

## Mapping the Terrain of Whiteness in Education Policy: A Scoping Literature Review

Rachel Piontak<sup>a</sup>

[rpiontak@uark.edu](mailto:rpiontak@uark.edu)

Anna Zajicek<sup>a</sup>

[azajicek@uark.edu](mailto:azajicek@uark.edu)

<sup>a</sup>University of Arkansas, Fayetteville  
1125 W. Maple Street, Fayetteville, AR, 72701  
United States

### Abstract

*Since 2021, although often ill-defined and used as a tool of inflammatory rhetoric, critical race theory, white privilege, and/or intersectionality have been defined as “divisive concepts.” Several states introduced and/or implemented anti-divisive concepts or anti-DEI educational policies. Embedded in these policies are normative whiteness ideologies. This scoping review of 39 articles examines the use of critical whiteness lenses in state and federal education policy analyses. While most articles examine affirmative action and race-conscious admissions policies, others focus on anti-divisive concepts and related curriculum legislation. The articles note that whiteness as property, emotionalities of whiteness, and manipulated discourse are the primary ways in which whiteness is embedded and reproduced in educational policies. This study provides valuable insight into the reproduction of whiteness in education policy and, in so doing, highlights knowledge gaps to be addressed through future scholarship.*

**Keywords:** Critical race theory, Critical whiteness studies, Education policy, Scoping review

### 1. Introduction

In an era of political polarization, education policy is often wielded as a tool of power and control. The education system has become a key intersection between politics and policies in action through book bans, restrictions of allowable topics in the classroom, and striking down affirmative action. Since 2021, critical race theory (CRT) has captured the media frenzy as the most recent scapegoat for a feared “woke education” (Wallace-Wells, 2021, p. 7), propelling critical scholars into the position to define and defend this and other critical social theories from being labeled as “offensive” and “anti-American” (Executive Office of the President, 2020).

Education policy has long been a cradle of protection for white comfort and the reproduction of white hegemony (Gillborn, 2005). The attacks on CRT offer a timely invitation to investigate whiteness in education policy. Enmeshed within the broader political context, critical theorists of educational policies have commonly examined Lowi’s (2015) questions of power by focusing on populations disadvantaged by the political system. Fewer studies, however, shift the gaze from marked to unmarked populations to

identify the structures that maintain the racial power hierarchy (Brekhus, 1998). Toni Morrison's (1992) call to "avert the critical gaze from the racial object to the racial subject; from the described and imagined to the describers and imaginers" (p. 90) is answered, in part, through the scholarship of critical whiteness studies in education policy research.

This scoping review contributes to the field of critical whiteness studies (CWS) and education policy by identifying research focused on integrating critical whiteness in education policy and asking how critical whiteness studies have been applied in education policy research. We also ask: (1) What are the general characteristics of the research that uses critical whiteness as a framework or method of analysis to examine education policy? and (2) What insights about critical whiteness studies in education policy can be extracted from this research?

To address the research questions, we begin with a contextualization of critical theories in education policy research. Following this, we discuss the scoping review methodology and provide quantitative charting and qualitative coding to inform the findings. Scoping reviews excel in mapping and visualizing emerging literature, synthesizing shared findings, and detecting knowledge gaps (Arksey & O'Malley, 2005). This study adapts Arksey and O'Malley's (2005) original scoping review framework and incorporates the PRISMA-ScR review protocols to meet the rigor of scoping review standards (Tricco et al., 2018). We conclude by discussing our findings alongside limitations and implications for future research.

## **2. Background**

This section presents a brief orientation to extant literature related to critical race theory and critical whiteness studies and a historical synthesis of critical research in education policy. This background provides the foundation from which to launch the scoping review.

### **2.1 Critical Race Theory**

Critical race theory has been the springboard to critical whiteness studies (CWS). With an academic home in legal studies, CRT has spread across disciplines to focus on power structures and the embeddedness of racial discrimination in institutional policies and practices (Delgado & Stefancic, 2017). CRT's core tenants include racism as ordinary, meaning that racism is always present but often unacknowledged, and interest-convergence, referencing the idea that progress for people of color occurs only when it benefits white people (Delgado & Stefancic, 2017). A third tenant, counter-stories, emphasizes centering narratives from those in the margins (Delgado & Stefancic, 2017). CRT is aware of the intersectional "complexities of the intersection of 'race' with the constructed and identity related nature of other forms of oppression" (Hylton, 2012, pp. 29-30). This lens allows CRT and other critical theories, like CWS, opportunities to attend to multiple oppressed identities. Racism does not exist in a vacuum, so the intersection of multiple identities and oppressions is central to these approaches.

### **2.2 Critical Whiteness Studies**

While the origins of critical whiteness studies (CWS) trace back to the early 1900s, mainstream academia has only shown interest in CWS since the 1990s (Corces-Zimmerman & Guida, 2019) as a way to "unmask and interrogate" (Beech, 2020, p. 3) the history, privileges, and hegemonic position of whiteness in the U.S. CWS, similar to CRT, Latino/a critical race theory (LatCrit), and tribal critical race theory (TribalCrit), and others, recognizes the social construction of race, alongside harmful effects of whiteness on communities of color (Delgado & Stefancic, 2017). To understand CWS, we must distinguish between whiteness and those who have been racialized as white. Whiteness does not refer to the racialized white race but rather serves as an ideology to capture the "system of policies and practices codified in law and maintained by society that conceptualize white ways of being and thinking to be superior and more deserving" (Corces-Zimmerman & Guida, 2019, p. 94). As such, whiteness is defined as the "normative structure" (McKinney, 2005, p. xiv) that benefits white people at the expense of people of color. Key

CWS concepts are whiteness as property, whiteness as invisible, emotionalities of whiteness, and colorblind racial ideologies (Harris, 1993; Cabrera et al., 2016; Bonilla-Silva, 2021).

First, Harris (1993) explores “whiteness as property,” which comes from the fact that the exclusions and protections conferred on the property are likewise conferred on whiteness. Whiteness as “usable property, the subject of the law’s regard and protection” (Harris, 1993, p. 1734) is theorized as status, transferability, and the right to exclude. In education, the status of whiteness is embedded in the curriculum as a form of “intellectual property” wherein the “quality and quantity of the curriculum varies with the ‘property values’ of the school” (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 2021, p. 23). Whiteness is a “valuable commodity” because it is attached to benefits that cannot be transferred (Cabrera et al., 2016, p. 24). Whiteness, as the right to exclude, is visible in racialized white spaces and nonwhite racialized spaces (Bell, 2017).

Second, whiteness as invisibility refers to its ability to appear “perspective less or transparent” (Delgado & Stefancic, 2017, p. 91). Lacking a consciousness of whiteness normalizes white-centricity at the expense of people of color (Matias & Aldern, 2020). One way that whiteness maintains invisibility is through color evasion, an aspect of colorblind racism ideology (Bonilla-Silva, 2021), which refers to the discursive gymnastics enacted to avoid acknowledging race’s impact and importance (Wilt et al., 2022).

Third, despite a default of invisibility, there are occasions when whiteness makes itself known through white emotionalities (Matias, 2016). These emotions, in the form of tears, defensiveness, or white backlash, known as whitelashing (Matias, 2016), occur when discomfort or a perceived threat de-centers the comfort of white people. Such tactics are deployed to restore a sense of balance and recenter whiteness as the default place of racial comfort (Matias & Aldern, 2020; Cabrera et al., 2016).

Fourth, related to the invisibility and emotionalities of whiteness is the concept of colorblindness. Based on the idea of not “seeing” different skin tones, the term originated from the 1896 Supreme Court case *Plessy v. Ferguson* but took hold in the 1980s when Reagan pushed for a virtuous interpretation of race-neutral policies (Jackson, 2009). Colorblind ideology has since served to prop up whiteness and reproduce systemic injustices (Jackson, 2009). Colorblind racism refers to the identification of racial inequities without acknowledging the role of racism (Cabrera et al., 2016). Bonilla-Silva (2021) notes that colorblindness is a racial ideology because it establishes a pattern of thinking and interpretation that serves as the “ideological armor for a covert and institutionalized system in the post-civil rights era” (Bonilla-Silva, 2021, p. 4), which ultimately “aids in the maintenance of white privilege without fanfare, without naming those who it subjects and those who it awards” (Bonilla-Silva, 2021, p. 4). The studies that make explicit this fanfare in education policy are at the core of this study.

### **2.3 Relationship of Critical Race Theory and Critical Whiteness Studies**

While CRT and CWS aim to dismantle white supremacy and recognize the social construction of race and the privilege afforded to those who have been racialized as white, their relationship is complicated (Delgado & Stefancic, 2017). Some scholars situate CWS as an offshoot of CRT, others as a framework that uses a CRT lens, an impediment to CRT, or yet something else (Matias et al., 2014; Earick, 2018). CRT is described as “a collection of activists and scholars engaged in studying and transforming the relationship among race, racism, and power” (Delgado & Stefancic, 2017, p. 3), while CWS exposes the hegemonic whiteness. However, CWS may “ipso facto leave whiteness intact” (Morales, 2022, p. 708) unless it is “connected to the central tenants of Critical Race Theory and aligned with approaches rooted in the racial knowledge of people of color” (Blaisdell & Bullock, 2022, p. 1). This scoping review further demonstrates the murky boundaries between these frameworks.

### **3. Method**

This review adopts Arksey and O’Malley’s (2005) scoping review framework alongside the PRISMA-ScR extension to address the research questions adequately (Tricco et al., 2018). Arksey and O’Malley’s (2005) framework suggests that scoping literature reviews begin with presenting the objective and

research questions described above. The remaining steps include 1) identifying relevant studies, 2) selecting relevant studies, 3) data organization and classification, 4) qualitative coding and quantitative charting, and 5) a synthesis of findings (Arksey & O'Malley, 2005).

### **3.1 Identifying Relevant Studies**

The first author conferred with two subject matter expert librarians in education and policy to determine effective information sources and search criteria. With their guidance, the following databases were included: 1) EBSCOHost- Academic Search Complete, 2) ProQuest, 3) JSTOR, 4) Web of Science, and 5) a specific sub-section of EBSCOHost to include ERIC, American Political and Social Movements, 1815-1884, Communication Source, Legal Collection, APA Psyc Articles, and APA PsycInfo. Additionally, the first author hand-searched several journals, including the Whiteness and Education journal, Critical Questions in Education, and Thresholds in Education. This decision was made to account for the lack of full-text search capabilities in the included databases, which may have overlooked relevant articles from these journals.

Search terms were used consistently across databases and included the concepts of “critical,” “whiteness” or “white,” “education,” and at least one of the following policy-related indicators: “policy/ies,” “bill,” “law,” “ban,” “ruling,” “statutes,” “guidelines,” “legislation,” or “preemptive.” After numerous iterations to adjust the search syntax, each database was queried twice; the first between October 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2021, and October 30<sup>th</sup>, 2021, which yielded 1,058 articles, and again between September 13<sup>th</sup> and September 17<sup>th</sup>, 2023. Given the political context of the United States between the two queries, the second search with the same query yielded an additional 601 unique articles. To avoid unrelated results, the researcher limited results to exclude “white house” and “white paper.” Both rounds of articles were uploaded into Rayyan, a cloud-based literature review screener tool, deduplicated, and sorted according to the inclusion and exclusion standards.

### **3.2 Selecting Relevant Studies**

After collecting the 1,414 unique articles in Rayyan, each article was screened to determine which sources adequately addressed the research questions. This task was completed by the first author with feedback and corroboration by a second author. The inclusion and exclusion criteria include:

1. Examines state or federal policy: To untangle the pre-service teacher training policies and pedagogical discussions of whiteness in education, only articles that examine a state or federal education policy are included. Since local policies at the city or district level are ultimately subsumed by state and federal policies, we focused only on policies at the state level or above. After much consideration, studies centered around Supreme Court decisions were also included as they are a direct catalyst to subsequent policy action.
2. Critical whiteness or critical white studies (CWS): To examine whiteness as a framework in education policy research, sources grounded in other forms of critical theory, such as critical race theory, are excluded unless they meet the marker for substantive inclusion of whiteness concepts in the framework or analysis. Substantial theoretical or conceptual engagement with critical whiteness had to meet two criteria: (1) extends beyond citing material from other included literature within the review (Durocher et al., 2014), (2) it must have shown intentional engagement of whiteness as an ideology or driving force within education policy. Articles that just noted racial or ethnic identity were excluded.
3. Publication date: The decision to exclude research before 1980 stems from the rise of critical whiteness studies (CWS) in the 1990s.
4. Published in English: Only English-language publications were included; translated works that fit the inclusion criteria are, however, considered in this scoping review.
5. Title or abstract included one search term: To ensure relevant research, results had to include at least one search term from each concept. While concepts related to whiteness and policy had several variations, the concepts of “education” and “critical” were consistent across all articles.

6. Peer-reviewed: In accordance with standard practices of rigorous research, this study includes only peer-reviewed articles.

During this process, any publications that could not be decisively excluded were also uploaded, erring on the side of inclusion. Once all articles had been screened and their exclusion reason(s) noted, the remaining 80 articles were assessed through a full-text screening, and a final 39 articles were selected for the scoping review.

### **3.2.1 Notable Omissions**

Several key articles, ultimately deemed not to meet the inclusion criteria, warrant additional attention due to their significant influence on the periphery of this discussion. Apple's (1999) conceptual essay about the centrality of race in education policy is one such example. In it, he highlights the instability of racial categories within education policy, noting that "what it means, how it is used, by whom, how it is mobilized in public discourse, and its role in educational and more general social policy" is all "contingent and historical" (p.10). This nuanced fluidity highlights the need to carefully examine how whiteness is defined and used as a means of power in education policy.

Several omitted studies examine speeches by major political actors through a discursive analysis of education policy. Gillborn (2008), Hairston (2012), and Williams and Grande (2021) examine a collection of speeches by Tony Blair, Barack Obama, and Donald Trump, respectively, to identify the presence of whiteness ideology embedded in political discourse. While these studies contribute to the wider research landscape about whiteness's impact on education policy, they fall outside the scope of this review.

## **4. Findings**

### **4.1 Charting the Data**

After selecting the 39 articles, the finalized list was downloaded into the citation management program, Zotero, for organization and reference. These full-text articles were then imported to a qualitative coding software, NVIVO, to record attributes and conduct coding. The recorded attributes included 1) author, 2) publication year, 3) article type, 4) journal subject area, 5) state or federal policy researched, 6) state or country of policy, 7) use of critical whiteness, 8) methodology, and 9) theoretical framework. These attributes were tracked in NVIVO through the data classification feature, creating a spreadsheet to display these attributes visually. In the 39 articles, whiteness was often used in the framework, discussion, or analysis sections. As such, the methodology and theoretical framework attributes are discussed in a separate section to allow for a more nuanced explanation. Although not every article reported every attribute, this comprehensive approach produced a more accessible categorization of article characteristics.

### **4.2 Synthesis of Whiteness in Education Policy Research**

#### **4.2.1 General Characteristics**

Given the inclusion criteria, it is not surprising that general characteristics overlap considerably between the articles. Articles were first characterized by type, with twenty-three original studies, twelve conceptual or theoretical articles, and four law reviews. Of the empirical articles, 43% used concepts rooted in critical race theory that address whiteness, including whiteness as property, white supremacy, and white privilege as the theoretical framework. Only seven articles, 30% of the empirical articles, outlined critical whiteness studies as their theoretical framework. Other frameworks included angelology (Scussel & Esposito Norris, 2023), disaster capitalism (Miller et al., 2023), the theory of racialized organizations (Snyder, 2020), and anti-colonial scholarship (Winter & Mills, 2020).

These frameworks were applied to a spread of state and federal policies, with 59% (23) focused on federal policy, 36% (14) on state policy, and 5% (2) exploring both state and federal policies. Of the federally

focused articles, *Fisher v. University of Texas* (2013) and related affirmative action legislation were the most common focus of analysis, with six articles. Inclusive of all article types, anti-CRT legislation was studied in eight of the total 39 articles, making it the most studied policy overall. Almost half of all articles (46%) were published after 2020.

Geographically, most articles focused on the U.S. (79%). Policies enacted in the United Kingdom (4) and Norway (2) were the second and third most referenced countries. Education policies in Brazil and Australia were each the focus of one article.

#### **4.2.2 Key Themes**

To identify key themes, the first author conducted text searches for a priori codes identified in critical whiteness studies, such as “unmarked,” “normalized/normed/normal,” and “emotionalities of whiteness.” In addition, the first author coded article texts for emergent themes related to whiteness. While each article included whiteness as central to its framework, analysis, or both, the nuances of critical engagement with whiteness varied. This section synthesizes key findings across articles to offer insight into critical whiteness studies in education policy through using the lens and reconfiguring the main CWS tenets, including whiteness as property, whiteness as invisible, emotionalities of whiteness, and colorblind racial ideologies. The key themes that emerged are those of manipulated discourse, the economics of whiteness in education, and the protection of whiteness.

##### **4.2.2.1 Whiteness as Manipulated Discourse**

The reviewed articles cover a spectrum of whiteness as manipulated discourse, from silence to avoiding disclosure of whiteness’ harms (Nikolaidis, 2023) to amplified levels of colorblind rhetoric in parent-led collective action (Baldwin Clark, 2023). For instance, in his critical policy analysis of federal school safety and discipline policies, Nikolaidis (2023) identifies manipulative silences as a tool to withhold demographic information about the demographics of school shooters, the majority of whom are white (Nikolaidis, 2023). By suppressing this information, students at risk of harming others are less likely to be identified or receive potentially life-saving services. The policy documents, then, both manipulate discourse to protect white identities and endanger everyone’s safety by not identifying the population in need of services.

Identifying another angle of discursive manipulation, Dowling and Flintoff (2018) examine federal-level physical education (PE) policies for inclusion and discover that PE practices heavily center on Eurocentric content. This normalization of the white student experience and its construction as universal marginalizes students of color (Dowling & Flintoff, 2018). This sentiment is echoed by Canen’s (2010) case study focused on Brazil’s multicultural education law, which, by failing to consider the nuanced racial identities of its students, contributes to race essentialization, thereby manipulating opportunities for effective racial literacy practices.

The strategic use of discursive logic to advantage whiteness is further explored through Goldstein Hode and Meisenbach’s (2017) work focused on the 2016 *Fisher vs. University of Texas* case. They highlight the ways that even pro-affirmative action arguments privilege whiteness by emphasizing a discourse of individualism as central. In doing so, they “mask Whiteness by obscuring the fact that racial identities are a product of White Supremacist ideology” (Hode & Meisenbach, 2014, pp. 170–171). Additionally, Cammarota (2017), in his study of Arizona’s ethnic studies ban, emphasizes how a narrow focus on individualism further “maintains white hegemony over people of color” (p. 524) as it further manipulates reality by failing to consider the broader systemic discrimination by whiteness.

Finally, in an interesting application of colorblind racial ideologies lenses with a focus on white parents, Baldwin Clark (2023) finds that the movement to protect students from indoctrination is, in fact, the drive to protect whiteness. As the author notes, the oft-misquoted Martin Luther King Jr.’s call to judge people according to the content of their character rather than skin color is an “ahistorical understanding of this

nation's race and racial subordination" (2023, p. 2191). This false interpretation is on par with the wider manipulative discourse used to conceal, individualize, and protect whiteness in education policy.

#### 4.2.2.2 Economics of Whiteness in Education Policy

At first glance, education and economics may seem a disparate combination for the critical engagement of whiteness, but oft-cited references to the property-bearing aspects of whiteness, disaster capitalism, and the business case for diversity are present in the reviewed articles. Analyzing affirmative action policies, Harris' (1993) influential work develops the concept of whiteness as property. This concept reappears in the form of cultural property in California's Proposition 227 about bilingual education (Sekhon, 1999), through the right to define eligibility in Washington's Seal of Illiteracy Law (Snyder, 2020), controlled access to the historical narrative in Nevada's Senate Bill 107 (Daftary et al., 2022), and within the exclusionary support provided for special education (Kearl, 2019). It is within this space, Kearl (2019) contends, that whiteness actively "recruits disability into its self-enclosed and propertied boundaries" (p. 475) at the expense of non-white students. Yet whiteness as property extends beyond these propertied boundaries of access and exclusion and into the concrete structure of oppression itself.

Thompson Dorsey and Venzant Chambers' (2014) work on the pushback against affirmative action policies argues that in this "period of more active and ardent reassertion of white property rights" (p. 82), the concept of "imperialistic reclamation" (p. 82) better captures the attempts to nullify the progress of people of color than the original concept of convergence-divergence-reclamation (C-D-R) cycles. Similarly, Aggarwal (2016) analyzes *Brown v. Board of Education* to outline an "ideological architecture of whiteness as property" (p. 130). She demonstrates "how accumulation by dispossession is always and already built into the liberal capitalist state" (Aggarwal, 2016, p. 145).

The economics of whiteness is further explored in Miller et al.'s (2023) study of anti-CRT legislation as an example of disaster capitalism. This happens through the funneling of private funding through conservative educational groups fighting for harsh bans against discussions of race and racism in the classroom in the name of protecting white children's psychological comfort. This unique approach exposes whose comfort is prioritized and whose is excluded within the economics of whiteness.

James (2014) and Goldstein Hode and Meisenbach (2017) offer insight into the economics of whiteness by examining the influence of whiteness within pro-affirmative action arguments for racial diversity in admissions policies. They highlight the unintended consequences of emphasizing the idea that diversity has a broadly positive impact on all (Goldstein Hode & Meisenbach, 2017). Both authors draw from the *Fisher vs. University of Texas* case to highlight the damaging irony of this rationale, noting that it may ultimately serve to uphold the "status quo of racial hierarchy" (Goldstein Hode & Meisenbach, 2017, p. 163) and undercut the opportunity for white people to interrogate their own class representation within higher education (James, 2014). These studies exemplify the second main theme in extant studies of whiteness in education policy.

#### 4.2.2.3 Protection of Whiteness

While the protection of whiteness can be teased out from the previous themes, there is evidence that whiteness ideologies are protected in education policy through the guise of colorblind racism and emotionality (see Sheppard, 2023; Mayorga & Bradley, 2023; Gomez et al., 2023; Kearl, 2023; Leonardo, 2007; Winter & Mills, 2020). Sheppard (2023) addresses this theme through the emotion discourses of hope and fear in Iowa's anti-CRT legislation. Using an emotion discourse analysis, she examines how the production of fear and hope through legislative discourse serves to sustain, and thereby protect, the white-centric social studies curriculum in public schools (Sheppard, 2023). Gomez et al.'s (2023) examination of recent legislation against ethnic study courses and "divisive concepts" suggests that "fear of racial reconciliation" (p. 2) is at the crux of this issue, as it "may transform interpretation of the racial categorization that maintains the US social hierarchical order" (p. 2). This is further echoed by Kearl's (2023) recall of the Kanawha County political opposition against the multiracial curriculum, wherein



parents “ground their political opposition in the emotionality of white victimhood and feelings of future ideological captivity” (p. 119). These studies indicate that any perceived threat to white dominance in education will result in tighter state control (Winter & Mills, 2020), conservative backlash (Kearl, 2023), and widespread attempts to protect the “curricular souls of white children” (Kearl, 2023, p. 119).

### **5. Implications and Conclusion**

This scoping review unveiled three themes underlying the use of CWS in education policy research. Beyond those discussed here, other studies offered theoretical or abstract reflections about the insidiousness of white supremacy in education policy but lacked substantive analysis with which to anchor their advocacy. This speaks to the inherent tension of CWS. As a framework designed to dismantle the oppressive structures created and upheld by whiteness ideologies, effective research is a challenging task. Without ongoing consideration of the research’s potential and actual impact, the criticality of whiteness studies risks being a stripped-down approach, lacking racial self-reflection, and even the potential erasure of other critical theories. Engaging in the change-making work of dismantling the system of whiteness is both a call and a shortcoming for many scholars and requires considerable intentionality with the presentation and use of critical whiteness in research.

Moreover, the current political situation in the United States is marked by increasing polarization (Pew Research Center, 2014). This study reveals whiteness ideologies' ongoing presence and impact throughout policymaking. Recognizing harmful indications of whiteness is especially crucial in the current political moment. Further research, grounded by the call to dismantle the white supremacist system, will widen the bridge between policy, practice, and the harmful hegemonic practices of whiteness in education.

This scoping review sought to understand how critical whiteness studies have been applied in education policy research by identifying, categorizing, and synthesizing key findings from relevant articles in the field. Using Arksey and O’Malley’s (2005) scoping review methodology, this study outlined general characteristics and discussed their overarching themes as relevant to the field of critical whiteness studies. This timely research is merely a steppingstone to deeper understanding and, ultimately, disentanglement of the system of whiteness within current education policy.

### **6. Limitations**

Despite the thorough process of the scoping review, the nature of critical theories in education is not always clear. Given the conceptual overlap between CWS and CRT, the substantive use of whiteness in the framework or analysis had to be explicitly stated or risk exclusion from the final scoping review numbers. We may have erroneously overlooked articles that did engage whiteness via other approaches. Understanding that everything in education is rooted in policy at some level, including local or non-specific education policy analyses, may have expanded or deepened the findings presented here.

Additionally, it is important to acknowledge the inclusion of Cheryl Harris’ (1993) fundamental work about whiteness as property. In her research, she established a set of concepts related to whiteness that have been widely used to inform other studies included in this scoping review. This unique factor may have contributed to a sense of circular reasoning between theory and findings within articles grounded in Harris’ concepts of whiteness as property. Finally, gray literature, doctoral dissertations, and books were also omitted, and given the recent proliferation of this topic, this decision may have barred relevant literature from this scoping review.

### **7. Funding**

The researcher did not receive any funding from internal or external agencies to complete the scoping review.



## References

- Aggarwal, U. (2016). The ideological architecture of whiteness as property in educational policy. *Educational Policy*, 30(1), 128.
- Apple, M. W. (1999). The absent presence of race in educational reform. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 2(1), 9–37.
- Applebaum, B. (2016). Critical whiteness studies. In B. Applebaum, *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.5>
- Arksey, H., & O'Malley, L. (2005). Scoping studies: Towards a methodological framework. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 8(1), 19–32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1364557032000119616>
- Baldwin Clark, L. A. (2023). The Critical Racialization of Parents' Rights. *Yale Law Journal*, 132(7), 2139–2204.
- Beech, J. (2020). *White out: A guidebook for teaching and engaging with critical whiteness studies*. Brill. <https://brill.com/display/title/38847>
- Bell, M. (2017). Whiteness interrupted: Examining the impact of racialized space on white racial identity. *Syracuse University*. <https://surface.syr.edu/etd/769>
- Blaisdell, B., & Bullock, R. T. (2022). White imagination, Black reality: Recentering critical race theory in critical whiteness studies. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2022.2025484>
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2021). *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in America* (6th ed.). Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Brekhus, W. (1998). A sociology of the unmarked: Redirecting our focus. *Sociological Theory*, 16(1), 34–51. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0735-2751.00041>
- Cabrera, N. L., Franklin, J. D., & Watson, J. S. (2016). Whiteness in higher education: The invisible missing link in diversity and racial analyses: Whiteness in higher education. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, 42(6), 7–125. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aehe.20116>
- Camarota, J. (2017). Race war in Arizona: Reflections on the ethnic studies ban and white hegemony. *Latino Studies*, 15(4), 522–531. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41276-017-0094-7>
- Canen, A. (2010). Teaching Racial Literacy: Challenges and Contributions of Multiculturalism. *Policy Futures in Education*, 8(5), 548–555. <https://doi.org/10.2304/pfie.2010.8.5.548>
- Corces-Zimmerman, C., & Guida, T. F. (2019). Toward a critical whiteness methodology: Challenging whiteness through qualitative research. In J. Huisman & M. Tight (Eds.), *Theory and method in higher education research* (pp. 91–109). Emerald Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S2056-375220190000005007>
- Daftary, A., Ortega, D., Sanders, C., & Hylton, M. (2022). A CRT analysis of policy making in Nevada: A case study for social work education. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 58(4), 768–779. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10437797.2021.1957734>
- Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2017). *Critical race theory: An introduction, Third Edition*. NYU Press.
- Dowling, F., & Flintoff, A. (2018). A whitewashed curriculum? The construction of race in contemporary PE curriculum policy. *Sport, Education and Society*, 23(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2015.1122584>
- Durocher, E., Gibson, B. E., & Rappolt, S. (2014). Occupational justice: A conceptual review. *Journal of Occupational Science*, 21(4), 418–430. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14427591.2013.775692>
- Earick, M. E. (2018). We are not social justice equals: The need for white scholars to understand their whiteness. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 31(8), 800–820. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2018.1479044>
- Executive Office of the President. (2020). *Executive Order 13950 of September 22, 2020*. Federal Register. <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2020/09/28/2020-21534/combating-race-and-sex-stereotyping>

- Fylkesnes, S. (2019). Patterns of racialised discourses in Norwegian teacher education policy: Whiteness as a pedagogy of amnesia in the national curriculum. *Journal of Education Policy*, 34(3), 394–422. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2018.1482503>
- Gillborn, D. (2005). Education policy as an act of white supremacy: Whiteness, critical race theory and education reform. *Journal of Education Policy*, 20(4), 485–505. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680930500132346>
- Gillborn, D. (2008). Tony Blair and the politics of race in education: Whiteness, doublethink and New Labour. *Oxford Review of Education*, 34(6), 713–725.
- Goldstein Hode, M. G., & Meisenbach, R. (2014). *Affirming whiteness: A critical discourse analysis of the affirmative action debate in the Fisher case*. 10157650, 255.
- Goldstein Hode, M., & Meisenbach, R. J. (2017). Reproducing whiteness through diversity: A critical discourse analysis of the pro-affirmative action amicus briefs in the Fisher case. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 10(2), 162–180. pdh. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000014>
- Gomez, R., Bennett, E., & Cammarota, J. (2023). The battle for curriculum: Arrested semantics and reconciling racism with critical race theory and Ethnic Studies. *Race Ethnicity and Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2023.2239726>
- Hairston, T. W. (2012). Continuing inequity through neoliberalism: The conveyance of white dominance in the educational policy speeches of President Barack Obama. *Interchange: A Quarterly Review of Education*, 43(3), 229–244. eric. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10780-013-9180-4>
- Harris, C. I. (1993). Whiteness as property. *Harvard Law Review*, 106(8), 1707–1791.
- Hylton, K. (2012). Talk the talk, walk the walk: Defining critical race theory in research. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 15(1), 23–41. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2012.638862>
- Jackson, M. (Ed.). (2009). Neo-Colonialism, same old racism: A critical analysis of the United States' shift toward colorblindness as a tool for the protection of the American colonial empire and white supremacy. *Berkeley Journal of African-American Law & Policy*. <https://doi.org/10.15779/Z38K338>
- James, O. R. (2014). White like me: The negative impact of the diversity rationale on white identity formation. *New York University Law Review*, 89(2), 425–512.
- Kearl, B. (2019). Special education as neoliberal property: The racecraft, biopolitics, and immunization of disability. *Educational Studies*, 55(4), 473–488. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131946.2019.1630126>
- Kearl, B. (2023). Affirming Black Sociality in a time of anti-CRT Legislation, White Emotionality, & Immunitary Whiteness. *Thresholds in Education*, 46(1), 114–125.
- Leonardo, Z. (2007). The war on schools: NCLB, nation creation and the educational construction of whiteness. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 10(3), 261–278. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13613320701503249>
- Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. F. (2021). Toward a Critical Race Theory of Education. In G. Ladson-Billings, *Critical Race Theory in Education: A Scholar's Journey* (pp. 17–38). Teachers College Press.
- Lowi, T. J., & Nicholson, N. K. (2015). *Arenas of Power: Reflections on Politics and Policy*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315635958>
- Matias, C. E. (2016). *Feeling white: Whiteness, emotionality, and education*. Brill. <https://brill.com/display/title/37002>
- Matias, C. E., & Aldern, J. (2020). (Un)Common white sense: The whiteness behind digital media. *Postdigital Science and Education*, 2(2), 330–347. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-019-00076-5>
- Matias, C. E., Viesca, K. M., Garrison-Wade, D. F., Tandon, M., & Galindo, R. (2014). “What is critical whiteness doing in OUR nice field like critical race theory?” Applying CRT and CWS to understand the white imaginations of white teacher candidates. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 47(3), 289.
- Mayorga, E., & Bradley, J. (2023). Critical Race Theory & Abolition: Disrupting Racial Policy Whiplash in Teacher Education. *Thresholds in Education*, 46(1), 126–138.
- McKinney, K. D. (2005). *Being white: Stories of race and racism*. Routledge.

- Miller, R., Liu, K., & Ball, A. F. (2023). Misunderstanding the Campaign Against CRT: Absurdity and White Supremacy in Attacks on Teaching and Teacher Education. *Thresholds in Education*, 46(1), 139–156.
- Morales, S. (2022). Locating the “white” in critical whiteness studies: Considerations for white scholars seeking to dismantle whiteness within educational research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 35(7), 703–710. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2022.2061731>
- Morrison, T. (1992). *Playing in the dark: Whiteness and the literary imagination*. Harvard University Press.
- Nikolaidis, A. (2023). Race in education policy: School safety and the discursive legitimization of disproportionate punishment. *Journal of Education Policy*, 38(5), 713–737. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2022.2085812>
- Pew Research Center. (2014, June 12). *Political polarization in the American public*. Pew Research Center. <https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/2014/06/12/political-polarization-in-the-american-public/>
- Scussel, E. C., & Esposito Norris, J. (2023). “That Sounds Scary, Let’s Ban It:” Analyzing Manufactured Ignorance & the Attack on Critical Race Theory in K-12 Schools. *Thresholds in Education*, 46(1), 48–60.
- Sekhon, N. (1999). A birthright rearticulated: The politics of bilingual education. *New York University Law Review*, 74(5), 1407–1450.
- Sheppard, M. (2023). Legislating whiteness: An emotion discourse analysis of divisive concepts legislation. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14681366.2023.2242351>
- Snyder, R. (2020). The right to define: Analyzing whiteness as a form of property in Washington state bilingual education law. *Language Policy*, 19(1), 31–60.
- Thompson Dorsey, D. N., & Venzant Chambers, T. T. (2014). Growing C-D-R (Cedar): Working the intersections of interest convergence and whiteness as property in the affirmative action legal debate. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 17(1), 56–87. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2013.812628>
- Tricco, A. C., Lillie, E., Zarin, W., O’Brien, K. K., Colquhoun, H., Levac, D., Moher, D., Peters, M. D. J., Horsley, T., Weeks, L., Hempel, S., Akl, E. A., Chang, C., McGowan, J., Stewart, L., Hartling, L., Aldcroft, A., Wilson, M. G., Garritty, C., Straus, S. E. (2018). PRISMA extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and explanation. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 169(7), 467–473. <https://doi.org/10.7326/M18-0850>
- Wallace-Wells, B. (2021, June 18). How a Conservative Activist Invented the Conflict Over Critical Race Theory. *The New Yorker*. <https://www.newyorker.com/news/annals-of-inquiry/how-a-conservative-activist-invented-the-conflict-over-critical-race-theory>
- Williams, L., & Grande, S. (2021). Trumpocalypse and the Historical Limits of Higher Education Policy: Making the Case for Study/Struggle. *Qualitative Inquiry*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10778004211014615>
- Wilt, C. L., Annamma, S. A., Wilmot, J. M., Nyegenye, S. N., Miller, A. L., & Jackson, E. E. (2022). Performing color-evasiveness: A DisCrit analysis of educators’ discourse in the U.S. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 117, 103761. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2022.103761>
- Winter, C., & Mills, C. (2020). The psy-security-curriculum ensemble: British values curriculum policy in English schools. *Journal of Education Policy*, 35(1), 46–67.