

March 2023

A Critical Analysis of the Graduate Socialization of Racially Minoritized School Psychology Students

Tatiana J. Broughton
University of South Florida

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/etd>



Part of the [Counseling Psychology Commons](#), and the [Educational Psychology Commons](#)

Scholar Commons Citation

Broughton, Tatiana J., "A Critical Analysis of the Graduate Socialization of Racially Minoritized School Psychology Students" (2023). *USF Tampa Graduate Theses and Dissertations*.
<https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/etd/9852>

This Ed. Specialist is brought to you for free and open access by the USF Graduate Theses and Dissertations at Digital Commons @ University of South Florida. It has been accepted for inclusion in USF Tampa Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ University of South Florida. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usf.edu.

A Critical Analysis of the Graduate Socialization of Racially Minoritized School Psychology

Students

by

Tatiana J. Broughton

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Educational Specialist
Department of Educational and Psychological Studies
College of Education
University of South Florida

Major Professor: Jose Castillo, Ph.D.
Kahlila Lawrence, Ph.D.
Jennifer Wolgemuth, Ph.D.

Date of Approval:
December 1, 2021

Keywords: Social Justice, Higher Education, Anti-racist, Marginalized

Copyright © 2023, Tatiana J. Broughton

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables	iii
Abstract	iv
Chapter One: Introduction	1
Background	1
Socialization.....	5
Statement of the Problem.....	7
Theoretical Framework	8
Purpose of Study and Research Questions.....	11
Significance.....	12
Chapter Two: Literature Review	14
History of Racism in the United States Education System.....	15
History of School Psychology	18
Multiculturalism, Social Justice, and Antiracism in School Psychology	23
Graduate School.....	28
Socialization and Identity Development.....	32
Critical Race Theory	33
Summary	36
Chapter Three: Method	39
Epistemology and Ontology	40
Reflexivity.....	41
Participants and Sampling.....	43
Interviews.....	45
Data Analysis	45
Quality Criteria	46
Ethical Considerations	47
Chapter Four: Findings	49
Question One: How do racially minoritized school psychology graduate students describe their graduate school socialization process?.....	49
Isolation and Community.....	50
Educational Labor and the Role of the Spokesperson	54
The Emotional Labor of Being a Minoritized Student	58
Question Two: How do school psychology graduate programs perpetuate	

oppressive structures through their professional socialization process?.....	60
Neglecting Social Justice	60
Coursework and Curriculum.....	61
Recency, Reaction, and Interest Convergence.....	65
Inaccessibility and Equity	67
Professional Expectations	73
White Privilege and White Fragility	78
Interactions with Faculty.....	80
Question Three: What anti-racist practices do racially minoritized school psychology graduate students recognize as supports in their graduate programs?.....	83
Representation in Faculty and Peers	83
Creating Spaces.....	85
Faculty Support and Disclosure	88
Chapter Five: Discussion	91
Summary of Findings.....	91
Question One: How do racially minoritized school psychology graduate students describe their graduate school socialization process?.....	91
Question Two: How do school psychology graduate programs perpetuate oppressive structures through their professional socialization process?.....	94
Question Three: What anti-racist practices do racially minoritized school psychology graduate students recognize as supports in their graduate programs?.....	98
Limitations and Future Research	100
Implications for Practice	101
Conclusions.....	105
References	107
Appendix A: Student Interview Protocol.....	123
Appendix B: Critical Race Theory A Priori Code Book	125
Appendix C: IRB Exemption Letter	128

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1:	Participant Demographic Information	44
----------	---	----

ABSTRACT

By centering the voices of racially/ethnically minoritized school psychology graduate students I sought to understand how racially minoritized individuals experience their socialization process into the field, to critique and expose oppressive structures in place in their graduate programs, and to utilize garnered information to provide implications to address and dismantle oppressive structure within school psychology programs. Additionally, I sought to provide insight for school psychology training programs by identifying antiracist practices that minoritized graduate students view as supports in their training programs. Participants were eight racial/ethnic minoritized graduate students who participated in one to two virtual interviews discussing their experiences in their school psychology graduate programs. I used constant comparative analysis to derive themes from these interviews. When describing their graduate school socialization, participants described common themes of isolation and community, educational labor and taking on the role of the spokesperson, and the emotional labor of being a minoritized student. Four themes were discovered when exploring participant's expression of their program's perpetuation of oppressive structures (1) neglecting social justice (2) universal expectations for professionalism, (3) interactions with faculty, and (4) White fragility. Three themes were identified as perceived supports among participants: (1) representation in faculty and peers, (2) creating spaces, (3) faculty support and disclosure. Implications for research and practice are discussed.

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Background

School psychologists are qualified professionals with specialized training to support students' abilities to learn and teachers' abilities to teach. They apply their expertise in mental health, learning, and behavior to support children academically, socially, emotionally, and behaviorally. School psychologists work in collaboration with teachers, school administrators, families, and other professionals to foster environments for students that are safe, healthy, and supportive to help students succeed (NASP, 2010). School psychologists serve a student population that is becoming increasingly diverse. While the field has made efforts to recruit and retain more culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) school psychology graduate students, most school psychologists in the field are monolingual white identifying women (Castillo, Curtis, & Gelley, 2013), with about 88 percent of those in the field identifying as white (Walcott & Hyson, 2018).

There are decades of research that demonstrate the disproportionate outcomes of racially, ethnically, and linguistically minoritized students, in special education (Blanchett, 2006; Harry & Klinger, 2006; U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 2009) and in higher rates of exclusionary disciplinary practices (Children's Defense Fund, 2004; Losen & Skiba, 2010). School psychologists have traditionally served as gatekeepers for special education. While the roles of school psychologists have expanded beyond the traditional test and place perspective, school psychologists still play a critical role in determining if a student is eligible to receive special education services and other important educational decisions. There is reason to believe the lack

of diversity among school psychologists likely contributes to inequity in decision-making, as disparities in the race and ethnicities of school psychologists and their clients may impair their ability to relate to their clients and to provide the appropriate services (Thompson & Alexander, 2006; Yeh, Eastman, & Cheung, 1994). Racially minoritized practitioners understand cultural variability and can assist racially and ethnically minoritized students and their families in navigating our Eurocentric education system (Behring, Cabello, Kushida, & Murguia, 2000; Newell, 2010). Therefore, the stagnant growth of diversity in the field paired with the growing diversity of the student population in the United States is cause for concern regarding representation and culturally responsive practice.

Diversifying the field is merely one aspect of consideration when addressing the needs of students. While relevant for representation, it is not enough to address the field's goal and commitment to social justice. School psychologists have an ethical obligation to address the needs of all students, no matter their race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, gender, or sexual orientation. The consequences of the social, political, and historical injustices faced by minoritized populations are far-reaching, negatively impacting the well-being of our nation's children and needs to be addressed. Social justice is both a process and a goal, a goal adopted by the National Association of School Psychologist (NASP) in 2017 to address the needs of our minoritized youth.

School psychologists work to ensure the protection of the educational rights, opportunities, and well-being of all children, especially those whose voices have been muted, identities obscured, or needs ignored. Social justice requires promoting nondiscriminatory practices and the empowerment of families and communities. School psychologists enact social justice through culturally responsive professional practice and

advocacy to create schools, communities, and systems that ensure equity and fairness for all children and youth.

(Adopted by the NASP Board of Directors, April 2017).

Furthermore, after the murder of George Floyd in the summer of 2020 and the global unrest that followed NASP and other professional school psychology organizations released a unified anti-racist statement, acknowledging the long-standing systematic injustices that impact and target the Black community in the United States, such as mass incarceration, inequitable access to quality health care, education, food, safe and affordable housing, and gainful employment. This statement was a call to action, with an action plan to enact change.

School psychology organizations and graduate education programs play an important role in shaping future generations of school psychologists to lead the mental health, educational and research, and advocacy initiatives that promote equity for school personnel, students, families and communities they serve. This is only possible if our field acknowledges, evaluates, and works to reconstruct existing systems, structures, and policies that lead to inequitable outcomes for some groups and not others.

(Garcia-Vasquez et al., 2020)

Advocating for social justice is a process that extends beyond one level or acknowledging injustices in one system. Racial oppression is embedded into every facet of our U.S. society, while those with racial privilege can experience life without this burden, these oppressive structures are part of the everyday lived experiences of racially minoritized individuals. While our society has been slow to acknowledge these injustices, critical race scholars work to address these systems of oppression by exposing, disrupting, and eliminating racism (Parker & Lynn, 2002). For the field of school psychology to truly engage in the social justice process, be

antiracist, and to be true advocates for the children and communities they serve the field must work towards addressing and actively disrupting systems that exclude, consciously or not, the inclusion and acceptance of oppressed racial groups. We must understand how institutions and the systems they are embedded within continue to oppress racially minoritized individuals even when they are “invited in.” Racism is endemic, it is a permanent aspect of the lived experiences of racially minoritized individuals. The burden of oppression is heavy and isolating when the oppressor does not acknowledge its presence.

The lack of representation of racially minoritized individuals in the field is cited as a primary barrier to the widespread promotion of social justice and cultural responsiveness in the field (Walcott et al., 2018). Despite NASP’s efforts to recruit and retain students and practitioners of racially and ethnically minoritized groups, the disproportionate demographic of the field does not appear to be trending towards change (Walcott & Hyson, 2018). Prior research both within and outside the field of school psychology indicates that graduate school can be a negative experience for racially minoritized students. When examining reasons for African American student attrition from school psychology programs Proctor & Truscott (2012) cited poor relationships with program staff and peers, misalignment between participants’ career aims and the practice, status quo of the field, and funding all as factors to students’ decision to leave their programs. Asian international students reported experiencing a lack of social integration, microaggressions, threats, and discrimination (Yang et al., 2020). Ethnically minoritized graduate students, including Hispanic American, Asian American, African American, and Native American identifying individuals, reported lower perceptions of belongingness in their graduate programs than their ethnic majority peers (Clark et al., 2012).

School psychology graduate education programs play a critical role in shaping future generations of school psychologists. School psychologists have an ethical and professional responsibility to engage in social justice. This requires the field to address institutional barriers, disproportionality, and promote justice. This includes examining and acknowledging areas in which our own training programs may be contributing to the oppression of minoritized individuals. It involves asking “Are school psychology programs training future school psychologist to perpetuate the status quo system? Are our training programs upholding normative standards that only benefit the white majority? Are they engaging in social justice and antiracist actions to support not only our nation’s youth but also our minoritized peers and colleagues?”

Racially minoritized individuals face various systemic barriers to completing their graduate education such as financial barriers, negative program climate, and microaggressions (Grapin & Pereiras, 2019; Norcross, Kohout, & Wicherski, 2005; Sue, Capodilupo, & Holder, 2008). Institutions of higher educations have always been strongholds of white privilege. While entrance into higher educations is based on meritocratic assumptions, these institutions continue to uphold white supremacy in their norms, values, and practices further subjugating individuals of minoritized identities. These variables must be further examined and critiqued, so we can address the oppressive systems which our society upholds.

Socialization

In terms of professional identity development, socialization is defined as a process in which individuals “internalize behavioral norms, standards, and form a sense of identity and commitment to a professional field” (Weidman, Twale, & Stein, 2001, p. 6). The socialization process is an inevitable part of the graduate education training process. It is a developmental,

two-way process (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996) “through which individuals gain the knowledge, skills, and values necessary for successful entry into a professional career” (Weidman et al., p. iii). Through this process an individual transforms from an outsider of the field to an insider, when an individual fails to become socialized and form a professional identity it may limit their effectiveness in their professional role (Ibarra, 1999). Prior research suggests that minoritized graduate students struggle negotiating the process of socialization during their graduate training (Grapin, Lee, & Jaafar, 2015; Proctor & Truscott, 2012; Clark et al., 2012). Students from diverse backgrounds and cultures must negotiate their own norms, values, and beliefs while also balancing the norms, values, and beliefs of their training program. Given the lack of diversity among school psychology practitioners, understanding how students from racially minoritized groups experience the socialization process is important to promote training programs that are more inclusive of minoritized groups, and that seek to remove or reduce oppressive structures and actions.

We must additionally consider how our field’s socialization process continues to perpetuate the subjugation of racially minoritized individuals. Prior research on African American doctoral students notes the weight these individuals carry of wanting to improve their communities, the pressure to respond to stereotype threats (Taylor & Anthony, 2000). This objective to strengthen underserved and marginalized communities is highly correlated with an obligation to social justice (Gasman et al, 2008; Hopp et al., 2003). Yet when examining reasons for attrition of school psychology graduate students, participants reported one major reason being the perception that the curricula were perpetuating the practices they entered the profession to change (Proctor & Truscott, 2012). There appears to be an obvious disconnect between our field’s social justice goal and the actuality of our field’s curricula and training. Statements of

social justice and antiracism are just statements when there is no action, there needs to be change, literature and theory are nothing without praxis.

Statement of the Problem

Given the goals and commitment to social justice in the field and the lack of diversity among school psychology practitioners it is important to understand how students from minoritized racial and ethnic groups experience their graduate school socialization process. While our clients, first and foremost, are the children and families we work with, for us to address systematic injustices and disproportionality we must examine all structures in our field that continue to contribute to oppression and subjugation of minoritized individuals. This includes school psychology graduate training programs which play a critical role in training school psychologist to be leaders and advocates for our field.

Despite the increasing evidence that graduate school can be a negative experience for minoritized graduate students, there is a scarcity of research that examines the socialization process during graduate school (Liddell et al., 2014; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). Much of the prior research focuses on personal and professional development in psychology graduate training programs (Bruss & Kopala, 1993), however these approaches put the onus on individuals rather than the structures and systems in place that contribute to inequitable outcomes. As such I aim to employ a critical approach to expose these oppressive structures that place inequitable burdens on racially minoritized school psychology graduate students. There is currently limited application of critical race theory to the field of school psychology, though CRT theoretically aligns with social justice and antiracist goals of our field. Addressing the unjust structures embedded within our education system cannot be done without a critical examination of

oppressive power structures, the liberal ideologies now in place do not foster enough change to dismantle the power structure our society reinforces.

Theoretical Framework

I will utilize Critical Race Theory (CRT) to answer my research questions. CRT is a theoretical framework drawn from critical legal studies and utilized by scholars in education to centralize structural and institutional racism in schools (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995). CRT challenges Eurocentric ideals and values, such as “whiteness” being the normalized American standard. Critical Race Theory is comprised of key tenets including but not limited to the permanence of racism, experiential knowledge and counter storytelling, interest convergence theory, intersectionality, whiteness as property, a critique of liberalism, and commitment to social justice.

Critical race theory purports that race is a construct that permeates every aspect of the United States society. Racism is so embedded in American society it has become normalized, accepted, and seldom challenged. The structure of higher education in the United States is inherently exclusive and reinforces the dominance of whiteness. While there is leadership in higher education across disciplines who aim to foster more inclusive environments, and there are members of institutions who aim to break down white supremacist’s ways of being, these structures continue to perpetuate a culture of white supremacy by reinforcing what characteristics and ways of leading are valued, often insidiously (Jones & Okun; 2001). Forms of oppression such as racism, become isolating when they no longer seem like oppression to the perpetrator (Taylor, 2009).

Critical race scholars recognize racially minoritized individual’s lived experiences or experiential knowledge as critical to understanding, analyzing, and teaching about racial

subordination in education (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004; Solórzano & Yosso, 2001). This knowledge has traditionally been excluded from higher education, however it provides necessary context to the objectivity of positivist perspectives (Ladson-Billings, 1998). Racially and ethnically minoritized individuals experience a society built on white supremacy differently than those that benefit from white privilege. Their experiences counter those of the master or majoritarian narrative (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002; Stanley, 2007). These counterstories challenge the validity of premises held and accepted by the majority (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004; Delgado & Stefancic, 2011).

Derrick A. Bell Jr. initially presented the theory of interest convergence. This theory is grounded on the premise that the interest of racially minoritized individuals in achieving racial equality is only advanced when these interests “converge” with the interest of those in power (Bell, 1980; Brown & Jackson, 2013; Taylor, 2009). In higher education a visible example of this would be Predominately White Institutions (PWIs) admitting students of minoritized racial identities in an effort to meet diversity goals, while the climate of the institution may not be inclusive or may not have the necessary resources to support the students’ success. Historically, white people in the United States have been willing to sacrifice the well-being of racially minoritized individuals for their own self-interests (Taylor, 1998). While increasing diversity efforts benefits institutions, if these same institutions are not examining the additional barriers minoritized students face, they are unable to provide sufficient support for these students, and the cycle of negative graduate school experiences for minoritized individuals continues.

While Critical Race Theory centers on race and racism, scholars recognize and acknowledge the intersectionality of identities, and how these intersections influence our lived experiences. As individuals we represent multiple identities, and CRT analyses should consider

this complexity. The concept of whiteness as property proposes that privileges and benefits associated with identifying as white are valuable assets that white individuals seek to protect, even at times being protected legally. An example of this being in higher education, considering individuals who have historically accessed higher education through admissions policies.

Whiteness could be exchanged for access to high paying career, better neighborhoods (typically associated with white suburbia), and higher quality schools. Even the curriculum in higher education is considered a form of “Whiteness as property” as it has historically focused on white, western perspectives. Whiteness is based on power relations, based on white dominance and the simultaneous subordination of racially minoritized individuals (Harris, 1993).

Critical race scholars are highly critical of liberal ideologies such as objectivity, meritocracy, color blindness, equal opportunity, and incremental change (Ford & Airhihenbuwa, 2010; Museus, 2013; Solórzano & Yosso, 2001). Meritocracy is a social system in which individual’s advancement in society is based on their capabilities and merit rather than family, wealth, or their social background (Bellows, 2009; Castilla & Benard, 2010; Poocharoen & Brillantes, 2013; Imbroscio, 2016). Meritocracy is recognized as a positive system in Western societies aligning with notions of capitalism and egalitarian values, fundamental to the concept of the American Dream (Sealy, 2010). Equality of opportunity is a dominant aspect of meritocracy, and a promise of Western U.S. society. It implies that the U.S. is a fair society, in which any individual is capable of achieving great things if they work hard enough, as individuals are treated fairly unhindered by prejudices or barriers, unless these distinctions can be explicitly justified. A color-blind ideology is based on principles of non-discrimination, due process of law, equal opportunities regardless of race, and equal protection under the law, all ideas which have influenced Western liberalism in the post-World War II period (Ansel, 2013).

In a color blind society, one's racial classification would not impact an individual's social opportunities. Society would be free from differential legal and social treatment based on race. Society would have race-neutral government policies and would reject racial discrimination in all forms. Color-blindness operates under the assumption that we live in a "post-race" society in which race no longer matters (Ansell, 2006). Solórzano and Yosso (2001) maintain that these liberal ideologies act as "camouflage for the self-interest, power, and privilege of dominant groups in U.S. society" (p. 473). While these ideologies appear to be desirable and well intentioned, they are incompatible with the history of racism in the United States (DeCuir & Dixon, 2004). Critical race scholars are committed to the creation of a socially just society and commit to activism that aligns with their scholarly endeavors (Bartlett & Brayboy, 2005). CRT places an emphasis on social justice, focusing on racisms' role in society as a catalyst but advancing towards a larger goal of eliminating all forms of subordination in our society based on gender, class, sexual orientation, language, religion, or national origin (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002). Eradicating racism in our society requires drastic change, and liberal ideologies do not offer the necessary structure or tools to enact the necessary change (Ladson-Billings, 1998). Critical race theorists are adamant that if racial equality in education is genuinely valued, then the control that whites currently hold must be addressed.

Purpose of Study and Research Questions

The purpose of this study is first to empower the voices of racially minoritized school psychology students. This study aims to understand how racially minoritized individuals experience their socialization process into the field, to critique and expose oppressive structures in place in their programs. This study additionally aims to utilize garnered information to provide implications to address and dismantle oppressive structure within school psychology programs.

Finally, this study aims to provide implications for school psychology training programs by identifying antiracist practices that minoritized graduate students view as supports. These questions are posed from a critical perspective, utilizing a critical lens is intentionally aligned with the aims of exposing and dismantling oppressive structures. This lens will be particularly beneficial in examining the socialization process as these processes are often subtle and the ways in which socialization is oppressive is not explicit in the majoritarian discourse.

1. How do racially minoritized school psychology graduate students describe their graduate school socialization process?
2. How do school psychology graduate programs perpetuate oppressive structures through their professional socialization process?
3. What anti-racist practices do racially minoritized school psychology graduate students recognize as supports in their graduate programs?

Significance

Providing racially minoritized students with the opportunity to construct and share their own narrative of their lived experiences, not only empowers these traditionally minoritized groups but provides insight into the systems and practices that foster an inclusive, antiracist environment. It provides concrete data for relevant stakeholders to create a more equitable environment, to explicitly address oppressive structures, to implement anti-racist practices. The information garnered through this study will provide implications for school psychology graduate training programs on ways to recruit, retain, and more importantly support minoritized students throughout their graduate training experience. Additionally, this work furthers the social justice

work of the field, utilizing CRT will help explicitly examine structural and pervasive challenges minoritized students face in their training programs, this explicit acknowledgement is critical to change.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

School psychologists serve the most diverse client population of all professional specializations in the field of psychology (U.S. Census Bureau, 2018). This level of diversity continues to grow, as for the first time in history racial/ethnic minoritized people now make up majority (~50.3 percent) of the United States school-aged population (Snyder, de Brey, & Dillow, 2018). Although the term diversity is often narrowly applied to refer to racial differences alone (Nunn, 2008), diversity truly refers to a range of differences in identity (e.g., race, sex, gender identity, age, socio-economic status, religion, disability status, sexual orientation, ethnicity, language, national origin, and citizenship status) present among and across groups of people (Kelly, Garbacz, & Albers, 2020). When diversity is referred to in the field of education, it is traditionally used in reference to students with minoritized identities. The term minoritized refers to the process or mechanism through which individuals and/or groups are marginalized in society (Stewart, 2013). Marginalization is “the process through which persons are peripheralized based on their identities, associations, experiences, and environments” (Hall, Stevens, & Meleis, 1994, p. 25). Using the term minoritized rather than minority, better represents how groups and individuals are unjustly treated through laws, policies, and practices that result in their marginalization. Minority, as a noun indicates a more passive, deficit-based identity, while minoritized, as a verb, reflects upon the actions done upon individuals and groups who are marginalized.

In this chapter, the history of racism in the United States education system that has contributed to the marginalization of racial and ethnic minoritized individuals through exclusion,

subordination, devaluing, and segregation (Causadiaz, Umaña-Taylor, Kazak, & Eccles, 2018) will be discussed. Additionally, the history of school psychology as a field will be discussed as it relates and contributes to the experiences of minoritized individuals as well as the field's move towards and continued goal of social justice and ethical multicultural practice. Finally, to make connections to the purpose of this project, the prior literature on the experiences of minoritized individuals in their graduate training, the graduate socialization process and the development of professional identity will be discussed.

History of Racism in the United States Education System

The American Dream is a national ethos of the United States of America, largely based on the meritocratic ideology of equal opportunity based on talent, effort, and achievement. The United States education system has been historically considered the great equalizer; however, that is simply not true when one considers the history of inequities, and continued gaps in achievement, access, and opportunities for minoritized populations.

Legal chattel slavery, primarily of Africans and African Americans, existed in the United States prior to its inception in 1776 and until the passage of the thirteenth amendment in 1865. What followed was known as the Reconstruction Era (1863-1877) in which the U.S. government attempted to address the inequities and protect the rights of the almost 4 million Black human beings born into slavery. However, these practices of the reconstruction era were short lived. By the 1880s the south made their racist redemption arc by beginning to rollback these protections and rights of Black people in earnest, through Jim Crow Laws, voter suppression, and quasi re-enslavement through convict leasing. One landmark Supreme Court ruling that provided the foundation for institutional inequality was *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896), which effectively declared that “separate but equal” public facilities was constitutional and not in violation of the Fourteenth

Amendment. For racially minoritized students in Black-only schools this meant they were in schools denoted as “equal,” though in reality they received less educational funding than white-only schools and their schools lacked adequate resources and facilities.

This segregation was not limited to the south, nor was it limited to Black communities. While not dictated by law, in the 1920s as waves of Mexican laborers arrived to work in Southern California communities, other states began to enforce their own de facto segregation, in their businesses, in their public facilities, and in their schools. By 1940 more than 80 percent of Mexican American students attended so-called “Mexican schools.” State school boards claimed this separation was intended to help students, and they used I.Q. tests to argue that Mexican American students needed specialized instruction. *Mendez v. Westminster (1946)* was the result of Mexican American families’ frustration with these unjust practices. This case was an opportunity to defeat segregation in California for all students of color, including Asian Americans and Native Americans who experienced legal segregation in California schools at the time. In 1946, Federal District Judge Paul McCormick delivered the landmark ruling that segregation of Mexican Americans was both unenforceable under California law, but also violated the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment to the U.S. Constitution. The arguments here served as the basis for *Brown v. Board of Education (1954)*.

The *Brown v. Board of Education (1954)* ruling overturned formal racial segregation in schools, though this ruling did not initially come with any guidelines regarding how this decision would be implemented. It would take years for schools to be desegregated, and the Little Rock Nine is one example of the extreme resistance white folks demonstrated thorough the transition. *Brown v. Board* ruled that the legal segregation of students based on race was unconstitutional, however, there are covert ways segregation continued, particularly in the South. Consider

redlining, for example, one can see how using home address to determine school placement can continue to keep Black children from accessing the same schools and education as their white counterparts. Although redlining was outlawed in 1968 with the Fair Housing Act, neighborhoods previously redlined and the generations of individuals who are born in and continue to live in these neighborhoods continue to live with the repercussions of redlining, generally receiving less taxpayer funding for education due to lower property values. To this day, students are still largely racially and socioeconomically isolated, and the opportunity gap between Black, Hispanic/Latiné and white students remains significant (National Assessment of Educational Progress, 2018; Office for Civil Rights, 2016).

While the goal of this paper is not to discuss how to remedy the racial isolation of neighborhoods, it is important to note the impacts of these actions on the opportunities for racially minoritized individuals in these communities, and how the social-political and historical context has played a role in these outcomes. Students living in high poverty neighborhoods have less access to preventative healthcare, a contributor to greater absenteeism in school (Aysola, Orav & Ayanian, 2011; Starfield, 1997). As many families live in these neighborhoods for generations, negative outcomes expand across generations, with students in schools who are more likely to come from homes with less literate parents and are less likely to be exposed to complex language at home (Ayoub et al., 2009; Brooks-Gunn & Markman, 2005). Children who grow up in impoverished neighborhoods are more likely to be exposed to crime and violence and suffer the stress that comes with that exposure (Buka, Stichick, Birdthistle, & Earls 2001; Burdick-Will et al., 2010; Farah et al., 2006). This history and the outcomes it created play a role in how racially minoritized individuals are perceived in and navigate our society.

Despite the mission of the United States Department of Education to “promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access” (U.S. Department of Education, 2011, p. 1), and that schools are expected to provide students with the skills and opportunities to be successful in adulthood regardless of race, ethnicity, gender, or ability, there are decades of research that continue to demonstrate disparities in outcomes for racially, ethnically, and linguistically minoritized students in special education (Blanchett, 2006; Harry & Klinger, 2006; U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 2009) and in higher rates of exclusionary disciplinary practices (Children’s Defense Fund, 2004; Losen & Skiba, 2010). The education opportunity gap, defined as the differences in academic outcomes between historically advantaged groups and historically disadvantaged groups, is still significant and exists to this day. The persistent bias, oppression, and marginalization of minoritized students results in educational outcomes that reinforce these existing disparities based on race, class, disability, and gender (Proctor, 2016).

History of School Psychology

School psychology is an applied psychology specialty which incorporates the knowledge base of both education and psychology into a professional practice that delivers services to clients of a variety of ages, particularly school aged children (Fagan, 2012). The historical development of school psychology is described as consisting of two broad periods, the Hybrid Years, spanning 1890-1970, and the Thoroughbred Years (1970-present) (Fagan & Wise, 2007). The dominant role of school psychology in the Hybrid Years was assessment. This focus on assessment was established to meet the public’s need for diagnoses for special education placement. These assessment practices were conducted by practitioners from various fields of training, including clinical psychology, guidance counseling, and teacher education. These

practices were not limited to those trained specifically in school psychology. The thoroughbred years differed from the hybrid years due to the growth in the number of school psychology training programs, the growth in the number of practitioners, the establishment of state and national professional associations, an expansion of research literature in the field, and an increase in professional regulations established and enforced by bodies both within and outside of the field (Fagan, 2012). Together these changes contributed to the growth of school psychology as a professional entity.

The foundation on which school psychology was initially based was shaped by three historical trends: (1) major social and political reforms in U.S. education; (2) the development of intelligence testing; and (3) the relationship between school psychology and special education as established by federal policy and regulation. The period from 1890 through 1920 was a period of significant social and educational reform in the United States. One significant event from this period was the enacting of compulsory education laws in America, the last state to adopt this being Mississippi in 1918 (Braden, DiMarino-Linnen, & Good, 2001). These laws led to increased enrollment in public schools, notably among children from minoritized racial-ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds, many of whom had no prior education and demonstrated wide variations in academic outcomes. This shift in the demographics of school children led to educational professionals “sorting” children into education levels considered appropriate, this was primarily accomplished through testing (Fagan, 1992). These sorting methods and increased diversity among students was the catalyst for the development of special education, and with this development came the identity of school psychologists as the “sorters” and “gatekeepers” for special education.

Consistent with the sorting function of many school psychologists, the publication of the Binet-Simon scales of intelligence in 1905 was one of the most influential and enduring historical events in the field of school psychology (Oakland & Jimerson, 2006). This historical development was the result of Binet and his colleague, Theodore Simon being commissioned by the minister of public education in Paris, France to develop a testing measure that could be utilized to identify students who were unsuccessful in general education and in need of specialized services. The Binet-Simon scales would be later revised and translated into English, by Lewis Terman and colleagues at Stanford University. This revision and translation led to the publication of the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scales in 1918. This measure launched the standardized practice of mental abilities testing in the United States (Kaufman, 2000). With this publication the identification and testing of student's need became widespread in U.S. schools as did the need for professionals, school psychologists, to engage in these practices (Talley, Kubiszyn, Brassard, & Short, 1996).

The professional role of administering IQ tests to identify students with special needs is rooted in the medical model. From this medical perspective, it is believed that the origins of a child's struggles are due to variables "within the child" and these struggles can only be identified by conducting assessments to diagnosis the concerns (Fagan, 2002). In the 1920s, psychoeducational testing became common place in public schools. These standardized testing measures became the major tools of school psychologist and test administration and interpretation became school psychologists' primary professional role (Kaufman, 2000).

The next period of expansive growth of the school psychology field was during the 1970s and 1980s This significant growth was believed to be the direct result of the passage of federal laws constituting education of students with disabilities, particularly the Education for All

Handicapped Children Act in 1975 or Public Law (PL) 94-142 (Fagan, 1992). PL 94-142 mandated “free and appropriate” education for all students, particularly those with “handicapping” conditions and those identified as having special needs. Schools were to provide these students with “related” services as needed, including psychological services. As PL 94-142 required appropriate assessment to determine eligibility for special education, the need for school psychologists, particularly with expertise in ability and achievement testing, increased (Talley et al., 1996). PL 94-142 solidified school psychologists’ role as the “sorters” and “gatekeepers” of special education.

This legal mandate and subsequent related legislation, such as the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* (1975), *No Child Left Behind* (2001), and *Every Student Succeeds Act* (2015), unfortunately came at the expense of limiting school psychologists professional priorities and involvement in prevention, intervention, and consultation activities (Reschley, 2000). This limited role runs counter to how many individuals describe the field. According to scholars, the field of school psychology contributes to the overarching field of psychology due to its focus on the cognitive and social-emotional development of children, it’s main deviation of standard developmental psychology being due to the strong association of school psychologist with schools and the schooling process (Minke & Brown, 1996). School psychologist are an integral part of school functioning and student wellbeing. Despite how scholars describe the field, the professional activities and roles of school psychologists are influenced and will continue to be influenced and regulated by the sociopolitical, economic, and legislative forces that impact the educational system.

Although the limited role of school psychologists continues to be a concern and a topic of discussion, the field continues to expand. Since the 1970s, practitioners have more consistently

been employed in roles in which they have been titled as “school psychologists,” working in states offering credentials to those trained as school psychologists from accredited school psychology training programs. United States based school psychology practitioners are prepared in 238 graduate level school psychology programs offering master’s, specialist, and doctoral level degrees (Miller, 2008).

Expansion of the field not only included increases in the number of school psychologists, but also in the professionalization of the field. A distinguishing feature of the thoroughbred years in school psychology was the significant growth in the regulation of training and credentialing of practitioners beginning in the 1970s (Fagan & Wise, 2007). Professional organizations, the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) and the American Psychological Association (APA) have served to represent the interest of school psychologists and address the research, training, and practice interests and concerns of the field. NASP and APA have also developed practice standards that have provided the foundation for training and credentialing in the field. School psychology training programs may be accredited by state level educational agencies, APA (doctoral programs only), NASP, and/or the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

These professional organizations along with some scholars and practitioners have made efforts to address broader outcomes for children, including the growing number of children and the complexity of learning and mental health concerns of children today (Crockett, 2004). These efforts and changes in perspectives among the field grew out of concerns with the profession’s traditional “refer-test-place” models of service delivery which some argue do nothing more than sort students into categories. Calls for change in the field advocate for the role of school psychologists to move beyond assessment and to be involved in data-based decision-making,

with emphasis on multitiered intervention and prevention of academic, social-emotional, and behavioral concerns, more consistent use of evidence based interventions, involvement in indirect service delivery, problem-solving and consultation, and heightened sensitivity to the cultural and linguistic diversity of school-age populations (Ball et al., 2011; Dawson et al., 2004; NASP, 2007; Reschly, 2000; Sheridan & Gutkin, 2000). Despite the field's continued efforts to expand the professional role of school psychologists, many duties of school psychologists still revolve around the profession's early roots in assessment and measurement (D'Amato, Zafiris, McConnell & Dean, 2011).

Multiculturalism, Social Justice, and Antiracism in School Psychology

Professional training within the field of school is largely defined, guided, and prescribed by accrediting bodies such as the APA and the NASP, in addition to state and national licensing bodies. Within the field, there have been various efforts toward establishing and providing models of culturally competent practice and training. Culturally competent practice is goal of NASP's practice model (NASP, 2010) and the Multicultural Guidelines of APA (APA, 2003). The APA acknowledges multicultural competence as a necessary and defining variable of psychological practice, training, education, and research (Sue, Bingham, Porche-Burke, & Vasquez, 1999). This acknowledgement by APA for the need to train to train culturally competent psychologists dates back to the Veil Conference of 1973, during which cultural competence was established as a matter of ethical practice. Following this establishment, several organizations (i.e. Office of Ethnic Minority Affairs [OEMA] in 1979 and the Board of Ethnic Minority Affairs [BEMA] in 1981) were established as well as the initial establishment of mandates to operationalize the preparation and practice of mental health professionals to work effectively with culturally and linguistically diverse populations in APA's (2002) *Guidelines and*

Principles for Accreditation of Programs in Professional Psychology. An example of this directive being that program eligibility requires “respect for and understanding of cultural and individual diversity is reflected in the program’s policies for the recruitment, retention, and development of faculty and students, and in its curriculum and field placement...” (p.8). Additionally, the National Association of School Psychologists (1995) has encouraged cultural diversity training by requiring students to develop a knowledge base in “Social and Cultural Bases of Behavior (e.g., cross-cultural studies, social development, and social and cultural diversity, social psychology)” (p. 1174). Despite these mandates school psychologists were reported to lack courses and internship experiences in cultural diversity (Loe, 2000).

Multiculturalism is an ideology that promotes that all cultural groups have perspectives, beliefs, and values that should be understood and respected, even if they differ from your own. Multicultural scholarship has become increasingly integrated into the field of psychology and counseling fields largely due to diversity advocates who championed bringing issues of diversity to the forefront of their respective fields. This integration is a sign of progress, as it inherently has helped the field take steps beyond the initial stage of diversity issues, which centered itself on the struggle of mere acknowledgment and discourse on multicultural considerations. Rather than read articles arguing for whether diversity is important we can now continue to contribute to a body of literature and way of practice that works to integrate multiculturalism within it. After this first stage of acknowledgment the natural next progression in adopting and integrating these considerations is the establishment of cultural competencies for practice. Within the field of school psychology there have been numerous efforts towards providing models of culturally competent practice, additionally the organizational bodies of the field have provided statements, goals, and guidelines to help shape the training research, and practice of culturally responsive

practice (ex: NASP's practice model (NASP, 2010) and the Multicultural Guidelines of the American Psychological Association (APA, 2003)).

These guidelines, while important and well intentioned, have been criticized by scholars as not being enough, for without a specific commitment to social justice, psychologists will maintain the status quo rather than actively work for social change (Vera & Speight, 2003). Multiculturalism is useful to inform theory, research, and practice, but inadequate at addressing systems of oppression that impact marginalized groups (Shriberg & Moy, 2014; Vera & Speight, 2003). Multiculturalism is criticized as lacking an understanding of the complexities of supporting students' intersectional identities, a commitment to the educational rights of marginalized students, and responding to inequity and injustice (e.g., racism, xenophobia, heterosexism; Gorski, 2016). Shriberg & Moy (2014) report the primary concern with multiculturalism being that school psychologists may embrace and understand differences, then use that information to improve practice such as assessment, intervention, and/or consultation. However, they will not address larger system-level policies that create inequities for groups of students. There is conflicting discourse among scholars on whether social justice is the next evolution of multiculturalism, or is already embedded within the conceptualization of multiculturalism, though there is agreement that these two frameworks are interconnected (Grapien & Kranzler, 2018). It is agreed that one cannot advance social justice without having multiculturalism (Ratts, 2011). Psychologists must understand their clients (multiculturalism) in order to advocate for and with them (social justice).

Utilizing a social justice lens requires a large shift from the initial foundation of our field built on the medical model. It requires one to move beyond the Westernized medical model, and to view our clients with a broader societal context (Bartolo, 2010). Traditionally, school

psychologists have relied pretty exclusively on medical conceptualizations of psychological problems, the belief being that learning, behavior, and emotional dysfunction is the result of intrinsic pathologies. This mindset has been severely criticized for decades (Albee & Joffee, 2004; Szasz, 1960) and the field has progressively been shifting towards an ecological conceptualization of human psychological and psychoeducational dysfunction.

As professional organizations of school psychology, NASP and APA, largely play a role in the development of the profession, through the establishment of practice standards that provide a foundation for training and credentialing. They are the leaders in creating a shift in our field of practice and providing guidance on how to meet the ever-changing needs of the individuals we serve. As issues of race and oppression have become more present in the mind of Americans, so have the responses from the field. The NASP board of directors adopted the field's social justice statement in April of 2017:

Social justice is both a process and a goal that requires action. School psychologists work to ensure the protection of the educational rights, opportunities, and well-being of all children, especially those whose voices have been muted, identities obscured, or needs ignored. Social justice requires promoting nondiscriminatory practices and the empowerment of families and communities. School psychologists enact social justice through culturally responsive professional practice and advocacy to create schools, communities, and systems that ensure equity and fairness for all children and youth.

The American Psychological Association (APA) released guidelines on race and ethnicity in psychology in August of 2019 to guide practitioners in promoting responsiveness and equity in their practice. After the national outrage over the murders of Breonna Taylor, George Floyd, and other Black, Indigenous, people of color (BIPOC) in the spring and summer of 2020, many

individuals and organizations were galvanized to respond to the blatant examples of racial injustice that have forever existed in American society. This national movement prompted school psychology professional organizations to publicly acknowledge the field's historical and current role in upholding racism in education and in the field's practice (García-Vázquez et al., 2020; Trainers of School Psychologists, 2020). This statement was a call to action, and an explicit acknowledgement of the field's anti-blackness, that is, the systematic dehumanization, devaluation, and marginalization of blackness through overt, implicit, and structural racism, as well as through the denial and/or disregard for anti-black policies, practices, or biases. Additionally, this statement called for the enactment of anti-oppressive school psychology practices to combat and mitigate the impact of systematic oppression. This statement was explicit in its acknowledgement of the field's role in systematic racism, and to accomplish the goals of this statement it will require the field critically reflect on its traditional 'ways of being' and embrace critical theories, methods, tools, and practices to facilitate movement towards anti-oppressive and socially just practice (Sabnis & Proctor, 2021).

Critical theories were conceptualized and developed to push traditional social science theory towards rectifying systems of oppression and injustice that the social sciences had, in part, contributed to through deficit based theoretical conceptualizations (Peters, Lankshear, & Olssen, 2003). Critical theories aim to deconstruct theories that enact deficit-based views on identities and reconstruct them with more representative and comprehensive understandings of groups and their lived experiences (Kelly, Garbacz, & Albers, 2020). As the goal of critical theories is to eliminate injustice and establish just and equitable systems, they are most reflective theoretically with a social justice approach. Despite school psychology's goals and guidelines for a socially just and antiracist field, the literature and research in the field aligned with social justice rarely

utilizes critical theories. As a result, there is a myriad of scholarship on social justice in school psychology and there is a lack of theory to inform how to bring about social justice through assessment, intervention, and consultation (Kelly, Garbacz, & Albers, 2020).

Graduate School

Because school psychologists typically are trained in graduate programs, it is important to investigate how training programs participate in racist or anti-racist actions. Racial and Ethnic minoritized individuals may encounter a range of barriers to their pursuit of graduate study in the field of psychology (Zhou et. al, 2004). Initially, racially and ethnically minoritized students may feel hesitant to apply to relevant programs due to the limited and stereotypical representation of minoritized individuals in psychology curricula, textbooks, and course materials (Lott & Rogers, 2011). Additionally, students from minoritized backgrounds report receiving less support and mentorship from faculty members than do individuals from majority backgrounds (Lott & Rogers, 2011). Racial/ethnic diversity has beneficial implications for university settings; positive impacts on salient learning outcomes such as intellectual engagement (Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, & Gurin, 2002), increases the degree to which students are able differentiate and integrate multiple perspectives and dimensions (Antonio et al., 2004) and prepares students to work in diverse work forces (Orfield & Lee, 2004). While there are benefits to racial/ethnic diversity, racial/ethnic minoritized individuals face many systematic barriers to the completion of their graduate education, such as microaggressions, financial barriers, and school climate (Grapin & Pereiras, 2019; Norcross, Kohout, & Wicherski, 2005; Sue, Capodilupo, & Holder, 2008). While increasing diversity in academia and the psychological field has far reaching benefits, it is important to understand the impact graduate education has on minoritized individuals and how this relationship impacts recruitment, retention, and for those who reach successful degree

completion, their practice. There is a variety of research that demonstrates the experiences of minoritized graduate students, though less so specifically in the field of school psychology.

To further the research on barriers to the educational success of minoritized graduate students, Clark, Mercer, Zeigler-Hill and Dufrene (2012) investigated the negative race-related experiences of school psychology students and examined if said experiences were associated with academic engagement and emotional distress. To explore this, researchers sought to answer if minoritized racial and ethnic students experienced more negative race-related experiences than their ethnic majority peers, examined if these negative race-related experiences were associated with lower perceptions of belongingness and autonomy, and analyzed if lower perceptions of belongingness and autonomy were associated with emotional distress and less academic engagement. Additionally, researchers explored the extent to which experiencing racial microaggressions were indirectly associated with emotional distress and less academic engagement through lower perceptions of belongingness and autonomy. The researchers surveyed 400 school psychology graduate students, 313 who identified as European American and 87 who identified as part of a racial or ethnic minoritized group, via an internet-based survey. Measures were utilized to assess racial microaggression experiences, sense of autonomy, belongingness, level of perceived stress (emotional distress), levels of depression and anxiety (emotional distress), and academic engagement.

The results of Clark et al. (2012) demonstrated that although both groups reported low levels of racial microaggressions, minoritized graduate students experienced higher levels of microaggressions than their majority graduate peers. Racially/Ethnically minoritized graduate students reported lower perceptions of belongingness in their graduate programs than their majority peers. Findings demonstrated a negative relationship between microaggressions and

belongingness, allowing researchers to indicate that the more graduate students encounter negative race-related experiences, the less likely they are to perceive social support in their environment. For both ethnic/racial minoritized and majority students, belongingness was found to be a significant predictor of academic engagement and emotional distress. The findings from this study emphasize the importance of academic environments fostering a sense of belongingness for their students, especially their racial/ethnic minoritized students who deal with more race related experiences that impact their belongingness, which contributes to their academic engagement and emotional distress.

In 2012, Proctor and Truscott sought to explore the experiences of seven African American individuals who left their school psychology graduate programs prior to obtaining their entry level degrees. More specifically, Proctor and Truscott sought to explore what experiences contributed to the attrition among these African American students. Seven individuals participated across a total of three interviews each for this study. Five participants left the discipline of school psychology altogether and two left one program to attend another. The researchers found two overarching themes that emerged from their data: professional misalignment and relatedness, these both being contributors for participant decisions to leave the graduate programs. Five participants indicated their decision to leave their program being related to professional misalignment, that is school psychology, as it was presented in their programs, was not the right fit given their career aims. For one participant, this was demonstrated via lack of exposure to work with the school population she was initially interested in working in and the belief that she was unable to garner the necessary skills to reach her career goal. While others who were interested in addressing disproportionality, described a frustration in not being equipped to address the disproportionality in special education particularly in relation to the use

of assessment measures and bias towards African American students in the education system. Additionally, five participants spoke on the perceived constraint of the job role, not wanting to be limited to assessment and other duties related to special education placement.

Regarding the theme of relatedness, all seven participants remarked on relationships across faculty and peers, or lack thereof, contributing to their decision to leave. Six participants described a lack of relationship with faculty, and lack of advising in their programs. Five participants described instances in which race played a role in their interactions, with examples of faculty members both explicitly and covertly discussing their lower perception of participants achievement due to the undergraduate experience at HBCUs. Additionally, one participant discussed an instance of faculty only seeking her input regarding diversity-related concerns prior to an APA accreditation site visit. Six participants indicated a lack of relationships with their program peers and four participants discussed issues of race regarding their interactions with program peers. One participant described being hesitant and suspicious of racism among his peers contributing to the lack of relationship building. Other participants described peers making insensitive and microaggressive comments in class about minoritized racial groups, lessening their interest in engaging with peers. Several participants described a feeling of being disconnected from their peers even when both parties were making an effort.

These findings demonstrate the impact race-related variables can impose on racial/ethnic minoritized individuals as they navigate higher education. The field of school psychology has made efforts to recruit and retain more minoritized individuals as to meet the needs of growing diversity in the student demographics of the United States. While a noble effort, it is important to acknowledge how recruitment efforts are not enough to support the well-being of minoritized individuals who often lack a sense of belongingness in their programs. Additionally, as the field

puts out statements that indicate a shift towards a goal of social justice and antiracism, it is important to better understand how our field contributes to disparities in outcomes for students of color. Based on Proctor and Truscott's (2012) research, there is evidence that there are racially/ethnically minoritized individuals who are eager and willing to work to address the needs of minoritized groups who are frustrated with our fields lack of training in addressing these concerns. Increasing diversity is not enough if our field is replicating the same practices and training that fostered these outcomes initially.

Socialization and Identity Development

Socialization is an ongoing process in which an individual becomes a member of a community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991). A community of practice is a group of individuals who share a common concern or passion for something and learn how to improve in their passion by engaging and interacting with each other. When an individual enters graduate school, they are joining and are being socialized by multiple communities. They are joining a community of graduate students, of a specific department, of a discipline, and more (Austin & McDaniels, 2006). As a newcomer to a community, one must learn what is expected and needed to succeed in a community. They must learn about and adopt to the culture of the community, including the norms, practices, values, and discourse of the community (Bieber & Worley, 2006: Sfard, 1998: Wegner & Nückles, 2015).

Since its inception, graduate education has predominately served a white, single, male population (Berelson, 1960). As such, it is this population that established the normative expectations, standards, and culture of graduate education across disciplines. This population has established the organizational culture or “shaped the mold” for graduate education. For students from minoritized groups, the normative socialization and experience of graduate education often

may not fit their lifestyle or backgrounds, isolating them and making them feel they do not “fit the mold” (Gardner, 2008). Considering that the attrition rate of racial/ethnic minoritized students is considerably higher than for white male students (Council of Graduate Schools 2004; Lovitts 2001), it is important to understand how students’ identity, lived experiences, and background characteristics “interact with the structures they confront in their programs to determine their persistence” (Lovitts 2001, p. 41). The process of socialization generally acts upon and across individuals uniformly, traditionally not allowing for individual differences, and when an individual’s traits or characteristics are not the norm, the socialization process may not be successful (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979).

While there is existing literature exploring the topic of graduate school socialization upon minoritized populations (Clark & Corcoran 1986; Ellis 2001; Margolis and Romero 1998), demonstrating inequities in the socialization process for those who do not match the majority profile (Baird, 1990; Turner & Thompson, 1993), this research largely treats graduate education as a monolithic experience and does not represent differences across various disciplines of study. There is little to no research on the graduate school socialization process in the field of school psychology. Clearly, research focused on the socialization of minoritized school psychology students during their graduate school experiences is a worthy area of study.

Critical Race Theory

Critical Race Theory (CRT) emerged in the mid-1970s as lawyers, activist, and legal scholars began to recognize that the lack of advancement in the civil rights movement. Legal scholars, including Derrick A. Bell, Jr., Charles Lawrence, Richard Delgado, and Kimberlé Crenshaw, began to examine the role of the law in maintaining and further constructing race-based social and economic oppression (Lynn & Adams, 2002; Taylor, 1998, 2009). CRT built

off critical legal studies and radical feminism, placing race and racism at the center of scholarship and analysis focusing on issues such as affirmative action and disparities in sentencing of people of color in the U.S. criminal justice system (Lynn & Adams, 2002; Taylor, 1998).

As a theoretical framework, CRT examines the “unequal and unjust distribution of power and resources along political, economic, racial, and gendered lines” (Taylor, 2009, p. 1). The CRT movement is comprised of scholars and activists that are committed to challenging and disrupting racism and its related social, legal, political, and educational consequences (Patton et al, 2011). CRT is an outcome of a racist system and was developed as a means of challenging the dominant systems of racial oppression (Museus, 2013).

Critical Race Theory was applied to the field of education in the mid-1990s. In 1994, Gloria Ladson-Billings and William Tate argued that while race remains a salient factor in all of U.S. society, and especially education, race itself was undertheorized in education. Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995) built off the work of Critical Race Theorist in the law field to detail how the intersection of race and property rights can be utilized to understand inequity in school systems. Critical Race Theory, as articulated by scholars such as Ladson-Billing and Tate, has seven key tenets that have been applied to the field of education: (1) the permanence of racism; (2) experiential knowledge or counter storytelling; (3) interest convergence theory; (4) intersectionality; (5) whiteness as property; (6) critique of liberalism; and (7) commitment to social justice (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002). These tenets are further discussed in chapter three.

While the critical literature in the field of school psychology is limited, more recently Sabnis & Proctor (2021) introduced a tentative framework for critical school psychology. I will utilize this framework to conceptualize and understand the supports school psychology programs

are providing for their racially and ethnically minoritized students, that is to answer my third research question. The proposed goal of critical school psychology is to challenge the field through uncovering, naming, and interrogating the ways in school psychology is complicit in oppression and force it to do better. Sabnis & Proctor (2021) present two broad spheres of action: creating new knowledge and creating new spaces. Critical school psychologists should strive to create counter knowledge, that is knowledge from and about minoritized groups that challenge the status quo and push the boundaries of what is considered possible within the majorities' narrative. One way of creating this new knowledge is through research done with a critical orientation that sheds light on the various social, cultural, and economic inequities that exist in education. Additionally, in this research one should be introspective of the field of school psychology and seek to understand all the ways this discipline is complicit in the perpetuation of injustices and inequities.

The second broad sphere of the framework is creating new spaces. Sabnis & Proctor (2021) present four types of spaces that may be created to transform the field and strengthen its connection to sociopolitical movements of social justice. An oppositional space is created when an individual or group interrupts or calls out an organizational practice that is sustaining oppression. A counterspace is space that provides momentary relief, peace, or strength to members of minoritized groups when they enter it. Counterspaces can foster a sense of community and belonging, allowing those that attend to learn from one another and network. Educational spaces are created primarily to increase the fundamental understanding of social injustices, having participants engage in activities or lectures to increase their awareness and understanding of the dynamics of social injustice, often rarely discussed in other spaces. Critical amplifying spaces, these spaces are defined by amplifying the voices of marginalized

communities utilizing a critical anti-oppressive perspective to an audience that is traditionally more privileged than the speaker. Critical perspectives aim to bring about systematic change and is necessary to respond to social injustices.

Summary

The impact of slavery and segregation are long lasting and systematic racism still exists in our society till this day, including in the field of education. While education is perceived as the great equalizer, bias, oppression, and marginalization are persistent in our K-12 schools and result in educational outcomes that reinforce the existing disparities based on race and class in our society (Proctor, 2016). School psychologists have specialized training to support children academically, socially, emotionally, and behaviorally. They work in collaboration with families, communities, and other school professionals to foster environments for students that are safe, healthy, and supportive to help students succeed (NASP, 2010).

School psychologists have an ethical obligation to engage in social justice and antiracist action to effectively serve students regardless of race, class, gender, religion, culture, and other identifying characteristics. However, the field's history is rooted in the medical model, utilizing assessment as a means to justify within school segregation along racial lines (Blanchett, 2010; Harry & Klinger, 2006), contributing to the historical and continued disparities in placement of Black students in special and gifted education programs (*Larry P. v. Riles, 1979*; Pitre, 2009), and forming the basis of some arguments on racial inferiority (Guthrie, 2004; Newell et al., 2010). There have been calls for change in the field to advocate for the role of school psychologists to move beyond assessment to be involved in data-based decision-making, with emphasis on multitiered intervention and prevention of academic, social-emotional, and behavioral concerns, more consistent use of evidence based interventions, involvement in

indirect service delivery, problem-solving and consultation, and heightened sensitivity to the cultural and linguistic diversity of school-age populations (Ball et al., 2011; Dawson et al., 2004; NASP, 2007; Reschly, 2000; Sheridan & Gutkin, 2000). Despite the field's continued effort to expand the professional role of school psychologists, many duties of school psychologists still revolve around the profession's early roots in assessment and measurement (D'Amato, Zafiris, McConnell & Dean, 2011).

Shriberg et al. (2008) cited one major barrier to social justice work in the field being the lack of minoritized school psychologists. Efforts to recruit and retain school psychology students and faculty from minoritized backgrounds has been cited as a way to improve school psychology programs' diversity-related training (Loe & Miranda, 2005), as well as a way to promote cultural competence among school psychologists (Brown, Shriberg, & Wang, 2007). While there are benefits to racial/ethnic diversity, racial/ethnic minoritized individuals face many systematic barriers to the completion of their graduate education, such as microaggressions, financial barriers, and school climate (Grapin & Pereiras, 2019; Norcross, Kohout, & Wicherski, 2005; Sue, Capodilupo, & Holder, 2008). Additionally, discoveries from Proctor (2012) demonstrate that particularly for African American students seeking to address disparities in the education system, reported frustration exists with the fields lack of training to address these issues, acknowledging the fields contributions to it with biased assessment practices.

To meet the field's goal of social justice and antiracism, there must be a critical examination of the field, particularly the field's training practices and how these practices contribute to racism in the education system. When minoritized individuals are pursuing their degrees in school psychology programs, how are they being socialized into the field? What are

their experiences in their program? How is their program engaging in antiracist work? These are the questions this project seeks to explore.

CHAPTER THREE: METHOD

The data utilized for this thesis is part of a larger study being conducted by the social justice research group, which is part of the school psychology program at the University of South Florida. The research group is conducting a qualitative research study in which researchers are utilizing semi-structured interview methodology to gather data to better understand the perspectives and experiences of minoritized school psychology graduate students in their training programs. The specific aims of the larger study are to investigate the ways in which minoritized school psychology graduate students understand and experience their socialization into their school psychology program and their field, to investigate the ways in which school psychology faculty members understand and explain the socialization of minoritized graduate students in their school psychology programs, and to critique the socialization process of minoritized students in school psychology programs.

For this paper, I will focus on the perspectives and experiences of racially minoritized school psychology graduate students. I have delimited my study to data collected from racially minoritized students only. Thus, I aim to answer the following questions utilizing data from the aforementioned larger study:

1. How do racially minoritized school psychology graduate students describe their graduate school socialization process?
2. How do school psychology graduate programs perpetuate oppressive structures through their professional socialization process?

3. What anti-racist practices do racially minoritized school psychology graduate students recognize as supports in their graduate programs?

Epistemology and Ontology

Given the intention of this study, I employed a critical paradigm and a qualitative inquiry approach to explore the research questions. The qualitative methodology was chosen as it provides in-depth insight into the perceptions and experiences of minoritized individuals, this is important as often minoritized individuals' experiences are not fully represented in majoritarian narratives. Qualitative researchers adopt research paradigms to assist in examining their data through a specific lens. In this study I sought to understand how the social, political, and historical variables surrounding race in the United States have contributed to the socialization experiences of racially minoritized graduate students in school psychology programs. Therefore, Critical Race Theory was used as a theoretical framework.

Critical Race Theory is a scholarly movement committed to challenging and disrupting racism and its associated, social, legal, political, and educational consequences (Patton et al., 2011). Critical Race Theorists argue that Eurocentric versions of history belie the socially constructed nature of race, ingrained in our society to distinguish racial groups and to show superiority of one group over another (Solórzano and Yosso, 2002). Solórzano and Yosso (2002) identified five aims of critical race methodology: (a) center race and racism in all aspects of the research process; (b) challenge the traditional research paradigms used to explain the experiences of racial and ethnic minoritized individuals; (c) provide a transformative response to all forms of oppression (racism, genderism, classism); (d) focus on the intersectional experiences of racial and ethnic minoritized individuals; and (e) apply interdisciplinary knowledge to develop and enhance understanding of racial and ethnic minoritized student's experiences in higher

education. Employing a critical race methodology was appropriate for this thesis as it challenges traditional research methodologies that reinforce the majoritarian narrative. Critical Race Theory recognizes experiential knowledge as a strength, legitimizing racially minoritized individuals' lived experiences as valued tools for analyzing racism and other forms of oppression (Museus, 2013).

Critical race researchers are committed to social justice and engage in a research agenda that empowers minoritized persons and contests issues of racial inequality, oppression, and exclusionary practices (Liu, 2009; Taylor, 1998). Critical race theorists explicitly ask questions about oppressive social processes that lead to subordination of minoritized groups and employ an advocacy-based approach to understand and disrupt the system of structural racial inequality. Employing this critical perspective, I utilized semi structured interviews being conducted as part of the larger study to gather the stories, narratives, and the subjective truths of racially minoritized school psychology graduate students. These counternarratives were critical to learn about their lived experiences, as they deconstruct the master narrative and dominant discourse in education (Stanley, 2007), I am using these counter stories to give a voice to racially minoritized graduate students (Liu, 2009), and will later provide implications for creating systemic changes that lead to positive developments (Love, 2004) based on my analysis of interviews.

Reflexivity

As the author of this thesis, I am writing as someone who identifies as a multiracial, Black and Latina, female student in a school psychology program at a predominately white institution. As a racially minoritized student in higher education, I understand the systemic barriers racially and ethnically minoritized students face while navigating the United States education system. I additionally, understand the nuance of intersecting identities and how these

identities contribute to an individuals' various lived experiences, to an individuals' beliefs, values, and biases. I understand and have experienced instances of racism, I understand and have experienced living in poverty and the complexities that come with that. My lived experiences strengthen my commitment to social justice and my empathy for minoritized groups. I understand that practices as they are currently in place continue to perpetuate disproportionate outcomes for students from minoritized racial groups. I believe the United States has demonstrated long-standing systemic injustices, and with this research I want to expose and disrupt systems that contribute to this continued oppression and subordination of racially minoritized groups.

Beyond my racial identity, I must recognize the privilege I have as a graduate student. The opportunity and access I have to higher education have additionally shape my lived experiences. I am part of a post-positivist-oriented training program with an eco-behavioral training model. This training has shaped my perspective and understanding of the field, both in practice and in research. It is important for me to acknowledge how this training may have impacted my analysis and at times misaligned with the critical analysis in which I chose to engage. School psychologists are evidence-based practitioners who emphasize data driven decision making, much of which is grounded in quantitative statistics. Given the goal of this study, engaging in the same majorative research practices that largely delegitimizes the experiences of minoritized individuals would be insincere.

Engaging with a critical race perspective requires me to recognize my identities, as these identities inform the research process, and assert my positionality. As I've engaged in these interviews and analysis, my lived experiences have been incorporated, and as such I have taken steps to circumvent any misinterpretations or misrepresentations of individuals or systems

involved in this research (Milner, 2007). While my own identity and experiences have required me to be cognizant of my subjectivity and required me to manage my biases by attending to data saturation, conferring with research group colleagues, member reflection, and journaling, my identity and lived experiences are still a strength that have contributed to this research process. My own identity allowed me to better facilitate open conversation with the participants I've worked with and increased my interest in hearing the perspectives and insights of the individuals involved.

Participants and Sampling

Participants were recruited via purposive and snowball sampling. The research team disseminated recruitment letters and flyers to professional and student networks, school- psychology based social media, school psychology-based forums, listservs, and other forms of networking such as professional conferences (i.e. the 2021 NASP conference). Participant eligibility was confirmed using an online demographic survey. While recruitment for the larger study included participants who identify with various minoritized groups (racial/ethnic, varying exceptionalities, nondominant religions, LGBTQ+), for this thesis participants must have met the following inclusion criteria: a) currently enrolled full-time in a School Psychology graduate program that is NASP approved and/or APA accredited, b) identifies with at least one of the following minoritized racial/ethnic groups: African American, Latiné, Asian American, Native American/Pacific Islander, Middle Eastern, Multiracial.

For the purpose of this thesis eight of the 30 participants of the larger study were included in this thesis. All participants met the prescribed inclusion criteria, and due to time constraints only participants interviewed in March of 2020 were included in this data analysis. Given the scarcity of racially and ethnically minoritized individuals in the field of school psychology

(APA, 2010; Castillo et al., 2013) this number was considered appropriate. Demographic information for participants is provided in table one. To maintain the anonymity of my participants, participants will be referred to by pseudonyms throughout this work.

Table 1. Participant Demographic Information

Participant Pseudonym	Gender	Pronouns	Sexual Orientation	Age	Race/ Ethnicity	U.S. Region in which program is located
Aaliyah	Female	She/ Her/Hers	Straight/ Heterosexual	23	Hispanic /Latinx	Southwest
Larissa	Female	She/ Her/Hers	Straight/ Heterosexual	23	Black/ African-American	Southeast
Kai	Female	She/ Her/Hers	Straight/ Heterosexual	26	Black/ African-American	Midwest
Jocelyn	Female	She/ Her/Hers	Bisexual	24	Other	West
Veronica	Female	She/ Her/Hers	Straight/ Heterosexual	47	Black/ African-American	Southeast
Elizabeth	Female	She/ Her/Hers	Straight/ Heterosexual	24	Asian	Southeast
Brandy	Female	She/ Her/Hers	Bisexual	24	Black/ African-American	Southeast
Sophie	Female	She/They	Queer	22	Hispanic/ Latinx	Mid-Atlantic

Interviews

Data was collected through the use of semi-structured interviews. Participants engaged in one to two virtual 30-60 minute interviews. These interviews were conducted remotely utilizing virtual platforms (Microsoft teams & Zoom) and were recorded to allow for transcription. The interviews were conducted utilizing a 'Romantic' conceptualization (Alvesson, 2003). This romantic conceptualization allows interviewers to develop detailed understanding of the interviewees perspectives by developing rapport, being friendly, open, honest, and forthcoming (Roulston, 2010). In developing this genuine trust and rapport the interviewer fosters an environment in which the interviewer-interviewee may engage in intimate and self-revealing conversations (Oakley 1981; Douglas 1985; Reinharz 1992; Rubin and Rubin, 2005). The interviewer may provide personal accounts and invest their own personal identity in the relationship, creating a non-hierarchical relationship between interview and interviewee (Oakley, 1981). This self-disclosure initiates a "true dialog," allowing participants to become "co-researchers," and together interviewer and interviewee co-construct the data (Reinharz, 1992). The semi-structured interviews included open-ended questions to establish rapport between the interviewer and interviewee (Ex: What made you choose to pursue a degree in School Psychology?) in addition to six questions about the interviewee's experiences with professional training and social interactions in their programs (Ex: How is diversity incorporated in your program's training model, if at all?). The interview protocol can be found in Appendix A.

Data Analysis

The interview transcripts were analyzed through coding. The data was coded as it was collected. I utilized constant comparative analysis throughout data collection and analysis to find common categories and make comparisons across the data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). An initial *a*

priori codebook was developed based on the tenets of Critical Race Theory in education. The codebook can be found in Appendix B. While using these critical deductive codes allowed me to make sense of the historical, political, and social context of my participants' experiences, open coding was necessary to generate additional codes not captured in the *a priori* codebook. I used the codes to cluster data into categories and categorizing allowed me to detect consistent and overarching themes in the data. As I engaged in the coding process, I made analytic memos. Analytic memos are useful for recording the research process, increasing credibility, and helping with "future directions, unanswered questions, frustrations with the analysis, insightful connections." (Saldaña, 2016, p. 45). Analytic memoing assisted and allowed me to make connections among the codes and make sense of the data as I categorized and aggregated data into themes. I continued the process of re-reading transcripts, developing codes, and clustering data into categories until data saturation was met.

Quality Criteria

Tracy's (2010) qualitative quality criteria was utilized to ensure and assess the quality of my research. The criteria included to assess the quality of this study included (1) worthy topic and (2) sincerity. Understanding the perspectives of racially minoritized individuals in school psychology graduate programs is a worthy topic due to the stagnant growth of diversity in the field. The psychology field, and especially school psychology, demonstrates continued barriers to the recruitment and retention of diverse professionals. An increase of diverse professionals is not only beneficial to the growing population of diverse students, but also to all students as it is important for there to be diverse representation in our multicultural society.

This research also is relevant and timely as the field has committed to adopting the goal and process of social justice and antiracism work. In NASP's (2020) anti-racist statement they asserted:

As school psychologists, we have an **ethical responsibility** to engage in **social justice and anti-racist action**. School psychology organizations and graduate education programs play an important role in shaping future generations of school psychologists to lead the mental health, educational and research, and advocacy initiatives that promote equity for school personnel, students, families and communities they serve. This is only possible if our field acknowledges, evaluates, and works to reconstruct existing systems, structures, and policies that lead to inequitable outcomes for some groups and not others.

(p. 1)

So, it is important as a field to look at the oppressive structures that continue to inhibit and challenge the growth of racially minoritized individuals within our own training programs.

To achieve a level of sincerity I have made an effort to be self-reflexive and transparent throughout the research process. I have described my critical paradigm and provided my reflexivity statement. Additionally, I have engaged in journaling through my data analysis process, allowing myself space for self-reflection and time to identify my own biases as to put them aside to the best of my ability throughout interviewing and data analysis.

Ethical Considerations

Several steps have been taken to ensure the research is conducted in an ethical manner.

Participation in this study was completely voluntary. To minimize risk of coercion and influence, potential participants were notified about the voluntary nature of the study and were told that they are free to withdraw participation or the use of their data at any time. Any personal or

identifying information is being disguised from the transcripts, and pseudonyms are being utilized in transcripts to protect the identities of participants. The data, recorded interviews and transcripts, are being stored in a secure online cloud with access only given to the research team. The data will be stored for five years and destroyed after the five-year period.

As for potential risks and benefits, discussing negative experiences and emotions with others is associated with a reduction of stress and an increase physical health functioning (Pennebaker, Kiecolt-Glaser, & Glaser, 1988). As such participants may benefit from the opportunity to describe their lived experiences and have their stories heard. However, while the interview process is believed to entail minimal risks for participants, it is possible that the interviews may elicit negative emotions from participants dependent on what the participants chose to disclose during the interview. Due to the possibility of emotional risk or discomfort participants were given the opportunity to take a break or cease participation at any point during the interview. Additionally, all participants were emailed a resource guide that will include national mental health, crises, and well-being resources. These resources provide participants with options for further support outside of the study's capacity (Opsal et al., 2015; Wolegmuth et al., 2015).

CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS

I will share the findings discovered through the research process in this chapter. These findings will be organized by research question, featuring overarching themes and topic areas discussed by participants during their interviews. In this chapter I will feature direct quotes from participants, with a goal of putting their voice at the forefront of this work. In the next chapter, I will provide a deeper explanation on how these responses answer my research questions. To understand the ways in which racially minoritized school psychology graduate students describe their graduate school socialization process, the ways in which school psychology programs perpetuate oppressive structures through their professional socialization process, and the anti-racist practices racially minoritized school psychology graduate students recognize as supports in their graduate programs, I share several overarching themes from interviews below.

Question One: How do racially minoritized school psychology graduate students describe their graduate school socialization process?

The interviews conducted thorough the research process provide an array of insight into the graduate experiences of the racially and ethnically minoritized school psychology participants. Participants shared both positive and negative aspects of their programs and their graduate experience, much of which will be discussed throughout this chapter. Based on participant interviews three themes emerged to represent how racially and ethnically minoritized school psychology students describe their graduate school socialization process: 1) isolation and community, (2) educational labor and the role of the spokesperson, and (3) the emotional labor of being a minoritized student.

Isolation and Community

Graduate education is a fast paced, high stress environment. Social support is a resilience factor in navigating the process. With a sense of belongingness being positively associated with academic engagement and negatively associated with emotional distress (Clark et al. 2012), having strong ties to one's program is important. Across the eight participants various degrees of belongingness and relatability with peers was discussed. A common sentiment expressed across participants as to if an individual was able to make a connection to their peers was representation of others from minoritized backgrounds and/or others with similar and shared lived experiences. Even if an individual did not share the same minoritized identities or lived experience there was a greater sense of community among peers if individuals share the experience of being from a minoritized identity group.

In speaking on her program Larissa shared "This sounds so sad. I don't really feel like I've ever fit in within my cohort or just the program." Larissa explained there to be a lack of understanding in having different societal privileges, citing even when talking to a peer whom she knew was "making an effort," there was a gap in understanding and communication. After explaining a race related conflict in her program, and talking with faculty to no avail, Larissa attempted to explain the situation to a white peer:

I was explaining that to her, and I could tell she didn't really understand. It was like even when I was talking about that experience, I had to explain again why that wasn't appropriate. It was just like it's hard. I feel like that is in some ways barriers for me to create relationships with these people, because it's not that I don't want to, but it's just hard because you don't understand my experiences. It's hard for me to have to keep explaining and teaching you basically as I'm explaining the stuff I've went through.

Larissa shared that she struggled to relate to faculty and peers in her program due to pushback on her ideals and experiences, and a lack of understanding of her lived experience as a racially-minoritized individual. As such, finding a community that she could relate to was very important, even if she had to seek that out outside of her program:

Although I mentioned last week about not really feeling like sometimes supported by my peers in the program and faculty in the program, I do think that I've sought out that community elsewhere and have found students who understand what I'm going through, although they're not in school psych program... There are a lot of professors that I've created, I guess, a network with and they've been very supportive. I reach out to them when I feel things are going crazy in my life and the program. They're just always very understanding and supportive. I think despite those differences, those very real differences that exist in the field, I have been able to find people who look like me and who even if they don't look like me, they understand my experiences as a minoritized student.

Finding someone who understands your lived experiences was an important factor across participants. Jocelyn shared that while she has various levels of communication and relationships with peers in her program, she tends to gravitate towards others from minoritized identity groups:

because there's just much less groundwork to do to have a conversation... so I have a bias, but it's just going to be work to build a real relationship the way that I want to have relationships with people who don't share experiences of oppression, and so I will naturally gravitate towards people who are minoritized in some way to find a common

understanding in like, "Let's talk about this thing" and have more of an assurance that I'm not going to feel gaslit.

Jocelyn expands on how difficult it is to be vulnerable with individuals who may not be like minded:

I think it's tough for me because I build a wall around me and I want to talk social justice about the things that we have in common that we're studying together and things like that but then at one point, there's a wall where my personal experiences are mine and I don't know that somebody is going to have that privilege yet of knowing me to that level. I battle with that because it's important. I think it's important for people to know where you're coming from and why something matters to you, and what experiences you've had so that they can contextualize all of this theory of social justice. At the same time, it's a really vulnerable thing to do to share your life story with people when you're not really sure where they stand yet.

Existing within a system which constantly invalidates your lived experience is often a burden and having relationships with others who are like minded can save energy and emotional burden when one is searching for an outlet. Kai shares that while having other Black students in her program helps her create bonds, they still do have differing lived experiences that can impact their relatability:

There are a few Black students in my program, so we naturally just bond and have no unsaid thing between us, but even then I feel like I have to be careful in that too. Just with my reflection over the years, there are some even Black students who I can't really identify with or don't really feel connected to, because we just don't see eye-to-eye with

something, or they may have had just those different experiences from growing up in a rural versus urban area where we just didn't match or didn't see eye-to-eye.

Veronica explains a sense of loneliness she has in her program never really having the opportunity to relate and foster relationships with her peers, to have conversations that were relevant to her and her life:

There was not a format or avenue other than my own personal family that I could discuss some of these things with. Just that loneliness. There's a lot of loneliness and alienation that you almost feel as being a BIPOC in a program such as this... I have yet to really find a buddy. I felt that more after our interview.

Elizabeth expressed how while she does see her peers as allies, she felt incredibly isolated with the increase of anti-Asian racism in 2020 when her program was looking to her to be the “spokesperson:”

In this process as a graduate student, I'm going to be very transparent in the sense of feeling isolated in this experience, because I am possibly the only student in my graduate training program that identifies with the AAPI community...For the most part, I have really just relied on my family and talking to my friends back home and those from the community, because as much as I've talked about the diversity in my cohort, I know everyone definitely has different lived experiences, and I don't know if I'm personally at the point where we can start now sharing together to find those commonalities. I'm still in the moment of processing in my own community of, "How are we addressing this? What are we going to do?" And just a lot of sense of insecurity.

Brandy explained in her interview how fostering positive connections between faculty and peers, contributes to her being able to present her authentic self in her program, she notes that if these connections were not there her experience would be very different:

We have a lot of students who do their best to be involved, but then there's others who just don't seem that invested in some of the things that I think are really important. One of the things that I think have made my grad school experience-- If I just went to class every time and went home, I'd probably been miserable and would have dropped out already. I think that the sense of community that I get from being active in the program is what makes the difference for me.

Educational Labor and the Role of the Spokesperson

The school psychology field has made efforts to recruit and retain diverse practitioners and graduate students, despite these efforts the presence of majority white school psychologists has remained relatively unchanged (Proctor & Truscott, 2012). Many of the participants of this research cited a desire and passion to work with underserved students; students of low socioeconomic status; and racially and ethnically minoritized students who are disproportionately represented in school discipline, special education, or in their academic outcomes when compared to their white peers. Whether this passion and interest came from their own lived experiences or their empathy for supporting individuals who look like them and experience the same oppressive structures, the participants of this study were very motivated by the prospect of supporting racially and ethnically minoritized youth, and students in higher education like themselves. However, during their time in the program, many participants cited a lack of minoritized student representation in the student body, in faculty, and in course content, leading to this sense of educational labor and “spokesperson” role on their end. Many

participants felt the pressure to educate their peers and faculty, the need to advocate for certain topics, and the pressure to speak for other minoritized individuals. Jocelyn shared how due to her interest in equity she finds she naturally has a lens that has her focusing on the biases of her peers in their practice and discussion:

I feel I'm very predisposed to notice the biases that other people hold because of how long I've been thinking about equity. It just makes it weird for me in terms of connecting with people.

She expands to share how this leads to her attempting to give her peers some concession, but she often finds herself having to be the person to bring up certain topics:

I want to have grace because however it might make me feel, at the end of the day, this is my cohort and it's a group of future leaders and I would like to have a constructive thing going on versus "you're my age and you haven't thought about this, what's going on?" I think that they do care about people that's why they are in this field versus another field. Sometimes I feel just like I'm going to be the angry person because I'm bringing all of these things up.

Several participants spoke of this perception they have that their peers are open, empathetic, and supportive in regard to diversity concerns and social justice, stating that their interest in this helping field makes them more open minded than the country at large, though these same peers still often neglect facilitating interest in diversity and social justice without being prompted. When speaking on the supportiveness of her peers regarding discussions of diversity or acknowledging minoritized identities, Larissa stated:

I think that people try to be very empathetic, but most of the times, I find myself being in class being like, "Okay, what does this statistic mean for Black students or what does it

mean for other Brown students? What does that mean?" In that way, I feel like I may jump in and ask questions, but oftentimes, I don't know, I wouldn't say that they can be the most supportive. I think it's just because it's something they don't have to think about. They don't think about it until I bring it up. Then that worries me because I'm like if I wasn't in the room, then what would the conversations be like? You're not just serving white students, you're going to serve diverse students. I say all of that to say that most of the times it's a very reactive thing. I wouldn't say it's always a supportive kind of thing. There are times when people ask me for my opinion. It's rare though, but they'll ask if they're doing a project that has Black students, they may be like, "Oh, what's your opinion on this?" That is interesting too, because I just feel like sometimes, I'm not seen until those moments where you have to see me. It's like I'm invisible until I'm needed if that makes sense.

In Larissa's experience conversations of diversity and social justice often fall short. In her program of white presenting faculty and cohort members, these conversations of diversity do not come up very often, and Larissa's opinion is only prompted when it benefits the asker, a form of interest convergence. Larissa goes on to explain that she cannot speak on behalf of all Black folk, only her own lived experience. She takes the time to do research and she wishes her peers did the same, so she is not just around to explain everything, so everyone is there to have a conversation:

even as a Black person, I don't understand all of everyone's Black experience. There's still research that I do on the back end to try to understand and then I'll come with my questions. I feel like there is a balance and the line for me is when I've seen you at least try to initiate, to try to understand, that's different. Sure, we can have a conversation, I don't mind. I had this conversation with some peers when BLM was happening because

they didn't really understand some stuff. I don't mind having conversations with you but what I'm not going to do is be like Google for you. There are some things that you can look up and you can go to search. I think that's my issue, I don't mind helping and explaining these things but you have to meet me halfway. If I've never seen you take any interest, any initiative to try to learn, and then you just come to me and I'm just supposed to explain and bring up everything on you, I don't like that, because it's like again, you didn't see me or this issue until this moment, it's not my job to inform you now. You have resources and I see you use them when it's something that you're interested in. The same applies here. If this is something that you really want to learn about, you will take some type of initiative. I feel that's where the balance is for me. When I've seen you put in the work in, then sure, let's talk about it, but if you've never seen me or this issue until that moment, I don't really care to try to help you understand. I don't know, that sounded bad but it's just not my job.

In a similar fashion, Jocelyn explains that an individual should not feel the pressure to explain these dynamics of living with a minoritized identity if they do not want to:

I feel like and the mere fact that you're having to explain it means that there's a whole lot of education that needs to happen there and if you want to take that responsibility on you can, but you really don't have to because you're just existing in this world and that's a lot of stuff to carry and a lot of responsibility to hold for other people.

Living and existing in a society that systematically oppresses you for who you are is heavy enough of a burden and one should only have to explain that if it is their choice. Elizabeth explains how isolating being the one individual to explain these things can be, particularly regarding her peers' response after the increase in AAPI hate during the COVID-19 pandemic:

I'm not saying I don't have allies, I think my cohort has expressed their level of wanting to be involved in the conversation to learn, but I'm in a position at this moment where the spotlight's on me. How am I going to educate others on these issues? As a graduate student, that's very isolating in the sense of, I know it's a great power to shed light on these issues and bring people into the conversation, but in a personal side of it as a graduate student, it's like, now I need my support system though.

The Emotional Labor of Being a Minoritized Student

Across participants' narratives there was a larger theme of emotionality, an emotional burden or emotional labor. Navigating graduate education, a system which reinforces white supremacy, in a larger society that reinforces white supremacy, where whiteness is a property that garners one power at the expense of minoritized groups, is difficult. During her interview Larissa shared several anecdotes of experiencing microaggressions and racial related conflicts during her time in her program. While Larissa made several efforts to address her concerns with faculty, they often were disregarded. When reflecting on one of these experiences Larissa stated:

I was having to validate my experiences as a Black woman in this program. It was like my experience is valid enough. The things that I'm telling you it's very real, it's happening to me. You just don't understand it because it's not like your lived experience, but I feel like that's a part of your job, is to understand where we're coming from as students from marginalized backgrounds and trying to support us...I just feel like the support goes beyond getting us here and getting us funding and getting us through. It's getting us through where we're not exhausted mentally, physically, and emotionally when we cross that finish line. You should be supporting us and trying to understand where we're coming from.

Having one's lived experiences as a minoritized graduate student invalidated was not an uncommon occurrence across participants. While society has made strides away from more explicit instances of racism, the covert ways society still minoritizes non-white racial and ethnic groups has negative impacts on those who experience it. Having to navigate oppression in institutions that largely deny said oppression is "exhausting" to Larissa's point. To mitigate some of this emotional labor a few participants spoke about guarding themselves from being vulnerable as a form of self-preservation and protection, Jocelyn explained:

There's a level of self-preservation that is really important and really necessary and so you have to make choices of who do you trust with certain information. Then that affects your ability to be social and that affects your ability to build good relationships I feel like. (Protection) I think it can be literal and it can also just be emotional just like if something is really important to you and someone doesn't know how important it is to you and they don't give it the same value or respect, then I think that would be very hurtful. I think I just try to prevent myself from being in that situation.

Navigating the lack of representation in their programs at time requires students to engage in practices to protect themselves, to provide some protection from the inevitable emotional labor required as a minoritized graduate student in a liberal, race neutral institution. Veronica shared that while the limited representation of racial/ethnic minoritized students in her program has her embracing her identity more, it also leads her to feel the need to protect it, that is to hide pieces of herself:

What this program has taught me really is that I have really embraced my identity more. I hate to say I've embraced it more because I know it's not similar to everyone else. It makes me protect it more too, because I know that in representation, I might be that one

example. I have to monitor and I hate to say monitor, but I have to filter. I have to consider, I have to really be aware of my actions, my attitudes, my words, my thoughts, not so that I mask my identity, but just that sometimes, my identity has to have a cloak on it in some populations, whereas it can come full out, dress to impress in others. I've learned a lot more about who I am and what my presence is in various situations by being in this program.

This plight of being the only individual who is the “representative” of a particular group is a heavy weight to carry.

Question Two: How do school psychology graduate programs perpetuate oppressive structures through their professional socialization process?

Four themes emerged to represent commonalities across participants’ experiences in their program as they described oppressive structures. Participants’ programs perpetuated oppressive structures through their socialization process by: (1) neglecting social justice (2) universal expectations for professionalism, (3) interactions with faculty, and (4) white fragility.

Neglecting Social Justice

Despite the field’s goals of trending towards more socially just and antiracism practice, there are several ways in which graduate programs continue to neglect social justice work. Participants identified several areas in which their programs were falling short. Three subthemes will be presented here, school psychology graduate programs neglect social justice in their (1) coursework and curriculum, (2) recency, reaction, and interest convergence, and their (3) inaccessibility and lack of equitable action.

Coursework and Curriculum

When it comes to diversity and social justice, many participants spoke on their perceptions that while there are opportunities to work on and learn about social justice research and coursework available on an individual level, it is not necessarily embedded in the program or coursework on a universal level. When asked about how diversity is incorporated in her program, Aaliyah shared that although her program has incorporated a statement into their handbook, there's still a lack of integration of diversity issues across their coursework.

It's said in all the statements and their goals and everything in the handbook, but it's hard to do that I think when there's only one class that really focuses on diversity and culture. I wish that there were more classes about it just because it's so important, and then it is a little bit integrated into all the other classrooms, but it's not the big picture.

Aligning with NASP and APA guidelines and expectations, many participants spoke on their program having at least one class dedicated to diversity. Several participants cited a multicultural course as being the main incorporation of diversity and social justice at the program wide level. Beyond this type of course, additional interest in social justice or diversity work was limited to research labs, and individual faculty or student research interests. Participants asserted that multiculturalism was limited and critiqued the concept as not being enough to promote social justice. When describing some of the work in a research lab in the program, Sophie stated:

We're actually doing a study comparing multiculturalism to antiracist behaviors and we're kind of describe it is like, this is like the cutesy like All Lives Matter but like we still want everybody at the table...multiculturalism is that, then antiracism is like "No, we're gonna actually like not... colorblind this, we're going to talk about actual oppression and what white supremacy really means in America, and how it still ingrained in every

system. We're going to talk about colonialism. We're going to talk about all these oppressive powers.” That's like, I feel like the vibe I get from anti-racism. And I don't think that that is been incorporated yet into our program's professional development. So, while you know those issues of diversity kind of get pushed under the multiculturalism, I don't think it's enough...So I'm glad we do have those conversations to make us aware, I'm just not convinced they're enough.

Sophie expanded to share that their program is good about acknowledging differences and trying to work around them. For instance, she stated “if we acknowledge it, then we can maybe have at least like a book in our head of potential things, like maybe Latinx people typically like XYZ, and even that I think still falls under not really understanding anti-racism I think that still plays into racism.” She explained how even their well-intentioned practices can play into racism.

Racism's role in society is often subtle. Sophie critiques multiculturalism, colorblindness, and other liberal ideologies that often further the subordination of minoritized groups.

Multiculturalism is an ideology that promotes that all cultural groups have perspectives, beliefs, and values that should be understood and respected, even if they differ from your own. While multiculturalism as a concept provides a level of racial and ethnic consciousness, the mere nature of having one course dedicated to multiculturalism, and diversity, and not having this content embedded thorough the curriculum contributes to the “othering” of racially and ethnically minoritized individuals, establishes and reinforces white as the norm through other coursework.

One multiculturalism course is not sufficient to meet a training goal of “cultural competency.”

When discussing their thoughts on how beneficial the content of their multicultural course was,

Larissa shared:

I got a lot of feedback from peers who were just like they learned so much and blah, blah, blah. Meanwhile, on my end, not to sound rude or anything, but it felt like a very elementary level class, introduction to these differences. I don't know if I can say that people should do things, but I think in this field, there should be some type of basic level of understanding of the differences between sex and gender and race and ethnicity and these things and the power that people have, you're from a different background. Some people did get things out of it, but I just felt like it was a very basic level understanding. For me it's concerning, knowing that this is the only diversity training that you're going to receive from the program, and this is what you're expected to apply, because it's not much. I think that's where my issue is, just not sure what you are really going to be able to apply from what we got in this class.

Larissa was critical of how limited the diversity coursework is in their program. For many students, this single course is all they would receive about diversity content. Larissa shared that while other courses may dedicate one lecture on diversity or cultural considerations throughout the semester, this content was not embedded in the curriculum throughout, if at all.

Additionally, concerning is the consideration that for students who do not have an individual interest in social justice, diversity, equity, or related topics, how will their limited training in said areas continue to perpetuate oppression in the field? Restating Larissa's quote from earlier "You're not just serving white students, you're going to serve diverse students." Similarly Jocelyn stated:

"I hyper-focus on the people who need work [laughs] because it just makes me not happy to be like, "You're going to be the future of what you're doing. If you're going to be a leader, please be an inclusive, really thoughtful leader."

In our training we are often framing ourselves as leaders, however if our training prioritizes just the majority groups, the leadership we are offering is quite questionable. Jocelyn presented an important consideration, that if our programs are not teaching us to advocate, to be leaders and enact change, how will that translate into our practice:

Community trauma and historical trauma is very present in my life and in the way that I navigate the world and so I think that I don't want to be exploited. I think that if I was in a program where I couldn't speak up about something important like that, then all that that's teaching me is to be that way in my professional life as well. If I can't speak up now, then next I get a job and it's going to be like, "Oh, I can't speak up because I'm new here."

Then I move up and, "Oh, I can't speak up because I'm in charge of all these people or I'm the face of this company, and so, therefore, I have to hold their bellies." I don't want to be that person that gets, what's the word? Gaslit into compliance. That's not me at all. That's how I approach it.

Jocelyn herself, was very adamant in her opposition of practices that will not allow her to be the leader she desires to be, very much based on her lived experiences, which is inspiring.

A few participants did speak on the racist history and bias of cognitive testing, though more so to just acknowledge it as most programs are not doing anything to address these biases beyond bringing it up as a discussion point in class. Though, Jocelyn acknowledged her program's effort to hire minoritized faculty to bring a new perspective to the historical context of the field:

I feel really good that they hired her because the framework for that class has been the racist context of intelligence testing, historically and currently, and what that looks like in terms of the context of being a school psychologist and being very careful and cognizant

of the way and the way that you do a cognitive assessment when you do one, stuff like that.

Recency, Reaction, and Interest Convergence

The discoveries of this study cannot be examined without acknowledging the socio-political context of the United States in the years of 2020 and into 2021. These interviews were conducted during one of the COVID-19 pandemic's peaks, as well as after the murder of George Floyd in the Summer of 2020 and the resurgence of the Black Lives Matter movement. Many participants talked about their program's more recent diversity and social justice efforts, some explicitly citing the BLM movement as a variable:

It (diversity) has become a focus because of student activism. This year, that was my incoming year, we hired two Black professors because we didn't have any before. We're expanding the program to be from a doctoral program, back to also having master's, like terminal master's degrees as well and because of the Black Lives Matter movement.

Several participants spoke on the reactive versus proactive nature of social justice content in their program, with much social justice discussion and action being enacted recently. Following the murder of George Floyd in 2020 and the political and social unrest that followed, many organizations and institutions were galvanized to respond to the racial/ethnic oppression forever present in the United States. Although racism is certainly not a new concept, it seems to be a hot topic in research and academia as of late, Sophie shared:

I think that's the thing that's makes me most mad, is people saying especially in 2020 and especially following 2020. As if racism just happened in 2020. Where have you been for the past Inception of America?

Many participants spoke to this balance of appreciating how these conversations and practices that have come out of these horrific situations are a net positive, though also a symbol of how far we have to go. The greater interest and acknowledgement of social justice issues is important, though true to the concept of interest convergence (Bell, 1980), this addressing of oppression is only taken as far as it benefits those in power. Sophie expands:

And so that's really frustrating to me that it's simultaneously co-opting of language that folks like activists that folks really trying to dismantle all these oppressive systems have been utilizing get put into literature that is not even close to the same wavelength of pursuing that same level of equity. So that, I think can be really frustrating. I think that they are very much adhering to the standard norms of what academics want to hear. Sort of challenging it in the sense that we're talking now more about, you know, Black experiences, Latinx experiences, but still not really challenging the status quo.

Additionally, another prevalent commonality, was programs utilizing their minoritized students' work when it was beneficial to the program. Larissa cites one example:

after the BLM protests, we were coming back in the fall, I think (university name) was requiring departments to have anti-racism statements or to just really incorporate that. I had a faculty member who never was interested in anything I was doing, didn't really care. It was like, "Hey, I know you are working on papers related to social justice, you think you could send me some articles?" I didn't send them. I was like, "Yes, sure," but I was just like, no, because the same way I sat there and searched for articles is the same way you can do it. I see you do it all the time in your specific area of interest. It goes back to point of you doing the work. I'm not here to explain to you. Again, there's a lot of things that you can do on your end to understand experiences of minoritized individuals.

As stated earlier, often racially minoritized students felt the need to take on the role of spokesperson, to advocate for certain topics, their opinions are valuable when it benefits the group at large.

With this recency in interest on social justice and anti-racism there is also a sense of hesitancy, students with apprehension about if these practices will continue. Elizabeth stated:

I think we're being tested at this moment truly of, are we for social justice? Are we really talking about social justice? Because we've really started in the summer given after the death of George Floyd. I don't know if it's just a performative thing at the end, and I hope it's not, I hope it continues on.

Inaccessibility and Equity

While racially/ethnically minoritized individuals are not a monolith and each individual has their own lived experience, none of the participants fit this white male identity that academia norms were largely based around, and these are norms that are still upheld to this day. While program expectations can be fair in the sense that they are generalizable and universal, they are inherently inequitable when considering the additional barriers minoritized students face in higher education. Racial/ethnic minoritized individuals face many systematic barriers to the completion of their graduate education, such as microaggressions, financial barriers, and school climate (Grapin & Pereiras, 2019; Norcross, Kohout, & Wicherski, 2005; Sue, Capodilupo, & Holder, 2008). Several participants cited financial/socioeconomic concerns when navigating their programs. Monetary limitations can limit you from the start of the grad school application process as Sophie noted:

Grad school is just inaccessible in and of itself. I remember I had to pick up a part-time job and then quit other things I was a part of, because I couldn't afford the application process. Paying for the GRE, paying for all the applications, paying to go to interviews. I remember lodging was an issue, knowing that I had to travel and they're like, "Nope, we don't do Skype interviews, you have to be here in person." I'm like, "I can't afford to be there." That was honestly a reason why I didn't apply to as many schools, which means that you're basically letting go of a lot of potential applicants, because they just literally cannot afford to... I think programs need to do a better job of recognizing that there is such privilege in being able to just pay for the application process, to even just put my name down as a potential person that you should consider.

Lack of accommodations is another way higher education upholds these systems of power in society. Unfortunately, these financial concerns do not disappear for many. Even after entering their program, they continue to limit one's ability to meet program requirements when individuals must balance the expectations of their programs while balancing working one or more jobs to meet their basic human needs of food and shelter. Programs not being flexible or considerate of these economic barriers is another way systems of power work against minoritized individuals. Aaliyah shared how this impacted her ability to balance program requirements:

It's hard because there's a certain amount of hours for me I have to work to support myself, and so having a job and then also having to meet that requirement for the program is hard, and I don't think that they really put that into perspective or really think about that. It's like a cycle, I can't support myself if I don't work but I also can't graduate if I don't put in the hours for practicum. It's just on and on, so yes, that's definitely a struggle.

When graduate programs do not address or acknowledge concerns of financial inequity they contribute to the oppression of racially/ethnically minoritized students who make less money, accumulate more debt, and have worse health outcomes than their white counterparts (Baker, 2019; Groulx, 2018; Jankov, & Caref, 2017). Sophie is very grateful for the fellowship she currently holds though still notes there is some ignorance and privilege in her program about varying financial situations.

I think I'm very fortunate to be on fellowship here. I don't actually have to worry in the way that there's two girls in our program who do have to seek out GA-ships, which have been really hard with COVID. Most people typically before COVID could just get a GA-ship, and then they basically renewed it every year. For them, they've already had to basically be on semesterly plans with their GA-ships, which has been really difficult for them. I think that the program very much tries to be like, "Well, we'll find you something." It doesn't really, they don't think about the stress that is going on behind the scenes for a lot of students. When tuition billing has already started, and people haven't secured their GA-ships and whatnot yet, and aren't actually sure if they can pay their rent. I remember being concerned about my fellowship package hadn't been added to my account yet. There was just a delay. I was like, "Well, I have rent due soon, so I kind of have to get my refund, so that I can actually pay rent." I think there's a lot of little concern because I think people just assume that you must have a savings account or money and some way to get through. I think there is a little bit of ignorance on that end. I don't think it's intended to be ignorant, but it's there.

Accessibility and inequities went beyond issues related to funding. Several participants shared instances of experiencing or witnessing a microaggression or other race-related conflict.

Microaggressions are unconscious, brief, daily exchanges that send disparaging messages to minorities (Sue et al., 2007; Sue, 2010). Clark et al. (2012) notes that race related microaggressions can impact a sense of belongingness. This theme is demonstrated across interviews. Both Elizabeth and Larissa shared various experiences of microaggressions within their program. One example Elizabeth provided being:

a faculty member said to me that, "Oh, I like working with you. Also, there was another student that I really liked working with. She was also Asian and that she always was easy to work with." ...Anyway, I didn't say it in the moment until I realized afterwards, "Wait, wait wasn't that really mean? I thought that was a compliment. Oh, they like, working with me." No, being that they brought in the race card of like, I'm Asian so that makes me submissive and easy to work with because I don't make things difficult. I'm not going to stir the pot, whatever that meant. Things like that, which is just really fascinating right off the bat, where there's assumptions in that, I guess it's easier to work with me than maybe another student that might have more opinions.

Larissa shared:

My first year, I think (I) had box braids one semester and my professor was talking about practicum and working with younger kids and she just pointed me out. I don't know, it made me feel weird but she just pointed me out she was like, " You might want to put those up because kids might try to play with your hair, pull on your hair," I was just like, " Okay." Everybody else has long hair, I feel like long hair, in general, is like-- so I was like, "Oh okay."

Experiencing microaggressions and other race related conflicts often contributed to participant's emotional burden and a constant questioning if their experiences were based on their identity or if they were "over-thinking" a given situation.

Participants additionally cited lack of accommodations for diverse needs, something especially poignant in the time of the Coronavirus-19 pandemic, as an additional barrier while navigating their graduate education. Graduate school is difficult, but our individual burdens vary and contribute to our progress in our programs. In regard to burnout Veronica shared:

I think there's a level of burnout. All of our professors, and I'm making a very broad generalization here. All of our professors have been graduate students at some point or the other. They've been through the graduate level process, even a PhD and doctoral process. However, the burnout was different, because maybe, for them, it was just the tediousness of the work and being here, there, and everywhere and not really getting appropriate rest and self-care. The burnout now is the program burnout and assignments, plus unspoken burnout. For me, I have nothing else, whatsoever. It's like, this is a shell right now of a person. I am empty. I know I have been empty for the past two years, and I'll say, really, a good year. After I finished the first year of the program and I cried and stuff and I figured, "Okay, I'm going to hang in there." Year two, I really did become empty. now, it is burnout. I'm just going through the process.

Jocelyn similarly stated, when asked if her program considers how her identities impact her experience in her program:

I don't think that they do. I think that a lot of them think that we're all in the same COVID boat, but we're not all in the same COVID boat. We're each in our own. Some of us are in kayaks and some of us are in yachts and it's not the same.

The COVID-19 pandemic impacted many for various reasons indirectly and directly, for some due to the loss of a loved one, economic fallout, concerns of food shortages, and domestic violence. For certain populations this stress, trauma, and grief was exacerbated by the social climate following the murders of Black individuals such as George Floyd and Breonna Taylor, and the increase of AAPI hate crimes due to bias and misinformation related to the COVID-19 virus. These events impact our collective sense of belonging, safety, and well-being, particularly for Black communities (Bor, Venkataramani, Williams, & Tsai, 2018). Additionally, exposure to the viral video evidence of these crimes has harmful consequences for racially and ethnically minoritized individuals (Tynes, Willis, Stewart, & Hamilton, 2019). In our racialized society, where this hierarchy exists, racially minoritized individuals will carry additional burdens due to systemic oppression, and these need to be acknowledged and addressed.

Another potential barrier face by minoritized students, mentioned by a couple of participants was having a lack of generational knowledge, which impacts the knowledge we have coming into these graduate institutions. Elizabeth shared:

I sought out a relationship or a mentorship with my faculty and my advisor, and really asked them the questions of, "How do I go about this if this is my goal," or, "I don't even know what my goals are like, what should I be considering for my future?" Things like that. That's not obviously a conversation I have with my parents because they don't know anything as far as going to graduate school or even more or less college and everything like that. I think mentorship really overcame making things more transparent about what needs to be done in order to be successful and graduate on time, knowing what courses to take as the expectations.

Even with a positive relationship with a mentor, there are still unspoken rules and nuances to navigating graduate education. Elizabeth recalls not realizing that it was appropriate to set boundaries or to say no to requests:

I didn't know that until I spoke with a peer in my cohort who she shared.

I think it's very interesting, she is from a monolingual monocultural background and she did express she's from a privileged background, and since her family is educated and so she understood what it means by being taken advantage of within the life of academia as a graduate assistant because she herself as a GA and she's divulged to me you can say no, or you can set boundaries. You are only set to work X amount of hours and they need to respect that. We had a conversation. I didn't realize that I can do that, but what if like this? What if that? Me thinking about repercussions of saying no?

The norm of saying no is also weird and strange because you feel like if you say no to an opportunity and they will never present you with another opportunity to move up the ladder and break ceilings and barriers. That was my biggest concern...I talked with one of my faculty that I hold very near and dear to my heart as a mentor and that they say it's okay to set boundaries. If it means blocking a number and say, "I will return your phone call." Be more assertive. That's something I've had to learn because I guess the expectation sometimes is to work all the time.

Fortunately, for Elizabeth, she has identified mentors to help her navigate these nuances, though the consistency of finding supportive mentors was variable across participant experiences.

Professional Expectations

When it comes to professional expectations, there were various ways this was described across participants, particularly centered around dress and ethical behavior. Most participants

were unable to identify specific or explicit guidelines for this. Larissa describes “I feel like sometimes programs are just hush-hush about these things,” expanding that unless one explicitly asks an advisor they may never learn certain things. A couple of participants noted a dress code with images in their program handbook. A few others noted the NASP or APA ethical guidelines are cited to address professional expectations. When asked if professional expectations consider diversity, Kai shared:

It's very often taught from once again a whitewash perspective of that, the minority students are just left to figure it out and get on the bandwagon of the norms and expectations of the program and what it's to be a graduate student and what that means. I think from a larger perspective we're thinking about the hidden curriculum or just minority students' experiences in general, typically, in graduate programs, a lot of that is missing with having minority students to really just figure it out for the most part, and really not having access to some of those loopholes or different ways of thinking about certain things that most of the other students may have, especially white peers. I would say that not really, it's not fully considered, especially when we're thinking about the expectations portion.

Sophie reflected on how lack of explicit guidance in this realm, of professional dress expectations, was the result of privilege and racism, stating:

that is kind of one of the ways that like little bits of racism and stuff get kind of brushed under the rug and kind of just like so normalized that people don't realize how much their BIPOC students are probably over thinking this in ways that their white students are just not and so, to make a statement to make their students just feel comfortable having a conversation with them about, “Hey is this OK? Like am I allowed to wear this? Am I

allowed to feel this way? Am I allowed to do the XYZ? Does this count as professional?"

I think just having these conversations would be a weight lifted off of so many folks' shoulders. So, I think the fact that our programs haven't really had this discussion with us, is kind of problematic now that I'm thinking about it.

This overthinking and need to compensate was common across participants. In regard to dress Larissa stated:

I found myself, I don't know overdressing or trying to overcompensate in that way. I felt I did that because ... I don't feel those norms or those expectations included things that are important for me or who I am...

Several participants spoke on code-switching or conformity. Even within interviews, participants would share their struggle reflecting on the questions, Sophie stated:

I'm like typically the biggest advocate of like you literally do not have to conform to anyone's standards, that is some bull. It is like you are literally no more qualified or unqualified for whatever outward appearance you portray or anything like that so I think, I personally believe that people should literally not have to conform in the slightest. I think in reality we, as humans, just want to be able to fit in and to feel validated and to feel like people will take us seriously. So, I know for me there are bits where I'm going to conform a bit just like subconsciously a lot of the times, whether it's the way I code switch in a professional setting or how I choose to carry myself or choose to dress like I, I do not want to wear a pantsuit, but will I probably wear a pantsuit to practicum, likely. So, I think there is, like internally, like my true belief system is saying absolutely not, you shouldn't have to change yourself and at the same time I know to be taken seriously in

this society I'm likely going to have to give a little bit of myself to feel, you know, taken seriously

Similarly, Larissa stated:

You have to conform a lot. Personally, I don't think you should, but I just feel in these settings you sometimes, you might have to. It's sad to say because you shouldn't, you should be able to show up as your authentic self. The environments that we're placed into, it doesn't give you that space to show up as your authentic self. Lacking the support and everything else contributes to you conforming. These are conversations that I've had with other minoritized students in our program from the past, from other cohorts talking about assimilation. Some students will assimilate into a dominant culture, do what they see being done. For me, that was something that I went back and forth within my first year. I was just like, I'm not going to change who I am to meet this idea of who they think I or who they want me to be. I definitely think that plays a huge part and students sometimes do have to conform because it can be—I'm trying to think of the word. (it) can just be a very hostile environment depending on where you are if you're not conforming to how they're expecting you to be.

Kai expressed this need to conform and this constant awareness of how one is being perceived.

It's a lot that we have to conform to...it can just be the simplest thing, but when you see yourself in a classroom for white individuals or people who don't look you, it's really hard to truly be authentic in yourself or even to speak up and to want to have authentic conversations with those individuals. It's either you're in a position where you don't want to speak or you're forced to make your airfare fit the room and make everyone else feel comfortable to a perspective from a standpoint.

She expands on how this feeling expands to the school setting as well:

constantly having to even conform or minimize yourself even a little bit in those settings because you don't want to come off. For me, I didn't want to come off as "too Black", or, "too urban", especially given that I'm serving in a rural community.

It's very much so of like me being always mindful of myself and my surroundings and how my attitude or mannerisms may affect those around me, given that I'm mostly surrounded by white people in a rural community. A lot of times there's a lot of putting on that mask or code switching to fit the norms of my environment.

Brandy presented a slightly different perspective based on her position and positive relationships in her program, a level of comfort to be her authentic self:

I feel like they know who I am. I'm able to run a meeting, and I don't feel bad that I have locs in my program. I can run a meeting in my SPSA hoodie and tell jokes and still have my personality and let that shine through and not think that a professor or a higher up is going to be like, "Wow, this person is unkept or not professional or not deserving of her leadership position."

Unfortunately, this comfort does not extend beyond her program. Preparing for internship brought back the sense of concern other participants have shared in regard to professional expectations:

I was honestly scared because I just finished my interviews for internship. I had my hair up, but I had a tattoo on my hands. I was like, "Should I put concealer on it?" You don't know how different people are going to perceive you just because my program directors are like, "Yes, we love (Brandy) either way." It doesn't mean somebody else is going to

be like, "Well, we've got a lot of affluent families. We don't want this person there." I think about it outside of my school professionally, but not in my program. For Brandy her program is a safe space for her to be her authentic self; however, the professional world outside of that has not proven to be so.

White Privilege and White Fragility

Talk of privilege can instigate a sense of defensiveness in many of us. Having racial privilege does not mean one simply has not encountered any challenges in one's life, and it surely does not mean that an individual does not deserve their accomplishments they've worked hard for. There is a nuance to these conversations, but when individuals get stuck in defensiveness, conversations go nowhere. Jocelyn provided a very insightful description on the topic of privilege:

It is really easy for you to believe that privilege is a myth because you don't see yourself moving through the world as having all of these extra bonuses you think that you work hard and you get what you deserve, but privilege isn't having bonuses. Privilege is the lack of barriers. If you don't have barriers that other people have in different facets of life, then it's very, very easy for you to miss that difference between you and the other person because you're lacking barriers, you don't have something extra to look at. It's rather the absence of something. How do you miss the absence of something that you didn't really ever know potentially?

The issue with defensiveness regarding privilege acknowledgment is that when individuals respond with defensiveness it makes it difficult to raise relevant ideas, particularly of race and racism. White fragility has individuals spending time and energy making sure people's feeling

are not getting hurt, or navigating around defensive people rather than utilizing those resources to address the root issue. White folks often spend more time defending themselves against the charges of racism rather than addressing racism itself by becoming defensive when confronted with discussion of racism. Sophie shared how navigating the feelings of others keeps them from fully sharing their beliefs:

I still feel I don't want to completely share everything about my beliefs and views and concerns, because it might be too much flooding for her (Sophie's advisor) at once in a way. I'm constantly concerned about the way these other people around me, especially white colleagues, will perceive me and my beliefs and part of it is because I don't want to make them feel dumb, or make them feel they're just really not getting it or feel bad while they're still learning. Then I'm constantly still putting their feelings and stuff at the forefront of what could be justice for the people of color within my class or the clients that will eventually be seeing or whatnot.

It is a privilege to be able to see discussions of race and racism as a non-priority. Aaliyah explains how navigating these conversations is difficult when people do not want to talk about them:

It's hard definitely. With my family, I feel that that's easy because we're all the same. We're all from the family, so we understand what obstacles we would face just being a different skin tone than the rest. With some friends, it's been hard, definitely. A lot of people don't want to talk about it, they don't want to admit that there's a problem in society. Because of that, nothing really ever changes, which is hard because to fix the problem, you have to first acknowledge that it's there. A lot of people, I've tried to talk to

about it friends or past friends, past colleagues, they just don't want to. Then, those are usually people who are not minoritized, so white people.

Interactions with Faculty

Interactions with faculty members play a large role in the graduate school experience, as faculty plays a powerful role in graduate student socialization (Adler & Adler, 2005; Austin, 2002; Barnes & Austin, 2009; Bryan et al., 2012; Gardner, 2007). Faculty has the power and authority to convey what is important to a program both covertly and overtly. Due to the power faculty members hold they should be cognizant that it is their responsibility to foster inclusive environments and work actively to support and advocate for minoritized students, this allows minoritized students to feel like their program or field is a good fit for them (Perez, Robbins, Harris, & Montgomery, 2020). Conversely when minoritized students receive messages from faculty that their identities do not matter, or if they were the target of microaggressions, they tend to doubt their place in the institution (Gildersleeve et al., 2011). Faculty holds power over their students' success and must be cognizant of any biases they have, implicit or explicit, as they navigate supporting students through their time in the program. When discussing faculty interactions Elizabeth shared:

I noticed certain faculty will only want to work with certain kinds of students on side projects, on research, or include them in knowing how to go about writing papers and stuff. They may not make that same effort towards other students, not to say they have an interest or not to have an interest. I don't think that's for them to decide who they should bring on board on to wanting to do research. It should be up to the student to decide whether they want to be involved or not. It's really interesting when certain faculty come to certain students for opportunities, but maybe not for others.

These decisions and biases faculty have do not just impact their students on an interpersonal level but impact the success and outcomes of the graduate students they serve. Elizabeth expanded:

I think that comes down to the assumptions of I don't know, work ethics or may be assumptions of interests, but wherever that lies, it's interesting that that's how it's expressed as far as opportunities. Who are they going to give an opportunity to publish a paper with? Who are they going to give an opportunity to-- all those things. As well as faculty are empowered to nominate students for awards, recognition, so that comes down to a little bit of favoritism in some ways that I think that ultimately they need to reflect on. Is it based off of merit? Are they nominating students based off of merit? Are they doing it performatively because they know they're representative of a culture that they want to show diversity, what are their rationale in selecting students for certain opportunities and recognition, and things like that too?

For students who don't make those close connections with an advisor or a faculty member there becomes the "culture of silence" where one is trying to navigate their program, find their interest, reach their goals, this involves asking the right people the right questions. However, some student's do not know what to ask. Jocelyn speaks on having to ask around to figure out who was doing work she was interested in:

It feels like if I hadn't asked that question, then I would have never known, and I would have never been aware that she was doing that work. I think that it would be really helpful to have a little bit more transparency in general and a little bit more-- I think it's a lot of people's experience in these types of programs that they don't know what they don't know, and what's out there, and what's possible outside of their own labs. I don't know

how to fix that, I don't even know what my recommendation is, but I think that that should be different.

Jocelyn expands to speak on the lack of transparency from her professors, and how appreciated it is when professors, such as her statistics professor, are transparent about their educational trajectory:

I also have a comment about transparency, faculty being transparent with us, because I just had a stats professor talked to us about literally the trajectory from their freshman year of college to where they are now, and be very much like, I was afraid of going into academia because I wanted a family. I was like I didn't think that was something that you can effectively do, but I can because of these factors, my partner takes on a lot as well and that enables me to do this work. If you want to be in academia and you're afraid of work-life balance, there isn't balance, but it's doable if it's what you want, and I'm happy to talk to you about that. I'm like why? I just realized that all the other professors didn't do that, how come they didn't do that? Because you don't really know what the heck you're getting yourself into. It's like they put you on this path of when you graduate, you should try to be a professor, but what does that really mean? How much money do you really make? How do you negotiate that? What are the perks, what are the cons professionally and personally? All of that. I think that's really obscure and I think we're also focused on getting through our classes and getting through our work that we don't realize that there's all of this lack of information, but it's there.

When it comes to these interactions, relatedness, trust, and transparency plays a large role in how connections are made, and whether racial/ethnic minoritized individuals feel a sense of support or connectedness to their program and graduate experience.

Question Three: What anti-racist practices do racially minoritized school psychology graduate students recognize as supports in their graduate programs?

Three themes were identified as perceived supports among participants: (1) representation in faculty and peers, (2) Creating spaces, (3) faculty support and disclosure.

Representation in Faculty and Peers

Several participants spoke on having diverse representation across faculty members and peers as a source of strength in their program. Participants shared a greater sense of trust, and willingness to share their lived experiences with faculty members from minoritized backgrounds. Additionally, several participants mentioned racial and ethnic minoritized faculty members to be a great resource and advocates for work based in equity and diversity, areas most programs discussed were lacking in. Brandy spoke on how in her program there's not just diverse representation across faculty, but also how these faculty members from racially minoritized groups facilitate active discussions and research on disparities, culture, and advocacy:

Our faculty, I think their own professional dispositions are very culturally aware. We have an Asian faculty member, and all of his research is with regard to cultural considerations, cultural disparities, and those kinds of things. It's great because you can see how that shines through in everything he does. Then we also have faculty that are from minority groups, and so they'll discuss how we can advocate for students, and how culture impacts, and those kinds of things.

Elizabeth spoke on how she appreciated an Asian American faculty member who reached out and had a conversation with her about their thoughts and experiences after the increase of AAPI hate in 2020. This faculty member continued to send her resources and check in after their discussion, Elizabeth spoke on this and compared their response to that of another faculty member also reached out to show support, but not to the same extent:

Faculty have reached out to me and talked to me, asked me if there's anything that I need. They've expressed their support, but it's very interesting. There's variation in that. I didn't know that someone saying, "I'm here for you," can sound so differently from different individuals. For one, coming from a faculty who is of Asian American identity, comes to me and we had a very long conversation about our experiences and where we're at, what are we thinking, what's on our mind? It's like a judgment-free zone, but when we have a white male faculty asking me how am I doing and, "I'm here for you." More or less, I know the intentions are to be a mentor, a supporter, but the conversation stopped after...I'm not getting a conversation from this individual where I feel like, "If you're truly expressing this ally or support, then would you want to have a conversation, and either we educate one another on where we are?" It just stopped at like, "Oh, I'm here to support," and that's it. Then that's the end of it.

While her white faculty member may have been well intentioned there was a disconnect in their approach and Elizabeth perceived their offer of support to be disingenuous. Having these deeper conversations with faculty members requires a level of disclosure and vulnerability, and many participants expressed this only being a possibility when they perceived a faculty member as a source of trust. Racially and ethnically minoritized students, specifically female identifying students, tend to seek out minoritized and/or female faculty who they believe will understand and

appreciate their identity and academic and personal struggles (Crawford & Smith, 2005; Few, Stephens, & Rouse-Arnett, 2003).

In regard to recruitment efforts and representation among peers, Sophie mentions an appreciation in her programs efforts to recruit more diverse individuals, a big shift from her own experience when going through the interview process:

I know that they changed the recruitment practices a lot because I was shocked at interview day when I saw like maybe 5 white people in the room and the rest were Brown and Black folks, Indigenous folks, I was so shocked. I was like I've never seen this before, but they changed their recruitment practices a lot to ensure that we could have a more diverse sampling of candidates, which I was actually extremely impressed by 'cause that was my biggest gripe with the whole interview process of school psych doctoral processes, every interview I had gone to I was pretty much the only person of color in the room, which was very frustrating to me.

Several participants discussed an appreciation for increased representation of diverse peers and were happy to acknowledge their programs efforts in recruitment.

Creating Spaces

In their framework for Critical School Psychology, Sabnis & Proctor (2021) note the importance of creating new spaces in the field. The importance of conversations, confronting oppressive structures, creating community and safe spaces for minoritized individuals, creating educational spaces that increase understanding of social justice and oppression, and creating spaces amplifying the voices of minoritized individuals were common across interviews. Often being in environments which were perceived as being safe with well-intentioned peers and

faculty was a great facilitator for participants to share their beliefs, their values, their concerns, and lived experiences. Sophie shared:

I think in general I can see where people have good intentions, and I think it's in those moments where you can tell that they're just so well-intended that I feel like, "Okay, you're not actually being ignorant about this issue. You're wanting to learn more."

Yesterday in class I could tell that that's how the space was opening up about discussion so then I felt comfortable sharing an experience I had.

Participants appreciate these safe spaces of discussion and community, though they provide considerations for programs when facilitating these spaces. Sophie spoke on how limiting social justice work to faculty meetings is quite the opposite of facilitating space for minoritized groups:

When the majority of our faculty are white in a program, and they're the ones leading discussions about this, I don't know how fruitful, or how much change can really be made from that. They're not really inviting in the perspectives of Black, Brown, Indigenous people, the people who are typically affected. I cannot think of any other meaningful change really that's come from that other than maybe the fact that people are individually learning on their own.

Faculty can play a key role in facilitating discussions on social justice and equity, and considering power differentials they should prioritize doing so, though there is a balance of not speaking over the voices of minoritized groups. Aaliyah shared that although she believes generally those in the psychology field are more open to having these discussions, there still needs to be a facilitator to prompt them to have these important conversations:

It's hard because it's mostly the faculty. In that class, she's like, "Well, what do you guys

think about this topic relating to maybe the over-representation of black students in special education?" That opens up the conversation for everyone, but I feel like we wouldn't talk about it ourselves if that makes sense. There needs to be a facilitator that actually presents the question and then we respond. I feel like together, the cohort, just us wouldn't really talk about those kinds of things.

The facilitation of these conversations is appreciated and participants acknowledge their programs efforts, though there is still work to be done. Sophie shared her programs efforts to create space:

I think there's an effort there. Typically, what we do at the beginning of a new course is we'll establish ground rules for how we talk to each other and discuss with each other, and how we respond to people's personal narratives and stuff. I think that's been a really great thing, because just establishing ground rules and having reminders throughout the course makes it feel a safer space place to discuss. I think that's appreciated just it's sometimes doesn't always pan out that way. There can be a lot of microaggressions within conversation that people don't even realize and that isn't a part of the ground rules. Really get slipped under the rug and stuff. I think there's an effort there at least to not, but aside from that, I can't really think of other things that we do to help establish that space.

Christina spoke on how there is a lack of training and knowledge on how to facilitate these spaces:

there is still a lot of work to be done with creating more authentic and comfortable spaces for students of all backgrounds to talk about minority issues or racial inequality, injustices and all those different things. Right now, it's not there from my perspective. Sometimes when I'm in classrooms and having those experience, I often feel

conversations about race or just injustice or social justice is typically left towards the end, because the topics make people so uncomfortable. There isn't a lot of training about how to facilitate those conversations.

These spaces expand beyond educational spaces in our coursework, Elizabeth shared her appreciation of resources she received from her mentor after the increase of Asian American Pacific Islander (AAPI) hate during the COVID-19 pandemic:

Creating spaces, I think that's the keyword that you're saying, and I really resonate with that because I realized all those resources that my mentor pretty much sent to me, were spaces I can go to. Whether or not I do or not, but that's my decision, and when I'm ready, but that's leaving the power to me, making those decisions for myself and for my own sake. Every student (that) may be from a minoritized background would feel safer in that way knowing there's a space to go, but not forced to, or encouraged to, but just knowing and having that power in their decision-making I think is important. Because it wasn't pushy, but it wasn't knowing that I had to talk about it or I didn't want to talk about it, but that was really important having a space. That space needs to be created, not by myself though. That's the thing.

Faculty Support and Disclosure

Appreciation of faculty is not limited to minoritized faculty members, participants additionally showed an appreciation of faculty members who were receptive to their input and perspectives. Jocelyn shared her professor's response when she brought up her concerns about how her program was not supporting student needs:

(I told her)"I want to draft a letter with them so that we can collectively ask for the accommodations that we all feel that we deserve and the ways that we feel that the

courses aren't meeting our needs. Especially in the pandemic and how ableist it is and everything like that and how much it goes against the mission of the class. She totally supported it. She literally told me, "I want you to not feel like your degree is on the line or anything like that. I think that it's really great that you're advocating for yourself. This is practice for getting out into the world, and there's going to be people disagreeing on important things that you stand for and just use this as practice for that, and I have your back."

Jocelyn appreciated that support, especially considering she was unaware of what her response would be going into the situation.

Several participants spoke on how discussion about their identity and experiences requires a level of vulnerability, a level of vulnerability they often do not see from their professors leading to a level of distrust. As such faculty disclosure was appreciated by many participants. Brandy described an appreciation of her professor's disclosure:

On a personal note, some of our faculty members have disclosed things like that with us, which I think makes us feel more comfortable with our faculty members in meetings and stuff. We've been like, "Yes, well, I'm a Black woman and I'm bisexual or something." They've been like, "Well, I'm this and I'm also that." I'm like, "Wow." Sometimes faculty members are like, "I won't even tell you my political affiliation." You're comfortable enough with us as your students to disclose your sexual orientation or your relationships with your family with regard to some of these issues. It makes it feel nicer and more comfortable.

Kai discussed how having a supervisor who was open, honest, and willing to have deep conversations with them was valuable:

I've had one supervisor specifically who I really resonated with. We always had conversations about whether it'd be about diversity, just like in terms of race, low income, SES, what that looks like taking into consideration the different identities of the students that we work with. We spent a lot of our time, either sharing our personal experience, biases, and beliefs and how that is implemented or affected when we work with students or how it got some of the perspectives and things that we take. To me, that was the first time I really felt like I'm being heard or I'm really having a true, I think the conversations about these things, not only just in terms of personal experience, but how those personal values and beliefs are put into play when that personally worked with students or why I choose to do certain curriculums and things of that nature.

While there are some faculty members, and students, who view the student-faculty relationship as strictly professional, graduate education can be an extended process and interpersonal issues and feelings inevitably arise along the way, forming a substantial part of these relationships. It may at times be necessary for institutions to reflect on their true ideals and values and consider if they are meeting the needs of students.

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

Summary of Findings

The purpose of this research was to empower the voices of racially and ethnically minoritized school psychology graduate students, to discover the ways in which racially/ethnically minoritized school psychology students experience their socialization process into the field, to critique and expose oppressive structures in place in their programs, and to identify antiracist practices that minoritized graduate students view as supports. In this chapter I will provide some discussion on the overarching themes presented in chapter four. This will be organized by research questions and I will make connections to relevant literature and my theoretical framework, CRT. Next, I will discuss study limitations and areas for future/continued research. Based on the discoveries made through this research process I will provide implications for practice. Finally, I will follow up with concluding thoughts.

Question One: How do racially minoritized school psychology graduate students describe their graduate school socialization process?

When describing their graduate school socialization process, three themes emerged across participant interviews: (1) isolation and community, (2) educational labor and the role of the spokesperson, and (3) the emotional labor of being a minoritized student. While NASP has made calls for the recruitment of more racially minoritized students and faculty in school psychology graduate programs (NASP, 2010a; 2016; 2017), the field and graduate programs are still predominately white. When navigating the graduate education process, participants seek out an outlet, and a relationship with a faculty or peer member that understands their lived

experiences. Often this outlet can be found in a peer or faculty member from a minoritized group or with a similar lived experience. Unfortunately, without this outlet racially minoritized school psychology graduate students can experience a sense of isolation and alienation from their programs. Reports of alienation and isolation are especially concerning considering how these factors are contributors to program attrition (Proctor & Truscott, 2012). Fortunately, one participant, Brandy was able to foster positive relationships with peers and faculty which contributed to her being able to express her authentic self though out her program, which she cites as a resiliency factor and contributor to her success.

Beyond the sense of isolation, the lack of representation in programs often leads to additional emotional and educational labor required of racially minoritized graduate students as racially minoritized individuals often feel like the “representative” of their minoritized group and feel the need to be a “spokesperson” and advocate on their behalf. This is an added stressor to carry on top of general graduate school stress and expectations. Particularly for social justice and equity minded folk, who want to be leaders and make change in the field but come to learn that their learning environment is just facilitating continued oppression. It takes energy to speak out and participants have felt varying level of support to bringing up important and relevant content to class discussion.

By design institutions of higher education were produced historically by several racist processes (Feagin, 2006; Moore, 2008). First U.S. institutions historically excluded racial and ethnic minoritized individuals. White powers then constructed white centered logic that organized institutional norms and values (Bonilla-Silva & Baiocchi, 2008). These contributions resulted in a frame that explicitly and implicitly enforce institutional white power, privilege, and wealth. Finally, institutions relied on liberal ideologies which claimed neutrality, impartiality,

and objectivity as principal in the construction of rules, practices, and ideologies of the institutions (Bonilla-Silva 1997; Bonilla-Silva & Baiocchi 2008). Modern day institutions are characterized by an ideological frame based upon color-blind racism, the hierarchical racialized structure, practice, and ideology of white privilege and power get obscured through assertions of abstract liberalism and notions of equality, equality of opportunity and meritocracy for example, and the minimization of racist activities and practices (Bonilla-Silva 2010; Pierce 2003, 2012). To engage in white institutions racially and ethnically minoritized individuals are required to engage in emotional labor and management of their emotions, navigating the contradiction between their racialized experiences in these institutions, and the dominant narrative that minimizes and delegitimizes their experiences. Jocelyn's statement of having a bias towards engaging with minoritized students exemplifies this contradiction as she states there to be a promise of not being "gaslit," that is not having your perception of reality challenged in an institution which chooses to delegitimize the permanence of racism within the institution.

Minoritized school psychology students do not navigate their programs sans resistance to these instances of racism (Bonilla-Silva & Baiocchi, 2008), when participants create the oppositional space to challenge institutional practices or curriculum, or to advocate for themselves, they are being resistant to these everyday instances of racism. However, the way in which minoritized students respond to their own marginalization does impact how they are perceived in their program. If one responds to these instances with normal human emotions, anger, frustration, sadness, they confirm the white racial framing of themselves as overly emotional or emotionally "deviant" (Evans, 2013; Thoits, 2004; Wingfield 2010, 2013). If racially and ethnically minoritized students manage to hide their emotions they "unwittingly reproduce their subordinate position in the hierarchy" (Pierce p. 3, 1996). These choices in

response have greater implications for one's program success and inclusion as will be discussed further below.

Question Two: How do school psychology graduate programs perpetuate oppressive structures through their professional socialization process?

The permanence of racism in the United States works in direct contradiction of the meritocratic ideology of the American dream. The historical and political context of the United States has facilitated a hierarchy of power that systematically and disproportionately negatively impacts racially and ethnically minoritized individuals. The persistent bias, oppression, and marginalization of minoritized students results in educational outcomes that reinforce these existing disparities based on race, class, disability, and gender (Proctor, 2016). Higher education is an institution which upholds white supremacy and racial hierarchical structures. There are calls across fields for increased diversity and inclusion, but this is all statements and lip service when the work is not being done to support the advancement of equity and the dismantling of systematic barriers. Often increased diversity into historically exclusively white places are signaled as evidence of race neutrality and equality, however this inclusion often occurs without meaningful institutional change in terms of racist dynamics of power. Racialized practices and ideologies in turn become implicit (Bell 1987; Carmichael and Hamilton 1977; Crenshaw 1988; Ferguson 2012; Mills 1999). Racist hierarchical structures allocate privileges to white individuals and works to "other" racially minoritized individuals (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004).

Interviews provided insight into programs professional expectations, the culture of silence related to untaught norms, participants perceptions for the need to conform, code-switch, and the cloaking of one's authentic self. Racially minoritized individuals navigating white institutional spaces carry the burden between participating in their degradation and

minoritization within these institutions -- or actively countering and objecting against racial and power dynamics at the risk of institutional alienation and possible exclusion (Pierce 2003, 2012). During interviews Participants of this work often referred to the need to “conform,” “code-switch,” and hide aspects of their “authentic” selves to fulfill the professional expectations of their programs. Due to the culture of higher education, participants are compelled to alter themselves to fit into the stereotypical characteristics among those in power who establish the norms. Racially and ethnically minoritized students must acclimate to the dominant culture or face racial conflict, such as microaggressions which are associated with emotional labor, or risk the consequences of resistance to the dominant ideology. Larissa stating that it can be an “hostile” environment when one chooses not to conform, and Elizabeth stated that faculty has the power to choose to work with students based on preconceived notion on how they expect them to behave. As Sophie described there are layers to power dynamics, there is a hierarchy to socioeconomic status, to race, between graduate student and faculty member. While it is not uncommon for faculty to try to establish a level of comfortability with their students, no matter a faculty member’s personal philosophy or disposition, they inherently have much authority and power over their students. They have the power and ability to provide students with the much-needed resources and opportunities for success. Elizabeth discussed how faculty may have their own biases in how they allocate opportunities to students, this is concerning in a system built to reinforce whiteness.

Cheryl Harris (1993) introduced the concept of whiteness as property, which asserts that the “assumptions, privileges, and benefits” (p.1713) associated with identifying as white were valuable assets that white individuals sought to protect. Property includes the rights of ownership, use, transfer, disposition, and exclusion. Curriculum in higher education is

considered to be a form of “whiteness as property” as it has historically focused on white, western perspectives, and its accession offers benefits in the form of capital to the individual (Patton, McEwen, Rendón, & Howard-Hamilton, 2007). The field of school psychology’s curriculum is no different, with origins in racist theory, i.e. theory of genetic inferiority and the theory of cultural deprivation. The theory of genetic inferiority purported that minoritized youth were genetically inferior and this “genetic inferiority” was the explanation for why they did not perform well in school (Gould, 1996; Guthrie, 2004). Thus, minoritized students were tested and sorted into special programs or excluded from schools all together (Johnson, 1962). This sorting process, largely shaped by intellectual quotient (IQ) testing, was largely allocated to the role of school psychologists. Later the theory of cultural deprivation emerged, “blaming culture instead of blaming genes” (Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis, 1992, p.479). Under this theory minoritized students did not have adequate exposure to Euro-American values and customs, and were considered culturally deprived (Parham, Ajamu, & White, 2011). This established white European American values as the universal norm and encouraged attempts to indoctrinate minoritized groups into white middle-class values and morals. While these theories are not as predominant in the field today, we can see the continued impacts of them to this day.

While school psychology professional associations have established guidelines and standards to emphasize “cultural competency” and equitable practice, participants described limited coursework and curriculum in considerations of diversity. This training was often limited to one course, and a single lecture in other foundational courses. Participants additionally criticized the content within these specified courses or lectures, as they were largely multicultural curriculum, and very introductory in nature. Sophie criticized multiculturalism as it was far less progressive than anti-racism, and even contributed to racists ideology in its subtle othering and

descriptions of minoritized groups. Multicultural education has been criticized as a way to appease racial and ethnic minoritized individuals, while simultaneously assuring the “safety” of whites by making the least possible change in education (McCarthy, 1988). Larissa criticized the limited knowledge in her multicultural course as being introductory in nature, stating that this was especially concerning considering this would be the extent of training her white peers would get before going into practice to serve a diverse population.

Institutions of higher education additionally contribute to the maintenance of racism through systemic barriers (Amiot, Mayer-Glenn, & Parker, 2020; Clark, Mercer, Hill & Dufrene, 2012; Grapin & Pereiras, 2019; Norcross, Kohout, & Wicherski, 2005). Institutions of higher education are one example of the many hierarchical institutions that have historically excluded racially and ethnically minoritized individuals prior to legal changes enacted during the civil rights era. While no longer explicit in their exclusion these institutions maintain the institutional boundaries of white power and privilege despite the increased representation of racially minoritized individuals. Consistent with prior research the participants of this study shared barriers to their graduate school experience from application to enrollment including but not limited to financial concerns, experiencing microaggressions, lack of faculty support, lack of relatedness with peers (Grapin & Pereiras, 2019; Norcross, Kohout, & Wicherski, 2005; Sue, Capodilupo, & Holder, 2008; Clark et al., 2012; Proctor & Truscott, 2012). When graduate programs position minoritized students as important during recruitment and admissions, but not once they are enrolled, this leaves minoritized individuals feeling marginalized and tokenized (Gildersleeve et al., 2011; Noy & Ray, 2012).

Several participants spoke on white fragility, a response exhibited by faculty and peers in their programs. Like many other tactics, this practice invalidates and minimizes the existence of

racism and the experiences of racially and ethnically minoritized individuals. However, white fragility can work on a more individual level, and this means that individuals at the program level do have the agency to address these behaviors, much like one can address microaggressions.

Several participants spoke on the recency in social justice and antiracists in their programs, describing the reactive nature of their programs after the national outrage following the murder of George Floyd and the resurgence and peaked interest of the Black Lives Matter movement. Participants described programs increased diversity and social justice efforts which aligned with Bell's (1980) concept of interest convergence, which assert that the interest of racially minoritized people only advances when those interests "converge" with the interest of those in power. Historically white people have been willing to sacrifice racially minoritized individuals' well-being for economic self-interest and the continued subordination of racially minoritized individuals (Taylor, 2009). This becomes most evident when considering programs' lack of accommodations and supports for their racially minoritized students, increased recruitment and admission of diverse individuals allows programs to exhibit an image of equality and demonstrate and align with liberal ideologies consistent with U.S. society today. While popular these liberal ideologies do not offer the instrument nor structure for enacting the necessary societal change (Ladson-Billings, 1998).

Question Three: What anti-racist practices do racially minoritized school psychology graduate students recognize as supports in their graduate programs?

Based on participant's shared narratives three themes were identified as supports for racially minoritized students: (1) representation in faculty and peers, (2) creating spaces, and (3) faculty support and disclosure. Several participants cited an advisor or mentor they could turn to

for assistance in program navigation or to address individual concerns. Having at least one individual to guide one through the graduate process is a valuable point of support as past studies have found that students with access to mentors reported high academic achievement, retention, and program completion in higher education (Campbell & Campbell, 1997; Dixon-Reeves, 2003; Holland et al., 2012). While not every participant was able to find this resource within their program, having this resource even outside their program, was still cited as a valuable resource as Larissa shared “I reach out to them when I feel things are going crazy in my life and the program.” Aligning with prior research mentorship in higher education promotes resiliency and provides students with coping skills to navigate academia (Mondisa & McComb 2015; Summers & Hrabowski 2006).

The sentiment that having safe supportive spaces as beneficial to navigating one’s program was shared across participants. When students perceive their programs and academic institutions as safe places in which to learn and express themselves it contributes to their involvement and persistence (Engstrom & Tinto, 2008). Participants described the importance of their programs facilitating safe spaces for discussion. White institutions are framed within liberal ideologies of race neutrality, as participants noted there is a certain level of vulnerability required for them to share their beliefs and lived experiences, and they are less likely to do so if they will experience invalidation, microaggressions, or white fragility as a result. Additionally, in the case of Elizabeth, when discussing the creation of spaces this was not limited to educational spaces of discussion, but also in regard to spaces for community and support. Prior research demonstrates that minoritized graduate students may seek out support and opportunities to discuss equity and diversity through minoritized student organizations, these spaces help reduce feeling of isolation, allows them to connect with a community of supportive peers, allows for identity exploration,

and helps individuals cope with a lack of diversity and support in their own programs (Perez, Robbins, Harris, & Montgomery, 2020).

Limitations and Future Research

It is important to discuss these findings within the context of the study's limitations. One consideration is that the critical framework of this study was limited to critical race theory, incorporating extensions of CRT such as, Latina/o critical theory (LatCrit), disability critical race studies (DisCrit), or Asian critical (AsianCrit) theory as an analytical tool to compliment CRT may have provided another lens for interpreting the racialized and intersectional experiences of these minoritized groups. LatCrit examines experiences unique to the latiné community such as immigration status, language, ethnicity, and culture (Solorano & Delgado Bernal, 2001). DisCrit as a framework draws on the work of disability studies and CRT and considers the intersection of disability and other minoritized identities and how these intersecting identities can have a compounding adverse impact on individuals or groups (Annamma, Connor, & Ferri, 2013). AsianCrit aligns with CRT while bringing the unique racial history, stratification, and formation of Asians in the United States to the forefront. Offering an analytical lens to understand and critique how Asian Americans struggle with racism based on their distinct racialization relative to other racial groups. While all minoritized groups have faced a history of challenges associated with prejudice, discrimination, and or antagonism, based on their identity, or membership in a particular group, each individual group has dealt with unique experiences, challenges, and histories. Utilizing these additional theoretical frameworks would have provided more nuanced and fuller conceptualization of the participants identities and perspectives.

Additionally, the discoveries shared in this paper were discussed broadly as the experiences of racially minoritized school psychology graduate students. A deeper examination

of the shared experiences through an intersectional lens, examining both the positions of privilege and oppression individual's experience may have provided a more nuanced understanding of the participants experiences.

Future researchers seeking to enhance this area of study may seek to examine how participant perceptions change across differing context. All participants interviewed attended PWIs, interviewing racially minoritized students from HBCUs could enhance our understanding of the differing experiences of racially minoritized students navigating their graduate study. The experiences of students attending HBCUs may be unique due to the predominance of racially minoritized students and faculty in their programs.

While the focus of this work was to center the voices of racially minoritized students, faculty members play a vital role in the selection, support, and trajectory of graduate students. Future research exploring faculty experiences and perspectives working with racially minoritized groups should be explored. Understanding their perspectives and if there are any discrepancies or similarities in the perspectives between faculty and students is useful for change.

To truly understand the impact of school psychology program's socialization of their racially and ethnically minoritized individuals, further research should be done to explore how the socialization translates into practice, particularly for students who are critically orientated, and social justice focused. One may explore if the levels of conformity, decreased with time, or if one's advocacy or opposition to oppressive practices increased outside of their program setting.

Implications for Practice

The discoveries in this study provide a critical examination of the graduate socialization process of racially and ethnically minoritized students. This was done in an effort to create new

knowledge (Sabnis & Proctor, 2021) exploring how school psychology programs are complicit in the perpetuation of injustices and inequities in the field. Considering the field's goals toward social justice and antiracism there is much work to do to address the ways in which school psychology programs are contributing oppressive structures through their graduate school socialization process. Based on student interviews school psychology programs are largely neglecting social justice work. Many programs make generalized statements in syllabi and handbooks about diversity and social justice, yet still provide coursework and curriculum that is lacking in sufficient training on what it means to engage in social justice work, or even to have a sufficient understanding of working and engaging with diverse populations.

School psychology programs should work towards embedding a social justice lens through their curriculum, this includes a critical examination of the field. Based on a review of the literature Shriberg, Song, Miranda, and Radliff (2013) provides some guides on incorporating social justice in school psychology training: (1) engage in dialogue as to why it's important, (2) develop a mission statement/core training goal related to social justice, (3) embed meaningful experiences that make social justice practical and real, not just theoretical, (ex: service learning) (4) provide safe and supportive environments for eliciting dialogue, experiential and constructive. While there is an abundance of literature on social justice in the field of school psychology, there is a lack of theory to inform how to bring about justice through assessment, intervention, and practice (Kelly, Garbacz & Albers, 2020). Critical theories are the most reflective of a social justice approach to diversity and equity, as one of its main goals is to expose the ways in which psychology and psychologists help to maintain a social and culture status quo (Richardson & Fowers, 1997).

When employing these changes programs should make the effort to avoid liberal ideologies and take an identity conscious approach to supporting students through their time in their programs, this comprehensive approach is crucial to supporting student success. Programs must consider the additional barriers racially and ethnically minoritized individuals face such as financial concerns and experiencing microaggressions. Programs should be prioritizing minoritized school psychology graduate students when allocating program funding opportunities, this is crucial given that the racial wealth gap between white people and people from minoritized backgrounds has continued to increase overtime (McKernan, Quakenbush, Ratcliffe, Kalish, & Steuerle, 2017). Additionally, programs should provide education of microaggressions and their negative impact on racially minoritized individuals (Proctor et al., 2016).

When considering practices participants identified as supports within their graduate programs several participants cited the diverse representation in peers in faculty. NASP has made calls to recruit racially minoritized students and racially minoritized faculty members (NASP, 2010a; 2016; 2017). This should be a continued effort considering peer support is beneficial to racially minoritized students who often suffer from social isolation and feelings of loneliness in higher education (Ancis, Sedlacek, & Mohr, 2000; Bernard, Lige, Willis, Sosoo, & Neblett, 2017). Additionally, participants cited white faculty and peers who are “making an effort,” as a source of appreciation and support, though this does require work on behalf of those with white privilege to educate themselves on ways to serve as allies and to create safe and understanding learning environments for all students (Gusa, 2010; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). To reiterate one of Larissa’s points “I just feel like the support goes beyond getting us here and getting us funding and getting us through. It’s getting us through where we’re not exhausted mentally,

physically, and emotionally when we cross that finish line. You should be supporting us and trying to understand where we're coming from.”

An important source of support cited across participants was the facilitation of spaces. Sabnis and Proctor (2021) provide a framework of the various critical spaces that can assist the field in challenging and dismantling oppressive structures. There are four differing spaces that may be created. An oppositional space is created when an individual calls out a practice or event within an organization that is sustaining oppression. Several participants spoke on taking on this oppositional role when advocating for minoritized groups, with varying results, sometimes faced with invalidation, at times face with support. Though more concerning was the lack of white peers engaging in oppositional space without prompt. School psychology programs have offered social justice and antiracists statements but are not providing the training necessary for future school psychologists to engage in this leadership and advocacy. The second space described by Sabnis and Proctor (2021) is a counterspace, which is defined by a space that provides a moment of relief, laughter and strengths to members of minoritized group that enter it. Elizabeth mentioned her appreciation a faculty member providing her with resources to connect with other AAPI students when the anti-Asian American hate increased during the COVID-19 pandemic. She appreciated the gesture and the community this provided after feeling isolated in her program as the only student in her cohort identifying with the AAPI community. These resources helped counter some of that isolation. The third space described is an educational space are intended to increase individuals fundamental understanding of social justice. Creating these educational spaces in programs, and involving all students, would address the concerns voiced by several participants that their peers tended to not prioritize social justice or even diversity considerations till necessary. This noninterest and non-acknowledgement is a privilege future

practitioners, of majority identities, can partake in and is a disservice not to address when considering the increasing diverse population of the United States. The final space described is critical amplifying spaces, in which critical anti-oppressive perspectives from minoritized communities are intentionally amplified to an audience traditionally more privileged than the minoritized speakers. This is of particular importance in the ideological framework of higher education which traditionally delegitimizes the experiences of minoritized individuals.

Racial and ethnic minoritized individuals would benefit from faculty support while navigating their program. There is prior research to suggest that some faculty members may view certain students as more worthy of advisor support than others (Wolf-Wendel & Ruel, 1999). As traditionally, white men have been dominantly represented in academia they tend to be viewed as the default and “ideal student” (Glazer-Raymo, 2001, 2008; Turner & Meyers, 2000).

Meanwhile, this rigid expectation of an ideal student in addition to other variables such as a lack of generational knowledge and systematic oppression have contributed to racially and ethnically minoritized graduate students’ difficulties navigating their programs. If programs claim to value diversity and inclusion, they need to prioritize supporting students who have been traditionally excluded from higher education.

Conclusions

Institutions claim they seek to diversify graduate programs, and in turn faculty and the workforce, though they engage in practices (e.g., admissions, inequitable mentoring) and create environments that negatively impact minoritized students (Gildersleeve, Croom, & Vasquez, 2011; Noy & Ray, 2012; Posselt, 2016). Employing critical theory to explore the way social sciences have contributed to systems of injustice and oppression (Peters, Lankshear, & Olssen, 2003) is a necessary step to deconstruct white institutions of higher education which have framed

themselves within liberal ideologies of meritocracy and fairness. Aligned with the 2020 *School Psychology Unified Anti-Racism Statement and Call to Action* this project has created new knowledge (Sabnis & Proctor, 2021), and centered the voices of racially and ethnically minoritized school psychology graduate students, creating a counternarrative to the majority narrative of school psychology graduate school experience. It is now imperative for school psychology graduate programs to make a true commitment to social justice, move pass generalized statements of support and act.

REFERENCES

- Adler, P. A., & Adler, P. (2005). The identity career of the graduate student: Professional socialization to academic sociology. *The American Sociologist*, 36, 11–27.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s12108-005-1002-4>
- Alvesson, M. (2003) ‘Beyond neopositivists, romantics, and localists: Reflexive approach to interviews in organizational research. *Academy of Management Review*, 28(1): 13–33.
- American Psychological Association. (2010). Commission on Accreditation 2010 annual report: Summary data for doctoral programs. Retrieved May 15, 2020, from
<http://www.apa.org/ed/accreditation/about/research/2010-doctoral-summary.pdf>
- Amiot, M., Mayer-Glenn, J., & Parker, L. (2020). Applied critical race theory: educational leadership actions for student equity. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 2, 200.
- Ancis, J. R., Sedlacek, W. E., & Mohr, J. J. (2000). Student perceptions of campus cultural climate by race. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 78, 180 –185.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.2000.tb02576.x>
- Annamma, S. A., Connor, D., & Ferri, B. (2013). Dis/ability critical race studies (DisCrit): Theorizing at the intersections of race and dis/ability. *Race and Ethnicity and Educationza*, 16, 1–31.
- Austin, A. E. (2002). Preparing the next generation of faculty: Graduate school as socialization to the academic career. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73, 94 –122.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2002.11777132>

- Austin, A. E., & McDaniels, M. (2006). Preparing the professoriate of the future: Graduate student socialization for faculty roles. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. XXI, pp. 397–456). Amsterdam, the Netherlands: Springer.
[http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1007/1-4020-4512-3_8](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/1-4020-4512-3_8)
- Baker, R. B. (2019). Finding the fat: The relative impact of budget fluctuations on African American schools. *Explorations in Economic History*, 72, 93–113.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eeh.2018.11.002>
- Barnes, B. J., & Austin, A. E. (2009). The role of doctoral advisors: A look at advising from the advisor's perspective. *Innovative Higher Education*, 33, 297–315.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10755-008-9084-x>
- Bartlett, L., & Brayboy, B. M. J. (2005). Race and schooling: Theories and ethnographies. *The Urban Review*, 37(5), 361–374
- Behring, S. T., Cabello, B., Kushida, D., & Murguia, A. (2000). Cultural modifications to current school-based consultation approaches reported by culturally diverse beginning consultants. *School Psychology Review*, (3). 354.
- Bell, D. A. (1980). Brown v. Board of Education and the interest-convergence dilemma. *Harvard Law Review*, 93(3), 518–533.
- Bell, Derrick. 1987. *And We Are Not Saved: The Elusive Quest for Racial Justice*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bellows, T. J. (2009), Meritocracy and the Singapore Political System, *Asian Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 17, No. 1, pp. 24-44.

- Blanchett, W. (2006). Disproportionate representation of African American students in special education: Acknowledging the role of White privilege and racism. *Educational Researcher*, 35(6), 24–28.
- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 1997. “Rethinking Racism: Toward a Structural Interpretation.” *American Sociological Review* 62(3):465–80.
- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2010. *Racism Without Racists, Color-Blind Racism, and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in the United States*. 3d ed. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo and Gianpaolo Baiocchi. 2008. “Anything But Racism: How Sociologists Limit The Significance of Race.” Pp. 137–52 in *White Logic, White Methods: Racism and Methodology*, edited by Tukufu Zuberi and Eduardo Bonilla-Silva. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Bor, J., Venkataramani, A. S., Williams, D. R., & Tsai, A. C. (2018). Police killings and their spillover effects on the mental health of black Americans: A population-based, quasi-experimental study. *Lancet*, 392, 302–310. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(18\)31130-9](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(18)31130-9)
- Braden, J., DiMarino-Linnen, E., & Good, T. (2001). Schools, society, and school psychologists: History and future directions. *Journal of School Psychology*, 39, 203–219.
- Brown, S. L., Shriberg, D., & Wang, A. (2007). Diversity research literature on the rise? A review of school psychology journals from 2000 to 2003. *Psychology in the Schools*, 44(6), 639-650.
- Bruss, K. V., & Kopala, M. (1993). Graduate school training in psychology: Its impact upon the development of professional identity. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training*, 30(4), 685.

- Bryan, M. L., Wilson, B. S., Lewis, A. A., & Willis, L. E. (2012). Exploring the impact of “race talk” in the education classroom: Doctoral student reflections. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 5, 123–137. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0029489>
- Campbell, T. A., & Campbell, D. E. (1997). Faculty/student mentor program: effects on academic performance and retention. *Research in Higher Education*, 38(6), 727–742.
- Carmichael, Stokely (Kwame Ture) and Charles V. Hamilton. 1977. *Black Power: The Politics of Liberation in America*. New York: Random House.
- Castilla, E. J., & Benard, S. (2010), The Paradox of Meritocracy in Organizations, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 55, No. 4, pp. 543-676.
- Castillo, J., Curtis, M., & Gelley, C. (2013). Gender and Race in School Psychology. *School Psychology Review*, 42(3), 262–279.
- Children’s Defense Fund (CDF). (2004). *The road to dropping out: Minority students & academic factors correlated with failure to complete high school*. Retrieved from: <http://www.childrensdefense.org/child-research-data-publications/data/education-dropping-out-facts-2004.pdf>
- Clark, C. R., Mercer, S. H., Zeigler-Hill, V., & Dufrene, B. A. (2012). Barriers to the success of ethnic minority students in school psychology graduate programs. *School Psychology Review*, 41(2), 176-192.
- Crawford, K., & Smith, D. (2005). The we and the us: Mentoring African American women. *Journal of Black Studies*, 36, 52–67.
- Crenshaw, Kimberle’ W. 1988. “Race, Reform, and Retrenchment: Transformation and Legitimation in Antidiscrimination Law.” *Harvard Law Review* 101(7):1331–87.

- DeCuir, J. T., & Dixson, A. D. (2004). "So when it comes out, they aren't that surprised that it is there": Using critical race theory as a tool of analysis of race and racism in education. *Educational Researcher*, 33(5), 26–31.
- Dixon-Reeves, R. (2003). Mentoring as a precursor to incorporation: An assessment of the mentoring experience of recently minted PhDs. *Journal of Black Studies*, 34, 12–27.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0021934703253680>
- Engstrom, C., & Tinto, V. (2008). Access without support is not opportunity. *Change: The magazine of higher learning*, 40(1), 46-50.
- Esquivel, G. B. (1985). Best practices in the assessment of limited English proficient and bilingual children. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology* (pp. 113–123). Washington, DC: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Evans, Louwanda. 2013. *Cabin Pressure: African American Pilots, Flight Attendants, and Emotional Labor*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Fagan, T. K., & Wise, P. S. (2007). *School psychology: Past, present, and future* (3rd Ed.). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Feagin, Joe R. 2006. *Systemic Racism: A Theory of Oppression*. New York: Routledge.
- Ferguson, Roderick A. 2012. *Aberrations in Black: Toward a Queer Color Critique*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Few, A. L., Stephens, D. P., & Rouse-Arnett, M. (2003). Sister-to-sister talk: Transcending boundaries and challenges in qualitative research with Black women. *Family Relations*, 52, 205–215.

- García-Vázquez, E., Reddy, L., Arora, P., Crepeau- Hobson, F., Fenning, P., Hatt, C., Hughes, T. Jimerson, S., Malone, C., Minke, K., Radliff, K., Raines, T., Song, S., & Vaillancourt Strobach, K. (2020). School Psychology Unified Anti- Racism Statement and Call to Action. *School Psychology Review*, 49(3), 209–211.
- Gardner, S. K. (2007). “I heard it through the grapevine”: Doctoral student socialization in chemistry and history. *Higher Education*, 54, 723–740. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10734-006-9020-x>
- Gasman, M., Hirschfield, A., & Vultaggio, J. (2008). “Difficult yet rewarding”: The experiences of African American graduate students. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 1(2), 126-138.
- Gildersleeve, R. E., Croom, N. N., & Vasquez, P. L. (2011). “Am I going crazy?!” A critical race analysis of doctoral education. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 44, 93–114. 10.1080/10665684.2011.539472
- Glazer-Raymo, J. (2001). Shattering the myths: Women in academe. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Glazer-Raymo, J. (Ed.). (2008). Unfinished agendas: New and continuing gender challenges in higher education. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Gould, S. J. (1996). The mismeasure of man. New York, NY: Norton.
- Grapin, S. L., Lee, E. T., & Jaafar, D. (2015). A Multilevel Framework for Recruiting and Supporting Graduate Students from Culturally Diverse Backgrounds in School Psychology Programs. *School Psychology International*, 36(4), 339–357.

- Grapin, S. L., & Pereiras, M. I. (2019). Supporting diverse students and faculty in higher education through multicultural organizational development. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, 13(4), 307–315.
<https://doi.org.ezproxy.lib.usf.edu/10.1037/tep0000226>
- Groulx, T. J. (2018). Influences of segregation and integration on the bands at historically Black high Schools in Duval County, Florida. *Journal of Historical Research in Music Education*, 40(1), 58.
<http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.lib.usf.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edo&AN=131976163&site=eds-live>
- Gusa, D. L. (2010). White institutional presence: The impact of Whiteness on campus climate. *Harvard Educational Review*, 80(4), 464-490.
- Guthrie, R. V. (2004). Even the rat was white: A historical view of psychology (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Harris, C. 1993. Whiteness as property. *Harvard Law Review* 106 (8): 1709–91
- Harry, B., & Klingner, J. (2006). *Why are so many minority students in special education? Understanding race and disability in schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Holland, J. M., Major, D. A., & Orvis, K. A. (2012). Understanding how peer mentoring and capitalization link STEM students to their majors. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 60(4), 343-354.
- Hopp, C., Mumford, V., & Williams, F. (2003). The role of mentoring for future academicians. In A. L. Green & L. V. Scott (Eds.), *Journey to the Ph.D.: How to navigate the process as African Americans* (pp. 255 – 269). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

- Ibarra, H. (1999). Professional selves: Experimenting with image and identity in professional adaptation. *Administrative Quarterly*, 44(4), 764–791.
- Imbroscio, D. (2016), Urban Policy as Meritocracy: A Critique, *Journal of Urban Affairs*, Vol. 38, No. 1, pp. 79-104.
- Jankov, P., & Caref, C. (2017). Segregation and inequality in Chicago Public Schools, transformed and intensified under corporate education reform. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 25(56).
<http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.lib.usf.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ1144439&site=eds-live>
- Johnson, G. O. (1962). Special education for the mentally handicapped: A paradox. *Exceptional Children*, 29, 62–69.
- Jones, K., & Okun, T. (2001). White supremacy culture. *Dismantling Racism: A Workbook for Social Change*.
- Kelly, Garbacz, S. A., & Albers, C. A. (2020). *Theories of School Psychology: Critical Perspectives*. Taylor and Francis. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351064941>
- Kaufman, A. S. (2000). Intelligence tests and school psychology: Predicting the future by studying the past. *Psychology in the Schools*, 37, 7–16.
- Ladson-Billings, G., and Tate, W. 1995. “Toward a Critical Race Theory of Education.” *Teachers College Record*. 97 (1): 47–68.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1998). Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a nice field like education? *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 11 (1), 7– 24.

- Liddell, D. L., Wilson, M. E., Pasquesi, K., Hirschy, A. S., & Boyle, K. M. (2014). Development of professional identity through socialization in graduate school. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 51(1), 69-84.
- Losen, D. & Skiba, R. (2010). *Suspended education: Urban middle schools in crisis*. Retrieved from: http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/k-12education/schooldiscipline/suspended-education-urban-middle-schools-in-crisis/Suspended-Education_FINAL-2
- Lott, B., & Rogers, M. (2011). Ethnicity matters for undergraduate majors in challenges, experiences, and perceptions of psychology. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 17, 204–210. doi:10.1037/a0023673.
- Love, B. J. (2004). Brown plus 50 counter-storytelling. A critical race theory analysis of the “majoritarian achievement gap” story. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 37, 227-246.
- Lynn, M., & Adams, M. (2002). Introductory overview to the special issue critical race theory and education: Recent developments in the field. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 35(2), 87-92.
- McCarthy, C. (1988). Rethinking liberal and radical perspectives on racial inequality in schooling: Making the case for nonsynchrony. *Harvard Educational Review*, 58(3), 265-280.
- McKernan, S., Quakenbush, C., Ratcliffe, C., Kalish, E., & Steuerle, C. (2017). Nine Charts about Wealth Inequality in America (Updated). <https://apps.urban.org/features/wealth-inequality-charts/>

- Miller, D. C. (2008). Appendix VII: School psychology training programs. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology V* (pp. 155–198). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Mills, Charles. 1999. *The Racial Contract*. Ithica, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Milner IV, H. R. (2007). Race, culture, and researcher positionality: Working through dangers seen, unseen, and unforeseen. *Educational researcher*, 36(7), 388-400.
- Mondisa J.-L., & McComb, S. A. (2015). Social community: A mechanism to explain the success of STEM minority mentoring programs. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 23:2, 149-163.
- Moore, Wendy. 2008. *Reproducing Racism: White Space, Elite Law Schools, and Racial Inequality*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield
- National Association of School Psychologists. (2010). *What is a school psychologist?* Retrieved from www.nasponline.org/about_sp/whatis.aspx
- Newell, M. (2010). The implementation of problem-solving consultation: An analysis of problem conceptualization in a multiracial context. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 20(2), 83-105.
- Norcross, J. C., Kohout, J. L., & Wicherski, M. (2005). Graduate study in psychology: 1971–2004. *American Psychologist*, 60, 959–975. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.60.9.959>
- Noy, S., & Ray, R. (2012). **Graduate students'** perceptions of their advisors: Is there systematic disadvantage in mentorship? *The Journal of Higher Education*, 83, 876–914.
10.1080/00221546.2012.11777273

- Parham, T. A., Ajamu, A., & White, J. L. (2011). *The psychology of blacks: Centering our perspectives in the African consciousness* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Parker, L., & Lynn, M. (2002). What's race got to do with it? Critical race theory's conflicts with and connections to qualitative research methodology and epistemology. *Qualitative inquiry*, 8(1), 7-22.
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How College Affects Students: A Third Decade of Research. Volume 2*. Jossey-Bass, An Imprint of Wiley. 10475 Crosspoint Blvd, Indianapolis, IN 46256.
- Patton, L. D., McEwen, M., Rendón, L., & Howard-Hamilton, M. F. (2007). Critical race perspectives on theory in student affairs. *New directions for student services*, 2007(120), 39-53.
- Pennebaker, J. W., Kiecolt-Glaser, J. K., & Glaser, R. (1988). Disclosure of traumas and immune function: health implications for psychotherapy. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*, 56(2), 239.
- Perez, R. J., Robbins, C. K., Harris Jr, L., & Montgomery, C. (2020). Exploring graduate students' socialization to equity, diversity, and inclusion. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 13(2), 133.
- Peters, M., Lankshear, C., & Olssen, M. (2003). Introduction: Critical theory and the human condition. *Counterpoints*, 168, 1–14.
- Pierce, Jennifer L. 1996. *Gender Trials: Emotional Lives in Contemporary Law Firms*. Berkeley: University of California Press
- Pierce, Jennifer L. 2003. "Racing for Innocence: Whiteness, Corporate Culture, and Backlash Against Affirmative Action." *Qualitative Sociology* 26(1): 53-70.

- Pierce, Jennifer L. 2012. "Racing for Innocence: Whiteness, Gender, and Backlash Against Affirmative Action." Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Poocharoen, O., & Brillantes, A. (2013), Meritocracy in Asia Pacific: Status, Issues, and Challenges, *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, Vol. 33, No. 2, pp. 140-163.
- Posselt, J. R. (2016). *Inside graduate admissions*. Harvard University Press.
- Proctor, S. L., & Truscott, S. D. (2012). Reasons for African American student attrition from school psychology programs. *Journal of School Psychology*, 50, 655– 679.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2012.06.002>
- Proctor, S. L., Kyle, J., Lau, C., Fefer, K., & Fischetti, J. (2016). Racial microaggressions and school psychology students: Who gets targeted and how intern supervisors can facilitate racial justice. *School Psychology Forum*, 10(3), 321–336.
- Richardson, F. C., & Fowers, B. J. (1997). Critical theory, postmodernism, and hermeneutics: Insights for critical psychology. In D.Fox & I. Prilleltensky (Eds.), *Critical psychology: An introduction* (pp. 265–283). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Roulston, K. (2010). Considering quality in qualitative interviewing. *Qualitative Research*, 2, 199.
- Sabnis, S. V., & Proctor, S. L. (2021). Use of Critical Theory to Develop a Conceptual Framework for Critical School Psychology. *School Psychology Review*, 1-15.
- Saldaña, J., & Omasta, M. (2016). *Qualitative research: Analyzing life*. Sage Publications.
- Sealy, R. (2010), Changing Perceptions of Meritocracy in Senior Women's Careers, *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 25, No. 3, pp. 184-197.
- Shriberg, D., Bonner, M., Sarr, B. J., Walker, A. M., Hyland, M., & Chester, C. (2008). Social justice through a school psychology lens. *School Psychology Review*, 37 (4), 453–468.

- Shriberg, D., Miranda, A. H., Song, S. Y., & Radliff K. (2013). *School Psychology and Social Justice*. Taylor & Francis.
- Shriberg, D., & Moy, G. (2014). Best practices in school psychologists acting as agents of social justice. In P. L. Harrison & A. Thomas (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology: Foundations* (pp. 21–32). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Solorzano, D. G., & Yosso, T. J. (2001). Critical race and LatCrit theory and method: Counter-storytelling. Chicana and Chicano graduate school experiences. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 14(4), 471–495.
- Solorzano, D.G., & Yosso, T.J. (2002). Critical race methodology: Counter storytelling as an analytical framework for educational research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 8(1), 23-44.
- Stanley, C. A. (2007). When counter-narrative meets master narratives in the journal editorial review process. *Educational Researcher*, 36(1), 14-24.
- Sue, D., Arredondo, P., & McDavis, R. (1992). Multicultural counseling competencies and standards: A call to the profession. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 70, 477–486.
- Sue, D. W. (2010). *Microaggressions in everyday life: Race, gender, and sexual orientation*. John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Sue, D. W., Capodilupo, M., Torino, G., Bucceri, A., Holder, M., Nadal, K., et al. (2007). Racial microaggressions in everyday life: Implications for clinical practice. *American Psychologist*, 62, 271–286. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.62.4.271>
- Sue, D. W., Capodilupo, C., & Holder, A. (2008). Racial microaggressions and the life experiences of African Americans. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 39, 329–336. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0735-7028.39.3.329>

- Summers, M. F., & Hrabowski, F. A. (2006) Diversity preparing minority scientists and engineers. *Science*, 311(5769), 1870–1871.
- Taylor, E. (2009). The foundations of critical race theory in education: An introduction. In E. Taylor, D. Gillborn, & G. Ladson-Billings (Eds.), *Foundations of critical race theory in education* (pp. 1-13). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Taylor, E., & Antony, J. S. (2000). Stereotype threat reduction and wise schooling: Towards the successful socialization of African American doctoral students in education. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 69(3), 184-198.
- The United States Commission on Civil Rights. (2009). *Minorities in special education: a briefing before the United States Commission on Civil Rights*. Retrieved from: <http://www.usccr.gov/pubs/MinoritiesinSpecialEducation.pdf>
- Thoits, Peggy. 2004. “Emotion Norms, Emotion Work, and Social Order.” Pp. 359–78 in *Feelings and Emotions: The Amsterdam Symposium*, edited by Antony S. R. Manstead, Nico Frijda, and Agneta Fischer. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Thompson, V., & Alexander, H. (2006). Therapists’ race and African American clients’ reactions to therapy. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training*, 43, 99 –110.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-3204.43.1.99>
- Tierney, W. G., & Bensimon, E. M. (1996). *Promotion and tenure: Community and socialization in academe*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Tracy, S. J. (2010). Qualitative quality: Eight “big-tent” criteria for excellent qualitative research. *Qualitative inquiry*, 16(10), 837-851.
- Turner, C. S. V., & Myers, S. L. (2000). *Faculty of color in academe: Bittersweet success*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

- Tynes, B. M., Willis, H. A., Stewart, A. M., & Hamilton, M. W. (2019). Race-related traumatic events online and mental health among adolescents of color. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 65*, 371–377. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2019.03.006>
- Walcott, C. M., & Hyson, D. (2018). *Results from the NASP 2015 membership survey, part one: Demographics and employment conditions* (Research report). National Association of School Psychologists.
- Weidman, J. C., Twale, D. J., & Stein, E. L. (2001). *Socialization of graduate and professional students in higher education: A perilous passage?* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, no. 3. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Wingfield, Adia H. 2010. “Are Some Emotions Marked ‘White Only?’: Racialized Feeling Rules in Professional Workplaces.” *Social Problems* 57(2):251–68.
- Wingfield, Adia H. 2013. *No More Invisible Man: Race and Gender in Men’s Work*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Wolf-Wendel, L. E. & Ruel, M. (1999). *Developing the whole student: The collegiate ideal*. New Directions for Higher Education, 105, 35–46.
- Wolgemuth, J. R., Erdil-Moody, Z., Opsal, T., Cross, J. E., Kaanta, T., Dickmann, E. M., & Colomer, S. (2015). Participants’ experiences of the qualitative interview: Considering the importance of research paradigms. *Qualitative research, 15*(3), 351-372.
- Yang, C., Chen, C., Chan, M., Wang, C., Luo, H., & Lin, X. (2020) Training experience in the U.S. school psychology program: Understanding. *Contemporary School Psychology*, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40688-020-00320-x>

Yeh, M., Eastman, K., & Cheung, M. (1994). Children and adolescents in community health centers: Does the ethnicity or the language of the therapist matter? *Journal of Community Psychology*, 22, 153–163. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/1520-6629\(199404\)22:2153::AID-JCOP 22902202103.0.CO;2-R](http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/1520-6629(199404)22:2153::AID-JCOP 22902202103.0.CO;2-R)

APPENDIX A: STUDENT INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Introduction to Study

My name is _____. I am a graduate student at USF. I want to first thank you for agreeing to participate in this study. Our research group is interested in hearing the lived experiences of minoritized students in school psychology graduate students with the hope of identifying oppressive structures, if any. We hope to use the information collected to better serve students from minoritized backgrounds in school psychology programs. We use the term “minoritized” because we feel that people aren’t minorities, but rather placed in these groups by larger society. If you would like to use a different term, let me know. We will be asking about sensitive and possibly negative experiences. The experiences you have had may be variable, but we would like to hear from you whether positive or negative. Before we begin, do you have any questions for me?

I would also like to ask if I can record this session just in case I miss something and need to review.

Rapport Building Questions

I want to start by taking some time to get to know you.

1. What made you choose to pursue a degree in School Psychology?
2. What are your career goals?
3. Tell me a little bit about what interested you in this study and what motivated you to participate.
 - a. Based off of the demographic survey, we know that you identify as _____, can you tell me more about your identity means to you?
4. What is your program like for you as minoritized student?

Socialization Questions

Thank you for letting us get to know about you. The next few questions will be about your experiences with professional training and social interactions in your program.

1. How is diversity incorporated in your program’s training model, if at all?
 - a. *Provide examples if needed (classes, practicum, etc.)*
2. How much of a focus would you say diversity is in your program? What about social justice?
 - a. What does social justice mean to you?
 - b. To your program?
3. What norms or expectations does your program have for professional behaviors? Ethical behaviors?
 - a. Do you feel that these expectations consider diversity or minoritized students’ experiences?
 - b. Do you feel that your expectations and experiences are represented?
4. To what extent does your Program challenge typical academia norms and expectations?

5. How much do you believe minoritized students must conform to professional expectations they may not embrace?
6. Now I am going to ask you about your experiences with colleagues (peers) and faculty in your program as well as your practicum/internship supervisors.
 - a. To what extent do you feel that you are able to share your beliefs, values, perspectives, and experiences with colleagues and/or faculty in your program?
 - i. *What allows you to be open?*
 - ii. *What prevents you from being open?*
 - b. To what extent do you feel that you can relate to peers and faculty in your program?
 - c. To what extent do you relate to school psychologists in the profession?
 - d. To what extent do you feel your minoritized identities are accepted, acknowledged, or discussed by peers, faculty members, and practicum supervisors?
 - e. What conflicts have you experienced in reference to your minoritized identities with peers, faculty, or practicum supervisors?
 - i. *How was it handled?*
 - ii. *How do you feel about how it was handled?*
 - f. To what extent do conversations surrounding social justice with faculty, supervisors, or peers produce change in professional and social expectations for behavior?

APPENDIX B: CRITICAL RACE THEORY A PRIORI CODE BOOK

Theme 1: The Permanence of Racism

1. Racist hierarchical structures

a. System of Power	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social, political, and economic systems that contribute to disparities • Societal Norms • Top-down control
b. White Privilege	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unearned advantages based on race • Alternative explanation for disparities (ex: SES, not race) • Disidentification with whiteness
c. History of racism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eurocentric telling of U.S. History • Civil rights movement
d. Subtleness of racism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The belief that racism has been fixed, only exists when explicit • Othering of people of color • Generalizations of the “other” group • Stereotype threat • Political correctness • Deculturalization • Assimilation

Theme 2: Interest Convergence Theory

a. Interest Convergence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Alignment, not altruism” • The interest of people of color of achieving racial equality only advances when these interests “converge” with those of the people in power
b. The Diversity Argument	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In regard to diversity admissions in higher education (Grutter v. Bollinger), these ideals imply that white students benefit compositional diversity.

Theme 3: Experiential Knowledge & Counter-Storytelling

a. Experiential Knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People of color’s lived experiences • Daily experiences with racism • Storytelling
---------------------------	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Family histories
b. Counterstories	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stories that counter master narratives of majoritarian story

Theme 4: Intersectionality

1. Intersects with other subordinated identities: gender, class, religion, ability/disability, sexual orientation, etc.

a. People of color's lived experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on not only one's racial identity but also their class position, gender, etc.
b. U.S. society organized along binaries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intersectionality is more complex than binaries, individuals represent multiple identities

Theme 5 "Whiteness as Property"

a. Valuable assets White people seek to protect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assumptions • Privileges • benefits
b. Property	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possession • Use transfer • Disposition • And exclusion • Ex: Higher education admissions policies

Theme 6: Critique of Liberalism

1. Critique of race-neutral dominant ideologies

a. Critique of race-neutral dominant ideologies (ex. Colorblindness, meritocracy, objectivity, race neutrality, equal opportunity, incremental change, etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledgement that these ideologies ignore inequity, inopportunity, and oppression • Acknowledgement that these ideologies align with White self-interest • Acknowledgment that these ideologies have contributed to deficit thinking about people of color
--	---

Theme 7: Commitment to Social Justice

1. Commitment to a just U.S. society and education system

a. Overall goal: eradication of all forms of subordination in society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding racism's role in society and working towards elimination of said oppression • Recognizing other forms of oppression (discrimination based
---	--

	<p>on gender, class, sexual orientation, and religious affiliation) and actively resisting all forms of inequality.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vision of society in which the distribution of resources is equitable for all
b. Actively challenge racism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stand up to injustices • Openly confront racism
c. Empowerment of oppressed and Marginalized groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Celebrate/affirm diverse cultures
d. Racial consciousness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultural sensitivity • Understanding of own identity & biases

APPENDIX C: IRB EXEMPTION LETTER



EXEMPT DETERMINATION

November 23, 2020

Jose Castillo
4202 E. Fowler Ave., EDU 105
Tampa, FL 33620

Dear Dr. Jose Castillo:

On 11/22/2020, the IRB reviewed and approved the following protocol:

Application Type:	Initial Study
IRB ID:	STUDY001528
Review Type:	Exempt 2
Title:	Underrepresentation and Socialization: Experiences of Marginalized School Psychology Graduate Students
Protocol:	• IRB Protocol SJRG

The IRB determined that this protocol meets the criteria for exemption from IRB review.

In conducting this protocol, you are required to follow the requirements listed in the INVESTIGATOR MANUAL (HRP-103).

Please note, as per USF policy, once the exempt determination is made, the application is closed in BullsIRB. This does not limit your ability to conduct the research. Any proposed or anticipated change to the study design that was previously declared exempt from IRB oversight must be submitted to the IRB as a new study prior to initiation of the change. However, administrative changes, including changes in research personnel, do not warrant a modification or new application.

Ongoing IRB review and approval by this organization is not required. This determination applies only to the activities described in the IRB submission and does not apply should any changes be made. If changes are made and there are questions about whether these activities impact the exempt determination, please submit a new request to the IRB for a determination.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Walker
IRB Research Compliance Administrator

Institutional Review Boards / Research Integrity & Compliance

FWA No. 00001669

University of South Florida / 3702 Spectrum Blvd., Suite 165 / Tampa, FL 33612 / 813-974-5638

Page 1 of 1