Articulated Racial Projects: Towards a Framework for Analyzing the Intersection Between Race and Neoliberalism in Higher Education

Jon S. Iftikar
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Articulated Racial Projects:
Toward a Framework for Analyzing the Intersection Between Race and Neoliberalism in Higher Education

Jon Syed Iftikar, University of Wisconsin-Madison

Abstract

Scholars have been documenting the effects of neoliberal educational policies, practices, and ideologies on staff, faculty, and students of color in higher education. Their work has raised important conceptual questions about the relationship between neoliberalism and race: Has neoliberal hegemony brought about a significant rupture with previous racial regimes, or does the current racial-neoliberal formation in higher education represent a rearticulation, a recombination of preexisting elements in new formations? Our ability to answer this question will aid in theory development and lead to new strategies for interventions. In this article, I argue that the intersection between race and neoliberalism should be understood as a rearticulation of already existing elements by introducing an articulated racial projects framework developed from Stuart Hall's theory of articulation and Michael Omi and Howard Winant's racial formation theory. I focus on two of the major neoliberal racial subprojects—colorblindness and diversity—and then discuss some of the ways these subprojects position students and suggest possible implications for higher education research, policy, and practice.

Keywords

race, neoliberalism, racial formation, articulation

LOYOLA
UNIVERSITY
CHICAGO

Preparing people to lead extraordinary lives

Neoliberalism has become hegemonic in higher education. Its tenets inform how students, policy makers, practitioners, and the general public understand teaching, curriculum, and the roles and identities of educational actors, as well as the very meaning of higher education itself (Giroux, 2002; Saunders, 2010). Primarily an economic theory that became dominant in the late-20th century (Harvey, 2009), neoliberalism has expanded to significantly inform political and social theory as well. Central to neoliberalism is the view that the free market is best able to dictate the allocation of resources (Olssen & Peters, 2005) and people are supposed to behave as rational, self-interested consumers (Apple, 2006). Additionally, although its predecessor, liberalism, was antagonistic to the state, neoliberalism utilizes the state to further market imperatives (Olssen & Peters, 2005).

Neoliberalism's influence on higher education has been substantial and can be seen in the impact of entrepreneurialism, surveillance, and consumerism on university policy, staff, faculty, and students (Davies, 2005; Saunders, 2014; Shahjahan, 2014; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2009), the shaping of policy priorities in the interest of profit making (Ball, 2012; Saunders, 2010), the corporatization of institutional culture (Giroux, 2002), and the reframing of the value and purposes of higher education within a market-centered discourse (Ayers, 2005; Iverson, 2008; Torres, 2011). As part of the state or in conjunction with the state, colleges and universities play a crucial role in this process of supporting and reproducing neoliberal ideology (Giroux, 2002; Saunders, 2010). Higher education is also the site where entrepreneurial and consumer identities are reproduced (Davies, 2005; Giroux, 2003; Saunders, 2014).

At the same time, White supremacy continues to serve as a fundamental structuring principle in colleges and universities (Museus, Ledesma, & Parker, 2015; Savas, 2014). Scholars have thus been documenting the effects of neoliberal educational policies, practices, and ideologies on people of color in higher education (e.g., Giroux, 2003; Hamer & Lang, 2015; Hernandez, 2016; Osei-Kofi, 2012; Squire, 2015). Their work has raised important conceptual questions about the relationship between neoliberalism and race: Has neoliberal hegemony brought about a significant rupture with previous racial regimes—a "new racism" (Giroux, 2003), "racisms without racism" (Goldberg, 2009), or "neoliberal multiculturalism" (Melamed, 2011)? Or, does the current racial-neoliberal formation in higher education represent a rearticulation, a recombination of preexisting elements in new formations?

In this article, I argue that the intersection between race and neoliberalism should be understood not as creating something wholly new but rather as a reordering of already existing elements. The articulated racial projects framework, which I introduce herein, is an alternative framework that situates the relationship between race and neoliberalism as a structure of interconnected racial projects. The framework responds to Roberts and Mahtani (2010) who wrote, "It is important to analyze the processes through which the ideology neoliberalism is actualized through various policies, discourses, and social relations," and who recommended "focusing on the ways neoliberalism (its underlying philosophy) is fundamentally raced and actively produces racialized bodies" (p. 248). The purpose of this article is not to offer a complete and detailed analysis of the relationship between race and neoliberalism in higher education (with all its complexities) but to introduce a framework that can provide additional insights into their intersection. Researchers, policy makers, and educational and administrative professionals can apply these

insights to their work in higher education (as I describe in more detail below).

The framework was developed by utilizing insights from various disciplines, most prominently ethnic studies, sociology, and cultural studies. Abes (2009), echoing Anzaldúa (1990), suggested researching in "the borderlands of theoretical perspectives" by blending and utilizing insights from multiple perspectives (p. 143). The articulated racial projects framework is thus an example of theorizing from the borderlands by integrating insights from articulation theory (Hall, 1980, 1985, 1987) and racial formation theory (Omi & Winant, 2014). Each is theoretically rich and offers significant possibilities for the analysis of the relationship between race and neoliberalism in higher education. These possibilities, including those that exist in the integration of the two theories, have yet to be sufficiently explored in the higher education literature.

In the following section, I will discuss the major concepts that provide the foundation for the articulated racial projects framework. Next, I explore the framework in more detail through two of the major neoliberal racial subprojects—colorblindness and diversity—and explore some of the subject positions these subprojects create for students. The analysis of these two subprojects will illustrate how race is rearticulated through the neoliberal racial project. Finally, I conclude by assessing some of the strengths and weaknesses of the framework and by offering possible implications for higher education research, policy, and practice.

Central Concepts and Theories

Racial Formation Theory

Racial formation is "the sociohistorical process by which racial categories are created, lived out, transformed, and destroyed" (Omi & Winant, 2014, p. 109). What is important to note about racial formation (and its consequent meaning for race and racism) is its recognition of race as an ongoing process, yet one that is historically situated. It also ties together the individual and the structural through racial projects. Omi and Winant (2014) defined the racial project as "simultaneously an interpretation, representation, or explanation of racial identities and meanings, and an effort to organize and distribute resources (economic, political, cultural) along particular racial lines" (p. 125). Racial projects, then, also bring together the ideological and material aspects of race and racism. Rather than reifying the binaries and polar positions that often plague racial theorizing, racial formation theory provides a more robust and fluid framework that allows us to recognize the complexity and significance of race and racism:

> [T]he theory of racial formation suggests that society is suffused with racial projects, large and small, to which all are subjected …. Everybody learns some combination, some version, of the rules of racial classification, and of their own racial identity, often without obvious teaching or conscious inculcation. Thus are we inserted in a comprehensively racialized social structure. Race becomes "common sense"—a way of comprehending, explaining, and acting in the world. A vast web of racial projects mediates between the discursive or representational means in which race is identified and signified on the one hand, and the institutional and organizational forms in which it is routinized and standardized on the other. The interaction and accumulation of these projects are the heart of the racial formation process. (2014, p. 127)

Omi and Winant's racial projects are thus a means of mapping racial formation in higher education, through the ideological and the material, on multiple levels (because there can be racial projects within larger racial projects).

Ideology

One of the foundational concepts for the theory of articulation (and racial formation as well) is ideology. Hall (1987) defined ideology as "those images, concepts, and premises which provide the frameworks through which we represent, interpret, understand and 'make sense' of some aspect of social existence" (p. 31). Additionally, ideologies are not unified, consistent bodies of thought, as they are commonly thought to be, but are instead composed of a chain of articulated, or connected, elements (Hall, 1987).

Articulation

Articulation is a powerful way of making sense of the relationships between ideologies, structures, and identities (or subject positions). Hall developed the concept such that it can be used to analyze both the macrolevel workings of structures, institutions, and dominant ideologies and the microlevel workings of individual actions, interests, ideologies, and identities (Clarke, 2015). In an interview with Grossberg (1996), Hall used the analogy of a truck and trailer to describe articulation: The two elements can connect to form a unity but can also be disconnected and reconnected. Moreover, the connection is "not necessary, determined, absolute and essential for all time" (1996, p. 141). Fundamental to the theory of articulation, then, is that the articulated elements are distinct and their connection is contingent. At the same time, there are what Hall (1980, 1996) called tendential articulations. These articulated formations become sedimented through time, and today retain elements of those earlier connotations, uses, and histories, which make them more difficult to disarticulate. The maintenance of even tendential combinations requires constant work. They are not locked together forever.

Articulation can also be utilized to ana-
lyze how subject positions are produced (Clarke, 2015). A subject position is a site or "place-holder" that is distinct from the "individual": "Individuals come to occupy the site of the subject … and they enjoy intelligibility only to the extent that they are … first established in language" (Butler, 1997, pp. 10–11). A racial subject position, then, is a site where various racial ideologies position individuals. This process begins before birth (Hall, 1985). Racial subject positions for students, instructors, and administrative staff in postsecondary institutions preexist them and are the means through which they view others and themselves and come to be as social subjects. For example, racial categories—Asian American, Black, White—preexist students and are the means through which they achieve recognition from other students, instructors, and staff on college campuses.

Hall's (1980, 1985, 1987) theory of articulation can be more fully integrated with Omi and Winant's (2014) racial formation theory as a way of better analyzing the intersection between neoliberalism and race in higher education. Integrating articulation with the racial project facilitates analysis of the specific contours and components of the racial formation process in higher education. Articulation can be utilized to analyze the structure of racial projects (i.e., the individual/micro- and structural/macro-, horizontal and vertical relationships between racial projects in a racial formation). It is also helpful for mapping a network of racial projects within a specific social context. Additionally, articulation can provide a better understanding of how racial projects are informed by ideological and cultural elements (including those that have sedimented through time) and how they position individuals as racialized subjects. One way, then, to theorize race and racism as well as their relationship with neoliberalism in higher education would be through an articulated racial projects framework where

neoliberalism is understood as a hegemonic racial project[1]. It is important to better understand this relationship because many of the major systemic issues in higher education are not just rooted in race nor are they just rooted in neoliberalism. As I show below, through diversity and colorblindness, both race and neoliberalism work to reshape individual and systemic race-related issues and experiences in higher education.

Neoliberal Racial Subprojects in Higher Education

In this section, I focus on two racial subprojects—colorblindness and diversity—that partially comprise the larger neoliberal racial project in education and explore some of the possible subject positions (i.e., consumer, commodity, and the "bad citizen") they create for college students. Exploring the subprojects will also shed light on the larger neoliberal racial project in higher education because the subprojects are constitutive of the larger project.

Diversity and colorblindness are, of course, not the only racial subprojects in higher education. I chose these two specifically because they are the most dominant and recognizable racial projects, especially in the context of higher education. Bell and Hartmann (2007) contended, for example, that diversity has become a central part of the discourse over race and suggested that it may be "the first 'racial project' … of the new millennium" (p. 910). And Bonilla-Silva (2005) claimed that since the 1960s, colorblindness has become what he called the "new racism." In Bonilla-Silva's (2014) foundational study of White college students' attitudes on race, he demonstrated how various iterations of colorblindness were central to their perspectives. Diversity

and colorblindness, then, serve as especially useful examples for illustrating the types of insights that the articulated racial formations framework can provide.

Colorblindness

Leonardo (2007) defined colorblindness as "the inability to deal with the reality of race" and lists the following "contours of color-blind discourse":
1. Race and racism are declining in significance.
2. Racism is largely isolated, an exception to the rule.
3. Individualizes racism as irrational and pathological.
4. Individualizes success and failure.
5. Blames people of color for their limitations and behaviors.
6. Mainly a study of attitude and attitudinal changes, rather than actual behavior.
7. Downplays institutional relations or the racialized system.
8. Plays up racial progress.
9. Emphasizes class stratification as the explanation for racism.
10. Downplays the legacy of slavery and genocide (as long ago). (p. 267)

According to colorblind ideologies, to notice race, or to base higher educational policies or decisions on race, is to participate in racial discrimination (Bonilla-Silva, 2014; Neville, Awad, Brooks, Flores, & Bluemel, 2013; Omi & Winant, 2014).

Colorblindness, or at least the idea that people should not take race into account, predates the rise of neoliberalism; but through neoliberalism, elements of colorblindness are articulated with self-interested individualism, consumerism, and free market economics. Colorblindness under neoliberalism retains

---

[1] Omi and Winant (2014), in the most recent edition of Racial Formation, added an extended discussion of neoliberalism as a racial project. In the discussion that follows here, I build on their general formulation with a more detailed exploration of the specifics of the neoliberal racial project and subprojects and how (re)articulations operate both to create racial projects and to connect them to other racial projects and a larger racial-neoliberal structure. In addition, although they had a much broader societal focus, I more explicitly apply the framework to higher education in the United States.

the residue of the previous articulations in that race is still to be avoided and unacknowledged, but newer ideological elements focused on market imperatives have revised the meanings for colorblindness. Neoliberal colorblindness is articulated with individualism that is, in turn, articulated with market-centered ideological elements such as rational consumption and entrepreneurism. In that articulation, colorblindness can speak to a preexisting racial common sense (e.g., that race should not and does not matter) and at the same time speak to market-centered ideological elements (e.g. self-discipline, rational choice-making, entrepreneurship). In the context of college and university admissions, "meritocracy" has become an important concept in the articulation of neoliberalism and colorblindness because both focus on the individual. Meritocracy, which argues that individual qualifications should be the basis upon which admissions decisions are made (Jayakumar & Garces, 2015; Park & Liu, 2014), aligns easily with many of Leonardo's (2007) contours of colorblind discourse (discussed above), namely how colorblindness "individualizes success and failure" and "downplays institutional relations or the racialized system" (p. 267). Through the meritocracy-individualism articulation, the neoliberal racial project rearticulates colorblindness as a racial-economic concept.

Diversity

Neoliberalism's hyper-individuality can also highlight racial difference through the ways that it can commodify this difference. This is a defining feature of another racial subproject of the larger neoliberal racial project: diversity. Carbado and Gulati (2003) defined diversity as "the idea that a relationship exists between race and social experiences, on the one hand, and knowledge and practices, on the other" (p. 1153). The diversity neoliberal subproject articulates race and racial differ-

ence with economic value. In other words, diversity capitalizes on racial difference. For example, Iverson (2008) found that a marketplace discourse was prominent in an analysis of 21 university diversity plans. This discourse positioned "diverse" students as commodities that benefitted the institutions. Thus, one of the major elements of diversity for these institutions is the value it can bring them.

It is important to note that the racial subprojects in higher education are not uniform and singular but are themselves made up of articulated elements. It may seem counterintuitive, for example, that the neoliberal racial project is made up of both colorblindness (within which race is invisible) and diversity (within which race is highlighted), yet colorblindness and diversity share important elements. For example, Bell and Hartmann's (2007) participants discussed diversity in ways that shifted the focus away from structural racism to individual attributes, as colorblindness does. Marvasti and McKinney's (2011) respondents also defined diversity in ways that overlapped with elements of colorblindness, such as focusing on individual human differences instead of racial group differences. As I noted above, individualism is a central element of neoliberalism as well. Thus, within the neoliberal racial project, diversity and colorblindness share similar elements yet operate in different ways.

On an institutional level, the shared elements between diversity and colorblindness can be seen in the implementation and effects of university admissions policies. For example, Berrey's (2015) study of diversity at the University of Michigan found that diversity and colorblindness were employed in ways that supported the same ideals (such as meritocracy and individual choice). As a result, Michigan did not view its diversity-related, race-conscious admissions policy as in conflict or contradiction with its color-

blind, merit-based admissions policy (2015). Carbado and Gulati (2003) also wrote about the mutually supportive relationship between diversity and colorblindness. They discussed the experience of a Black law student in a predominantly White law school with colorblind admissions policies. Being the only Black male student admitted, he became the voice of all Blacks and African Americans in his class discussions. Carbado and Gulati (2003) concluded from this example that a colorblind admissions policy "promotes, rather than discourages, racial identification, racial awareness, and racial consciousness" (p. 1158) Seemingly, paradoxically then, colorblind admissions policies can, like diversity, work to highlight race and racial difference.

Because they are made up of articulated elements themselves, each racial subproject can operate in both racially empowering and oppressive ways. For example, the diversity subproject simultaneously allows and limits access to resources (such as postsecondary education) for people of color. For even in its more empowering articulations that facilitate access to resources, the terms of the diversity subproject can limit specifically how access is defined. For example, in 2002, Texas A&M's diversity report "advocate[d] to 'enroll international students, particularly from diverse nations of strategic importance to Texas, as an important and effective way to diversify the overall climate of the university' (Texas A&M University, 2002, p. 18)" (as cited in Iverson, 2008, p. 187). Here, diversity is defined, in part, through the interests the university has in specific global partnerships in addition to possible racial climate benefits (as suggested by their use of "diverse nations"). Even in its ability to (relatively) empower people of color, then, diversity sets limits on the extent and nature of that empowerment (Bell, 2003).

Diversity also does symbolic work in reaffirming social structures and educational institutions as fair despite existing inequities because some people of color do benefit. This prevents any substantial calls for more radical structural change. Less attention, then, is paid to the ways that higher education processes and policies reproduce racism in higher education. Instead, the focus is on dealing with individual-level instances of racism such as microaggressions and trigger warnings. Diversity can thus serve as a distraction from more substantive issues such as the long history and ongoing operation of racial exclusion and discrimination in higher education (Bell, 2003).[2]

Neoliberal Racial Subject Positions for College Students

Articulation and racial formation can also be used to theorize the formation of neoliberal racial subject positions for college students[3]. It is important to theorize subject positions because they establish where individuals are situated within power hierarchies, influence their relations with others, and inform their identities as well as the very ways they think and act (Hall, 1996). I will briefly describe three subject positions (i.e., consumer, commodity, and "bad citizen"). These are not the only three neoliberal racial project subject positions. There are several others, and individuals can also be multiply positioned. I chose these because of their prominence in the higher education literature on neoliberalism and on the experiences of students.

One of the major effects of neoliberalism has been how it has positioned students as consumers (Saunders, 2014). Higher education becomes a good or service to be purchased (Patton, 2015; Saunders, 2014). As a racial

---

[2] In some ways, this mirrors the "equity" versus "equality" debate. Stewart (2017) argued, for example, that a focus on equality has led to superficial changes, whereas a shift to equity would bring about more substantive institutional change. One could argue that equality, framed this way, has been rearticulated by neoliberalism such that it has been individualized. An equity approach might represent an alternative to this.
[3] I restrict the discussion of racial subject positions here to students, but it can be applied to instructors, academic staff, and institutions as well.

project, neoliberalism also positions students as consumers but in racialized ways. One example of this is the way that White students are discursively positioned relative to diversity. Institutions market their ability to provide experiences with diversity to White students (Berrey, 2011). "Diversity" thus becomes a commodity that White students can consume. For example, admissions and recruitment materials often address White prospective students as consumers of diversity (e.g., Berrey, 2011; Osei-Kofi, Torres, & Lui, 2013; Urciuoli, 1999). White students also disproportionately experience the positive effects of diversity (e.g., Chang, Astin, & Kim, 2004; Gurin, 1990; Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, & Gurin, 2002; Saenz, Ngai, & Hurtado, 2007), which suggests that diversity is a commodity for White students to consume.

Students of color are positioned as the providers of diversity that, as I argue above, is consumed by White students (Leong, 2013; Urciuoli, 1999). Thus, another subject position (again, one of several created by the diversity racial subproject) is the commodity. This is not a new subject position. Slavery in the United States is a clear historical example of the ways that people of color have been made into commodities to be bought, sold, and owned. In the context of higher education, diversity creates value in the assumed cultural difference inherent in racial difference and thus creates value in the non-White student. In other words, non-White students are valued for the experiential and cultural differences that they provide and exemplify (Ahmed, 2012; DePouw, 2012; hooks, 1992; Leong, 2013; Urciuoli, 1999). They are thus objects to be consumed by White students. They are living textbooks or documentaries through which White students can be exposed to "difference" and as a result become more cosmopolitan and empathetic (and more attractive to corporations). Objectified in this way, students of color are positioned

as not fully students themselves with their own needs and goals. This partly explains why institutions are slow to engage in more transformational and substantive institutional change to better meet the needs of students of color. Positioned as objects for the consumption of institutions and White students, the needs or interests of students of color are made insignificant. Diversity can thus work to establish and reinforce the neglect of students of color.

Students of color are also commodities for institutions, as well. They can provide universities and colleges economic capital (e.g., international students who are primarily non-White) and symbolic capital that accrues with being a diverse institution (Leong, 2013). This capital raises their prestige as they compete with other institutions for White students.

A third neoliberal racial project subject position is the "bad citizen." Soss, Fording, and Schram (2011) described individuals excluded from the consumer subject position as neoliberalism's bad citizens. My usage of the term refers to the way that some students of color are positioned as deviant or criminal. The bad citizen is a rearticulation of elements that have sedimented through time. Historically, students of color have been positioned as deviant, criminal, and intellectually inferior to White students. Although we currently live in a racial regime where overt expressions of such positioning occur far less regularly (Bonilla-Silva, 2014; Omi & Winant, 2014), they still do occur. A major difference is that deviance, criminality, and intellectual inferiority have become rearticulated as culturally-based rather than genetically-based (although, again, the genetic arguments persist as well [e.g., Herrnstein & Murray, 1994]). Thus, college students of color are still positioned as outsiders, as individuals who do not belong, who do not fit the dominant view of who a college student is. This can be seen

in the ways that students of color have been interrogated by security, police officers, and university staff just for being present on campus spaces (Minikel-Lacocque, 2012; Museus & Park, 2015; Smith, Allen, & Danley, 2007; Solórzano, Ceja, & Yosso, 2000). Additionally, students of color are made to feel as if they are not qualified to be college students by being labelled as affirmative action admits or athletes or by being excluded and derided for being intellectually incapable (Fries-Britt & Griffin, 2007; González, 2002; Johnson-Ahorlu, 2013; Museus & Park, 2015; Solórzano et al., 2000). Positioned in this way, students of color are always subject to possible discipline or regulation from the university or college. This can happen through policy (restrictions on race-based admissions), coercion (policing, disciplining, and imprisonment), or ideology (the discursive construction of students and families of color as deviant and inferior).

Conclusion

Strengths and Limitations

In the above discussion, I introduced the articulated racial projects framework for theorizing the intersection between race and neoliberalism in higher education. Using the framework, I showed how neoliberalism did not bring about a complete rupture from previous racial regimes but rather a rearticulation of preexisting elements into different configurations. Conceptually, a major strength of the framework is that it maintains the distinctiveness of race and neoliberalism. As Hall (1985) noted, "An articulation between different practices does not mean that they become identical or that the one is dissolved in the other. Each retains its distinct determinations and conditions of existence" (pp. 113–114). There are two significant advantages that result from this. The first is that neither neoliberalism nor race take priority

over the other. When viewed through the lens of neoliberalism, race can become an effect of neoliberalism rather than a separate entity that interacts with neoliberalism. A second advantage of maintaining the distinctiveness of both race and neoliberalism is that it provides a clearer analysis of the points of intersection between (elements of) race and neoliberalism in higher education that can, in turn, be instructive for strategizing interventions (discussed more below). Approaches that theorize race and neoliberalism as mutually constituting and inseparably coextensive make it impossible to subject either or both to analysis. One could never make a claim about race without at the same time having to make a claim about neoliberalism (and vice versa). Instead, if racial elements are articulated with neoliberal elements rather than being so thoroughly blended, they can be disarticulated and rearticulated so that the connections and disconnections can be explored. The articulated racial projects framework thus allows for more conceptual clarity.

At the same time, it is important to note some limitations of the framework. Racial projects, central to the framework, are so expansive that they can lack sufficient specificity. For example, something as small as a person's t-shirt and something as large as colorblind ideology are both racial projects (Omi & Winant, 2014). Because so much is included under their definition of a racial project, the concept of the racial project becomes too expansive. Similarly, in the articulated racial projects framework, the term racial project can refer to a student's hairstyle, a student organization, a campus policy on hate speech, a U.S. Supreme court decision on race-conscious admissions, and a global ideology (e.g., neoliberalism). My use of the term subproject is an attempt to mitigate this and add some specificity, but it is admittedly limited in its ability to do so (without resorting to terminology such as "sub-sub-projects," "sub-sub-subprojects," etc.).

Relatedly, the framework, as I have presented it in an introductory fashion, does not have built-in distinctions between racial and ethnic groups. Although there are many commonalities, there are also important differences in the experiences of various racial groups in higher education. The framework is broad enough to apply effectively to all racial groups, but this very characteristic can also serve as a barrier in accounting for the specific issues and experiences of various racial groups. The framework can be interpreted as unable to recognize the important distinctions between racial projects across racial groups. At the same time, the framework does have the flexibility to analyze the ways that the intersection between neoliberalism and race impact specific groups differently. For example, one could use the framework to compare how, in the affirmative action debate, the neoliberal racial project positions Asian American students as the ideal neoliberal, model minority subject versus how it positions Black students as either undeserving bad citizens or diversity commodities.

Implications for Research, Policy, and Practice

Alternative theoretical frameworks such as the articulated racial projects framework are essential to the continued development of knowledge about race and racism and are thus valuable to all those who participate in higher education contexts. Because race and neoliberalism both exert such powerful influences on higher education, a theoretical framework that can facilitate better analysis and understanding of their intersection is important. Thus, it offers utility for higher education research, policy, and practice.

The articulated racial projects framework can serve as a lens for further research into the ways that neoliberalism and race both influence higher education. For example,

researchers can use the framework to explore how this period of neoliberal austerity has limited the ability of universities to provide ethnic studies courses or resources for students of color. These are not merely incidental outcomes of neoliberal policy but rather the results of a racialized neoliberalism (i.e., the neoliberal racial project). Additionally, it can also inform research on college student racial identity by accounting for the ways that students' identities are articulated with various racial projects. Finally, the framework creates the space for empirical research to identify additional racial subprojects in the context of higher education.

The framework has relevance for policy as well. It can increase policy makers' awareness of the ways that neoliberal and racial ideologies work through policies to position students. For example, I have argued above that diversity policies can position students in both empowering (e.g., consumer) and oppressive (e.g., commodity) ways. The framework will also enable policy makers to be more vigilant about the ways that even well-intended racial policies can be rearticulated to work counter to their original goals. Early iterations of affirmative action, for example, included racially redistributive and reparative goals, but it has since been rearticulated in ways that support the racial status quo (Bell, 2004).

Finally, the articulated racial projects framework has utility for student affairs professionals. It can facilitate their recognition of some of the negative ways students are being positioned through the neoliberal racial project. For example, DePouw (2012), as the faculty advisor for the Hmong Student Association, discussed how Hmong students were being treated as diversity commodities. DePouw regularly received requests from students, staff, and faculty to interview Hmong students as part of their diversity-related

assignments. The framework can thus be used by student affairs professionals to recognize how students at their institutions are being positioned as commodities or consumers so that they can aid students in understanding these phenomena as well. Student affairs professionals can also engage in dialogues with other members of the campus community (e.g., student organizations, campus culture centers, etc.) both to build campus awareness and to work to develop interventions. Finally, student affairs professionals can use the framework to better understand how the consumer subject position is raced and how certain groups (e.g., Black students) are, at times, excluded from it and as a result made subject to discipline and violence. With neoliberalism's promotion of consumption and choice, much attention is paid to the consumer subject position. Often lost within this focus are those who are discursively excluded from the consumer subject position, the bad citizens. Student affairs professionals can use the articulated racial projects framework to refocus analysis on those positioned as bad citizens. Amongst all the consumerism, Black students, for example, because they are often positioned as bad citizens, are rendered vulnerable to daily acts of racism (e.g., Johnson-Ahorlu, 2013; Smith et al., 2007; Solórzano et al., 2000).

Given its conceptual nature, the articulated racial projects framework's primary impact will be in providing student affairs professionals with a different "basis of knowledge," "medium of communication," and "common language" (McEwan, 2003, p. 154). It offers a shift in consciousness. As such, it can provide a means through which student affairs professionals can reflect on their practice and roles at their institutions and through which they can begin to develop their own interventions. The frameworks and theories they use to understand the relationship between racism and neoliberalism in education are crucial

to informing how they develop strategies to counter them. For example, the articulated racial projects framework shows how articulations are points of intervention. These connections can be disconnected and reconnected in new and different ways with new and different consequences. As I mentioned above, such articulations constantly require work to maintain their coherence and, as Hall noted, there is no necessary correspondence between elements (Grossberg, 1996). Framed this way, there is the possibility for intervening in even seemingly natural or crystallized articulations, working with existing elements to bring about more progressive effects, readings, and subject positions. For example, diversity need not be abandoned in favor of something new. It can be rearticulated as a critical, racially progressive project. Some are already engaged in this work (e.g., Garces & Jayakumar, 2014; Jayakumar, Adamian, & Chang, 2015; Vavrus, 2015).

The objective of this article is not to engage in a detailed and comprehensive analysis of the relationship between neoliberalism and race in higher education using the articulated projects framework nor is it to completely map all the neoliberal racial projects in higher education. Instead, it is to introduce the articulated projects framework and illustrate its utility in analyzing the intersection between race and neoliberalism in higher education. This is important because of the ways that race and neoliberalism continue to fundamentally (re)shape higher education, often with inequitable outcomes for people of color. Further research and implementation can aid in the development and evolution of the framework.

References

Abes, E. S. (2009). Theoretical borderlands: Using multiple theoretical perspectives to challenge inequitable power structures in student development theory. *Journal of College Student Development, 50*(2), 141–156. doi:10.1353/csd.0.0059

Ahmed, S. (2012). *On being included: Racism and diversity in institutional life*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Anzaldúa, G. (1990). Haciendo caras, una entrada. In G. Anzaldúa (Ed.), *Making face, making soul: Creative and critical perspectives by feminists of color* (pp. xv–xxviii). San Francisco, CA: Aunt Lute Books.

Apple, M. W. (2006). *Educating the "right" way: Markets, standards, God, and inequality* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Ayers, D. F. (2005). Neoliberal ideology in community college mission statements: A critical discourse analysis. *The Review of Higher Education, 28*(4), 527–549. doi:10.1353/rhe.2005.0033

Ball, S. J. (2012). *Global education inc.: New policy networks and the neoliberal imaginary*. Abingdon, England: Routledge.

Bell, D. A. (2003). Diversity's distractions. *Columbia Law Review, 103*(6), 1622–1633. doi:10.2307/3593396

Bell, D. A. (2004). *Silent covenants: Brown v. Board of Education and the unfulfilled hopes for racial reform*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Bell, J. M., & Hartmann, D. (2007). Diversity in everyday discourse: The cultural ambiguities and consequences of "happy talk." *American Sociological Review, 72*(6), 895–914.

Berrey, E. C. (2011). Why diversity became orthodox in higher education, and how it changed the meaning of race on campus. *Critical Sociology, 37*(5), 573–596. doi:10.1177/0896920510380069

Berrey, E. C. (2015). *The enigma of diversity: The language of race and the limits of racial justice*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2005). Introduction: "Racism" and "new racism": The contours of racial dynamics in contemporary America. In Z. Leonardo (Ed.), *Critical pedagogy and race* (pp. 1–35). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2014). *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in America* (4th ed.). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Butler, J. (1997). *The psychic life of power: Theories in subjection*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Carbado, D. W., & Gulati, M. (2003). What exactly is racial diversity? *California Law Review, 91*(4), 1149–1165. doi:10.2307/3481413

Chang, M. J., Astin, A. W., & Kim, D. (2004). Cross-racial interaction among undergraduates: Some consequences, causes, and patterns. *Research in Higher Education, 45*(5), 529–553. doi:10.1023/B:RIHE.0000032327.45961.33

Clarke, J. (2015). Stuart Hall and the theory and practice of articulation. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 36*(2), 275–286. doi:10.1080/01596306.2015.1013247

Davies, B. (2005). The (im)possibility of intellectual work in neoliberal regimes. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 26*(1), 1–14. doi:10.1080/01596300500039310

DePouw, C. (2012). When culture implies deficit: Placing race at the center of Hmong American education. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 15*(2), 223–239. doi:10.1080/13613324.2011.624505

Fries-Britt, S., & Griffin, K. (2007). The Black box: How high-achieving Blacks resist stereotypes about Black Americans. *Journal of College Student Development, 48*(5), 509–524. doi:10.1353/csd.2007.0048

Garces, L. M., & Jayakumar, U. M. (2014). Dynamic diversity: Toward a contextual understanding of critical mass. *Educational Researcher, 43*(3), 115–124.

Giroux, H. A. (2002). Neoliberalism, corporate culture, and the promise of higher education: The university as a democratic public sphere. *Harvard Educational Review, 72*(4), 425–464.

Giroux, H. A. (2003). Spectacles of race and pedagogies of denial: Anti-Black racist pedagogy under the reign of neoliberalism. *Communication Education, 52*(3), 191–211. doi:10.1080/0363452032000156190

Goldberg, D. T. (2009). *The threat of race: Reflections on racial neoliberalism*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

González, K. P. (2002). Campus culture and the experiences of Chicano students in a predominantly White university. *Urban Education, 37*(2), 193–218. doi:10.1177/0042085902372003

Grossberg, L. (1996). On postmodernism and articulation: An interview with Stuart Hall. In D. Morley & K.-H. Chen (Eds.), Stuart Hall: *Critical dialogues in cultural studies* (pp. 131–150). New York, NY: Routledge.

Gurin, P. (1990). Expert report of Patricia Gurin. Michigan Journal of Race & Law, 5, 363–425.

Gurin, P., Dey, E., Hurtado, S., & Gurin, G. (2002). Diversity and higher education: Theory and impact on educational outcomes. *Harvard Educational Review, 72*(3), 330–367.

Hall, S. (1980). Race, articulation, and societies structured in dominance. In *Sociological theories: Race and colonialism* (pp. 305–346). Poole, England: UNESCO.

Hall, S. (1985). Signification, representation, ideology: Althusser and the post-structuralist debates. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication, 2*(2), 91–114. doi:10.1080/15295038509360070

Hall, S. (1987). The whites of their eyes: Racist ideologies and the media. In G. Bridges & R. Brunt (Eds.), *Silver linings: Some strategies for the eighties* (pp. 28–52). London, England: Lawrence and Wishart.

Hall, S. (1996). The problem of ideology: Marxism without guarantees. In D. Morley & K.-H. Chen (Eds.), Stuart Hall: *Critical dialogues in cultural studies* (pp. 25–46). Abingdon, England: Routledge.

Hamer, J. F., & Lang, C. (2015). Race, structural violence, and the neoliberal university: The challenges of inhabitation. *Critical Sociology, 41*(6), 897–912. doi:10.1177/0896920515594765

Harvey, D. (2009). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Hernandez, X. J. (2016). Filipino American college students at the margins of neoliberalism. *Policy Futures in Education, 14*(3), 327–344. doi:10.1177/1478210316631870

Herrnstein, R. J., & Murray, C. (1994). *Bell curve: Intelligence and class structure in American life*. New York, NY: Free Press Paperbacks.

hooks, bell. (1992). *Black looks: Race and representation*. Boston, MA: South End Press.

Iverson, S. V. (2008). Capitalizing on change: The discursive framing of diversity in U.S. land-grant universities. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 41*(2), 182–199. doi:10.1080/10665680801972849

Jayakumar, U. M., Adamian, A. S., & Chang, M. J. (2015). Reflections on the diversity (rationale) literature: Examining the potential and need for critical diversity research praxis. In U. M. Jayakumar, L. M. Garces, & F. Fernandez (Eds.), *Affirmative action and racial equity: Considering the Fisher case to forge the path ahead* (pp. 186–209). New York, NY: Routledge.

Jayakumar, U. M., & Garces, L. M. (2015). Afterword: Working collectively toward racial equity in higher education policy. In U. M. Jayakumar, L. M. Garces, & F. Fernandez (Eds.), *Affirmative action and racial equity: Considering the Fisher case to forge the path ahead* (pp. 210–218). New York, NY: Routledge.

Johnson-Ahorlu, R. N. (2013). "Our biggest challenge is stereotypes": Understanding stereotype threat and the academic experiences of African American undergraduates. *The Journal of Negro Education, 82*(4), 382–392. doi:10.7709/jnegroeducation.82.4.0382

Leonardo, Z. (2007). The war on schools: NCLB, nation creation and the educational construction of Whiteness. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 10*(3), 261–278. doi:10.1080/13613320701503249

Leong, N. (2013). Racial capitalism. *Harvard Law Review, 126*(8), 2151–2226.

Marvasti, A. B., & McKinney, K. D. (2011). Does diversity mean assimilation? *Critical Sociology, 37*(5), 631–650. doi:10.1177/0896920510380071

McEwan, M. K. (2003). The nature and uses of theory. In S. R. Komives & D. B. J. Woodard (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (4th ed., pp. 153–178). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Melamed, J. (2011). *Represent and destroy: Rationalizing violence in the new racial capitalism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Minikel-Lacocque, J. (2012). Racism, college, and the power of words: Racial microaggressions reconsidered. *American Educational Research Journal, 50*(3), 432–465. doi:10.3102/0002831212468048

Museus, S. D., Ledesma, M. C., & Parker, T. L. (2015). Racism and racial equity in higher education. *ASHE Higher Education Report, 42*(1), 1–112. doi:10.1002/aehe.20067

Museus, S. D., & Park, J. J. (2015). The continuing significance of racism in the lives of Asian American college students. *Journal of College Student Development, 56*(6), 551–569.

Neville, H. A., Awad, G. H., Brooks, J. E., Flores, M. P., & Bluemel, J. (2013). Color-blind racial ideology: Theory, training, and measurement implications in psychology. *American Psychologist, 68*(6), 455–466. doi:10.1037/a0033282

Olssen, M., & Peters, M. A. (2005). Neoliberalism, higher education and the knowledge economy: From the market to knowledge capitalism. *Journal of Education Policy, 20*(3), 313–345. doi:10.1080/02680930500108718

Omi, M., & Winant, H. (2014). *Racial formation in the United States* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Osei-Kofi, N. (2012). Junior faculty of color in the corporate university: Implications of neoliberalism and neoconservatism on research, teaching and service. *Critical Studies in Education, 53*(2), 229–244. doi:10.1080/17508487.2012.672326

Osei-Kofi, N., Torres, L. E., & Lui, J. (2013). Practices of Whiteness: Racialization in college admissions viewbooks. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 16*(3), 386–405. doi:10.1080/13613324.2011.645572

Park, J. J., & Liu, A. (2014). Interest convergence or divergence?: A critical race analysis of Asian Americans, meritocracy, and critical mass in the affirmative action debate. *The Journal of Higher Education, 85*(1), 36–64. doi:10.1353/jhe.2014.0001

Patton, A. L. (2015). From individual difference to political analysis: An emerging application of critical theory in student affairs. *Journal of Critical Scholarship on Higher Education and Student Affairs, 2*(1), 5.

Roberts, D. J., & Mahtani, M. (2010). Neoliberalizing race, racing neoliberalism: Placing "race" in neoliberal discourses. *Antipode, 42*(2), 248–257. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8330.2009.00747.x

Saenz, V. B., Ngai, H. N., & Hurtado, S. (2007). Factors influencing positive interactions across race for African American, Asian American, Latino, and White college students. *Research in Higher Education, 48*(1), 1–38. doi:10.1007/s11162-006-9026-3

Saunders, D. B. (2010). Neoliberal ideology and public higher education in the United States. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies, 8*(1), 41–77.

Saunders, D. B. (2014). Exploring a customer orientation: Free-market logic and college students. *The Review of Higher Education, 37*(2), 197–219. doi:10.1353/rhe.2014.0013

Savas, G. (2014). Understanding critical race theory as a framework in higher educational research. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 35*(4), 506–522. doi:10.1080/01425692.2013.777211

Shahjahan, R. A. (2014). From "no" to "yes": Postcolonial perspectives on resistance to neoliberal higher education. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 35*(2), 219–232. doi:10.1080/01596306.2012.745732

Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2009). *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state, and higher education.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Smith, W. A., Allen, W. R., & Danley, L. L. (2007). "Assume the position . . . You fit the description": Psychosocial experiences and racial battle fatigue among African American male college students. *American Behavioral Scientist, 51*(4), 551–578. doi:10.1177/0002764207307742

Solórzano, D., Ceja, M., & Yosso, T. (2000). Critical race theory, racial microaggressions, and campus racial climate: The experiences of African American college students. *Journal of Negro Education, 69*(1/2), 60–73. doi:10.2307/2696265

Soss, J., Fording, R. C., & Schram, S. (2011). *Disciplining the poor: Neoliberal paternalism and the persistent power of race.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Squire, D. (2015). Engaging race and power in higher education organizations through a critical race institutional logics perspective. *Journal of Critical Scholarship on Higher Education and Student Affairs, 2*(1), 105–120.

Stewart, D.-L. (2017, March 30). Language of appeasement. *Inside Higher Ed.* Retrieved from https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2017/03/30/colleges-need-language-shift-not-one-you-think-essay

Torres, C. A. (2011). Public universities and the neoliberal common sense: Seven iconoclastic theses. *International Studies in Sociology of Education, 21*(3), 177–197. doi:10.1080/09620214.2011.616340

Urciuoli, B. (1999). Producing multiculturalism in higher education: Who's producing what for whom? *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 12*(3), 287–298. doi:10.1080/095183999236141

Vavrus, M. (2015). *Diversity education: A critical multicultural approach.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.