Race and White Supremacy in the Sociology of Education: Shifting the Intellectual Gaze

JOHN B. DIAMOND

Race and racial inequality are central issues in the sociology of education. The addition of the *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity* as one of the fourteen American Sociological Association journals, the resurgence of theoretical and empirical work on evolving patterns of racism in the post-civil rights era (Bonilla-Silva 2010), and the increasing multidisciplinary appreciation for the ongoing importance of race across various institutions (Pager and Shepherd 2008) all highlight the importance of this area of scholarship. The emergence of the Black Lives Matter movement, the continued struggles between US government officials and indigenous nations over land and water rights (e.g., the Dakota Access Pipeline conflict), contentious discourses about Latinx immigration, and the election of Donald Trump, a white supremacist sympathizer, as president further highlight the continuing centrality of the color line in the United States (Du Bois 1903).

While the study of race and education has produced important insights, broader research on race has not been fully incorporated into the mainstream sociology of education. This oversight has limited our ability to develop a complete understanding of how race matters in education. In this chapter, I identify three limitations of research on race in the mainstream sociology of education, and make suggestions for how the field can move forward most productively. First, as sociologists of education, we tend to treat race as a statistical variable or set cultural characteristics (O'Connor, Lewis, and Horvat 2007; Zuberi, Patterson, and Stewart 2015; Zuberi 2001) rather than a socially constructed, interactive process of categorization, resource allocation, and opportunity hoarding (Lewis-McCoy 2014; Lewis and Diamond 2015; Massey 2007).

Second, while we have documented race-based structural and organizational patterns of inequality, we have been less effective in understanding the importance of symbolic inequalities (rooted in social status) that are key mechanisms in the reproduction of racial inequality in education and society. As Ridgeway (2014) stated in her 2013 American Sociological Association presidential address:

> In contrast to resources and power, status is not seen as an *independent* mechanism by which inequality between individuals and groups is *made* . . . This, I argue, is a major misjudgment that greatly limits our ability to understand how stratification actually works in an advanced industrial society like our own (p. 2, emphasis in original).

Finally, while we have captured organizational patterns that are tied to racial disparities in outcomes (e.g., tracking and school segregation), we've been less effective at understanding how and why structural and symbolic inequalities become embedded in organizations. Analyzing these processes will help us better understand the multilevel process that undergirds the reproduction of racial inequality.

This chapter proceeds as follows. I begin by defining race as it emerged in the United States as a social construction designed to establish, justify, and sustain white supremacy. I then draw on scholarship in social psychology to highlight how race shapes social interactions in ways that advantage whites and disadvantage people of color. Following this, I discuss the consequences of racially biased beliefs and treatment, drawing on work using critical race theory, black feminist theory, psychology, social psychology, public health, and biosociology. I then discuss how structural and symbolic racial inequalities become embedded in organizational routines. Finally, I conclude with a discussion of the implications of these arguments for scholarship in the sociology of education.

What is Race?

The popular conception of race emphasizes biological or essentialist understandings of racial categories (Morning 2011).[1] However, as social scientists, most of us know that race is a socially constructed system developed by Europeans to support white supremacy and to justify the economic, social, political, and physical exploitation of people defined as nonwhite (Smedley and Smedley 2005). While social scientists at various periods have tried to identify a biological or genetic categorization of racial groups through

pseudoscientific studies (Golash-Boza 2016), no meaningful categorization exists. Race is a biological fiction but a social reality, in large part because people attach meaning to those who have been positioned in racialized categories (Smedley and Smedley 2005).

As Golash-Boza (2016) writes: "The idea of "race" . . . is inextricably linked to notions of white or European superiority that became concretized during the colonization of the Americas and the concomitant enslavement of Africans. Race is a modern concept and a product of colonial encounters" (p. 130). To justify the brutal treatment and murder of those defined as nonwhite, Europeans developed racial ideologies that espoused their intellectually and morally superiority over other groups (Bonilla-Silva 2010; Collins 1990). While race is based on arbitrary physical characteristics, it shapes social structures, institutions, laws, and interpersonal interactions in ways that perpetuate white supremacy (Bonilla-Silva 2010; Diamond 2006). As Bonilla-Silva (2010) argues, societies like the United States form "racialized social systems" across all dimensions of social life, which contribute to the reproduction of white supremacy. Other scholars have spoken to what Mills refers to as "global white supremacy" as both an ideology and a social system (Du Bois 1915; Mills 1997). This is not to suggest that race is the only form of stratification. Class and gender exist simultaneously, and interlock with race in an intersectional matrix of domination (Crenshaw 1989; Collins 2004).

While race is about how people attach meaning to human bodies, racial thinking helps to create, justify, and sustain a racialized social structure by determining which people have access to social rewards like jobs, housing, medical care, bank loans, civil liberties, voting rights, and freedom of movement. Race is a *relational* phenomenon that advantages whites and disadvantages everyone else. Whites, for example, receive structural advantages by gaining easier access to income and wealth-generating resources like jobs and homes (Oliver and Shapiro 1995; Shapiro 2004; Du Bois 1915, 1935). During the early to mid-twentieth century, the federal government subsidized the creation and growth of suburban communities through providing low-interest-rate Federal Housing Administration (FHA) loans almost exclusively to whites and simultaneously undermining black communities in central cities through redlining (Shapiro 2004; Katznelson 2005). This led to housing values appreciating more rapidly in the suburbs than in cities (and more rapidly in white communities than in black ones), which in turn has contributed to stark wealth disparities between black and white communities in the United States, which have continued to grow even when income is held constant (Shapiro et al. 2013; Shapiro 2004; Oliver and Shapiro

1995). Shapiro et al. (2013) demonstrates that the gap in median wealth between African American and white families was $236,500 in 2009 (triple what it was in 2009). Likewise, the United States has functioned as a white supremacist settler colonial power in relation to the pre-existing indigenous nations that existed prior to the arrival of Europeans. White supremacy was a foundational racial ideology supporting the genocide of indigenous people, violation of hundreds of treaties with indigenous nations, and land theft during the westward expansion of the United States.

Whites also receive the psychic advantages of white privilege (Du Bois 1935; Roediger 2007). As Du Bois wrote in 1935, "It must be remembered that the white group of laborers, while they received a low wage, were compensated in part by a sort of public and psychological wage. They were given public deference and titles of courtesy because they were white." This helps explain why various European groups in the United States, including Irish, Italians, and Jews, worked hard to attain white status.

Because of its structural and symbolic value, whites have actively worked to maintain the social advantages of whiteness through opportunity hoarding (Massey 2007; Lewis and Diamond 2015; Lewis-McCoy 2014; Tilly 1998). Du Bois demonstrates the role of the whites in opportunity hoarding in his analysis of race and class in the United States.

> The black proletariat is not part of the white proletariat. . . . while Negro labor in America suffers because of the fundamental inequities of the whole capitalist system, the lowest and most fatal degree of its suffering comes not from the capitalists but from fellow white laborers. It is white labor that deprives the Negro of his right to vote, denies him education, denies him affiliation with trade unions, expels him from decent houses and neighborhoods, and heaps upon him the public insults of open color discrimination (Du Bois, 1933; cited in Thompson 2016).

Here we see that race is reproduced in part through the active participation of whites who gain material and symbolic advantages from the perpetuation of white supremacy (also see Du Bois 1915; 1935; Bonilla-Silva 2003). In education this has been done through the creation of laws that regulate the distribution of education, differential allocation of resources through segregation (*Brown v. Board of Education*, 1954), institutionalized processes of residential segregation, and monopolization of privileged positions in integrated schools through tracking (Oakes 2005; Mickelson 2001; Lewis and Diamond 2015). The active work of creating group advantage through individual, institutional, and governmental action is a core feature of the inter-

active process through which whites have worked to establish and maintain white supremacy. Therefore, race is not an individual characteristic in a sociological sense, but instead a social position that determines how one is treated and rewarded in a racial hierarchy that privileges whiteness.

Treating Race as a Socially Constructed, Interactive Phenomenon

Most work in the sociology of education has treated race as a characteristic of individuals. It is operationalized as a variable in statistical analyses or as a set of cultural characteristics that resides within a person (Zuberi 2001; O'Connor, Lewis, and Horvat 2007). This is a particular problem in quantitative analyses of race (the dominant methodology in the sociology of education; see chapter 1) that draw on the limited number of available data sets. Race, however, is a socially constructed category along which resources are allocated and interactions are shaped. Saying that outcomes are caused by race, when race is measured as an individual characteristic, does little to capture the significance of race or how and why it matters. Because race is often undertheorized, the sociology of education has often missed the opportunity to develop more sophisticated racial analyses. We need work that takes race as a socially created, actively constructed process and operationalizes it as such.

Some work points to useful strategies for moving in this direction. One challenge of sociological research on race is the use of single quantitative methods. As Stewart and Sewell (2011) write, "The dilemma is that our methods, when used singularly, undermine our ability to clearly identify the range of mechanisms behind race and racial inequality. We can overcome the limitations in one method by supplementing our analyses with complimentary methods" (pp. 227–228). For instance, they argue that the triangulation of multiple quantitative methods has the potential to help us shed new light on the mechanisms that contribute to the reproduction of racial inequality.

In contrast to the static and individual conception that shapes much of our research, race is a dynamic and relational social process that can be understood using Weberian notions of social status (Ridgeway 2014, 2000; Weber 1978). Social status is an important mechanism of social stratification, but is often treated as less powerful than structural mechanisms (Ridgeway 2014). Ridgeway and her colleagues have demonstrated that status distinction can lead to status beliefs or "widely shared cultural beliefs that people who belong to one social group are more esteemed and competent than

those who belong to another social group" (Ridgeway and Erickson 2000: 580). These status beliefs "construct and justify social inequality between categories of people" (Ibid.: 580). She further elaborates thus:

> Contemporary U.S. status beliefs assert that people in a particular category, say whites, men, or the middle or upper class, are not only more respected but also presumed to be more *competent*, especially at what "counts most" in society, than are people in contrasting categories, such as people of color, women, or the working class" (Ridgeway 2014: 3).

A large and growing body of work in sociology, social psychology, psychology, and education provides important insights into how these status beliefs influence social interactions. Because of the dominant white supremacist and anti-black ideology in the United States, when someone is identified as "black," there is a semi-automatic set of negative beliefs that are triggered in most whites (Banaji et al. 2015; McAfee, 2014; Ridgeway 2014; Banaji and Greenwald 2013). Ridgeway's work on performance expectations demonstrates how stereotypes about gender, race, and intelligence are productive of structural inequality.

Such race-based status beliefs, and subsequent behaviors, lead to multiple results. For instance, we know that a large majority of whites hold negative associations toward African Americans on the Implicit Association Test. These unconscious biases are therefore associated with conscious beliefs and behaviors. As Banaji et al. (2015) write, "A signature result from research using the IAT is that people who have no intention to discriminate may still do so in their behavior toward others" (2015: 183). This work has shown that those with more anti-black biases behave in ways that detrimentally affect African Americans in medical care, criminal justice, and attitudes toward race-based public policies (Banaji, Bhaskar, and Brownstein 2015). Likewise, negative associations with Latinx are associated with attitudes toward legal and illegal immigration (Ibid.).

While sociologists who study racial attitudes have documented declines in overt racial antipathy among whites (as expressed on traditional surveys), they continued to document anti-black racism. For instance, a large percentage of whites prefer mostly white schools, hold negative racial stereotypes about African Americans, and believe that blacks are less hardworking and intelligent than whites (Bobo, Charles, Krysan, et al. 2009). However, in contrast to the Jim Crow–era expression of racism, current racial beliefs have shifted from biological innate characterizations to being seen as a manifestation of group culture (Ibid.) or what Bonilla-Silva refers to as the biolo-

gization of culture (Bonilla-Silva 2010). Other work on racial attitudes also highlights how new and more elusive forms of racism, including color-blind racism (Bonilla-Silva 2010) and racial apathy (Forman 2004) have emerged and serve as mechanisms for the reproduction of racial inequality in the contemporary racial environment. Unfortunately, these insights about the evolving nature of racism, even as they emerge in the contemporary sociology of race, have failed to penetrate deeply into the mainstream sociology of education.

The fact that negative stereotypes about people of color persist among whites is clearly an important issue given that the current US teaching force is overwhelmingly white and the student population is increasingly African American, Latinx, Asian, Native American, or biracial (Warikoo, chapter 15 in this volume). We have several studies that demonstrate the significance of this racial mismatch between teachers and students. White teachers, for instance, judge black students more harshly in terms of behavior and academic potential than they do white students (Fox 2016; Downey and Pribesh 2004) and these expectations can have negative implications on students' outcomes. There is also a more general body of work on race and ethnicity-based expectations that demonstrates teachers' lower expectations for black and Latinx students.

We also have good evidence that race shapes how students' behavior is interpreted (Ferguson 2000). The disproportionate suspension and expulsion rates of black and Latinx students emerges from teacher referrals for behaviors that are often subjective (e.g., defiance) rather than objective (e.g., drug possession), thus making these students highly susceptible to (mostly) white teachers' implicit or explicit racial biases. One indication of the power of these school discipline experiences to shape students' academic perceptions is the finding that on national surveys, black students are more pro-school than are white students on all indicators except the perception that discipline is fair (Downey, Ainsworth, and Qian 2009). There is a clear link between exclusionary discipline and racial disparities in educational outcomes (Morris and Perry 2016; Gregory, Skiba, and Noguera 2010).

What Are the Implications of Racially Biased Beliefs and Treatment?

The perpetuation of the myth of white supremacy has negative implications for the academic performance of black and Latinx students. A substantial body of this research has focused on the implications of experiencing discrimination. The work on stereotype threat, for example, emphasizes how

stigmatized group members perform less well on academic tasks because of the desire to disprove negative stereotypes about their group (Steele 2011). Research in this area demonstrates that the stereotype threat condition leads to a measurable stress reaction on the part of target group members. Black college students placed in a stereotype threat condition experienced physical and cognitive reactions including increased blood pressure, reduced memory capacity, increased heart rate variability, and taxed self-regulation ability. Thus, trying to disprove a stereotype takes away from one's cognitive capacity to do so. There is also evidence of the opposite effect known as *stereotype lift*, in which beliefs about white intellectual superiority can enhance white students' academic performance. Again, race is a relational phenomenon, not simply an individual characteristic. The psychological impact of status beliefs can have direct and indirect impacts of educational performance.

Critical race theory (CRT) scholarship, which emerged in law schools in the 1980s (Bell 1987) and later in education scholarship in the 1990s has contributed a key theoretical framework to understanding how racism in experienced. It has done so by adding empirical evidence for the idea of racial microaggression (Pierce 1970; Huber and Solorzano 2015). Chester Pierce (1970) defined microaggressions as "subtle and stunning" offensive actions that have implications because of their cumulative nature. The work in this area has been taken up by critical race scholars who have demonstrated how ideas about the intellectual inferiority and inherent criminality of people of color in educational contexts lead them to experience microaggressions that impact students' sense of safety and connection to educational institutions, and demonstrate the psychosocial implications of discrimination, including what Smith has called "racial battle fatigue," in higher education contexts (Smith et al. 2007). Much of this work has been conducted by psychologists and sociologists in higher education settings which suggests the need for more work in K–12 settings.

The literature on microaggression also points to the patterns of biased treatment that exit at the institutional and societal levels—what Sue et al. (2007) call environmental microaggressions—"racial assaults, insults and invalidations which are manifested on systemic and environmental levels" (Sue et al. 2007). These are features of social context beyond the interpersonal level. In education, many colleges and universities have buildings named almost exclusively after white heterosexual men. Such practices can send the message that students who do not fit those categories do not belong in the institution (Sue et al. 2007; Solorzano, Ceja, and Yosso 2000). Likewise, integrated schools, racial disproportionality in honors, Advanced

Placement, and regular level classes in which whites are positioned in upper-level classes and Blacks and Latinx students are in lower-level classes is another form of environmental microaggressions (Lewis and Diamond 2015; Tyson 2011).

The originators of work on microaggressions argue that it is their cumulative impact that makes them powerful factors that influence people's experiences and outcomes. Important work has emerged on race and health that relates to the implications of experiencing discrimination such as racial microaggressions. A growing body of work drawing on the biopsychosocial model of racism as a stressor demonstrates that experiencing discrimination leads to negative health outcomes (Clark et al. 1999; Goosby and Heidbrink 2013; Williams 2012). For example, African Americans who experience more discrimination develop bodily inflammation (in the form of increased C-reactive protein) and have higher blood pressure (Goosby et al. 2015) than African American students who attend predominantly white schools. They also report more early adult depression, stomach aches, headaches, and nausea than those who do not attend such schools. Other work shows that writing about personal experiences of discrimination inhibits the body's ability to response to flu vaccinations. Scholars like David Williams at Harvard and Bridget Goosby at Nebraska are continuing important work in this area which captures the cumulative impact of racial oppression as a set of experiences.

Another important contribution of CRT, drawing on black feminist scholarship, is the idea of intersectionality. As Crenshaw (1989) writes, "The intersectional experience is greater than the sum of racism and sexism; any analysis that does not take intersectionality into account cannot sufficiently address the particular manner in which Black women are subordinated." While intersectionality has emerged as an important theoretical advancement in understanding stratification, and a section on race, class, and gender intersections exists in the American Sociological Association, work in the sociology of education has not fully incorporated these insights. In fact, given its heavy reliance on regression analysis in status attainment studies (Mehta and Davies, chapter 1) most mainstream quantitative work still treats the contributions of race and gender as distinct variables (race or gender) or in an additive fashion (race + gender). However, recent work suggests using alternative methods that are more consistent with an intersectional approach such as fuzzy-set qualitative comparative case studies.

An interesting insight from the work on microaggressions and intersectionality is that bringing cross-disciplinary insights and methodological approaches together can yield more sophisticated ways of understand-

ing the implications of race. Work on racial microaggressions, when linked with work in psychology, social psychology, education, and health, can lead to more robust theoretical, methodological, and practical advancements in the examination of race.

Unfortunately, much of this work has failed to penetrate the mainstream sociology of education. This could result in part from patterns of subdisciplinary specialization within sociology, the preponderance of quantitative articles published in mainstream journals, and the lingering issue of the marginalization of both critical scholarship and what Mehta and Davies call "studies" units (e.g., African American Studies, Latino/a Studies, Women's Studies; Mehta and Davies, chapter 1 in this volume).

To this I would add the marginalization of scholars of color from inclusion in our most prominent venues. This exclusion dates back to the founding of US sociology. W. E. B. Du Bois, the scholar who founded the first school of sociology in the United States at Atlanta University (Morris 2015), was largely written out of the history of the field because of white supremacist beliefs and structures. Du Bois laid the foundation for several sociological subdisciplines, including urban sociology (Du Bois 1899), the sociology of race (Du Bois 1903), and whiteness studies (Du Bois 1920). He conceptualized race as a social construct (challenging the scientific racism of the early twentieth century), analyzed race and class as interactive processes, engaged in intersectional analysis (Morris 2015) and introduced various methodological innovations including data triangulation, qualitative/ quantitative mixed-method approaches, and participant observation. His exclusion from the mainstream of sociology is perhaps the quintessential example of the perils of white supremacy for the discipline's development.

But How Do These Status Beliefs Matter in Education?

The sociology of education has documented structural and organizational processes related to the reproduction of racial inequality. This work has provided important insights into how race-based structural inequality related to social class and wealth (Johnson 2014; Shapiro 2004), residential and school segregation (Shapiro 2004) *and* organizational processes and characteristics like tracking (Oakes 1985; Tyson 2011), teacher quality (Darling-Hammond 2010), and disproportionate suspension and expulsion (Skiba, Gregory, and Noguera 2005) contribute to the reproduction of inequality.

However, we need to better understand how racial inequality becomes embedded in organizational routines that are ostensibly designed to produce more equitable outcomes. I argue that borrowing from work on orga-

nizational routines can help illustrate how structural and symbolic racial inequality is perpetuated through organizational processes.

Schools (and all organizations) partly function through the operation of organizational routines (Feldman and Pentland 2003). These routines include the collective daily practices that people engage in to get things done. We can think about the typical morning ritual at a school, the changes of class on the hour, or teacher-faculty meetings as examples of organizational routines. Discipline practices like teacher referrals are also organizational routines. Recent work has identified two key "aspects" of these routines— the *ostensive aspect* or the ideal of the routine, and the *performative aspect* or the routine as practiced (Feldman and Pentland 2003; Sherer 2007). As Feldman and Pentland (2003: 101) put it, "The ostensive aspect is the … abstract, generalized idea of a routine or the narrative in the organization about how things *should* be done." They continue, "The performative aspect of the routine consists of specific actions, by specific people, in specific places and times." It consists of how the routine is *actually* performed in everyday practice. The performative aspect of a routine may be highly aligned with the implicit intentions of the ostensive aspect, or it may diverge dramatically.

For instance, Feldman and Pentland (2003) use the example of the hiring routine to illustrate this distinction. Hiring is usually broken down into three related activities: attracting candidates, screening applicants, and hiring the most qualified candidate. However, the performance of the hiring routine is much more complicated. An informative study by Pager, Western, and Bonikowski (2009) sent black, Latinx, and white field testers to interview for jobs with the same credentials. Whites were more likely to be called back for a second interview than were black and Latinx people, even when whites reported felony records and blacks reported clean records. In this case, it is critical to distinguish between the ideal of the routine and how it is actually practiced.

Other studies have shown a disjuncture between the ostensive and performative aspects of the hiring routines. Employers with more inclusive diversity statements are no more likely to hire applicants of color than those with less inclusive statements (Kang et al. 2016) and employers who expressed an equal likelihood of hiring black and white ex-offenders are still more likely to hire whites over blacks (Quillian and Pager 2005).

In my recent book with Amanda Lewis about race and education in an integrated high school (Lewis and Diamond 2015), we argue that it is important to understand how everyday interpersonal interactions are shaped by the structural and symbolic racial inequalities (Lewis and Diamond 2015). For example, school discipline practices can be thought of as an orga-

nizational routine with ostensive and performative aspects. All schools have rules of conduct that dictate how students interact with each other and with teachers and administrators. These rules and regulations form the ostensive aspect of disciplinary routines and are written as if they apply equally to all students, regardless of background.

While discipline routines are stated in race-neutral terms, their practice can deviate from the ideal. This is because of the way race works symbolically (the meaning and values people attach to members of different racial groups) and structurally (affecting who has access to certain kinds of resources) when real people interact in specific contexts. Rather than a discrete moment, discipline is a process (Gregory, Skiba, and Noguera 2010). This process includes at least three components: selection for discipline, movement through the discipline process, and enforcement of consequences (Piquero 2008; Gregory, Skiba, and Noguera 2010). Racial differences in disciplinary experiences can emerge at any moment during the process, from *differential selection* (institutional practices that might lead minorities to get picked out for wrongdoing more often despite episodes of misbehavior similar to those of white students) to *differential processing* (institutional practices that might lead minorities, once picked out for wrongdoing, to get different sanctions despite transgressions similar to those committed by white students; Gregory, Skiba, and Noguera 2010; Piquero 2008; Skiba et al. 2011).[2]

In our study, we found that black and Latinx students were more likely to be singled out for intervention even when white students engaged in similar behavior. This was because of the performance expectations of black and Latinx students tied to racial status beliefs. For example, students were expected to have hall passes when they were not in class during class periods. However, race determined the extent to which students were scrutinized during these periods. This pattern repeated itself and was identified by students, teachers, and administrators of all races.

Black and Latinx students were also treated differently from white students once they were cited for disciplinary infractions. Because of their structural and symbolic advantages, white parents had access to valued resources (economic, social, cultural, and symbolic) that led white students to receive less punitive treatment. White parents were able to use their social position to negotiate favorable outcomes for their children. Here, whiteness served as a form of symbolic capital that shaped students' experiences with the discipline process. As a result, black and Latinx students were more likely to be sanctioned for their behavior *and* to receive more punitive sanctions when they did receive them. Our work points to the simultaneous

functioning of structural and symbolic inequality in the reproduction of racial stratification.

Conclusion

I have argued that mainstream sociology of education has been limited by its failure to fully engage with the broader work on race in sociology and across the social sciences. This has limited the theoretical and empirical sophistication of work on race in the sociology of education. To address these limitations, I argue that educational sociologists need to conduct research that treats race as a socially constructed category designed to promote white supremacy through the unequal distribution of structural and symbolic resources. This system is maintained through conscious and unconscious practices of opportunity hoarding in which whites seek to maintain interpersonal, institutional, and structural advantages and to exclude people of color from those advantages.

While we have a large body of work that documents structural and institutional patterns of racial inequality (e.g., income and wealth disparities, residential and schools segregation, ability grouping/tracking), we have been less successful in documenting how race functions symbolically to reproduce educational inequality, and how structural and symbolic inequality become embedded in routine organizational practices.

In order to move the sociology of education forward, I argue that we need to reinvigorate work on social status—drawing on the work of social psychologists who have provided powerful insights into how status beliefs influence performance expectations and intergroup dynamics (Ridgeway 2011). In particular, we need to understand how daily social interactions are shaped by race-based performance expectations that are dynamic and cumulative. We also need work that critically analyzes the implications of navigating racially hostile schools where broader racial ideologies question the intellectual and behavioral competence of students of color. I have discussed the biological and psychological implications of white supremacist ideologies on the health of people of color; we need more work that attends to these dynamics and tracks them over time with a focus on education and the interactions between physical and psychological well-being and educational experiences and outcomes.

In light of the interactive nature of racial ideologies, more attention needs to be paid to the implications of status beliefs for white students' achievement. Work on stereotype lift has demonstrated that white students' performance is boosted by positive beliefs about their capacity. The kind of

work I believe is needed would include the analysis of national and international data sets, but would not be as limited to them as it has been. Such data sets provide key information, but they are limited in their ability to capture how race operates in schools. Future work will benefit from multi-method studies that combine qualitative and quantitative work, as well as work that brings multiple quantitative approaches to bear on specific race-based educational issues. Many of the most powerful insights on contemporary racial inequality require studies that document actual practices rather than just statements about race (e.g., audit studies), that draw on social psychological experiments (Ridgeway 2011; Steele 2011), and which build upon biopsychosocial models of racism (Goosby and Heidebrink 2013). Our work in the sociology of education needs to treat race as a category that is meaningful because it shapes how people are treated and the opportunities to which they have access, rather than as a characteristic that individuals carry with them into educational contexts.

Likewise, most work in the sociology of education fails to interrogate how whites actively maintain their educational advantages though opportunity hoarding. The intellectual gaze of sociologists is too often focused on black and Latinx students and families who are perceived to lack some form of cultural and intellectual know-how or investment in education, rather than on whites who have worked tirelessly to monopolize educational advantages. Promising work has begun to shed light on the reproduction of elite status, but more studies of the interactive, relational nature of racial privileges and penalties is needed.

Finally, with regard to methodology, we need to expand how we study race. Mainstream sociology of education has been dominated by quantitative studies relying on surveys that treat race as a variable. The most innovative work discussed here expands beyond single methods to utilize qualitative/quantitative mixed-method approaches, multiple quantitative methods, experiments, and other forms of analysis. It also takes seriously the theoretical insights from work in psychology, social psychology, public health, critical race theory, and black feminist epistemology. Taking race seriously in the sociology of education means seriously revising how we conceptualize and study it.

Notes

1. In this chapter, race is discussed in the context of the United States because of this volume's emphasis on the sociology of education in the United States.
2. Of course, while race mattered, it did not function in isolation. Instead, as we will

discuss further, there was an intermingling of race, class, gender, and cultural style that "colored" students' interactions with school officials.

References

Anderson, K. F. 2013. Diagnosing Discrimination: Stress from Perceived Racism and the Mental and Physical Health Effects. *Sociological Inquiry* 83 (1): 55–81.

Banaji, M. R., R. Bhaskar, and M. Brownstein. 2015. When Bias Is Implicit, How Might We Think about Repairing Harm? *Current Opinion in Psychology* 2015 (6): 183–188.

Banaji, M. R., and A. G. Greenwald. 2013. *Blindspot: Hidden Biases of Good People*. New York: Delacorte Press.

Bell, D. 1987. *And We Are Not Saved: The Elusive Quest for Racial Justice*. New York: Basic Books.

Bobo, Lawrence D., Camille Z. Charles, Maria Krysan, and Alicia D. Simmons. 2012. The Real Record on Racial Attitudes. In *Social Trends in the United States: Evidence from the General Social Survey since 1972*, edited by P. V. Marsden, pp. 38–83. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bonilla-Silva, E. 2003. *Racism without Racists*. Third edition. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Clark, R., N. B. Anderson, R. Clark, and D. R. Williams. 1999. Racism as a Stressor for African Americans: A Biopsychosocial Model. *American Psychologist* 54 (10): 805–816.

Collins, P. H. 1990. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. New York: Routledge.

———. 2004. *Black Sexual Politics: African Americans, Gender, and the New Racism*. New York: Routledge.

Crenshaw, K. W. 1989. Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Anti-Discrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Practices. *University of Chicago Legal Forum* (1).

Darling-Hammond, L. 2010. *The Flat World and Education: How America's Commitment to Equity Will Determine Our Future*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Diamond, J. B. 2006. Still Separate and Unequal: Examining Race, Opportunity, and School Achievement in "Integrated" Suburbs. *Journal of Negro Education* 75 (3): 495–505.

Downey, D., J. W. Ainsworth, and Z. Qian. 2009. Rethinking the Attitude Achievement Paradox among Blacks. *Sociology of Education*, 82:1–19.

Downey, D. B., and S. Pribesh. 2004. Missing When Race Matters: Teachers' Evaluations of Students' Classroom Behavior. *Sociology of Education* 77 (4): 267–282.

Du Bois, W. E. B. 1903. *The Souls of Black Folk*. Chicago: A. C. McClurg.

———. 1915. The African Roots War. *Atlantic Monthly*, 707–714.

———. 1935. *Black Reconstruction in America: An Essay toward a History of the Part Which Black Folk Played in the Attempt to Reconstruct Democracy in America, 1860–1880*. New York: Harcourt Brace.

———. 1999. *Darkwater: Voices from within the Veil*. New York: Dover Publications.

Eze, Emannuel C. 1997. *Race and the Enlightenment: A Reader*. New York: Wiley-Blackwell.

Feldman, M. S., and B. T. Pentland. 2003. Reconceptualizing Organizational Routines as a Source of Flexibility and Change. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 48 (1): 94–118.

Ferguson, A. 2000. *Bad Boys: Public Schools in the Making of Black Masculinity*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Forman, T. 2004. Color-Blind Racism and Racial Indifference: The Role of Racial Apathy in Facilitating Enduring Inequalities. In *The Changing Terrain of Race and Ethnicity*, edited by M. Krysan and A. Lewis, pp. 43–66. New York: Russell Sage.

Fox, L. 2016. Seeing Potential: The Effects of Student–Teacher Demographic Congruence on Teacher Expectations and Recommendations. *AERA Open* 2 (1): 1–17.

Golash-Boza, T. 2016. A Critical and Comprehensive Sociological Theory of Race and Racism. *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity*. 2 (2): 129–141.

Goosby, B. J., and Chelsea Heidebrink. 2013. African American Health over the Life Course: The Transgenerational Consequences of Racial Discrimination. *Sociology Compass* 7:630–643.

Goosby, Bridget J., Sarah Malone, Elizabeth Richardson, Jacob E. Cheadle, and Deadric Williams. 2015. Perceived Discrimination and Markers of Cardiovascular Risk among Low-Income African American Youth. *American Journal of Human Biology* 27 (4): 546–552.

Gregory, A., S. J. Skiba, and P. A. Noguera. 2010. The Achievement Gap and the Discipline Gap: Two Sides of the Same Coin? *Educational Researcher* 39 (1): 59–68.

Huber, L. P., and D. Solorzano. 2015. Racial Microaggressions as a Tool for Critical Race Research. *Race, Ethnicity, and Education* 18:297–320.

Johnson, H. B. 2006. *The American Dream and the Power of Wealth: Choosing Schools and Inheriting Inequality in the Land of Opportunity*. New York: Routledge.

Kang, S. K., K. A. DeCelles, A. Tilcsik, and S. Jun. 2016. Whitened Resumes: Race and Self-Presentation in the Labor Market. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 61: 469–502.

Katznelson, I. 2005. *When Affirmative Action Was White: An Untold History of Racial Inequality in Twentieth Century America*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Lewis, A. E., and J. B. Diamond. 2015. *Despite the Best Intentions: How Inequality Thrives in Good Schools*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lewis-McCoy, R. 2014. *Inequality in the Promised Land: Race, Resources, and Suburban Schooling*. Stanford: University of California Press.

Massey, D. S. 2007. *Categorically Unequal: The American Stratification System*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

McAfee, Myosha. 2014. The Kinesiology of Race. *Harvard Educational Review* 84 (4).

Mickelson, Roslyn. 2001. Subverting Swann: First and Second-Generation Segregation in the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools. *American Educational Research Journal* 38 (2): 215–252.

Mills, C. W. 1997. *The Racial Contract*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Morning, A. 2011. *The Nature of Race: How Scientists Think and Teach about Human Difference*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Morris, Aldon D. 2015. *The Scholar Denied: W. E. B. Du Bois and the Birth of American Sociology*, Oakland: University of California Press.

Morris, E W., and B. L. Perry. 2016. The Punishment Gap: School Suspension and Racial Disparities in Achievement. *Social Problems* 63:68–86.

Oakes, Jeannie. 2005. *Keeping Track: How Schools Structure Inequality*. 2nd ed. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

O'Connor, C., A. E. Lewis, and E. Horvat. 2007. Researching "Black" Educational Experiences and Outcomes: Theoretical and Methodological Considerations. *Educational Researcher* 36 (9): 541–552.

Oliver, M., and T. Shapiro. 1995. *Black Wealth/White Wealth: A New Perspective on Racial Inequality*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Pager, D., and H. Shepherd. 2008. The Sociology of Discrimination: Racial Discrimination in Employment, Housing, Credit, and Consumer Markets. *Annual Review of Sociology* 34: 181–209.

Pager, D., B. Western, and B. Bonikowski. 2009. Discrimination in a Low-Wage Market: A Field Experiment. *American Sociological Review* 74 (5): 777–799.

Pentland, B. T., and M. S. Feldman. 2005. Organizational Routines as a Unit of Analysis. *Industrial and Corporate Change* 14 (5): 793–815.

Pierce, C. 1970. Offensive Mechanisms. In *The Black Seventies*, edited by F. Barbour, pp. 265–282. Boston: Porter Sargent.

Piquero. A. R. 2008. Taking Stock of Developmental Trajectories of Criminal Activity over the Life Course. In *The Long View of Crime: A Synthesis of Longitudinal Research*, edited by A. M. Liberman, pp. 23–78. New York: Springer.

Quillian, L. 2008. Does Unconscious Racism Exist? *Social Psychology Quarterly* 71:6–11.

Ridgeway, C. L. 2011. *Framed by Gender*. New York: Oxford University Press.

———. 2014. Why Status Matters for Inequality. *American Sociological Review* 79 (1): 1–16.

Ridgeway, C. L., and K. G. Erickson. 2000. Creating and Spreading Status Beliefs. *American Journal of Sociology* 106:579–615.

Roediger, D. R. 2007. *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class*. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr.

Shapiro, T. 2004. *The Hidden Cost of Being African American*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Shapiro, T., T. Meschede, and S. Osoro. 2013. The Roots of the Widening Racial Wealth Gap: Explaining the Black-White Economic Divide. Institute for Assets and Social Policy Research and Policy Brief.

Sherer, J. Z. 2007. The Practice of Leadership in Mathematics and Language Arts: The Adams Case. In *Distributed Leadership in Practice*, edited by J. Spillane and J. B. Diamond, pp. 106–138. New York: Teachers College Press.

Smedley, A., and B. Smedley. 2005. Race as Biology Is Fiction: Racism as Social Problem Is Real: Anthropological and Historical Perspectives on the Social Construction of Race. *American Psychologist* 60 (1): 16–26.

Smith, W. A., W. R. Allen, and L. L. Danley. 2007. "Assume the Position . . . You Fit the Description": Campus Racial Climate and the Psychoeducational Experiences and Racial Battle Fatigue among African American Male College Students. *American Behavioral Scientist* 51 (4): 551–578.

Solorzano, D., M. Ceja, and T. J. Yosso. 2000. Critical Race Theory, Racial Microaggressions, and Campus Racial Climate: The Experiences of African American College. *Journal of Negro Education* 69 (1/2): 60–73.

Steele, C. 2011. *Whistling Vivaldi: How Stereotypes Affect Us and What We Can Do*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Stewart, Q. T., and A. A. Sewell. 2011. Quantitative Methods for Analyzing Categorical Inequality, in *Rethinking Race and Ethnicity in Research Methods*, edited by J. Stanfield. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Sue, D. W., C. M. Capodilupo, G. C. Torino, J. M. Bucceri, A. M. B. Holder, K. L. Nadal, and M. Esquilin. 2007. Racial Microaggressions in Everyday Life: Implications for Clinical Practice. *American Psychologist* 62 (4): 271–286.

Thompson, J. P. 2016. Capitalism, Democracy, and Du Bois's *"Two* Proletariats." Items: Insight from the Social Sciences. Accessed December 8, 2016, at http://items.ssrc.org/capitalism-democracy-and-du-boiss-two-proletariats/.

Tilly, C. 1998. *Durable Inequality*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Tyson, K. 2011. *Integration Interrupted: Tracking, Black Students, and Acting White after Brown*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Weber, M. 1978. *Economy and Society: An Outline of an Interpretive Sociology*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Williams, David R. 2012. Miles to Go before We Sleep: Racial Inequalities in Health. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 53:279–295.

Zuberi, T. 2001. *Thicker Than Blood: How Racial Statistics Lie*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Zuberi, T., E. J. Patterson, and Q. T. Stewart. 2015. Race, Methodology, and Social Construction in the Genomic Era. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 661 (1):109–127.