

EDITED BY NATALIA DEEB-SOSSA
FOREWORD BY LOUIE F. RODRIGUEZ

**COMMUNITY-BASED
PARTICIPATORY
RESEARCH**

Testimonios from Chicana/o Studies



THE UNIVERSITY OF
ARIZONA PRESS
TUCSON

- Studies." In *"White" Washing American Education: The New Culture Wars in Ethnic Studies*, edited by D. M. Sandoval, A. J. Ratcliff, T. L. Buenavista, and J. R. Marin, 67–93. Santa Barbara, Calif.: Praeger.
- Oliva, N., J. C. Pérez, and L. Parker. 2013. "Educational Policy Contradictions: A LatCrit Perspective on Undocumented Latino Students." In *Handbook of Critical Race Theory in Education*, edited by M. Lynn and A. D. Dixson, 140–52. New York: Routledge.
- Quinones, S. 2016. "(Re)braiding to Tell: Using Trenzas as a Metaphorical-Analytical Tool in Qualitative Research." *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 29, no. 3: 338–58.
- Revilla, A. 2004. "Muxerista Pedagogy: Raza Womyn Teaching Social Justice Through Student Activism." *The High School Journal* 87, no. 4: 80–94.
- San Miguel, G., and R. R. Valencia. 1998. "From the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo to *Hopwood*: The Educational Plight and Struggle of Mexican Americans in the Southwest." *Harvard Educational Review* 68, no. 3: 353–412.
- Solórzano, D. G. 1998. "Critical Race Theory, Racial and Gender Microaggressions, and the Experiences of Chicana and Chicano Scholars." *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 11:121–36.
- Teranishi, R. T., and L. B. Pazich. 2013. "The Inclusion and Representation of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders in America's Equity Agenda in Higher Education." In *Handbook of Critical Race Theory in Education*, edited by M. Lynn and A. D. Dixson, 204–15. New York: Routledge.
- Trinidad Galván, R. T. 2015. *Women Who Stay Behind: Pedagogies of Survival in Rural Transmigrant Mexico*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Tuck, E. 2009. "Suspending Damage: A Letter to Communities." *Harvard Educational Review* 79, no. 3: 409–27.
- Utah State Board of Education. 2018. Data Gateway, Mary W. Jackson School. Retrieved from <https://datagateway.schools.utah.gov/Schools/36188>.
- Villenas, S. 1996. "The Colonizer/Colonized Chicana Ethnographer: Identity, Marginalization, and Co-optation in the Field." *Harvard Educational Review* 66, no. 4: 711–32.
- Yosso, T. J. 2005. "Whose Culture Has Capital? A Critical Race Theory Discussion of Community Cultural Wealth." *Race Ethnicity and Education* 8, no. 1: 69–91.

2

DEVELOPING CHICANX STUDIES METHODS

Living Racial Justice with Teachers, Communities, and Students

MARCOS PIZARRO, JANINE NKOSI, AND
ALONDRA RIOS-CERVANTES

INTRODUCTION

THIS CHAPTER unpacks a more than twenty-year journey to explore and develop Chicana/o studies methods for racial justice both through teaching and research.¹ Chicana/o studies emerged as a challenge to the injustice in academia and research, but Chicana/o studies scholars always faced the contradiction of making that challenge while relying on their training in the conventional disciplines they were challenging. The implications of these contradictions have been felt greatest in the research methods in the field, as Chicana/o studies has been slow to develop its own methods. Some researchers, however, have created innovative methodological possibilities (Delgado Bernal 1998; Solórzano and Yosso 2002) as they have begun to center Chicanx communities and their powerful knowledge systems, as well as their ability to deconstruct and challenge dominant narratives and practices. We approached this chapter as an intergenerational dialogue about the methodological issues and contradictions we face in engaging in community-based participatory research. Each of us as authors plays a distinct role in this chapter, mapping out the methodological contradictions and challenges just described and then explaining an evolving approach to meeting these challenges (Pizarro), applying this approach to an ongoing community collaboration to consider how best to center

community wisdom to address the challenges they face (Nkosi), centering the role of racial justice ethics in the development of community-based projects (Pizarro), and revealing the power of teaching/learning writing approaches that emerge from racial justice methods to provide insights both for methods and for how Chicana studies practitioners share the findings from their collective work (Nkosi and Rios-Cervantes).

DEVELOPING CHICANA/O STUDIES RACIAL JUSTICE METHODS—MARCOS PIZARRO

In 1996, I started my first tenure track position as a professor in Chicana/o studies. I was excited, hopeful, and nervous. I was also disappointed. I had already worked in two of the premier Chicano studies departments in the country (as a lecturer in one and as an affiliated postdoctoral fellow in a research center for another). My work to that point had been deeply influenced by Paulo Freire (2000), whose writing demonstrated the power of community-based approaches to schooling that centered students and those who had suffered the most from inequality and school-based oppression. I didn't have models for how to approach this work as a researcher, but I had already adapted his approach to my work as a schoolteacher in urban Los Angeles and as a Chicano studies lecturer. I sought a similar approach as a researcher. The year prior to this, I used my postdoc to center Chicana/o students' analyses of their own schooling and the relationship between their identity formation and their school experiences, inspired by my former sixth-grade students who had made it clear to me that this was critical to understanding their school lives and outcomes. Before starting that research project, I scoured the library and the online databases, and then I asked and even interviewed Chicana/o studies researchers in search of a Chicana/o studies method that centered our community as thinkers and knowledge creators. I had to keep searching, and I turned to educational research as well as qualitative research across other disciplines and found that some scholars were exploring similar questions, but they lacked a Chicana/o grounding that I was struggling to put into academic language and center. So I was disappointed. I expected that our racial justice focus in Chicana/o studies would have led us to confront these issues by the time I came along. At that time, I didn't realize how young we were as a field. I had embarked on a methodological journey, striving for a way to embody racial

justice as a process and not rely on my racial justice goals to give me a pass in how I worked with communities.

Before beginning that project, which eventually became a book on Chicana/o schooling, *Chicanas and Chicanos in School: Racial Profiling, Identity Battles and Empowerment* (Pizarro 2005), I wrote an article that unpacked the issues with which I had been wrestling (Pizarro 1998). This piece centered Chicana/o epistemology as essential for those of us wanting to create a Chicana/o studies method. The analyses explained that for us to engage in research with Chicana/o communities, we need to center their own understandings and analyses of the issues we are confronting, and then, in doing so, we must recognize that Chicana/o communities have their own knowledge systems, which have to be the basis on which we enter into our relationships with these communities, while also shaping our methods.

This approach defined the methods that I employed as I began the research that became *Chicanas and Chicanos in School*. I worked with Chicana/o students in high schools, community colleges, and universities, asking them to explain their experiences but also engaging in multiple conversations with many of them, working with them to analyze the work that we had been doing and to make meaning from it together. As it evolved, this multiyear project became more methodologically complex and just. I, and later my research team, learned how to build relationships with our collaborators to give them room to explore, to challenge them when it felt like they were phoning it in, to probe deeply when they seemed to contradict themselves, to clarify when the complexity of their analyses exposed new insights, and to always ask for help in understanding their experiences as a collective. This process was fraught, and we continued to struggle with power dynamics, like convincing this community that we really meant it when we said that we wanted to develop long-term relationships with them. We did have the sense that we were moving in the right direction, however, as many of our relationships grew and continued (some of which we have been lucky enough to maintain to this day). Perhaps the most poignant example of the approach came to me in one of my classes. One student, Ernesto Sanchez, wrote a paper for a class that brought to life so much of what we were seeing in the research. I realized that he had been a student at each of the three sites we were using for the research project. I later asked him if we could use his work in the book, and in the end we published his paper almost exactly as he had written it (cutting out a section that referenced readings to fulfill some of the assignment requirements). Ernesto's analysis was powerful:

It was during high school that I realized that in order to be successful you either have to be white or act the part. I was neither white, nor did I want to act white. I remember going into classes full of *gabachos* and being taught by *gabachos*. It was a very humbling experience for me. I was always made to feel as if I did not belong. I was not given proper attention, always the last one to be helped, always the one who was least desirable when choosing groups, always picked to answer questions that the rest of the group did not know the answer to. I was on the spot. I heard and experienced racism and had no idea how to confront it. I had to be twice as good, make twice as much effort and accept my inferior status to continue.

We wanted the readers to know that these students have the experience, insight, and power to make sense of their world in ways that transcend the analyses of conventional research. We were getting somewhere.

Later, as the field of critical race theory (CRT) in education emerged, several scholars with backgrounds in Chicana/o studies pushed our methodological approach further. Dolores Delgado Bernal (1998) built on my preliminary ideas on Chicana/o studies methods and even more so on the groundbreaking work in Chicana feminist theory to both center Chicana epistemologies in her research and to rely on Chicana cultural intuition as central to effectively engaging communities in research. Solórzano and Yosso (2002) demonstrated the vital need for a Chicana/o-centered counterstorytelling approach to research that relied on CRT principles, which included centering the experiences of those who have been oppressed in schools. Their work pushed the boundaries of what is considered academic research and helped establish the transformative power of relying on the experiences, insights, analyses, and counter-hegemonic approaches of our communities in these efforts to analyze and seek the transformation of the schools in which Latinx students are so often disenfranchised.

Native and aboriginal researchers also challenged and furthered our understandings of how Chicana/o studies methods can be informed and work in collaborative ways with our communities. As many researchers have noted, the work of Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999) was one of the most significant explorations of methods through the experiences of people of color.³ Smith pushed for “decolonizing methodologies,” where the wisdom and experiences of those who have been colonized are centered as the foundation on which research in these communities is built. One of her most compelling insights for my own work was a section in which she shared the essential role of Maori ethics in shaping the approach of any researcher working with Maori people. She explained

that researchers in these communities must understand and have lived the ethics of those communities so that these core principles of a given community determine the approach researchers take to building the relationships that must define the methods from start to finish.

Shawn Wilson (2008) provided the most important contribution to my own thinking about methods and the epistemological issues that must be understood before engaging in research. Wilson explained that indigenous communities have their own distinct ontologies—ways of being (which other researchers have explained are linked to their relationship to the land for which they are stewards). These ways of being that govern daily life in indigenous communities shape epistemology—the ways of knowing and forms of knowledge production that exist in these communities—as reflected in all facets of life, such as the nature of language itself. Both ways of being and ways of knowing also exist in relationship to axiology, the ethics that govern life in these communities. Wilson emphasized that a fundamental facet of axiology in indigenous communities is the construct of relational accountability, the understanding that members of these communities hold themselves accountable to and for their relations, ensuring that their actions respect, nurture, and honor these relations. He provided a model and explained that those who research indigenous communities must build their methods with these communities through the ontology, axiology, and epistemology of the given indigenous community. Wilson demonstrated that without this approach, research is ineffective, inaccurate, and unjust. As I read this work, I found the missing pieces to my earlier analysis of the role of Chicax epistemology in our Chicax studies research. While the works of Wilson and Smith are deeply informed by their specific nations, they provide a model that aligns with Chicax studies and which we, as researchers, have to integrate into our work in our own communities. They pushed me, as a researcher, to center what I call ethical validity, the idea that our methods are only “valid” if they align with and emerge from the ethical principles that guide the communities in which we work (which are linked to both the ways of being and knowing in these communities). This became the challenge of my next major research project.

As I completed the book, I founded a collective of raza teachers committed to racial justice through our work with raza youth. MAESTR@S, which I have coordinated for eighteen years, has always been informed by a racial justice framework that centers the experiences of raza youth and their teachers. Our goal from the beginning was to develop creative, innovative, and transformative

ways of helping raza youth in disenfranchised communities to thrive in school and, even more importantly, to support their communities in the pursuit of racial justice. This project became the cornerstone of my research, and as my methodological clarity came through the work described above, these insights determined the ways in which MAESTR@S evolved as a research site.

MAESTR@S became a true collective several years into the project when we agreed that our efforts to support the most pressing needs of our students had been limited. We began to explore the deeper issues that were impacting our youth and sought a way to focus on those rather than on the superficial issues that classroom teachers learn to emphasize. This was an important shift for the group because while I had already published work on our efforts, involving several of our participants in the analysis and writing, this new emphasis represented a collective decision and a sense of ownership of the project by the community that redirected all of our future efforts. The group identified the critical issues that we needed to explore, carved out a path for engaging in that work, provided feedback to each other on how this was working, responded to these assessments by engaging in new approaches, and then began to analyze all of our work and put it into an explanatory model, which eventually led to us sharing this work at conferences. We did not have Wilson's model when we began this process, but by the time we were solidifying our approach we were able to use it to inform our method.

The foundation of our method was that we did not do this work on or to students. We began with ourselves, striving to understand our own experiences both as K-12 students and now as teachers and community workers. This process involved several critical realizations and agreements:

- We recognized that the ways of being in our communities had shaped our own experiences and understandings of knowledge, and that the struggles of our families and the strength that they found in community and in shared resources (and knowledge) were the lifeblood of these communities.
- We relied on our own ethics of the centrality of family and community and of the importance of honoring this community in our daily lives and work.
- We knew that Latinx ways of being and knowing were crucial to developing a path for racial justice work with our students and that the ethics that we and our students learned from our families and communities allowed us to connect with each other in ways that gave meaning to our work together and transcended typical school approaches to Latinx student engagement.

- Our work was built on this shared nexus of ontology, epistemology, and axiology in a relational accountability that guided our practice, our methods as a collective, and my own as a researcher.
- We call the MAESTR@S model "Living Racial Justice," an acknowledgment that racial justice work is a process rather than an end-point and that it was a lifelong commitment for which we had to pace ourselves.²

The Living Racial Justice model also shaped my approach to the project as a researcher. I learned to trust the collective, letting the group identify the key insights from our work, develop the model, and decide when and how we could share it with others. Individuals from our collective and students from our classes (where I had implemented the model) wanted to work with me on the writing. They became co-authors and co-researchers, offering analyses and edits, answering questions, approving my requests, and even taking on sections of our writing (and being included as collaborators in the bylines). I learned to listen and follow, and that my work was to support the collective and learn from the process. I realized that this was a true learning opportunity for me as a researcher. I was learning how to live racial justice work rather than do research on issues related to racial inequality or even racial justice. This process was essential to my growth as a Chicax studies scholar. It was what I had been missing when I began, and I now understood why it had not been developed earlier: it was personally and intellectually demanding beyond anything I had ever experienced in academia. I also knew that it was going to help me in my efforts to achieve the goals of Chicax studies.

As a professor, I knew I had to bring all of these lessons into the classroom. I also quickly saw how difficult this would be. If it was a challenge for me to do this kind of work as a faculty member, how tough would it be for students who often have to prove themselves in conventional approaches to academic work, even in Chicax studies classes? I also knew that these students had gone to the K-12 schools that MAESTR@S was working in and responding to all of these years. As I introduced different facets of our MAESTR@S model in the classroom, I witnessed the deep engagement of students in the ideas and particularly in the application of those ideas to their own lives. I could see that the MAESTR@S Living Racial Justice model was also a method of racial justice work in Chicax studies, meaning that our method was not simply a research method but a method of doing and being, as it built on Latinx ontologies, epistemologies, and axiologies. In my work with undergraduates, this model

was taking life in ways that not only led to intense student engagement but also to amazing work, often resulting in students addressing critical needs in their families, engaging in important work in their communities, and pursuing these interests in graduate school.

I knew that I had to also bring this approach, as method, into my work with graduate students. Still, I worried that, by introducing our Living Racial Justice model, I would be asking too much of them. They are a dedicated group of students fighting to be heard and to have their work understood by others who often not only do not get it but also question these students' academic credentials, training, and the validity of their work. The students were just learning their own power as emerging scholars and sought to be accepted by mainstream academia, especially as many planned to apply to doctoral programs in non-ethnic studies departments. I decided that I would help our graduate students build on the understandings they were developing in other classes in the program (including our Research Methods class) and present our Living Racial Justice model as one option for engaging in the work of Chicana studies. My main focus was collectively considering the idea of ethical validity, centering a Latinx-informed relational accountability, and asking students to consider the role of Wilson's (2008) framework in their own experiences as well as their evolving understandings and what they envisioned for themselves as Chicana scholars.

I also presented students with alternative models of conducting research, in particular the counterstory approach (Solórzano and Yosso 2002), given the way in which it centers the experiences of people of color, as we worked through the concerns raised about alternative methods within academia. Solórzano and Yosso (2002) employ a CRT analysis that explains how majoritarian stories are among the primary forces propelling institutionalized racism in the United States. They suggest the necessity of counterstorytelling as "a tool for exposing, analyzing, and challenging the majoritarian stories of racial privilege" (32). In doing so, they outline CRT methods of counterstorytelling, including composite stories, which "draw on various forms of 'data' to recount racialized, sexualized, and classed experiences of people of color, . . . [and] offer both biographical and autobiographical analyses because the authors create composite characters and place them in social, historical, and political situations to discuss racism, sexism, classism, and other forms of subordination" (33). I introduced this method to graduate students and shared examples so that they could understand the way in which the method integrates multiple

forms of research and demands tremendous intellectual rigor. As I had seen in the undergraduate courses, the graduate students often quickly developed an affinity for these alternative approaches because they were aligned with their own histories, commitments, and hopes for confronting real issues they were living and seeking to upend. Each semester, a group of students wanted to develop their research as counterstories, challenging themselves and me, both as a teacher and researcher. They saw it as an opportunity to develop and build on relationships in their communities, to create new ways of sharing stories that challenged dominant narratives, rewriting both our histories and our current realities, centering community cultural wealth, and mapping out practical strategies for daily resistance.

The following three sections of this chapter provide an opportunity for the reader to fully unpack this analysis of the Living Racial Justice model. First, Janine Nkosi, a former graduate student who participated in the model in two classes, shares an analysis of how our approach impacted her work on a long-term project in her own community, including an excerpt from a counterstory she wrote on this. Next, I build on her analysis and provide a conclusion that explains the central role of ethics in the model. Finally, Janine and Alondra Rios Cervantes, another former graduate student who participated in the model in two classes, collaborate to create a counterstory that allows readers to experience aspects of teaching the model and its implications for long-term racial justice work.

APPLYING CHICANA/O STUDIES RACIAL JUSTICE METHODS—JANINE NKOSI

In fall 2016, while taking classes toward a master's degree in sociology, I enrolled in a graduate elective course in the Mexican American Studies (MAS) Department at San José State University. This course selection was a mix of chance, due to limited grad-level course offerings, and intent. I was interested in taking courses outside my discipline in an effort to strengthen my chances of earning a full-time teaching position in an increasingly competitive job market. By the end of my first week in MAS, I wondered why I had not taken any Chicana/o studies courses before. Chicana/o studies methodologies and praxis resonated deeply with my teaching philosophy and sociological practice. I was also alarmed at the prospect of having continued down the same path of engaging in community-based social justice work as an educator without having

acquired this heightened level of critical consciousness and praxis. I had been teaching for a few years at another university, where I was engaged in a long-term service-learning project that brought students to work directly with the community. I prided myself on my commitment to critical service-learning, a pedagogy that connects “book-learned” material and coursework to “real-world” experiences in the community to help address local social justice issues, such as poverty, homelessness, or substandard housing. By my second semester in MAS, uncertainty brewed as I engaged with thought partners in critical dialogue and uncovered the subtle and unconscious ways I had exploited the very community I cared so deeply about. It was much easier to recognize and accept the seemingly overt ways institutions exploited communities of color than it was to accept the fact that I too was implicated.

Critical race theory (CRT) (Solórzano and Yosso 2002), community cultural wealth (Yosso 2005, 2006), and critical pedagogy (Freire 2000) provided me with a framework to critique and understand *how* (the process) my students, community partners, and I engaged in community-based social justice work. To illustrate how my consciousness and praxis evolved through the Living Racial Justice model, an example of my work with critical service learning in sociology is examined. Three years before I entered MAS, I had begun engaging with my students in a critical service-learning project to address the slum housing crisis, which has plagued California’s Central Valley for over a century. There are distinct differences in terms of how I now engage in this work, post-Chicana/o studies.

My initial attempt to understand slum housing was rooted in secondary research (i.e., census data) on the prevalence and geographic concentration of housing insecurity based on race, ethnicity, and income. As our work progressed, my students, community partners, and I developed more sophisticated data-collection methods to empirically study the problem in various neighborhoods. We produced reports and presented them to local politicians, held community forums, and organized rallies at city hall. Our work culminated in the passage of local housing policy reforms.

Conventional academic approaches would suggest that I was engaging in successful community-based participatory action research. This was the way my education and training had taught me to address social problems. Looking back now, I no longer see this as success. The majority of encounters my students and I had consisted of working with community-based organizations and carrying out projects *on behalf of* the community but rarely *with* the community.

By the end of my first year in Chicana/o studies, CRT taught me that if I wanted to understand the slum-housing crisis, I couldn’t start by looking at large-scale patterns or even canvassing in neighborhoods. I needed to start by journeying alongside the most vulnerable residents living in slum units (such as undocumented, immigrant, single women of color). Prior to Chicana/o studies, I thought I was doing this. I encountered hundreds of individuals and families; however, I never genuinely connected with them. For example, I recently came across a photo one of my students took to document the unsecured broken front door of an apartment unit during our first summer canvassing. As I study the picture now, a pink Dora the Explorer bike stands out. At the time, however, we did not see the significance of that bike, how essential it was to understand the housing crisis through the eyes of that child we never met, spoke to, or even really thought of.

After I learned and began applying Chicana/o studies methodologies, my community-based work evolved. Community cultural wealth taught me to see assets within the communities beyond the superficial. The term *asset-based* was not new to me; however, before MAS, I focused more on physical structures (green space, employment opportunities, sidewalks), human resources that met our needs (e.g., families showing up for community events or forums), the presence of CBOs (community benefit organizations) within a neighborhood, a school’s Academic Performance Index, and the like. Each of these variables is empirically measurable. Focusing on quantitative measures restricted my ability to capture assets such as resistant capital and navigational capital (Yosso 2005, 2006). For example, I encountered many residents who refused to quit fighting for safe housing and overcame difficult challenges with their landlords and the institutions established to help them seek justice (e.g., code enforcement). Maria, a grandmother who lived in an apartment with health and safety violations, reported them to her landlord, filed a code enforcement complaint when her landlord was unresponsive, met with her city council representative when the code enforcement process failed her, and continued to fight even though her landlord tried to intimidate her with an eviction notice. When I met Maria through our local organizing committee, she was seeking legal assistance but was not eligible for free legal aid because she is undocumented. Maria still did not give up. On the day the housing reform passed city council, Maria shared her story during public comment. Her resilience and drive were a source of motivation for many people on the local organizing committee. Her knowledge and experience navigating the code enforcement and legal aid system helped us

learn about the flaws in our public policy reforms, something we never would have learned if we had not listened intently.

Chicana/o studies methodologies exposed the limits in my practice and moved me to praxis when I began engaging more fully with my community partners. We engaged in a rigorous inquiry, which included open and honest dialogue, critical self-reflection, and action, and which led to new insights. During one of our conversations, my community partner commented,

Working with students who are just coming up with plans on their own and it's based on data from . . . whatever they find online and then making a program and going into a community, uprooting people from where they are and disrupting their lives . . . and making these false promises, . . . creating hope in the community that hasn't had it for a long time . . . and then abandoning them. And literally there's no follow-up afterward, there is no structure that's in place . . . It's dangerous.

The more I reflected on our conversations, the more I uncovered some of the ways my projects mirrored certain aspects of the dominant white savior complex model (Cole 2012) to community-based university projects. Cole and others have used this concept to expose the way in which dominant approaches to communities of color view them only as deficit-ridden and needy, and center the good deeds of whites who “rescue” and “save” these individuals, emphasizing their heroism while never understanding the strengths, resources, and wisdom of these communities. In our work, at the end of each semester my students moved on to their next set of classes, while the community continued seeking justice. Critical race methodology exposed deficit-informed thinking and practices, which silenced and distorted the experiences of community partners. Community cultural wealth revealed how community experiences are sources of strength and valuable knowledge. Our inquiry was intended to interrogate the way privilege and power define the selection, development, implementation, and dominant narrative of university-community civic engagement partnerships. To reconceptualize the research questions guiding our project, I first had to break away from the dominant research paradigm. My inclination prior to this work in Chicana/o studies was to develop an inquiry *about* instead of *with* community. In my previous work, I generated research questions that would yield tangible findings and *produce* recommendations for other researchers and community groups.

However, under professor Pizarro's guidance, I applied Chicana/o studies methodologies and refocused my research to engage *with* community partners as thinkers (“thought partners”) and co-creators of the research design. Together, we examined “how community voice is represented, listened to, and acted upon in university-community partnerships.” We engaged in intentional conversations that were digitally recorded so we could listen to them and reflect. I transcribed the recordings and sent them to each thought partner. We again reflected on our conversations, shared insights, and sought clarification as needed. We identified themes using the critical lenses of race, power, privilege, and ideology. We developed action plans and acted immediately. I drafted a composite counterstory based on our collective voices, critical themes, and lessons. Learning about and engaging in counterstorytelling elevated my consciousness to new heights and helped me move beyond using words in an academic and superficial way without fully understanding their meaning toward using words to explore life in the real world. Counterstorytelling challenged me to think deeply about how CRT and community cultural wealth (one source of data) could be understood through community voice (second source of data), our experiences engaging in community-based work (third source of data), and secondary sources such as census data and university records (fourth source of data). Based on all of this data, I drafted a counterstory to paint a picture of our collective experiences. The settings were a university and community meeting and included characters that represented our local organizing committee (comprised of faith leaders, community organizers, legal experts, residents, and university faculty and students) that met weekly in the evening to plan, organize, and implement actions to help address housing justice issues, including the lack of safe, decent, and affordable housing throughout our valley, which disproportionately impacts economically disadvantaged communities of color. What follows is an excerpt from the counterstory. Through its guiding tenets, this methodology allowed me to see the ways critical themes uncovered during our community inquiry, such as white savior complex models of community engagement, live in the real world. In this scene, the professor, who engages her students in critical service-learning, realizes the deficit-based structure of university-community partnerships.

As Dr. Gonzalez entered the Service Award reception, she was feeling elated. When the President began his opening remarks, he asked various representatives from community agencies to stand in recognition of their commitment to

university-community collaborations. The audience applauded as the president read a few lines describing each agency's contribution to creating a better city of Landport. Then he announced, "Once again, the university exceeded its annual goal of providing one million hours of service to the community. In fact, during the 2015–16 academic year, 13,870 students, faculty, and staff broke all previous university records by providing 1,296,868 hours of service to the community, which equals an estimated economic value of over \$35.9 million!" Everyone applauded with excitement and a buzz filled the room. Dr. Gonzalez heard someone say, "Wow, over 1 million hours of service!" Another university employee replied, "Those poor communities sure are fortunate."

Dr. Gonzalez was stunned by the announcement. She leaned over to one of her colleagues, "One million hours of service, but we're still ranked among the highest in the nation for concentrated poverty, one in five children goes to bed hungry at night, and we have one of the biggest slumlords in the entire state of California. It's important to understand how these figures are impacting local issues." Her colleague looked slightly puzzled before responding, "Hmm . . . I hadn't thought about it like that before."

"I'm not saying we shouldn't celebrate our success, but how is our community factored into this calculation? Do you think this is a good measure of success?"

This section of the counterstory illustrates several aspects of institution-based service-learning that are problematic, including (a) the lack of community voice, as very few residents are at the "service award" event—even the location of the event implies that the university is more important and of greater value in the partnership; (b) the way universities (and institutions in general) measure success, which in this case is in terms of hours served to the community, number of university stakeholders involved in service, and an estimated labor value, reflecting a market-based definition of return on investment to publicize the university's value to taxpayers, rather than an assessment of the impact the work has on addressing an actual social issue and/or long-term sustainable change; and (c) the use of the term *service* centers a deficit perspective toward the communities "served," rooted in a long history of racial ideology (superiority and inferiority), the racialization of social problems (e.g., poverty inextricably linked to people of color), and cultural deficit theories, which blame the victims for their circumstances and ignore structural discrimination (e.g., unjust laws and policies that produce unequal access to opportunities and resources). Language such as "serving the community" carries hidden notions of superiority and inferiority and reveals an imbalance in power among the various stakeholders.

These insights, gleaned from our initial inquiry, led to small but important collective action. During summer and fall we continued to engage in conversations, reflection, and action. Our hope was that university stakeholders, especially folks who *do* community-based work, would engage in critical self-reflection and, if needed, take necessary steps to center work on community voice. This critical shift can help institutions move away from institution-based service-learning, which unintentionally exploits communities of color by engaging in a white savior model of community engagement, to a community-based social justice model.

Through Chicana/o studies concepts, frameworks, and methodologies that were centered in our Mexican American studies classes, I learned many valuable lessons that have helped me move closer to being the kind of scholar and person I strive to be. I understand how essential it is to center community work on community voice and cultural wealth, meaning the knowledge, expertise, and experiences of people living within the community. I now engage in critical self-reflection and ongoing dialogue with my community partners to question *how* we engaged in our work together and *how* we can continue developing a process that is truly mutually beneficial. While I learned many important lessons from our inquiry, what follows are some of the most essential lessons from our application of Chicana/o studies methods for engaging in community-based social justice work.

Analyzing the process of how we engage with one another is more critical than planning specific action steps or quantitatively assessing the impact our work has on the community. When we see *how* we do community work, the other pieces (planning, assessment, and impact) will be what we need/want them to be. The most significant lesson from my encounter with Chicana/o studies methodologies is the ongoing reflection, dialogue, and action with my community partners, specifically focused on interrogating the *process*—how we engaged in our community-based work together. I am thankful for the friendships that grew over the past four years, which allowed us to engage in open and honest dialogue with one another. The pressure, demands, and rewards for the production of measurable outcomes (e.g., hours served, papers produced, reforms passed) creates real challenges to engaging in the kind of community-based work required to address systemic racism. Many institution-based community projects are shorter-term commitments designed to fulfill the demands of the

institution (e.g., grant requirements, semester schedules, student learning outcomes), but how we engage in our work, how our work fully engages the community, and how we address the root cause of the problems are key. By engaging in a critical examination of the process of our community work, we discovered challenges, but we also developed plans to work toward addressing them that the community found meaningful.

Working alongside grassroots organizers committed to social justice requires long-term commitment and centering their expertise—always. This lesson was cemented through my work with Faith in the Valley, Fresno, which is community-based and uses a congregation-community model of grassroots organizing to develop local leadership from the community up. Their central goals are to bring people together based on values and relationships rather than issues (e.g., housing inequality), to conduct Community-Based Participatory Action Research (CBPAR) to have the collective voices of the community heard, and to hold those in power and authority accountable for serving the common good. As our partnership evolved and our impact in the community grew, I learned to do CBPAR. However, Chicana/o studies methodologies (which are directly aligned with their model) helped me rethink the way I did CBPAR by uncovering problems with our approach (e.g., unaddressed power dynamics) and solutions (e.g., not centering community voice). In looking back at the way I engaged in community-based work before Chicana/o studies, I see how much control I had over the process. This is not to say that we didn't engage as partners, but the partnership was not balanced. For example, when we collected community data, I maintained control of the database, and when students first wrote white papers or gave presentations, they were presenting to Faith in Fresno, not *with* them or *with* residents. After fully engaging with my community partners through our inquiry, we discussed ways that our work could be truly centered on community voice. One suggestion that we acted on immediately was to decrease the number of students who work with community groups. This creates an opportunity for community members and students to engage in more meaningful interactions and foster authentic relationships with one another. It also challenges the university's focus on the number of volunteers and service hours, which would have never been considered if we had not centered the expertise of these community partners.

Trusting community voice is nonnegotiable and a prerequisite for journeying alongside community in social justice work. Academics must listen. We must be willing to relinquish control. We must trust, honor, and center community voice. If we are to engage in authentic community-based social justice work, we must learn to trust community voice, listen to one another, help each other recognize our growing edges, and support each other as we strive to become the people we need to be to embody social justice. Academics learn to believe (consciously or subconsciously) that they know what's best for "poor" communities. This is rooted in Western ideology, specifically based on the kind of knowledge that is valued in our society (e.g., degrees versus lived experiences). Academics are well-read and engage in extensive research to become "experts" in their fields but often do so at the expense of listening to the real experts, the people struggling and surviving in the communities we seek to rescue. People living in the community have the ability to transform our "theories" about what's causing their "problems" if we give them the power to challenge our belief that we know what's best. Trusting in their insights and de-centering ourselves and our authority as researchers can be unsettling as it demands our vulnerability. It was difficult for me to share my analyses as a researcher because it put me on more equal footing with community partners and gave them the ability to question my interpretations. My thoughts and ideas were examined by people who are experts in their own lives and have more knowledge of the social problems that I was striving to understand. Engaging *with* thought partners means everyone is collaborating and co-creating in the research process together and that everyone's knowledge and perspective is valued. As researchers, we become vulnerable, and in the process our understanding is clearer and our ability to actually support these communities becomes possible.

Authentic relationships are a source of healing. Relationships sustain us in community work. To engage in social justice work as the practice of revolutionary love is to engage in lifelong relationships with our community as we journey alongside one another. Although I often engaged in self-reflection, I rarely engaged in critical self-reflection, especially with my community partners. I am still not sure if I would have been able to see how I engaged with my community had we not been friends doing this work together. I am not sure if they would

have been able to keep it real with me. We must always recognize the imbalances and confront power dynamics because these power dynamics are at the root of the social inequalities we strive to upend. This is possible through a meaningful commitment to lifelong relationship-building with our thought partners.

Counterstorytelling helped me rethink my approach to teaching, research, and community-based, critical service-learning work. Counterstorytelling provided an essential method to confront and then work toward challenging traditional university-community partnerships by revealing the deficit-view and a white savior complex model that typically shapes university-led service-learning. Counterstorytelling helped us challenge dominant narratives and placed the experiences, knowledge, history, and voices of community at the center of our inquiry and praxis. Counterstorytelling was key in helping me move away from deficit-based phrasing that is so common in university-community partnerships (e.g., “serving the community,” “poor people,” “helping the disadvantaged”), which Coates (2015) argues we engage in in order to distance and protect ourselves from the “visceral experience” of confronting these realities. Common, deficit-based remarks by students who engaged in “service” work included “I feel so bad for the people” and “I am so thankful for everything I have.” Rather than feeling outrage about grave, institutional injustices and seeing people they encounter as resilient and capable, students often feel pity and guilt. Critiquing these common depictions is essential because deficit-based phrasing reflects underlying thinking (shaped by dominant ideology) that then shapes our actions at every phase of community-based work. Counterstorytelling helped me see and feel how theory and concepts live in the real world so that we could move toward addressing the root causes of social problems (e.g., poverty and racism) and see the most vulnerable people as the experts who will lead us in our work. Counterstorytelling gave me clarity on how I embodied dominant paradigms in my teaching, research, and community work, which helped me make necessary changes.

Prior to my encounter with Chicana/o studies, I was supremely confident that “do no harm” was an ethical principle I upheld to the fullest extent. I now realize that while I certainly did not commit any egregious ethical violations toward my students and community partners, I engaged in subtle

subordination. As I have learned in Chicana/o studies, even the subtlest forms of oppression (e.g., microaggressions) have lasting consequences. I hope by sharing my experience of engaging in a critical examination of the *process* (“the how”) of our community-based social justice work, as opposed to “what” was produced through community partnerships, this analysis serves as a lesson and a cautionary tale. If we are to engage in authentic social justice work, we must commit to ongoing critical self-reflection, critical community dialogue, and action. One of the greatest lessons I learned in Chicana/o studies is that relationships are central to our work. We must become fully conscious of the way we engage with one another, and challenge systems that impede our ability to place people and community voice at the center of our work.

THE CENTRAL ROLE OF ETHICS IN RACIAL JUSTICE METHODS—MARCOS PIZARRO

Thinking about our work as Racial Justice Methods practitioners, as I look at it through Janine’s eyes and experiences, I am reminded of the centrality of ethics to our community-based participatory research with communities. Janine engages in a thoughtful self-critique that allowed her to highlight essential facets of our approach, all of which are linked to our ethical responsibility as Chicana studies practitioners. To build on that, I want to center the core of these ethics: community building and accountability.

- Our work is based on the understanding that in Chicana studies Racial Justice Methods we are building a community. We are a community because of a shared commitment to racial justice, specifically as that is understood within a given context.
- This is a community to which we commit ourselves for life: individuals do leave the group because of changes in their jobs and relocation, but our understanding is that this is not a project or a study with an ending. We recognize that we are always going to be committed to racial justice, that we are always going to be working for that objective, and that we will always do everything in our power to support each other.
- We also understand that racial justice is not a product, but rather it is a way of being. We embody racial justice through our daily practice and

actions. We model the goals we seek in how we interact with each other as a community as well as how we interact with each of our students and their families. This doesn't mean that we never make mistakes; we are always engaging in self-assessment and critique, looking for ways in which we can better understand and confront the challenges and contradictions we face and how to embody this work in every act and thought.

- The concept of ethical validity is central to our racial justice methods, bringing us back to the challenge that our methods have to be aligned with the ways of being that have shaped our ways of knowing, all of which inform the undergirding principles to which we and our communities hold ourselves accountable (Wilson 2008).
- We also redefine the concept of accountability, focusing on the way in which the collective is accountable to each individual who is part of our community. We are accountable to each person who is part of our circle, striving to understand, support, and live with them, even when we face interpersonal differences and challenges. This demands our deep commitment to the community in the form of our time and energy: to listen, to strive to understand, to challenge, and to confront our power imbalances as well as our privilege, both in that we have the time to invest in this work and the honor to learn from others who are willing to invest their time in teaching us. We, therefore, center Wilson's (2008) concept of relational accountability, which reflects our deepest commitment to these communities.
- We recognize that this kind of commitment extends beyond what is normally expected of researchers in conventional disciplines within academia and we also understand that not all of us can make this kind of commitment, but we also know that the very definition of Chicana studies demands that our work move us toward living racial justice, and, therefore, if we hold ourselves accountable to those goals, we must ask more of ourselves as researchers, teachers, and human beings.

These are the most important beliefs and practices that represent the ethic of researchers engaging in living racial justice. They are principles that we keep present in all of our community-based participatory research and which we adapt to the unique relationships and forms of accountability that we create with communities.

LEARNING TO LIVE RACIAL JUSTICE: A COUNTERSTORY— JANINE NKOSI AND ALONDRA RIOS-CERVANTES

"How's everyone doing tonight?" asked Dr. Castro as he started writing the evening goals on the whiteboard (a check-in, reflections from the previous week, practice presentations for the campus/community forum). "Did you all get something to eat?"

"This Balela salad is the best," said Blanca.

Esperanza replied, "Did you try those sriracha chips with the potato salad? It's the bomb." Miguel and Blanca laughed thinking about how reluctant they were to get food on the first day. Miguel recalled, "I remember when I was all shy and didn't want to eat, but now I get my grub on. Hey, everyone save room for dessert. I brought a cake for Ana, Esperanza, and Maria's birthdays."

Students continued talking as Dr. Castro took his seat in the circle with them. "Food really creates a more comfortable learning space," said Esperanza. "As a matter of fact, because of this class, I bring snacks when I meet with my thought partners, and they really appreciate it. I think it shows I care. It's like they know I'm thinking about them in a holistic way."

"I agree, you're thinking about mind, body, and spirit and their most fundamental needs. It's all interconnected," said Miguel. "Right, Dr. Castro? Isn't that the conclusion Linda Tuhiwai Smith and," he paused, fumbling through his notes, "you know, um, that other author, are leading us to?"

"Yeah. So, that's interesting. What do others think?" Dr. Castro replied. He had a way of drawing other students into the conversation before responding to them directly.

After a brief pause, Blanca chimed in, "It's Wilson, Miguel. This reminds me of what Wilson talked about in terms of ontology and epistemology. Our ways of being in the Chicana community are very much connected to creating a 'sense of community,' and food is a core part of how we do that. It's like the way we live our lives."

Esperanza added, "And they're both embodied in axiology: our ethical principles. We treat one another with humanity. Nourishing students, who often experience food hardship or come to class straight from work, is one way of seeing us and treating us with humanity. These are the rules we live by."

"It's critical to remember: if we don't understand the ways of being, ways of knowing, and the ethics of a community, then we don't have any business

doing research in that community,” cautioned Dr. Castro. Everyone nodded in agreement.

“I hate to cut this discussion short, but I want to make sure everyone has time to practice their presentations and get feedback before next week’s forum. Thank you for the thoughtful reflections. Keep thinking about these ideas. You’re bringing up some really important points.”

They were excited to see how each other’s community work came together. Students had engaged as thought partners in the classroom for the past fifteen weeks, while at the same time they engaged with community thought partners on their projects. Everyone was invested in each other’s work, as peers, as friends, and as Chicana studies scholars committed to social justice.

At the end of a long night, Esperanza presented last, projecting a quote on the large white screen at the front of the room attributed to Jesus, a high school student, who was one of her thought partners. The room fell silent as everyone read:

“I hate going to the class. I mean . . . I still go because I want to learn, I do! It’s just, Maestra, it’s hard to pay attention and continue to want to learn. Especially, when Mrs. Rodriguez puts me on blast in front of the whole class. . . . Like today, she said, ‘Jesus, you call this an essay!’ And later she added, ‘Some of you are talented, natural born writers and some of you . . . (she looked at me) . . . are not!’”

Esperanza looked around the room gauging the audience. Then she began. “Hello everyone. My name is Esperanza Muñoz. My project is titled ‘An Analysis of Latinx High School Students’ Experiences with Mundane and Perpetual Systematic Violence.’ The purpose of this work is to understand Latinx students’ experiences with school-based violence and to learn how students cope.” Students leaned forward and looked at Esperanza with intent.

Esperanza explained, “Understanding how Latinx students ‘make sense’ of their schooling experiences, in particular, experiences related to educational violence—any physical or verbal abuse that creates a disturbance in a student’s learning and academic success—is central to Chicana studies.” Students shifted in their seats while giving affirming head nods.

“For this work, I engaged with six high school students as thought partners. In the beginning, it was difficult to build trust. I think they were skeptical about my intentions. I tried to explain intergenerational teaching and learning, and how I wanted to learn about their personal experiences. I explained that they

were the experts in their own lives, but this seemed foreign or impossible to them. ‘What could we possibly teach you?’ was the impression I got.

“Through this process, I learned that words were cheap. I had to show them I was sincere. I did this by hearing them out all the way through without interrupting them, giving them enough time to think when I asked a question, checking in with them by text the day after our conversations, and perhaps most important was that, from the beginning, we spent time exploring what they wanted and needed out of our conversations. As a matter of fact, this project changed pretty drastically after our initial conversations, as they steered me toward what mattered most to them. These gestures showed how sincerely I cared and helped us build community.

“Besides, denying someone the opportunity to engage in inquiry is an act of violence. We learned that from Paulo Freire, in his analysis of banking education in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*.

“When we met, we engaged in a community circle, which is a practice of teaching restorative justice for purposes of building community. We sat together and shared our school experiences. This allowed everyone to feel like they belonged. Everyone was seen, heard, and respected.

“At the core of my ethical principles is the Mayan way, *In Lak’ech*, or ‘You are my other me; I am you, and you are me!’ My thought partners are a reflection of me. I try my best to embody *In Lak’ech* by always showing respect and appreciation for the knowledge and wisdom they share during our conversations. We all treat each other with care. I listened when they shared how I could best support them. Then I honored them by following through on what they asked.” Esperanza went on to break down the ways in which Jesus and his peers were faced with different forms of violence by those entrusted with the responsibility for their learning, and how the process she engaged in with the students offered them support. When she was done presenting, everyone applauded.

Blanca couldn’t contain herself, “Wow! Esperanza, the voices of your thought partners are so powerful.” Chatter began to fill the room as students affirmed the sheer weight of the voices in her presentation.

As students began packing up, Esperanza opened up to Dr. Castro. Her eyes began to tear-up, “I gotta tell you, it’s been really difficult to engage with my thought partners in this work. It’s been hard to listen to their stories. I feel helpless. I’m not sure how I can help them.”

“Esperanza,” Dr. Castro said in a gentle voice, “Remember—part of your role as a Chicana studies scholar is to continue working with your thought partners

and help them process the microaggressions they encounter in their daily school interactions with teachers, so they won't have to internalize them."

"Yeah, that's helpful," she said as she wiped away her tears. "I can work with them to 'create the tools,' to build them up, help them identify their strengths, and name what they're gonna experience when they walk into those classrooms."

"Yes, and don't forget to always ask them, 'What are you going to do when that happens, when that teacher says hurtful things to you?' Together, you're helping them theorize or make sense of their experience, but we must always remember the praxis—putting theories into action."

As Blanca and Esperanza walked to their cars, Blanca said, "You know what's so hard to believe? Conventional research teaches us to enter into spaces as objective observers, collect data, analyze it, present policy or research recommendations, and then leave and forget about the community."

"Yeah, and that's supposed to be the 'credible' research!" Esperanza exclaimed, letting out a deep sigh.

Blanca continued, "Chicanx studies methods taught me to engage *with* my thought partners in an inquiry centered on their voices—the history, knowledge, and experiences of the community. Then, together, we create action steps that we all act upon as an *ongoing* process."

"I totally agree!" Esperanza shouted as they approached the parking lot.

"So much of what I knew about research methods and solutions to social problems was challenged. I used to think, if I couldn't solve the whole problem, like let's say ending school-based violence, then I wasn't making a difference.

"The reality is that my thought partners may not be able to end all microaggressions, but they'll know what they are when these things happen and have the strength to not internalize those comments in damaging ways."

"Amiga! It's really good to hear you say that. I remember last semester when you were literally in tears in our Chicanx Education class sharing how hard it was for you to witness the microaggressions perpetrated by the teachers."

"¡Oye Blanca, es que si fue difícil! It was really tough on me, but sharing my struggles in class, meeting with Dr. Castro during office hours, and talking with you and Miguel is really what kept me going. Otherwise, I would have lost it, just thinking in circles, trying to find a solution."

"The feeling's mutual. If I didn't have you and Miguel, I don't know how I would've gotten through this semester. Y'all are like family to me. You're my little sis now. We're gonna be in each others' lives forever!"

"¡Mil Gracias! There aren't enough words to express how thankful I am that I have y'all in my life and especially through this process."

"In MAS, I've become so conscious of how central relationships are to the work we do and to our lives in general," said Blanca. "I learned to appreciate my community partners even more. They are like my family. We support each other, personally and intellectually."

"Oh my God, yes! My family is always there for me, especially my mom. It's not only that she listens to me, but she always reminds me to eat, take a break, and take care of myself."

"It's really comforting," said Blanca, "that even though the work gets harder, the relationships become stronger and that's what helps us to keep going."

Esperanza added, "I think it also comes down to how we support and care for everyone involved, ourselves included. Caring for each other is crucial in the type of work we do."

"That's so true! And it's like Dr. Castro says, 'Our work is for a lifetime. We are not doing racial justice work for a minute. We are living racial justice.'"

"Have a good night, Amiga, and drive careful."

"You too. Text me when you get home, so I know you made it safe."

They hugged as they parted ways.

CONCLUSION

This counterstory is a demonstration of each of the key insights highlighted in the chapter. Janine and Alondra were centered as researchers, despite being students in the class. They created this counterstory, employing the lessons from Chicanx studies methods and the living racial justice framework as they understood them. In so doing, they provide the clearest possible analysis of the potential for transformative Chicanx studies methods. This work must be lived through a praxis that is grounded in ethics tied to the ways of being and knowledge production in the communities in which we live, work, and research. This work is always process-centered and guided by ethical validity, our unwavering commitment to build lifelong relationships with our communities and to center our accountability to our relations. This is how we live racial justice as researchers and community members.

NOTES

1. We use a number of ethnic labels almost interchangeably in this writing. While each label has a different meaning, they each also have multiple meanings depending on who is using them and for what reason. We always attempt to use the labels that individuals or communities use for themselves and even include multiple labels in given sections to reflect the fact that our work in certain communities includes people who use distinct labels from other members of their communities: raza, Chicana, Latino. We also include Chicana and Latinx at times to acknowledge the fact that members of our communities are challenging the normalization of gender binaries that do not include all members of these communities. In essence, we are striving for inclusion and a recognition of the diversity within our community. In addition, our discipline has been described by different names over the years, beginning with Mexican American studies and Chicano studies, then Chicana and Chicano studies (also written Chicana/o studies), and most recently Chicana studies, so we use the labels that departments, programs, and the discipline have used for themselves at different points in time.
2. We recently adapted our original concept of "Walking Social Justice" to "Living Racial Justice" to achieve two objectives: (1) to respond to the important critique that the former label is ableist and (2) to center racial justice work given the current climate in which many social justice movements are not adequately integrating or addressing issues of race. We still see our work as part of a larger social justice agenda as we challenge issues such as patriarchy, heteronormativity, and capitalism. We will not include a detailed description of the model, but it is mapped out fully in two publications (Pizarro 2016a, 2016b).
3. This counterstory draws from an analysis of classroom lectures, discussion notes, papers, professor and peer feedback, readings, the syllabus, in-class assignments and activity guidelines, email communications, and photos taken during a graduate seminar in Chicana studies. It serves as an example of this approach but also demonstrates the process of teaching the approach. We engaged in ongoing conversations to explore the process and lessons learned and wrote the counterstory to reflect our experiences in the class. We therefore center characters in the counterstory who embody our learning and do not include other students as prominent characters because we did not want to assume the kinds of learning experiences our peers had (although we did include one other minor character and consulted with the student who served as the inspiration for that character). The first section of this chapter serves as the reference material for this final section, so we do not provide footnotes or detailed references. The goal of the counterstory is to illustrate how the living racial justice model of Chicana studies methods was understood by students, without the professor's analysis.

REFERENCES

- Coates, T. 2015. *Between the World and Me*. New York: Spiegel and Grau.
- Cole, T. 2012. "The White Savior Industrial Complex." *The Atlantic* (March 21). Retrieved from <https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2012/03/the-white-savior-industrial-complex/254843/>.
- Delgado Bernal, Dolores. 1998. "Using a Chicana Feminist Epistemology in Educational Research." *Harvard Educational Review* 68:555–82.
- Freire, P. 2000. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Pizarro, M. 1998. "Chicana/o Power?: Epistemology and Methodology for Social Justice and Empowerment in Chicana/o Communities." *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 11:57–80.
- Pizarro, M. 2005. *Chicanas and Chicanos in School: Racial Profiling, Identity Battles, and Empowerment*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Pizarro, M. 2016a. "Preparing Teachers to Work in Disenfranchised Communities: Deconstructing Latina/o Historical Trauma and Internalized Racism." In *Envisioning Critical Race Praxis in K–12 Leadership Through Counter-Storytelling*, edited by T. Marsh and N. Croom, 163–82. Charlotte, N.C.: Information Age Publishing.
- Pizarro, M. 2016b. "Racial Justice Leadership in Disenfranchised Latina/o Communities: A Model for Walking Social Justice in Schools." In *Envisioning Critical Race Praxis in K–12 Leadership Through Counter-Storytelling*, edited by T. Marsh and N. Croom, 183–209. Charlotte, N.C.: Information Age Publishing.
- Smith, L. T. 1999. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. New York: Zed Press.
- Solórzano, D., and T. Yosso. 2002. "Critical Race Methodology: Counter-Storytelling as an Analytical Framework for Education Research." *Qualitative Inquiry* 8:23–44.
- Wilson, S. 2008. *Research Is Ceremony: Indigenous Research Methods*. Halifax, Canada: Fernwood.
- Yosso, T. 2005. "Whose Culture Has Capital? A Critical Race Theory Discussion of Community Cultural Wealth." *Race Ethnicity and Education* 8:69–91.
- Yosso, T. 2006. *Critical Race Counterstories Along the Chicana/Chicano Educational Pipeline*. New York: Routledge.