, shape how Latinx students come to inhabit and perform Latinx politics on campus and in the broader community. Since both studies focus on particular populations of students (i.e., conservatives and Latinx students), the question remains: are there cross-cutting organizational dynamics on campuses that influence how students engage in politics that transcend student demographics? Building on these studies, the next section highlights relevant theoretical frameworks that move the field towards a conceptual typology that helps researchers and practitioners account for the environmental aspects on a campus that inform and surround how students experience the political milieu.

Theoretical Frameworks

The campus climate literature highlights the ways in which students are shaped by visible and invisible manifestations of culture, policies, and interactions. The organizational theory literature illuminates how students shape and are shaped by the organizational resources and norms. Finally, public sphere theory grapples with the espoused versus enacted role higher education plays in facilitating discursive and experiential opportunities for students to hone their political identity and skills for engagement in a democracy.

Campus Climate/Multicontextual Model for Diverse Learning Environments

In their synthesis of literature on the educational benefits of diversity, Hurtado, Alvarez, Guillermo-Wann, Cuellar, and Arellano (2012) contend that one of the most important outcomes of a positive and healthy campus climate is the development of "competencies for a multicultural world." A specific component of this competency is the development of democratic outcomes, which they define as "the attitudes, knowledge, and skills necessary for participation in a diverse and pluralistic democracy" (Hurtado et al., 2012, p. 53). This then is the entry point for why this body of literature is relevant to the political

identity development of students. If diverse learning environments do indeed foster democratic outcomes such as political engagement, as a well-developed literature base suggest (Colby, Beaumont, Ehrlich, & Corngold, 2010; Hilly-gus, 2005; Hurtado, 2007; Hurtado, Engberg, Ponjuan, & Landreman, 2002; Saltmarsh & Hartley, 2011), then determining why and how the culture and campus climate factors into this development is critical. While an exhaustive review of the multicontextual model of diverse learning environment model (MMDLE) is beyond the purview of this chapter, there are three important points to highlight. First, the MMDLE is useful because it integrates macro (Bronfenbrenner, 1976, 1977), meso, and micro levels (Renn, 2004; Renn & Arnold, 2003) of postsecondary institutions to frame the processes, policies, and influences that shape institutions and the people who operate in them.

In the original and subsequent reconceptualization of the dimensions of campus climate (Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, & Allen, 1998, 1999; Milem, Chang, & Antonio, 2005), Hurtado et al. (2012) presented five dimensions that coalesce to shape postsecondary environments in prominent ways. The macro level of an institution's climate includes the historical, organizational/structural, and compositional dimensions (Hurtado et al., 2012). The meso and micro levels are made up of the behavioral and psychological dimensions of climate (Hurtado et al., 2012). The dimensions help situate and link together how students' identities are developed. For example, the historical dimension of an institution highlights the vestiges of practices and norms that shape how faculty and staff might think about and shape environments towards fostering opportunities for political development, whereas the psychological dimension captures an individual's perceptions of their environment and could reveal student's feelings about hostility to people that do not share their political identity. The behavioral dimension helps explain the important and desirable educational outcomes associated with students who interact with other students that possess social identities different from them.

Finally, the MMDLE separates but links how students experience the curricular and co-curricular environment. This is key because studies have found that students are differentially affected by the range of expectations, practices, and experiences in these two environments (Mayhew et al., 2016; Quaye & Harper, 2015). For instance, much is known about how the general education curriculum relates to civic engagement or how service learning is a reliable indicator of civic engagement (Jacoby, 2009; Spiezio, Baker, & Boland, 2006). Additionally, the Political Engagement Project (PEP) found that courses that contain political concepts and challenge students to be engaged outside of the classroom relate to increases in the student's understanding of their political capacity (Colby et al., 2010).

These insights equip researchers with important language to speak to how the campus climate in general works to shape students. Much can be gleaned from the ways in which scholars have thought about how dimensions of the

MMDLE have contributed to racial identity (Renn, 2004), gender (Drew & Work, 1998), and lesbian, gay, and bisexual identity (Rankin, 2005). Perhaps most importantly, the relationship between the MMDLE and these identities asserts that these factors do not influence student's identities equally because the organizational structure of postsecondary organizations is so highly differentiated. Hence, it is important to probe the organizational theory literature further for what it might indicate about student development and political identity development more precisely.

Organizational Culture

In the conclusion of *To Serve a Larger Purpose*, Saltmarsh and Hartley (2011) make the subtle yet provocative proposition that a "democratically engaged university entails creating a different kind of educational experience with its students" (p. 293). Broken down, what this suggestion really brings into focus is that postsecondary institutions are not *static* and *unchangeable* organizations. While enormously difficult to achieve at times and notoriously slow, campuses are in fact being continually shaped and changed by the macro and micro forces the MMDLE highlights. Thus, if we take the point that postsecondary institutions are malleable, we must more clearly ascertain how the organizational culture of postsecondary institutions shapes students and in turn how students shape the culture and climate.

The study of organizational culture is a vast intellectual field spanning multiple disciplines and has a particularly rich tradition in higher education. An advantageous mechanism for winnowing down the broad field of organizational culture is to focus in on organizational socialization, given this chapter's concern with how students' come to be politically engaged in a particular organizational context. To this end, Brim (1968) provides an intuitive definition of organizational socialization as "the process by which persons acquire the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that make them more or less effective members of their society" (p. 3).

In the realm of higher education, Bill Tierney (1997) added an important nuance to the study of organizational socialization when he positioned his ethnographic findings of newly hired faculty into two opposing frameworks of organizational socialization. The first he terms a modernist perspective, which encapsulates Brim's definition of socialization and plainly stated, means that the organization is concerned with imparting and imprinting its culture onto students and other stakeholders (Tierney, 1997). Conversely, Tierney (1997) asserts that a post-modern view of organizational culture "involves a give-and-take where new individuals make sense of an organization through their own unique backgrounds and the current contexts in which the organization resides" (p. 7). In this view, culture is being mutually and continuously constructed rather than transmitted. With a mixture of a modernist and post-modernist

interpretation of his findings, Tierney (1997) identifies that there are "conflicts and discontinuities" in the organizational environment due to the normative tendencies of culture. As a result, new faculty are unable to fully assimilate into the campus norms and end up "falling back on their own interpretations of how to fit into the organizational culture" (Tierney, 1997, p. 14).

Adjusted into the scope of students and their political engagement, Tierney's (1997) framework has two helpful applications that lend clarity to a potential organizational typology. First, it is not a stretch to conclude that students also face numerous "conflicts and discontinuities" about what they are supposed to get out of their college experience, least of which may be the development of a political identity that some have called for (The National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement, 2012). Second, a post–modern view of organizational socialization alerts us to the fact that students can shape the institution. This means that not only should a typology ask how students develop the skills and awareness to be politically engaged, but also how the institutional culture is developed in response to students' efforts.

Public Sphere Theory

The final theoretical strand necessary to ground the political dimension of campus climate pulls from public sphere theory. Jürgen Habermas (1991) is often credited with originating the term in his effort to reveal how certain segments of the European middle class, or 'the bourgeois,' could ideally be engaged in the political life of their communities through the medium of discourse, given the transformations society had endured at the time of his writing. Although often conflated for notions of the 'public good' (Marginson, 2011), the public sphere, in the Habermasian sense of the term, helps scholars define and frame the shared space in society that is distinctive between "state apparatuses, economic markets, and democratic associations" (Fraser, 1990, p. 57). Habermas (1991) defines the public sphere as the venue where "private people" come together to debate and discuss issues of "common concern." Many specific spaces on college campuses, such as free speech zones (Herrold, 2005; Langhauser, 2004) and even the typical classroom (Kelly-Woessner & Woessner, 2006) fit this definition. Giroux (2002) argues that higher education as a whole should be understood as a public sphere because higher education institutions serve as "a crucial site where students gain a public voice and come to grips with their own power as individual and social agents" (p. 430).

Despite the aspirational nature of the concept, Habermas's work has been extensively critiqued over the years for its lack of nuance and inability to explain the political realities of those marginalized in society (Calhoun, 1992). For instance, Nancy Fraser (1990) astutely points out four limitations of Habermas's notion of the public sphere, including the following:

1. The assumption that everyone can enter into the public sphere as equals and that those engaging in the public sphere can "bracket" their differences.
2. The assumption that a single public sphere is preferable to multiple, competing, public spheres.
3. The assumption that discourse in the public sphere should only be limited to issues of common concern and that "private" matters detract from a well-functioning public sphere.
4. The assumption that the ideal public sphere has deliberation as its main outcome and should lack decision-making authority.

(pp. 62–63)

Consequently, Fraser (1990) goes on to promote the idea of "subaltern counterpublics," which, she contends, explains the reality of "parallel discursive arenas where members of subordinated social groups invent and circulate 'counter-disocures,' which in turn permit them to formulate oppositional interpretations of their identities, interests, and needs" (p. 67). Squires (2002) builds on this reformulation of the public sphere by outlining specific ways the black public sphere operates via enclaves, counterpublics, and satellites:

> A public can enclave itself, hiding counterhegemonic ideas and strategies in order to survive or avoid sanctions, while internally producing lively debate and planning. It is also possible to create a counterpublic which can engage in debate with wider publics to test ideas and perhaps utilize traditional social movement tactics (boycotts, civil disobedience). Finally, a public that seeks separation from other publics for reasons other than oppressive relations but is involved in wider public discourses from time to time acts as a satellite public sphere.
>
> *(p. 448)*

Fraser and Squires revisions to public sphere theory add important nuances that update how the public sphere operates within the contemporary U.S. democratic context. This is arguably most evident on college campuses that cater to an array of students and where administrators must navigate a range of competing interests all in an effort to actualize the educational and democratic benefits that public sphere theory suggests are possible. A typology must privilege the ideal of the public sphere because of its congruence with the educational outcomes of many institutions while seeking to be inclusive of many different types of students.

Summary

These theories suggest that institutions can and should facilitate the optimal functioning of the public sphere by bringing people together to discuss issues

of common concern. However, a nuanced and inclusive understanding of how public spheres operate is necessary in order to remain sensitive to the various differences that students and other campus stakeholders bring with them to campus as the campus climate literature maintains. These tensions are circumscribed in the reality that the organizational culture is both shaped by students and is shaping their development and experiences. The final portion of this chapter presents the political dimension of campus climate, which is intended to name and explain the various ways students interact with the organizational environment of their campus and how they shape it and how it shapes them.

Case Analysis: Bridging Public Sphere Theory and the MMDLE: Illuminating the Political Dimension of Campus Climate

A key finding that emerged from an analysis of four geographically diverse public universities and the unique state sociopolitical environments where they were situated (Morgan, 2016) is the emergence of a distinct, yet previously undefined, dimension of campus climate. This *political dimension of campus climate* combines the spaces, experiences, and norms of both a state and institution that shape the political identity development and engagement activities of students. In other words, where students experience politics on a campus frames students' political perceptions, facilitates students' interactions with diverse political others, and conveys messages (both positive, neutral, and negative) from the institution that helps students draw parallels to how political systems operate outside of the institution.

Similar to other dimensions of campus climate (Hurtado et al., 2012), students shape this dimension with their activities, energies, and demands. Yet, how the campus is laid out, how faculty and staff moderate this dimension, and the influence of the larger state sociopolitical culture also have to be accounted for when trying to understand this dimension. For example, each of the institutions in the project is dealing with declines in state funding to higher education. This has material impacts on both the faculty and students that each institution can recruit and retain. The students and faculty that end up on a campus go on to shape the climate and culture of the institution, while also being shaped by the preceding norms of the climate and culture (Tierney, 2014). This ongoing dynamic invariably shapes the issues, policies, and campus dynamics that the comprehensive site overviews highlighted and the institutional vignettes brought to life. What is noteworthy about this typology is that there were more similarities in how the institutions were responding to their state sociopolitical environments than differences, despite the array of sociopolitical environments in the study. Consequently, the political dimension of campus climate is a robust typology that explains how students experience the intersection of their lived experiences, the climate and culture of their institution, and the state sociopolitical environment.

Overview

There are three levels of the political dimension of campus climate: public, semi–public/private, and private. There are also two stances from which students engage this dimension: the consumer stance and the producer stance. When students assume the *consumer stance*, they are being *influenced by* the political dimension of campus because they are actively or passively taking in the political messages or activities of the particular space they are operating in. Then there are students who take a *producer stance* because they are actively *constructing* the political dimension of whatever space they are operating in. The consumer/producer dynamic is less of a dichotomy and more of a spectrum. It is important to also clarify that my usage of "space" in this section is loosely conceptualized as both physical and intangible areas that students may encounter but are delimited in certain ways from other spaces. Table 12.1 provides an overview, and the following subsections describe in further detail the various levels of this dimension and how they come together to influence how students interact with the political system.

TABLE 12.1 Political Dimension of Campus Climate Typology

	Examples	*Institution's Influence*	*Student Production Stance*	*Student Consumption Stance*
Public	• Campus free speech zones	• Policies (i.e., determining time, place, and manner of demonstrations) • Resources (e.g., providing tables, electric outlets, etc.)	• Participating in a protest; handing out flyers	• Seeing a protest; receiving a flyer
Semi–public/ private	• Classrooms; student organizations; social media	• Faculty hiring and retention • Course sizes • Course offerings • Policies (e.g., registering student organizations)	• Asking and answering questions in class; leading a student organization meeting	• Attending class or a student organization meeting
Private	• Conversations in a residence hall room	• Enrollment decisions	• Debating politics with friends	• Listening to a debate about politics

Public

The public level of the political dimension of campus climate includes campus designated free speech zones and common meeting areas, such as student centers, study spaces, libraries, and other relatively open areas on campus. These spaces are public because the access to them is the least restrictive and the closest manifestation to Habermas's (1991) public sphere. From the consumption of political activity and messaging standpoint, all students theoretically have equal access to public political spaces. However, institutions wield much more power when it comes to who has access to generate or produce political activity and messaging. The Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (FIRE), which is a watch-dog organization that rates how open institutions are to free speech, is one way to think about how accessible public spaces are. They rate University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), Indiana University (IU), and Rutgers University-New Brunswick with "yellow lights," meaning that there is at least one ambiguous institutional policy that can be used to limit the free speech of students on campus. The University of Florida (UF) was given a "green light," meaning that all their policies nominally protect free speech.

During interviews, students could readily point out where the free speech zones and other public political spaces were on their campus. For example, when asked where political activity happens on his campus, Chris at IU said:

> [Sample Gates] that's right west of here. It's a landmark and I think it might be designated like a free speech center, whatever that means, but there. We've also had during the like a Black Lives Matter movement, we've had like Black Student Union and other protest groups go through the middle of campus and do like march, a walk, and they actually came in the union and did a die-in inside the Starbucks. It was like hundreds of people just lying on the ground. There's also a lot of . . . there's a lot of proselytization by the clock tower. That happens pretty regularly and that gets very political.
>
> *(Chris, 20, IU)*

The ability to name and to have also experienced these public political spaces has material influences on how some students come to understand the political system on campus. Yet there are differential consequences for students that have to navigate these public spaces echoing Fraser (1990) and Squires's (2002) critiques of Habermas's public sphere. For instance, Genevieve, a student at UF, described walking through Turlington Plaza (one of UF's designated free speech zones) and seeing, "someone with a giant cross saying, 'women shouldn't be in college' and stuff like that, or folks of color." She goes on to say:

> I understand where [the institution] is coming from, free speech zone, stuff like that, and neutrality. But allowing that isn't neutral to me. It

enforces hate and oppression and power that is already in place, so I think that that's one thing. And then just in general, messages of every voice should be heard, but it seems like the voices that are heard are the people reinforcing the status quo and a lot of oppression is a bad thing.

(Genevieve, 21, UF)

Other students acknowledged that they appreciated knowing that there was space on campus where they knew they could consume or participate in political activity if they wanted to. Abby from Rutgers, noted, "College Ave. is where all the demonstrations and all the poli-sci students and all the pre-law students are. There's a lot of political energy here" (Abby, 19, RU).

Semi-Public/Private

The second level of the political dimension of campus climate is comprised of all the semi–public/private spaces on a campus. These include classrooms, student organization meetings and events, and social media. What makes these spaces semi–public/private is that institutions or students can restrict access to them, to varying extents. For example, not all students have access to particular courses that may readily discuss political events and spur students to think more about their political identity. Course capacity and offerings have a measurable influence on which students get to talk about politics in a systematic way in a classroom. While access may be restricted to these spaces, students that do take these classes are still sharing experiences in a collective way.

Because these levels exist on a continuum, some spaces may be more public oriented whereas others tend to be more private. In the case of classrooms, the way campuses are structurally laid out push groups of students with certain major or career interests together and create these semi–public/private spaces that promote or dissuade political activity in the classroom space just by virtue of who students interact with most often in their academic life. Also, professors have a lot of autonomy in facilitating opportunities for students to think about political issues in the classroom. For example, Al, a student at IU, explained, "being a liberal with so many college professors tilting liberal, I think that makes it easier for me to share my opinions than if they were conservative or I was conservative" (Al, 21, IU).

However, contrary to the popular narrative that all college students are just as liberal as the professors (D'Souza, 1991), I spoke with many conservative and libertarian identified students who also described classroom environments that were open and engaging, despite differences that they may have with peers or the instructor. Michelle, a libertarian identified student at UF, described how she decided to take a stance on an assignment where she knew the professor "disagreed with it personally." She went on to say, "the discourse in the class-room has been fine. I've never really experienced, especially from students, I've

never experienced [problems]" (Michelle, 21, UF). For the most part, students across all the campuses agreed that their classmates and professors did not readily share their political ideology in class anyway, unless it was a course that was about issues that were partisan, like immigration. Most students described taking more of the consumer stance in the classroom, taking notes, asking questions for clarification, and not engaging beyond required amounts. Some students did note that they would try to spark conversations in class and produce political moments, but this was only in certain courses.

Likewise, students self-select and restrict access into different student organizations—not all students choose to or are selected to participate in student government, for example. Furthermore, some student organizations, like fraternities and sororities, limit access through financial barriers or other onboarding obstacles, which create semi–public/private spaces (Morgan, Zimmerman, Terrell, & Marcotte, 2015). Additionally, whereas in the classroom students reported assuming a consumption stance more regularly, student organizations inherently coax students to be producers in their spaces. One reason these types of semi–public/private spaces are important is that they bring students together around common interest, but then reveal differences within certain subgroups. Emily, a Rutgers student, recounts how working for the student newspaper shaped her thinking about politics. She describes herself as "an activist" and then noted that among her peers at the newspaper "there's a very strong feeling that you're not supposed to be partial at all. You have to be a robot or not have any feelings about anything because that would ruin your integrity or whatever as a journalist." She went on to critique her peers by saying, "they ended up not really doing anything" (Emily, 21, RU). Semi–public/private spaces such as student organizations also bring students into contact with political messaging or activities in a more intimate way. Sophia, a student at UCLA, talked about what she enjoys about the involvement culture at UCLA:

> A lot of things are brought to my attention. I wouldn't have had that opportunity anywhere else, because I was stuck with people that were the same as me in the same situation. Sometimes when I think about, why did I choose to come here? It was to get out.
>
> *(Sophia, 21, UCLA)*

Finally, on the semi–public/private level is social media. While social media spans all the levels to some extent, I classify social media as semi–public/private because a student must in the least, construct a social network on the platforms[1] available to them that may or may not push them to think about political activities. Their activities are semi–public because people in their social network can see what the student posts or likes. Social media is also private because students can limit in many ways what they and others see, creating a highly curated experience. This reality means that social media engagement takes on many forms.

James, a student at UCLA, explained his use of social media: "if I can spread the word on social media [about political issues] in any way, I think that there's also a power in that, because small ripples make waves" (James, 22, UCLA). However, Chris from IU said, "I don't post on social media very often about political topics. I will follow them and read other people's posts" (Chris, 20, IU).

While there has been a great deal of attention around Millennials and social media, I also heard many students express skepticism about the intersection of politics and social media. For instance, Nia described how she often encounters "unauthentic paragraphs" that are then "posted on social media for some likes." She went on to lament "that's not real, and I can't respect that. I can't respect the fact that you want to take a serious issue, and turn it into a popularity contest" (Nia, 21, RU). The main takeaway is that students' political experiences in semi–public/private spaces are highly variable and as a result, the influence of these spaces on their political identity is wide-ranging.

Private

The third level of the political dimensions are the spaces that are most private for students. Students have the greatest ability to define the contours of these spaces and also include the reflective intrapersonal experiences that students have. All of the students noted that their close friend groups were integral to their political identity development. The main difference I was able to pick up on was that interactions with friends caused more dissonance or left a greater impression with students than those that happened on either the public or semi–public/private levels, consistent with previous research focused on inter-racial relationships (Bowman & Park, 2014, 2015). Ashlyn, a student at UCLA, described an experience that exemplifies this level of the typology, stating:

> One of my friends was the valedictorian for our school. I didn't know she didn't have papers, but then as we were talking about what college are you going to go to, she said she was going to go to community college. I was like, "Wait, hold up. You're valedictorian. You got into UCLA, UC–Berkeley, like, all the top schools here and you're going to go to community? Why?" Then she said that she didn't have papers and she came from a low-income home, so she couldn't pay for college.

Ashlyn went on to say about the political system, "then it hit me, like, okay wait. So then what's going on with this whole meritocracy. Is it really, like, whoever wants to make it can make it on their own?" (Ashlyn, 21, UCLA). Because the private spaces are so close to how students see their own identities, unsurprisingly most students sought out friend groups with like-minded students that did not often lead to dissonant experiences. Additionally, institutions have the least amount of direct influence on this level. However, what type of

student an institution recruits, admits, and enrolls shapes who students come into contact with and thus their potential friendship networks. Private spaces have the most impact on student political identity, but at the same time are the least likely to have an impact because students work to keep this space devoid of dissonant experiences.

The political dimension of campus climate plays an important role in how students experience the institutional environment. As this section makes apparent, the physical layout of campuses, the policies of the campuses, and the sociopolitical environment of the state, via macro issues that become localized on campuses, all influence how the political dimension manifests itself on campus. Students experience the public, semi–public/private, and private spaces in many different ways, and the variability leads to many outcomes for their political identity development. Likewise, students take both consumer and producer stances that direct their experiences with the political dimension and also speak to the student agency in the construction of their political identity.

Reestablishing the Need for a Political Pedagogy

Based on the tensions the political dimension of campus climate highlights, and given the likelihood that institutions are not intentionally crafting public spheres that help students become active and engaged participants in their communities, I am calling for a renewed focus on *political pedagogy* in higher education that promotes politically dynamic and inclusive institutions. A political pedagogy is one that is concerned with "putting into place spaces, spheres, and modes of education that enable people to realize that in a real democracy, power has to be responsive to the needs, hopes, and desires of its citizens and other inhabitants around the globe" (Giroux, 2010, p. 108). Politically dynamic and inclusive institutions are where student affairs professionals, faculty, policymakers, and students work together to infuse a political pedagogy into the culture and climate of both curricular (Musil, 2015) and cocurricular spaces (Morgan & Orphan, 2016) in order to help institutions remediate political inequities. Politically dynamic and inclusive institutions recognize that students are at different points in their political identity development and that necessities institutional efforts to make accessible the required resources, people, and spaces that help move students along in their political identity development towards congruence (Morgan, 2016).

Politically dynamic and inclusive institutions are also spaces where tension and disagreement are encouraged and worked through without devolving into ad hominin attacks (Thomas, 2015). Furthermore, in politically dynamic and inclusive institutions, faculty and students with diverse political ideologies and political activities are called into the campus community, rather than called out for their non–normative political identities or actions. Finally, institutions that are politically dynamic and inclusive are not satisfied with surface level

indicators of political disengagement among students. Institutions that are committed to remediating political inequities work with disillusioned and cynical students to reflect on and eventually channel their sentiments into activities or practices that disrupt the political status quo and move towards a political system where they want to participate (Hoffman et al., 2018). Taken together, this type of campus culture and climate is one where there is more of a focus on the process of political learning and the many opportunities for reflection and political meaning-making, rather than simply a focus on being neutral or just serving as a backdrop to students' political performance.

In particular, educators on campus must devise ways to evaluate and assess political learning. Much has been gained in the areas of diversity (Museus, 2014) and student leadership (Dugan & Komives, 2010) because tools have been developed that help administrators and faculty speak to the impact that they are having on students in those domains. The same needs to be done for political learning and political identity development or the concept will have difficulty gaining traction as a fundamental concern for the field, beyond mission statement platitudes.

Note

1. Students identified Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, Snapchat, and Groupme as the most utilized social media platforms.

References

Binder, A. J., & Wood, K. (2013). *Becoming right: How campuses shape young conservatives*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bowman, N. A., & Park, J. J. (2014). Interracial contact on college campuses: Comparing and contrasting predictors of cross-racial interaction and interracial friendship. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *85*(5), 660–690.

Bowman, N. A., & Park, J. J. (2015). Not all diversity interactions are created equal: Cross-racial interaction, close interracial friendship, and college student outcomes. *Research in Higher Education*, *56*(6), 601–621.

Brim, O. G. (1968). Adult socialization. In J. A. Clausen (Ed.), *Socialization and society* (pp. 184–226). Boston, MA: Little, Brown.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1976). The experimental ecology of education. *Educational Researcher*, *5*(9), 5–15.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1977). Toward an experimental ecology of human development. *American Psychologist*, *32*(7), 513–531.

Calhoun, C. J. (Ed.). (1992). *Habermas and the public sphere*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Colby, A., Beaumont, E., Ehrlich, T., & Corngold, J. (2010). *Educating for democracy: Preparing undergraduates for responsible political engagement*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Daily Wire. (n.d.). *YAF launches Ben Shapiro national college tour*. Retrieved from www.dailywire.com/news/2516/yaf-launches-ben-shapiro-national-tour-hank-berrien#exit-modal

Doyle, W. R., & Skinner, B. T. (2017). Does postsecondary education result in civic benefits? *The Journal of Higher Education*, *88*(6), 863–893.

Drew, T. L., & Work, G. G. (1998). Gender-based differences in perception of experiences in higher education: Gaining a broader perspective. *Journal of Higher Education*, *69*(5), 542–555.

D'Souza, D. (1991). *Illiberal education: The politics of race and sex on campus*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Dugan, J. P., & Komives, S. R. (2010). Influences on college students' capacities for socially responsible leadership. *Journal of College Student Development*, *51*(5), 525–549.

Eagan, K., Stolzenberg, E. B., Zimmerman, H. B., Aragon, M. C., Whang, H., & Rios-Aguilar, C. (2016). *The American freshman: National norms fall 2016*. Los Angeles, CA: Higher Education Research Institute Graduate School of Education & Information Studies UCLA.

Fish, S. (2004, May 21). Why we built the ivory tower. *The New York Times*.

Foundation for Individual Right in Education [FIRE]. (n.d.). *Mission*. Retrieved from www.thefire.org/about-us/mission/

Fraser, N. (1990). Rethinking the public sphere: A contribution to the critique of actually existing democracy. *Social Text*, *25/26*, 56–80.

Giroux, H. A. (1988). *Teachers as intellectuals: Toward a critical pedagogy of learning*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey Publishers.

Giroux, H. A. (2002). Neoliberalism, corporate culture, and the promise of higher education: The university as a democratic public sphere. *Harvard Educational Review*, *72*(4), 425–463.

Giroux, H. A. (2010). *Politics after hope: Obama and the crisis of youth, race, and democracy*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Gross, N. (2013). *Why are professors liberal and why do conservatives care?* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gross, N., & Simmons, S. (Eds.). (2014). *Professors and their politics*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Habermas, J. (1991). *The Structural transformation of the public sphere: An inquiry into a category of bourgeois society*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Herrold, J. D. (2005). Capturing the dialogue: Free speech zones and the caging of first amendment rights. *Drake Law Review*, *54*(4), 949–996.

Hillygus, D. S. (2005). The missing link: Exploring the relationship between higher education and political engagement. *Political Behavior*, *27*(1), 25–47.

Hoffman, D., Domagal-Goldman, J., King, S., & Robinson, V. (2018). *Higher education's role in enacting a thriving democracy: Civic learning and democratic engagement theory of change*. Washington, DC: Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education.

Hurtado, S. (2007). Linking diversity with the educational and civic missions of higher education. *The Review of Higher Education*, *30*(2), 185–196.

Hurtado, S., Alvarez, C. L., Guillermo-Wann, C., Cuellar, M., & Arellano, L. (2012). A model for diverse learning environments: The scholarship on creating and assessing conditions for student success. In J. C. Smart & M. B. Paulsen (Eds.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. 27, pp. 41–122). Dordrecht: Springer.

Hurtado, S., Engberg, M. E., Ponjuan, L., & Landreman, L. (2002). Students' precollege preparation for participation in a diverse democracy. *Research in Higher Education*, *43*(2), 163–186.

Hurtado, S., Milem, J. F., Clayton-Pedersen, A. R., & Allen, W. R. (1998). Enhancing campus climates for racial/ethnic diversity: Educational policy and practice. *The Review of Higher Education*, *21*(3), 279–302.

Hurtado, S., Milem, J. F., Clayton-Pedersen, A. R., & Allen, W. R. (1999). *Enacting diverse learning environments: Improving the climate for racial/ethnic diversity in higher education* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report Series). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Jacoby, B. (2009). *Civic engagement in higher education: Concepts and practices*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Johnson, M. (2015). Developing college students' civic identity: The role of social perspective taking and sociocultural issues discussions. *Journal of College Student Development*, *56*(7), 687–704.

Kelly-Woessner, A., & Woessner, M. C. (2006). My professor is a partisan hack: How perceptions of a professor's political views affect student course evaluations. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, *39*(3), 495–501.

Langhauser, D. P. (2004). Free and regulated speech on campus: Using forum analysis for assessing facility use, speech zones, and related expressive activity. *Journal of College and University Law*, *31*(3), 481–512.

Marginson, S. (2011). Higher education and public good. *Higher Education Quarterly*, *65*(4), 411–433.

Mayhew, M. J., Bowman, N., Rockenbach, A., Seifert, T., Wolniak, G., Pascarella, E., & Terenzini, P. (2016). *How college affects students: 21st century evidence that higher education works* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

Milem, J. F., Chang, M. J., & Antonio, A. (2005). *Making diversity work on campus: A research-based perspective*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Morgan, D. L. (2016). *Revealing the role of higher education in a diverse democracy: A theory of college student political identity development*. (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from University of Pennsylvania. ProQuest. AAI10134980. https://repository.upenn.edu/dissertations/AAI10134980

Morgan, D. L., & Orphan, C. M. (2016). Student political engagement in the co-curriculum: Understanding the role of senior student affairs officers. *eJournal of Public Affairs*, *5*(2), 11–40.

Morgan, D. L., Zimmerman, H. B., Terrell, T. N., & Marcotte, B. A. (2015). "Stick with yourselves, it's what's normal": The intergroup racial attitudes of senior white fraternity men. *Journal of College and Character*, *16*(2), 103–119.

Museus, S. D. (2014). The Culturally Engaging Campus Environments (CECE) model: A new theory of success among racially diverse college student populations. In M. Paulsen (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (29th ed., pp. 189–227). The Netherlands: Springer.

Musil, C. M. (2015). *Civic prompts: Making civic learning routine across the disciplines*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

National Association of Scholars. (2017). *Making citizens: How American universities teach civics*. New York, NY: National Association of Scholars.

The National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement. (2012). *A crucible moment: College learning and democracy's future*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges & Universities.

Quaye, S. J., & Harper, S. R. (Eds.). (2015). *Student engagement in higher education: Theoretical perspectives and practical approaches for diverse populations* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Rankin, S. R. (2005). Campus climates for sexual minorities. *New Directions for Student Services*, *2005*(111), 17–23.

Renn, K. A. (2004). *Mixed race students in college: The ecology of race, identity, and community on campus*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Renn, K. A., & Arnold, K. D. (2003). Reconceptualizing research on college student peer culture. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *74*(3), 261–291.

Reyes Verduzco, D. (2015). Inhabiting latino politics: How colleges shape students' political styles. *Sociology of Education*, *88*(4), 302–319.

Saltmarsh, J., & Hartley, M. (2011). *"To serve a larger purpose": Engagement for democracy and the transformation of higher education*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Shapiro, B. (2004). *Brainwashed: How universities indoctrinate America's youth*. Nashville, TN: WND Books.

Smith, R. M. (2004). The politics of identities and the tasks of political science. In I. Shapiro, R. M. Smith, & T. E. Masoud (Eds.), *Problems and methods in the study of politics* (pp. 42–66). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Spiezio, K. E., Baker, K. Q., & Boland, K. (2006). General education and civic engagement: An empirical analysis of pedagogical possibilities. *The Journal of General Education*, *54*(4), 273–292.

Squires, C. R. (2002). Rethinking the black public sphere: An alternative vocabulary for multiple public spheres. *Communication Theory*, *12*(4), 446–468.

Thomas, N. (2015). The politics of learning for democracy. *Diversity & Democracy*, *18*(4).

Tierney, W. G. (1997). Organizational socialization in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*, *68*(1), 1–16.

Tierney, W. G. (2014). Organizational socialization in education higher, *The Journal of Higher Education,* *68*(1), 1–16.

Weerts, D. J., Cabrera, A. F., & Mejías, P. P. (2014). Uncovering categories of civically engaged college students: A latent class analysis. *The Review of Higher Education*, *37*(2), 141–168.

CONTRIBUTORS

Jade Agua, M.P.A., is the Associate Director for Learning & Organizational Development at the USC Race and Equity Center. With over 10 years of professional experience in higher education and nonprofit fields, Jade is a diversity and inclusion specialist committed to deinstitutionalizing White supremacy through social justice education, strategic planning, and organizational development. Just before this role, Jade served as the Director of the Cross-Cultural Center at the University of California, Irvine (UCI), where she cultivated a space for students to imagine and inspire an equitable, socially just campus; affirm and develop intersectional, cultural identities; and build a more inclusive community. While at UCI, Jade served on the Advisory Council on Campus Climate, Culture & Inclusion, chaired the New Narratives: Conversations on Identities & Cultures campus-wide programming committee, and chaired the search committee for the inaugural Director of the DREAM Center for undocumented students. Prior to working at UCI, Jade served as the Program Director of the Office for Multicultural Learning at Santa Clara University (SCU), where she oversaw the Multicultural Center and Rainbow Resource Center. At SCU, Jade was able to implement learning outcomes based on multicultural competencies and develop diversity trainings for students, staff, and faculty in collaboration with Human Resources. Before SCU, Jade worked at the University of Southern California (USC) as a Program Coordinator and Graduate Advisor in the School of Cinematic Arts and as Assistant Director for Asian Pacific American Student Services.

Shafiqa Ahmadi, J.D., is an Associate Professor of Clinical Education at the Rossier School of Education and the Co-Director for the Center for Education,

Identity, and Social Justice. She is an expert on diversity and legal protection of underrepresented students, including female Muslims, bias and hate crimes, and sexual assault survivors. Prior to joining the Rossier faculty, she taught at the Gould School of Law and was a Visiting Researcher at the Center for Urban Education at Rossier. She has also served as a Research Associate at the Research Institute at Rossier where she assisted with grant proposals and worked on a grant awarded by the Department of Education (DOE) designed to prevent and reduce on-campus sexual assault. Most recently she worked for the Hawaii Civil Rights Commission, where she investigated alleged violations of civil rights and discrimination in areas such as employment, housing, and access to state and state-funded services. She has presented extensively and conducted research on diversity and the legal protection of underrepresented students.

Dominique J. Baker, Ph.D., is an Assistant Professor of Education Policy in the Annette Caldwell Simmons School of Education and Human Development and an Associate in the John Goodwin Tower Center for Political Studies. Her research focuses on the way that education policy affects the access and success of underrepresented students in higher education. She was recently named a National Academy of Education/Spencer Postdoctoral Fellowship Semi-Finalist. She primarily investigates student financial aid, affirmative action, and policies that influence the ability to create an inclusive and equitable campus climate. Selected topics her research has focused on include the causal impact of undergraduate debt on credit accumulation, early-career earnings, and graduate school enrollment; the influence of precollege characteristics on the racial college completion gap; affirmative action; and student collective action. She is currently a researcher with the Texas OnCourse Research Network, focusing on factors that influence the debt burden of Texas graduates.

Richard S.L. Blissett, Ph.D., is an Assistant Professor of Quantitative Methods and Education Policy in the Department of Education Leadership, Management, and Policy at Seton Hall University. His research primarily focuses on the attitudinal and behavioral dimensions of the politics of education policy-making. His current research agenda is comprised of three overlapping fields of study: 1) information, values, and attitudes; 2) democratic structures in education governance (particularly school boards); and 3) advocacy and social movements. His work includes focus on citizens' attitudes towards school choice and charter schools, student anti-racism campaigns, public school board member attitudes, school board elections, unions, and causal reasoning in policymaking. In the end, how can we, as citizens and change-makers, work to understand both our own and others' perspectives and work through conflicts in order to implement policies that do the most good? His research methods are primarily quantitative with a focus on computational social science (including text analysis), particularly through R, Stata, SPSS, and Python.

Christopher J. Broadhurst is an Assistant Professor of Educational Leadership, focusing on Higher Education, at the University of New Orleans. His research agenda utilizes historical, quantitative, and qualitative methods to examine the impact of campus activism on organizational and policy change. His most recent line of research explored how campus administrators and staff advocate for students from marginalized backgrounds to foster more inclusive environments in higher education. He is about to embark on a new research project that will investigate the deaths of two campus activists at Southern University-Baton Rouge in 1972. His research has appeared in the *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice, Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, Journal of Women and Gender in Higher Education, New Directions for Higher Education, and the Journal of College and Character.*

Aurora Chang, Ph.D., once an undocumented immigrant from Guatemala and raised in Richmond, California, in a family of eight, is now an Associate Professor and Program Chair in Higher Education at Loyola University's School of Education, where she teaches coursework on multicultural education, social justice, undocumented students, critical social theory, Chicana feminism, and curriculum in higher education. Her research focuses on the intersection of education, identity, and agency within traditionally marginalized communities. Currently, she focuses on undocumented students' paths of educational survival, resistance, and persistence; how these experiences affect the "American" sociopolitical landscape; and what educators can do to support them.

Darnell Cole, Ph.D., is an Associate Professor of Education with an emphasis in higher education and education psychology at the University of Southern California. His areas of research include race/ethnicity, diversity, college student experiences, and learning. Previously he served as an Associate Professor in the Department of Educational Administration at the University of Hawaii, Manoa (Honolulu). He was also a faculty member at Marquette University. He has published over 25 articles and book chapters and is featured in the major journals for higher education and other related fields including *The Journal of Higher Education*, *Journal of College Student Development*, *NASPA Journal*, *Journal of Classroom Behavior*, and *Journal of Creative Behavior.*

Charles H.F. Davis III, Ph.D., is an Assistant Professor of Clinical Education and Chief Strategy and Research Officer of the USC Race and Equity Center. Dr. Davis's scholarship has been published in peer-reviewed journals, including the *Review of Higher Education*, *Urban Education*, *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, *Educational Foundations*, *Men and Masculinities*, and the *Journal of Negro Education*. His graduate research was recognized by the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, earning the Melvin D. Hardee Dissertation of the Year Award (runner-up). In addition, Dr. Davis

and his public work have been featured by the *Los Angeles Times*, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, *Diverse Issues in Higher Education Inside Higher Education*, *Colorlines* (by Race Forward), *Academe*, and *Change Magazine*. He is currently working on a forthcoming book, *Freedom Is On the Way*, an ethnohistoriography examining the contemporary activists practices of the Dream Defenders, an organization of Black and Brown youth building power and fighting for freedom in the Deep South.

Tomika L. Ferguson, Ph.D., is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Educational Leadership in the School of Education at Virginia Commonwealth University. Her research centers on the college experiences of women of color, intercollegiate athletics, and the professional development of K–12 and nonprofit leaders around issues of equity and inclusion. Dr. Ferguson's work has been featured in *Diverse Issues in Higher Education*, *Journal for College Student Development*, and *College Student Affairs Journal*. Dr. Ferguson is the founder of the Black Athlete Sister Circle (BASC) program, a holistic student development program for Black women student–athletes at Division I institutions. Additionally, she has professional experiences in college access, residence life, enrollment management, and community outreach programs.

Garrett H. Gowen, M. Ed., is a doctoral candidate in the School of Education at Iowa State University. His research focuses on the role of higher education in the American conservative movement, with a particular interest in understanding the identities, experiences, and interactions of conservative college students. Garrett has also published and taught on the history and organization of U.S. higher education and pursues interests in sociology, symbolic interactionism, and organizational theory.

Kevin M. Hemer, Ph.D., is an Institutional Research Analyst at the University of Colorado Boulder in the Office of Data Analytics. His research focuses on the public role of higher education in society and associated undergraduate student outcomes. He studies civic learning, campus climates, and leadership, employing predominantly quantitative approaches and a developmental perspective.

Devon T. Lockard, M. Ed., is currently a second year Ph.D. student at Southern Methodist University in the Annette Caldwell Simmons School of Education and Human Development studying education. Devon is a Graduate Research Assistant for Dr. Dominique J. Baker in the Department of Education Policy and Leadership. His primary research interests are higher education access and retention of underrepresented populations and econometrics of education. Prior to pursuing his Ph.D., Devon had multiple experiences with teaching,

tutoring, and mentoring low-income and minority students of all ages, as well as positions in data science and institutional research.

Júlia Mendes is currently a Ph.D. student at Loyola University Chicago. She works extensively with undocumented students and examines their experiences in higher education. Her research also focuses on young undocumented immigrants, their identity development, mental health concerns, and narratives of trauma and survival. Mendes seeks to step away from traditional research methods to focus on people's stories and real lived experiences.

Donté Miller, M.Ed. is a PhD student in the Higher Education program at Indiana University, Bloomington where he serves as an Associate Instructor and Coordinator for College and Career Readiness. He holds a B.A. in Sociology, Minor in Education Studies from UCLA and was highly active with the UCLA Black Male Institute with Dr. Tyrone Howard assessing access and retention for Black male students complimentary to his heavy involvement and activism in student organizations. His passion for advocating for Black students through student organizations persisted through his graduate work at USC and IU through Graduate Student Government and other internal and external university entities. His research interests include P16 Black male student success, educational counseling, student activism, and using radical politics to reshape society.

Demetri L. Morgan, Ph.D., is an Assistant Professor in the Higher Education Program at Loyola University Chicago. Dr. Morgan seeks to understand how colleges and universities create campus climates that build the cultural competencies of students in order to foster lifelong civic and political engagement. Additionally, Dr. Morgan explores issues of academic governance and institutional policy in relation to boards of trustees and their influence on the outcomes and success of students. Dr. Morgan has published articles in the *Review of Higher Education*, the *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, the *eJournal of Public Affairs*, and numerous book chapters on campus climate, civic and political engagement, and race in higher education.

Dr. Sumun L. Pendakur (Sumi) serves as the Chief Learning Officer and Director of the USC Equity Institutes at the USC Race and Equity Center, dedicated to advancing racial justice in higher education and other sectors. Prior to this position, Sumi held roles as the Assistant Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion at Harvey Mudd College and as the Director for USC Asian Pacific American Student Services. The body of her work focuses on helping campuses, non-profits, and other organizations build capacity for social justice and racial equity by empowering students, faculty, staff, and

administrators to be transformational agents of change in their spheres of influence. Sumi is a scholar–practitioner, whose research interests and publications focus on Critical Race Theory, Asian American and Pacific Islander students, change agents, and institutional transformation. She has held leadership positions in the professional associations for her field and presented her original research at NASPA, ACPA, NADOHE, NCORE, and ASHE. Sumi was recently re-appointed to the Board of Directors for NADOHE, the national chief diversity officers' organization. She has served as Faculty Coach for the AAC&U's TIDES (Teaching to Increase Diversity and Equity in STEM) Institute. She is also the co-editor, with Dr. Shaun Harper and Dr. Stephen Quaye, of Student Engagement in Higher Education: Theoretical Perspectives and Practical Approaches for Diverse Populations (3rd edition) (2019). In 2019, she was named one of the top 35 women in higher education by Diverse: Issues in Higher Education magazine.

Robert D. Reason, Ph.D., is a Professor of Student Affairs and Higher Education at Iowa State University. Dr. Reason is the Director of the Personal and Social Responsibility Inventory (PSRI), an ongoing research project in collaboration with the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U). The PSRI is designed to revitalize and lead a national conversation about higher education's role in developing college students' sense of personal and social responsibility, help campuses assess and refine environments that encourage such development, and engage students in activities that encourage them to fulfill their obligations in academic, campus, and global communities. Dr. Reason focuses much of his research and scholarship on the importance of personal and social responsibility in today's higher education contexts.

Gary D. Rhoades, Ph.D., is a Professor and Director of the University of Arizona's Center for the Study of Higher Education. From January 2009 to June 2011 he served as General Secretary of the American Association of University Professors. Rhoades's research focuses on the restructuring of academic institutions and professions. His books include *Managed Professionals: Unionized Faculty and Restructuring Academic Labor* (SUNY Press, 1998) and (with Sheila Slaughter) *Academic Capitalism and the New Economy* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004). Rhoades is working on an updated book on faculty, tentatively titled *Organizing 'Professionals': Negotiating the New Academy*. He is also beginning a book on management, tentatively titled *Managing to be Different: Strategic Imagination or Strategic Imitation*.

Mabel Sanchez, M. Ed., is a doctoral student at the University of Southern California and affiliated with the Center for Education, Identity and Social

Justice. She graduated from the University of California Los Angeles (UCLA) with a bachelor's in Sociology and completed her master's in Postsecondary Administration and Student Affairs at USC. Her research interests include students' educational gains, issues related to religion and diversity, and student's intersectional identities such as race, religion, and gender.

Sy Stokes, M.S. Ed., is a first-year doctoral student at the University of Southern California Rossier School of Education and Research Associate at the USC Race and Equity Center. While an undergraduate student at UCLA, Sy produced a video entitled *The Black Bruins* in which he took his alma mater to task for racial disparities among the admission and graduation of Black male undergraduates. In addition to having received more than 2 million views online, *The Black Bruins* was a catalyst for similar mediated mobilization campaigns at other colleges and universities including the University of Michigan, Harvard University, and Oregon State University. His research interests focus on how multiracial people develop activist identities in a society that is heavily structured upon monoracial stratifications.

Nancy Thomas, JD, EdD directs the Institute for Democracy and Higher Education (IDHE) at Tufts University's Jonathan M. Tisch College of Civic Life. IDHE conducts research and supports colleges and universities in advancing student and institutional commitment to the health and future of a diverse democracy. Her work and scholarship center on higher education's democratic mission, how institutions foster campus climates for student political learning, discourse, equity, and participation, free speech and academic freedom, college student voting, and deliberative democracy on campuses and in communities. Dr. Thomas is the author of many book chapters on campus climates, articles and resources on free speech and inclusion, reports on college student voting, and the monograph, Educating for Deliberative Democracy. She is an associate editor of the *Journal of Public Deliberation* and a senior associate with *Everyday Democracy*.

Angel L. Velez, MA, is a Ph.D. candidate in History of Education with a graduate minor in Latina/o Studies at the University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign. Angel is currently a Diversifying Faculty in Illinois Fellow and is a former ENLACE Leadership Institute Fellow. Broadly speaking, his research interests include historical and contemporary student activism in higher education, social movements, and Latinx studies. Angel is a research assistant in the Office of Community College Research and Leadership. He is also involved in the development of the Puerto Rican Community Archives Project in Chicago. Angel was born and raised in Puerto Rico and is a product of Chicago Public Schools.

Amy Wilkinson, M. Ed., is an Advanced Lecturer in the Loyola University Chicago Department of Fine and Performing Arts. She is also the Executive Director of the In/Motion Dance Film Festival, whose mission is to celebrate dance performance within digital media platforms by fostering innovation in the presentation of movement-based artworks and by encouraging artists to engage in interdisciplinary collaboration. Her most recent film project, titled *All*, involved a diverse group of dancers, many of whom are living with Parkinson's disease. Amy has performed with numerous Chicago companies including CDI/Concert Dance Inc., Luna Negra Dance Theatre, Same Planet Different World, and Thodos Dance Chicago, for whom she also served as the educational outreach coordinator and wrote, directed, and produced a physics-based touring performance, *The Science of Motion—The Art of Dance*. She is currently a doctoral student in the Loyola Higher Education program, where her research interest centers on higher education pedagogy and curriculum.

INDEX

Note: Page numbers in italic indicate a figure and page numbers in bold indicate a table on the corresponding page.