Teaching for Diversity and Social Justice

Third Edition

Edited by

Maurianne Adams and Lee Anne Bell
With Diane J. Goodman and Khyati Y. Joshi

For personal use by Berkeley faculty only, with permission of the author.
Please do not post, forward or otherwise distribute. Thank you.

NEW YORK AND LONDON

2016

12

Critical Self-Knowledge for Social Justice Educators

*Lee Anne Bell, Diane J. Goodman, and Rani Varghese**

INTRODUCTION

What do we need to know about ourselves in order to teach about social justice issues and interact thoughtfully, sensitively, and effectively with students/participants and the broader communities and institutions in which we teach? In social justice education, instructors as well as participants are central to the learning process. All of us experience and respond to classrooms and organizations differently based on our various social identities. Thus, in this chapter, we turn the lens on ourselves as educators. We explore how our own social identities and dominant and subordinated statuses affect the way we engage with learners, and we discuss the critical self-knowledge we need to be effective social justice educators.

First, we discuss the significance of our social identities and positions in our role as educators within systems of inequality, such as schools, colleges/universities, organizations, and communities. We then explore how our social group memberships and positionality, along with our social identity development, affect various aspects of our teaching, such as our pedagogical approaches and curriculum design. For example, we examine our levels of awareness regarding content, our biases and assumptions, the experiences of different students, and our responses to participants as well as group dynamics in the classroom. Next, we look at issues of competency and authority and suggest how self-knowledge can help instructors navigate these issues in classrooms and in institutions. We end with considering how issues of social identity and positionality affect co-teaching or co-facilitating.

SITUATING OURSELVES

There are many factors that will affect our facilitation of social justice issues. Our particular and unique personalities, family backgrounds, life histories, and educational training, to name a few, all impact who we are and how we are in the classroom. In order to better understand what we need to know about ourselves to be more effective social justice educators, we consider how we are situated in the classroom and broader community, using the lenses of social identities, dominant and subordinated statuses, and related socialization. While our approaches as educators cannot be reduced to these factors, we consider their significant and complex role in shaping our senses of self, responses, and experiences as social justice educators.

Social Identities

Our various and intersecting social identities based on race, ethnicity, gender, sexuality, class, religion, age, nationality, (dis)ability), and primary language(s), along with socialization in our families and communities, position us in particular ways in relation to social justice content and pedagogical processes. Our social identities shape our cultural

orientations, perspectives, and behaviors. "Social identity awareness includes analysis of one's multiple and interacting social identities as well as one's identity statuses and the impact of those identities and identity statuses on various dimensions of one's classroom practice" (Adams & Love, 2009, p. 11).

In conventional classrooms, where content or pedagogy may not take into account social justice principles, the particular social and cultural identities of instructors usually remain in the background. But in the social justice classroom or workshop, where social identity is central to the content, the significance of who we are often takes center stage. We may be more or less aware of different aspects of our identity and how they affect our capacity to be effective social justice educators. To explore their impact, we can reflect on questions like the following:

- What aspects of my social identities are most and least important to me?
- Which identities are most/least salient in different contexts?
- With which social identities am I most/least comfortable?
- How do my different social identities affect and interact with each other? Where are the alignments or tensions among my different identities in different contexts?

Self-knowledge about our social identities and how they shape us as social justice educators provides a critical foundation for this work.

OUR DOMINANT AND SUBORDINATED STATUSES AND POSITIONALITY

We are all located in societal hierarchies of power, mediated by our various social identities and our dominant and subordinated statuses. The constellation of our dominant and subordinated statuses affect how we perceive and respond to others, how they perceive and respond to us, and the content and pedagogies with which we are most comfortable. Thinking about these and other questions can help us examine and understand the potential impact of our social identities and dominant/subordinated statuses on our social justice teaching:

- How do I enact and experience my privilege or advantage due to my dominant identities?
- How do I experience disadvantage and oppression based on my subordinated identities?
- How do the intersections of my various dominant and subordinated identities affect my experiences of power and marginalization?
- How do my dominant and subordinated status affect my sense of competency and how I am perceived by others?

By asking ourselves such questions, we can recognize how our positions of advantage and disadvantage across different forms of oppression may enhance and impede our efforts as educators.

Our Intersecting Social Group Membership and Positionality

Our social identities and dominant and subordinated statuses do not operate in isolation from each other. Nor do we live as individuals removed from our social group memberships and how we are positioned within the social, historical, and political landscape in relation to other social groups. Although the three authors of this chapter identify similarly in terms of gender, we are positioned differently based on other aspects of our identities:

As a South Asian woman who gets "read" as younger than her actual age, I find myself at the beginning of the semester listing my degrees, the schools I've attended and my years of experience in order to get students to buy into the course and the topics that I am teaching (Rani).

As a white, middle-aged, full professor, I am more likely to be treated as an expert in my field, although when I initially asked my undergraduates to call me by my first name, instead of the title "Professor" typical at my new institution, only the white male undergraduates felt comfortable doing so (Lee).

Even though I am white, upper-middle-class, and got good academic preparation, it has only been as I've gotten older with many years of experience that I have felt more confident and more respected by others (Diane).

In these examples, our memberships in racial or ethnic groups, class status, gender identity, and categories of age are linked and impact how we show up in the classroom and how students see and interact with us. Scholars and activists engaged with intersectional issues raise awareness of how an intersectional lens changes the way we look at our social locations as well as how we experience specific isms and their intersections (Collins, 2008; Crenshaw, 1989, 1993). "We have still to recognize that being a woman is, in fact, not extractable from the context in which one is a woman—that is, race, class, time, and place. We have still to recognize that all women do not have the same gender" (Brown, 1997, p. 276).

Thus, it is important as social justice educators that we not only examine our own positionality in relation to others, but also consider how our different dominant and subordinated statuses intersect to shape our experiences in distinctive ways. Our individual social group memberships in dominant and subordinated groups are also complicated by and embedded in larger historical, political, and social contexts with their own power dynamics:

As a faculty member teaching in the field of Social Work, I think it is important to share with students that we are situated within a profession that has historically had a complex relationship to subordinated racial and ethnic groups who have experienced social work as an imposition of white, middle-class values and beliefs. I want students to be aware of this history when they work in different communities so they are not surprised by a client's potential mistrust of them. In addition, I want them to reflect on the biases they may bring to their work (Rani).

This is also true in my field of Education and preparing teachers (still predominantly white, middle-class, females) to work respectfully and knowledgeably with young people from a range of social identities in diverse schools and communities. I've been in this field a long time and I am still learning about biases and assumptions in teacher education that prevent teachers from dominant groups from seeing the strengths, capacities, and perspectives of people from marginalized communities—the very information that would enable educators from outside of the communities where they teach to be more effective (Lee).

Our social identities, dominant and subordinated statuses, our positionality in larger systems and ways these interact affect many facets of our work as social justice educators. The more aware we are of how who we are affects our knowledge, awareness, approaches, and interactions, the more effective we can be.

OUR DEGREE OF KNOWLEDGE AND SELF-AWARENESS

Each of us has varying levels of self-awareness and critical consciousness about different forms of oppression and our identities related to them. There are some social justice topics that we have explored deeply, while there may be others that we understand more

superficially. We may have a lot of relationships with and insight into the experiences of individuals from some social identity groups, but we may have had little exposure to the realities of other groups. We may have worked hard on rooting out our stereotypes and assumptions about people from certain social/cultural groups but still carry a lot of unconscious bias about others. Some questions to consider include:

- With individuals from which social groups do I feel most and least comfortable?
- Which students do I feel I educate most or least effectively?
- Which topics or isms do I feel most and least comfortable teaching?

Self-knowledge about our levels of awareness in relation to our own social identities and positionality, the experiences and lives of others, our knowledge of social justice issues and content are important considerations in our development as social justice educators.

Social Identity Development

As described in Chapter 2, social identity development theory describes a psychosocial process of phases of awareness and change in ways that people think about their own social group membership(s), other social groups, and social oppression. Where we are in our own journey of identity development influences how we intellectually understand and emotionally respond to particular social topics and interpersonal dynamics in the classroom.

Instructors who are early in their own process of social identity development may not be ready to teach about certain social justice issues where they lack a depth of knowledge in the subject, have not gained awareness of their own internalized assumptions, or have not developed knowledge to critique dominant narratives that support that particular form of oppression. At earlier stages of social identity development, it may be hard to clearly understand how we are affected by and participate in systems of inequality, or we may feel too self-conscious about our identity or knowledge of the oppression to be confident teaching the material. Consider these examples:

- A cisgender instructor, just learning about transgender issues, is tentative about addressing transgender issues and stumbles as he tries to find the right language.
- A white instructor's self-consciousness about her own racial identity and authority to speak on racial issues makes her reluctant to question an inaccurate statement about race made by a participant of color.
- A secular Jew, who has given little thought to his Jewish identity, is unprepared to address the questions and challenges Jewish students raise about the intersections of antisemitism, racism, and white privilege.

Some instructors at early points in their process may find it especially challenging to manage feelings such as anger, guilt, or frustration, or may be more likely to feel triggered by student comments or behaviors, and lack the patience or compassion to work with participants empathically and effectively. This dynamic can occur whether we are in the dominant or subordinated group working with people from our own or different social identity groups.

Early in my teaching about racism, when I was still grappling with guilt about being white, I sometimes found myself feeling disdainful and judgmental towards other white participants, in ways that interfered with my effectiveness. As I became clearer about my own white identity and my responsibility to educate other white people about racism, I was able to be more empathic about their struggles. I could then be more effective in helping them engage with the issues rather than resist or turn away from responsibly addressing racism (Lee).

When I first started teaching about sexism, I found myself being triggered by women in the class who were adamant that sexism was not an issue for "their generation." Over time, I was able to ask these women questions about why they didn't think sexism was relevant for them rather than bombard them with endless examples to try to get them to change their mind (Rani).

As instructors gain greater awareness and progress through their own social identity development around different issues, they can be more conscious and purposeful in dealing with students who are at various stages in their learning. Often the intensity of our reactions diminishes and we are better able to manage situations that arise.

Certain identities may also be more salient depending on where we are in our own development *across* forms of oppression. Sometimes when we are deeply involved with one identity or inequality, it can be more difficult to attend to other social identities or forms of oppression. As one instructor shared, *"I know it's really important that I'm white, but right now I'm dealing with coming out as a lesbian!"* Often we are not even aware that we are overlooking the significance of our other social identities.

While it can be helpful to focus on one social identity at a time when we are in the process of learning, ideally we want to become aware of our role in all forms of oppression. Undoubtedly, we will have varying degrees of awareness of different identities and will need to continually increase our self-awareness and critical consciousness across all forms of inequality. Moreover, instructors need to understand how our intersecting identities and positionalities affect our social identity development process.

I share with students that I didn't have to confront the ways in which I was privileged being Christian until later in college because most people assume that I am Hindu or Muslim. I use this example to illustrate my awareness about the complexity of identity, that I can simultaneously get "read" ethnically and religiously in a subordinate way but experience privilege because of my affinity to Christianity. Some of my students who don't feel "privileged" but are part of dominant social identity groups can relate to this example (Rani).

While I began to intentionally explore my white identity before my Jewish identity, understanding what it meant to be Jewish helped me deepen my understanding of the complexity and nuances of being white (Diane).

Reflecting on our process of social identity development can help us relate to the feelings and challenges our students may be facing as they move through their own social identity development with different issues of oppression. We can share with students how we have dealt with oppressive conditioning at different stages so as to continue to grow. When educators model self-awareness about their own identities, processes of identity development, and inevitable gaps in knowledge and consciousness, they are likely to garner more trust and respect from students. This is especially critical for educators from advantaged groups working with individuals from disadvantaged groups who may withhold trust until they see evidence from instructors that they are aware of their own social location(s) and what members of other groups experience. When we have worked on and are more comfortable with our own social identity development across the range of identities, we can be more authentic and competent in the classroom and teach with greater clarity, empathy, and effectiveness.

Awareness of Norms That Reinforce Privilege and Marginalization

Our social identities and relative privilege or marginality in different social groups will influence our perspectives on, and awareness of, particular social justice issues and dynamics. Dominant status generally makes us less conscious of our privileges and of

the disadvantages and oppression experienced by members of marginalized groups, since dominant identities and experiences are normalized. The culture of higher education, for example, tends to assume and take for granted white, Western, middle- and upper-class norms that may or may not match the cultural styles and social experiences of our students/participants. This is common in other organizations as well. Our own familiarity and comfort with these norms may vary depending on the mix of social identities and dominant/subordinated statuses we bring to the institution.

As social justice educators, we need to acknowledge the norms that surround learning and be aware of the extent to which we accept or question those norms.

In a course with adult learners who were balancing the class with jobs and family responsibilities, students were upset with the cost of the textbook and the amount of out-of-class work. Even though I had experienced these same constraints as a student myself, it had not occurred to me to challenge institutional norms. I initiated a discussion with them about the challenges they were experiencing and connected this back to issues of classism and the unexamined assumptions that reinforce class privilege. The discussion led to more thoughtful decisions about having course texts and class assignments accessible to students who may not be able to afford them (i.e., develop a library of books to loan students, ensure multiple copies on reserve in the library, encouraging sharing of texts and collaborative assignments, etc. (Lee).

Other examples of how dominant status can lead to lack of awareness that can reinforce norms that marginalize students include:

- A cisgender instructor does not consider the location of gender-neutral bathrooms that may be needed by trans* students.
- An upper-middle-class instructor assigns students to attend a local theater performance or museum exhibit without considering the impact of transportation and ticket costs on students with limited means, or accessible transportation and access for students with disabilities.

As educators, it is hard to figure out what we don't know. Therefore, it is important that we regularly reflect on our identities and positionality in communities of other scholars or learners who are different and similar to us, knowing that a lack of awareness can lead us to have limited perspectives or leave out information and views that are central to a social justice curriculum. For example,

During a workshop, a Deaf participant objected to having deafness considered a disability because for her it is solely a culture. This was an important perspective for me and the class to learn about (Diane).

We may also treat marginalized group perspectives in tokenized ways and miss the nuances that can effectively challenge stereotypes and exclusions. Since educators from dominant groups are often less aware of and informed about the lives of people from subordinated groups, it is not surprising that it is more often people from marginalized groups who notice omissions and push to have their experiences and voices included in the curriculum. Consider these examples:

- Native American or indigenous people often feel their histories and realities are not included in discussions of racism that do not give adequate attention to colonization.
- People of color have fought for years to have their histories and realities included as important and accurately reflected in courses that are not exclusively about race.
- LGBTQ (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer) students have been the ones spearheading efforts to have their experiences and oppression included in diversity and social justice courses.

Sometimes, marginalized status can make us more aware of and sensitive to issues that others from our social group face.

As someone who grew up working class and a first-generation academic, I am intentional about discussing graduate school with the undergraduate students I teach, many of them first-generation college students, in order to dispel ideas that this is not a route for them and to explicitly encourage this route as a possibility they can consider for themselves (Rani).

While instructors from marginalized groups have some first-hand knowledge of oppression, they are not immune from lack of awareness and knowledge about social injustice and/or from internalized oppression (where they have internalized the stereotypes about their group). None of us knows everything there is to know about our own social group(s) since we are only expert on our own experience. Additionally, we are individually at different places in our process of social identity development. Even when well-informed about one form of oppression we experience, if we are not also knowledgeable about other forms of oppression, we cannot effectively see and address how these issues intersect.

For a long time I've been involved with feminism and women's issues, but I still need to stay conscious about the complex and varied experiences of women who have other social identities different than mine and face other forms of oppression that impact how they encounter sexism. Just because I'm a woman does not mean I understand their realities (Diane).

Clearly, developing greater insight into the complexity of our own and other social identity groups and experiences of privilege and marginalization is an essential and ongoing process.

ASSUMPTIONS AND BIASES

Everyone has biases, both recognized and unrecognized. Like our students, we have internalized assumptions and stereotypes about our own and other social groups through socialization and societal conditioning. We need to recognize that none of us stand outside of or above the systems we study, and that our perspectives are inevitably partial and shaped by our social locations.

Research reveals how insidious and harmful implicit or unconscious bias can be (Banaji & Greenwald, 2013; Staats, 2013, 2014). Scholarship about "microaggressions," the commonplace, persistent, and often unintentional, negative slights toward people from marginalized groups, shows how biases reveal themselves and affect others in profound ways (Huber & Solórzano, 2015; Solórzano, Ceja, & Yosso, 2000; Sue, 2010a, 2010b). Research in educational settings demonstrates how microaggressions negatively impact academic achievement, feelings of inclusion, and levels of stress (Sue, Lin, Torino, Capodilupo, & Rivera, 2009). To ensure we do not unwittingly perpetuate or allow microaggressions in our classes or workshops, it is critical that instructors examine our own assumptions and become conscious of how they may shape our interactions with participants in damaging ways we may not consciously intend.

During a fishbowl activity where different ethnic/racial groups talked about their specific experiences of race and racism, the Native American affinity group was listed to go last, resulting in the students having the least amount of time to talk and enacting structural racism, where indigenous voices and perspectives are silenced or made invisible. In my next class, it was critical that I named what my co-instructor and I had unconsciously done and the ways we, she as a white woman and I as a South Asian woman, could still engage in oppressive behaviors after having taught about race and racism for years (Rani).

As illustrated, there are innumerable ways prejudices, stereotypes, and assumptions can show up in the classroom. An instructor may treat students as "experts" or representative

of their whole group rather than as individuals who may enact their experiences in the group in a range of ways. For example:

- Asking a Muslim person what Muslims think of the U.S. war on terror, as if all Muslims think alike
- Expecting a Latina student who is from Colombia to know about the history of the Mexican holiday Cinco de Mayo, not recognizing the variety of national, cultural, and historical experiences among people who are defined as Latina/o in the U.S.
- Requesting that a Jewish participant explain a particular Jewish holiday, assuming all Jews are knowledgeable about Judaism

Instructors may make presumptions that everyone shares the norms of the dominant culture, and/or may devalue subordinated group norms, styles, and experiences. For example:

- An instructor uses only hetero-normative examples or assumes all students are having heterosexual romantic relationships
- An educator complains that some students are "too quiet" or "too loud and emotional" or "not logical enough" and doesn't recognize their own limited knowledge about and inability to value different cultural orientations

Facilitators may also act out the ways they have internalized the pervasive societal messages about the superiority of dominant groups and inferiority of subordinated groups. This may be evidenced when:

- A facilitator pays more attention to male participants or gives more credence to their comments;
- An instructor takes a paternalistic stance that discourages independence and risk-taking by a student with a disability;
- A faculty member exhibits lower academic or intellectual expectations, such as being surprised or dubious when a working-class student hands in a particularly well-written paper.

While it can be unnerving to have our prejudices or unconscious biases revealed, we can learn to appreciate these missteps as important learning opportunities.

I mixed up the names of two black women in the class. One of them said she felt that it was a racist microaggression. I had to resist my urge to explain why I made that mistake, and instead, took a breath and apologized, said that I understood why she was offended, and would commit to not do that again (Diane).

We know that recognizing and rooting out deeply socialized prejudices and practices is a difficult and lifelong process. If we model willingness to acknowledge, get feedback, and reflect on our assumptions and biases (intentional or not) and demonstrate efforts to correct them, we show students that they, too, can be open to constructive feedback, will survive being challenged, and with practice and persistence, can develop more thoughtful and socially just ways to respond.

I have been fortunate to have the opportunity to spend a lot of time in Southeast Asia as part of the family I married into and have had many of my assumptions about my own and other ethnic groups or cultures challenged by these encounters. I try to share with students examples of some of the biases that have been uncovered and what I have learned through my experiences in another culture or with another ethnic group (Lee).

Only when we become aware of our biases and assumptions can we take active, conscious steps to overcome them and minimize their impact in our teaching. Research suggests that expanding our knowledge of and contact with different groups, monitoring our

thoughts and biases, engaging in perspective-taking, and building empathy are ways to mitigate unconscious bias (Staat, 2013). This is important ongoing work for educators, since acting on our unconscious bias only undermines our educational effectiveness and efforts for social justice.

INTERPERSONAL AND GROUP DYNAMICS

Self-knowledge and self-awareness are also essential for understanding how we relate with participants and interpret and respond to the group dynamics in classes and workshops. In this section, we focus on the impact of our interpersonal styles and how we manage and develop skillful responses to the inevitably challenging situations that arise in social justice teaching. To be effective facilitators, we need to be aware of the complex mix of feelings, thoughts, behaviors, and experiences that make us who we are, as well as monitor how this affects our interactions with participants and handling of group processes.

INTERPERSONAL STYLES

Social identities shape communication styles, how we interact with others, and our comfort with self-disclosure. Families and communities have different norms around eye contact, touch, speaking patterns, expression of humor and emotion, and degree of directness and indirectness in conversation and gestures (DuPraw & Axner, 1997; Sue & Sue, 2013). Our socialization and cultural norms influence our teaching style as well. Some instructors (and students) are more familiar and comfortable with a formal and linear approach to teaching that focuses on facts and figures. Others may prefer a more personal, fluid, and experiential approach that draws on storytelling, sharing feelings and experiences, and using imagery and metaphors. In some social/cultural groups, it is viewed as improper and inappropriate to share or solicit personal information; while in other communities, such sharing is considered acceptable, appropriate, and valued.

These norms influence how an instructor teaches, interacts with, and is perceived by participants.

I have found that my sarcastic sense of humor and direct communication style, a product of my New York area Jewish upbringing, can be perceived as harsh to those unaccustomed to that style (Diane).

Additionally:

- A formal teaching and interpersonal style may be interpreted by some as distant and uncaring or as more proper and professional, while a more informal style may be viewed as warm and caring or as unserious and unprofessional, depending on the perceptions of different students.
- A fast-talking educator may make it difficult for a hearing-impaired participant who is reading lips or using an interpreter, or for people for whom English is a second language.
- An instructor who requests eye contact from students may be perceived as intrusive or insensitive by students raised in cultures where eye contact, especially with authority figures, is considered inappropriate or disrespectful.

The dominant and subordinated status of the facilitator may also affect how the same behavior gets read differently by participants. A soft-spoken man may be viewed positively as gentle and approachable, while a woman may be seen as unassertive and weak. A white

woman who speaks strongly may be seen as confident and authoritative, while a black woman may be seen as angry and strident.

As we gain greater awareness of our social identities and related interpersonal styles and orientations, we can better appreciate how we may be perceived or misperceived by our students, adjust accordingly, and be prepared to deal with their reactions.

NOTICING AND RESPONDING TO GROUP DYNAMICS

Group dynamics in social justice education require attention to both content and process dimensions. The *content* of social justice education provides information about enduring historical injustice and inequitable patterns and practices that are normalized in mainstream society. It also includes information about struggles for justice and possibilities for change. The *process* of social justice education involves managing the individual, interpersonal, and group dynamics that arise as we and our students, with divergent levels of awareness, knowledge, and experience, grapple with social justice issues. Engagement with information that either confirms or questions what individuals have thought to be true typically generates feelings of anger, shock, guilt, disbelief, sadness, and powerlessness as they confront the enormity and pervasiveness of oppression.

While group dynamics are important in any learning situation, in the social justice classroom they take on added weight. Group members deal with emotional reactions, and negotiate asymmetric power relations and historically and culturally embedded patterns of interaction—whether tacit or explicit, acknowledged or not. What do we need to know about ourselves to create and maintain a learning environment that is respectful and inclusive for all? Facilitators who have spent time exploring how we typically respond to these process-level issues will be better prepared to address them rather than be taken off guard or unable to handle them when they arise.

For example, what do we do when a participant makes an offensive comment and all eyes turn to us to see how we will respond? The more we have reflected on our automatic feelings and reactions in such situations (fright, exposure, inadequacy, shutting down, or freezing), the more able we will be to respond in thoughtful and appropriate ways, rather than respond ineffectively by quickly avoiding and moving past the moment.

I was facilitating a fishbowl discussion on the film "Race: The Power of an Illusion" when an African American woman tearfully shared her deep sadness at realizing the structural barriers she had always taken as personal. When a white participant interrupted to say it was the same for her as a working-class white person and thus not about race, I could feel the air leave the room. By pausing the conversation to examine the dynamics of what had just happened, we were able to listen more carefully to both speakers and unpack relations of dominance and subordination reflected in the interaction. Had the conversation continued without fully discussing the dynamics involved, we would have reproduced the very dynamics of racism we were trying to challenge (Lee).

To a large extent, what we notice and how we respond to interpersonal dynamics are shaped by our families and communities of origin and the early injunctions we internalize about what is and is not appropriate. These messages affect how we respond to both verbal and nonverbal behavior. For example, those of us raised with familial or cultural norms that deem it inappropriate to comment on others' interactions or conduct may have a difficult time doing so in the classroom. For example:

- When a participant makes a rude face as another participant is speaking, a facilitator raised to "do as I say, not as I do" may ignore or fail to address nonverbal cues that impact relationships in the group in ways that interfere with learning.

- A trainer who was taught not to notice color or was "shushed" when noticing people with disabilities may be uncomfortable discussing differences and prefer to highlight similarities among people, thus avoiding important conversations about difference and discrimination.
- A female instructor raised to be "polite" and not interrupt may find it challenging to intervene when a participant is dominating or derailing the discussion.

Our ability to notice and respond to interpersonal dynamics is also affected by our various social group identities and relative positions of dominance and subordination. For example:

- White people are socialized to view the world from a white normative frame and thus may not notice the racial dynamics when a white participant interrupts or minimizes comments by classmates of color.
- Women are often socialized to harmonize and keep the peace, and may smooth over conflict rather than name and address it directly.
- Native English speakers may overlook participants for whom English is a second language, further marginalizing them in class discussions.

Facilitators who have not examined their own socialization may find it difficult to openly and effectively address racial, gender, sexuality, class, and other dynamics in ways that facilitate rather than block learning. Examining our own social identities and cultural conditioning can help us to be more conscious and willing to notice and name interactions we have been taught to ignore, even when we feel uncomfortable doing so. We can learn to address group dynamics directly, whether naming what is going on, asking clarifying questions, providing time for people to take a moment to reflect silently on the situation, or opening up a discussion about the impact of language and behavior and how people are feeling. Greater awareness of our own socialization will help us learn to facilitate group dynamics in ways that effectively interrupt oppressive interactions and promote learning.

UNDERSTANDING OUR RESPONSES TO EMOTIONAL INTENSITY

Exploring issues of social injustice in which we are all implicated and encountering information that challenges deeply held views and convictions, inevitably generates strong emotions. We have been shaped by the same damaging, misinformed view of the world as our students, and like them, we respond to learning about injustice emotionally as well as cognitively.

That social justice education is not only cognitive but also affective is a challenging awareness for those of us trained to show expertise in the subjects we teach, and to convey confidence and certainty in what we know. Many instructors have not been taught, nor do they feel prepared, to deal with emotionally laden content. Moreover, confronting the often fraught emotions raised by issues of injustice, and acknowledging that we don't have all the answers, places us as instructors in a very different position than how many of us have been groomed, especially in the academy. How we personally handle emotional intensity affects our ability to allow and handle emotion in the classroom in constructive ways. We can prepare ourselves by examining and reflecting on those emotions with which we feel most and least comfortable.

I grew up in a household with immigrant parents where I was taught to "keep to myself" and avoid conflict; and thus, in social justice classrooms where constructive conflict is

encouraged and may be a part of dialogue, I've had to re-examine my comfort or discomfort with conflict (Rani).

I grew up in a family where I remember the elders yelling at each other, in good fun, as they discussed the issues of the day. I now realize that I am not unnerved by conflict or strong voices and emotions (Diane).

Being raised in a family or culture where feelings are not openly expressed, for example, further reinforces professional training to be "neutral" and suppress the display of emotions in the classroom—responses that are usually counterproductive to facilitating authentic discussion. On the other hand, being raised in a familial or cultural context where feelings are stated bluntly and directly may clash with student beliefs that such directness is rude or improper. Those socialized to read strong emotion as hostile or to be feared may withdraw or shut down in the face of such emotions. A facilitator who is uncomfortable with tears may refocus the discussion when a student starts crying while speaking passionately, rather than accept the tears and tune into what the student is saying. Even instructors who are comfortable with emotion may not know how to effectively work with it in a class or workshop. For example:

- An instructor who was conditioned to devalue emotions may find it hard to validate and support the expression of feelings.
- A faculty member who was raised in a family with a lot of emotional intensity may regard classes as ineffective unless they are highly emotionally intense.
- People from some African American and Latino communities may value emotional expressiveness and heated discussions of issues that matter to them and may be suspicious of those who are perceived as too restrained in a discussion.

Self-reflection becomes a critical tool for understanding our reactions to and ability to respond to emotions honestly and constructively rather than avoiding them.

Examining the emotional climate in our family and cultural background can make us more conscious of the feelings we find hardest to address, especially those we tend to avoid, distort, or fear. We can learn to moderate automatic first reactions or interpretations and consider how emotional expressiveness can be a reflection of cultural and familial styles of expression different than ours. For example, white people may read people of color as "angry" when they are simply expressing strong feelings. White facilitators who are aware of this pattern can be more conscious and open to participants who express themselves in this way. Men often read women as "irrational" when they are expressing emotion directly. Male facilitators who have examined their own response to emotional expressiveness can be more respectful and empathic of other styles of response.

Emotional reactions may also be affected by dominant/subordinated status. It is common for those in the dominant group to take a more distant stance in discussions of injustices we have been taught to ignore or accept as normal. In fact, one of the ways privilege works is through insulating people in dominant groups from the stress of dealing with the uncomfortable topics of oppression (DiAngelo, 2011). It is much harder for someone who is directly targeted by oppression to have a dispassionate view. Acknowledging one's own feelings of outrage at injustices perpetuated on our group can help an instructor be more empathic and understanding of participants from other groups who react intensely to examples of injustice. With such awareness, they can then can proactively help those from dominant groups understand and respect the intensity their classmates feel.

Learning to recognize different patterns of expression provides a frame for developing more comfort with emotional or "heated" discussions and respond in ways that support learning from such encounters. A group whose members are too guarded or mistrustful:

> . . . may never move beyond the initial watchful stage as members fail to take the risks needed to move learning forward in the group. Or a group can become mired in conflict when there is not enough trust, skill or commitment to engage with and work through the challenges that inevitably arise.
>
> (Bell, 2010, p. 93)

When a supportive climate has been established, "losing control" or facing strong emotions can become constructive and often transformative, enabling students and facilitators to connect on a deeper level. In fact, participants often make fundamental shifts in their perspectives after they have experienced someone "losing" control, revealing the deeper feelings, fears, and experiences surrounding oppression that are always operating but rarely expressed, especially in mixed groups. Our ability as facilitators to manage the group process thoughtfully, skillfully, and empathically is crucial for learning and relies on our own self-awareness. This self-knowledge is important preparation for managing emotions in the classroom and responding thoughtfully to participants, especially in moments of tension and uncertainty.

IDENTIFYING TRIGGERS THAT "PUSH OUR BUTTONS"

Dealing with comments and behaviors that "push our buttons" or "trigger" us is another common concern for social justice educators. Being triggered refers to getting "hooked" or having an unexpected, intense emotional reaction to a situation or person (Obear, 2013). Any number of things can trigger us for any number of reasons. When we are triggered, it makes it harder to pay attention to what is going on in the moment while we are caught up with our own internal thoughts, feelings, and physical sensations.

Given the social justice content and our personal relationship to it, it is especially likely that we may have strong emotional responses to the material or dynamics in the group. It is no surprise that certain content, behaviors, or words can trigger emotional reactions.

People from marginalized communities usually have a long history with and a heightened sensitivity to negative cues (language as well as verbal and nonverbal behaviors) that signal oppressive attitudes. They have been subjected to, suffered from, discussed, and thought about such cues throughout the course of their lives, and so they are often highly tuned to note them in the behavior and language used by members of the dominant group. Dominant group members, on the other hand, are more likely oblivious to the effects of their verbal and nonverbal communication on people from subordinated groups, and in fact are quite often shocked to realize their effect. Thus, the potential for breakdown in communication, hurt feelings, defensiveness, and recrimination is high.

I recall facilitating a discussion where a middle-class teacher commented on the "trashy" appearance of a child in her class. Two class members immediately reacted with outrage at the stereotyping and devaluation of people with few resources. As working-class mothers themselves, they were triggered by the classist assumptions in the statement of which the speaker was oblivious (Lee).

Since facilitators are not immune to being triggered, we need to recognize the comments and signals to which we are most susceptible. As noted previously, where instructors are in the process of their own social identity development around different forms of oppression can affect how likely they are to be triggered. Facilitators who are members of a marginalized group may understandably find it difficult to listen to hurtful stereotypes and attitudes they have been confronted with all their lives. Such expressions are painful

and can re-stimulate past fears, anxieties, and intense feelings. We may feel angry and want to retaliate, even when we know that acting directly on these feelings would be inappropriate and counterproductive to the goals of the session. We may feel rejected and lose confidence, or become defensive and stuck while the "voices in our head" yammer on, reinforcing feelings of ineptitude or fear or anger.

I was doing a pre-planned role-play about addressing a homophobic comment. When we were done, my co-presenter, a lesbian, was supposed to lead the discussion. She sat there immobilized. She later explained that she was unexpectedly overwhelmed with emotion watching that interaction (Diane).

Other situations where triggers may arise include

- A facilitator who grew up in poverty may want to lash out when participants express disparaging stereotypes about poor people.
- A Native American instructor may be stunned into silence when seeing students jokingly do "tomahawk chops" and war cries while discussing conflicts between Indigenous people and settlers.
- A facilitator with a disability may bristle at listening to participants express pity and condescension toward people with disabilities.

Facilitators from dominant groups also can be triggered by situations in the classroom or workshop:

- A white facilitator may feel panic when challenged by a participant of color about a racial issue, feeling ignorant and exposed.
- A straight white male professor may react angrily when female students frame him as the "oppressor," feeling invalidated for all the work he has done on feminist issues.
- An instructor who grew up wealthy but has been committed to addressing income inequality may feel embarrassment and disdain when upper-class students express classist sentiments, reminding her of her own struggles.

We can notice and respond to triggers on several levels: We can look within at our own response and try to figure out what is going on for the participant who has been triggered, and we can consider the impact on the group. One level relates to reflecting on our own reactions to what is occurring in the moment: "Why am I so annoyed at this person or comment? What does it trigger for me?" On another level, we can consider how the individual who did or said the triggering behavior might be thinking or feeling and shift the frame to figure it out. Questions such as, "What prompted this behavior?" "What's really going on for this individual?" and "How can I help them try out a new perspective?" may help us respond more productively. Lastly, If we are feeling triggered, others may be as well, so we also need to consider the effect on the other members of the group. Not only do we need to try to gain clarity and composure about our own reaction and consider how to respond to the person who did the triggering behavior, but we need to assess what is happening for others in the class.

In a discussion about sexual assault where victim-blaming comments were made, I felt overwhelmed about how to engage those specific students as well as the whole class given my assumption that there were probably folks who identified as survivors of gender-based violence in the room (Rani).

In situations where we feel triggered, there are numerous options for what we can do. (Also see Chapter 3 for suggestions.) We can pause, take a deep breath, and try to refocus our attention to the situation at hand. We can utilize self-talk to help us regain composure

and shift our reaction. We can acknowledge the tensions of the moment and take a short break, or have people sit, reflect, and free-write for a few minutes, and then come back and share their thoughts with a partner or with the group as a whole. We can pose questions to the group that help participants to process the situation in a reflective and thoughtful way.

Developing a support system of peers with whom we can discuss issues, share feelings, and get support can be extremely helpful. For example, meeting regularly with a colleague to debrief and talk, and/or keeping a journal to note and analyze our feelings and reactions to certain triggering statements or actions, provide outlets for ongoing self-reflection. Analyzing how we typically react, and thinking through other possible responses ahead of time, provides more options for responding in thoughtful ways in those loaded moments when our buttons are pushed.

I know that I am triggered by participants who dominate conversation and seem unable to accurately hear what others are saying. I think this comes from my own experiences as a child feeling unheard or misinterpreted by the adults around me and helpless to change the situation. The more I have thought about this issue, the better able I have been to acknowledge when I am feeling triggered and to respond in a way that is constructive rather than defensive and emotionally loaded (Lee).

The more we can stay open to our own internal process, the more insight we can gain into our own feelings and reactions. Knowledge of our triggers helps us anticipate and even plan for them. This awareness allows us to get less hooked by particular actions and gives us more options for how to address the situation. We likely can be more present to what may be going on for our students so that we can respond to them with compassion and understanding. An appreciation for the process we all go through in developing awareness about oppression can also help us acquire patience when dealing with our own frustrations and feelings toward participants.

NAVIGATING ISSUES OF COMPETENCE AND AUTHORITY WITHIN INSTITUTIONS AND COMMUNITIES

In this section, we look at issues of competence and authority we may face as social justice educators. ***Competency*** encompasses our knowledge of the content we teach and our ability to effectively convey relevant theories and concepts, as well as our ability to manage group dynamics and relationships with participants in ways that promote learning. ***Authority*** includes our ability to establish ourselves in the classroom or workshop as credible, and to use our position in strategic and effective ways to accomplish curricular goals. Our social identities and social locations affect both our felt and perceived competence and authority, and greater self-knowledge can help us deal with both internal and external challenges to our sense of efficacy as instructors. These dynamics can include navigating organizational cultures, norms, and rules as well as managing interactions with other members of the institution (colleagues, faculty, staff, administrators, students, or clients), and the larger community.

SELF AND OTHER PERCEPTIONS OF COMPETENCY AND AUTHORITY

Our social identities and social locations affect both how we experience ourselves as capable and authoritative, as well as how our competence and authority are viewed by others. "Despite decades of efforts to increase faculty, staff and student diversity, the culture of academia remains distinctly white, male, heterosexual, and middle- to upper-class"

(Gonzalez & Harris, 2014, p. 183). Faculty of color, women, LGBTQ faculty, and other faculty from subordinated groups are often perceived as less authoritative, may experience resistance to course content, and face questions about their competency and authority in ways that members of the dominant group(s), whose competence and authority are assumed, do not (Amos, 2014; Jean-Marie, Grant, & Irby, 2014; Messner, 2000; Gutierrez y Muhs, Niemann, González, & Harris, 2012; Tuitt, Hanna, Martinez, Salazar, & Griffin, 2009).

As a faculty member of color, I have had to ask students to call me "Dr." or "Professor," refer explicitly to my educational training, and dress in a more formal manner to project authority even though the culture of the institutions where I've worked is one where faculty are called by their first names and the style of dress is much less formal (Rani).

Questions about our competency and authority are heightened when the course includes social justice content and pedagogy. Moving away from hierarchical, banking models and facilitating an interactive process that invites engagement, exploration, and critical analysis represents a different definition of competence and authority than the traditional one of content mastery and expertise (Brookfield (2012); Brookfield & Preskill, 2005; Maher & Tetreault, 2001). Given these issues, it is important for us think through and be able to articulate and support with confidence the philosophies that undergird our pedagogical decisions.

Utilizing social justice education pedagogy may raise additional concerns for instructors from marginalized groups. For example, rather than use more interactive, learner-centered approaches that she believes are more effective for particular learning goals, a new young instructor may feel obligated to rely on PowerPoint in order to assert her authority in the class or workshop.

The privileged and marginalized statuses of instructors from different social identity groups influence how students are likely to perceive us. The interplay of race, class, gender, sexual orientation, age, ability, and other subordinated identities can impact how comfortable instructors feel acknowledging mistakes or gaps in knowledge, given they often already get constructed as less competent. For example:

- An older instructor may find it difficult to acknowledge when he says something inaccurate because of fears that displaying uncertainty will be attributed to his age.
- A gay or lesbian instructor who has to weigh the risks of self-disclosure may not invite the further scrutiny that personal sharing may bring.
- An immigrant instructor of color who speaks with an accent may not want to reveal lack of knowledge of an issue for fear of being further invalidated.

Issues of authority become especially complicated for those with multiple subordinated identities. For example:

- Given the typical black-white narrative about racism, an Asian American female instructor in a class on race and racism may not be seen as having legitimate knowledge about the material or authority to speak on the subject matter.
- A gay Latino may be perceived by students as politicizing class content when he teaches about heterosexism and linguicism.
- A working-class African American who teaches about race and racism in classrooms that are predominantly white may be perceived by students as teaching this content to deal with his "personal problem" or "agenda."
- A female instructor who uses a wheelchair may be patronized by students who fail to recognize her scholarly strengths and pedagogical skills.

Gender may influence issues of competency and authority in particular ways. Through the process of socialization, women are bombarded with messages about deferring to male authority, being "nice," and not seeing themselves as those with power and voice. Women who ultimately achieve positions of power may be pressured to embody a "male" style of leadership, distance themselves from other women, or struggle with feeling like imposters in these roles (Clance & Imes, 1978; Young, 2011). Students may evaluate and judge female faculty according to gender stereotypes.

I once co-taught with a female professor who used examples of her experiences raising her daughter to illustrate sexism. She received feedback in her end-of-semester evaluations that the course was based in personal narratives and not theoretically grounded (Rani).

Or students may expect a female faculty member to fulfill stereotypes, such as being more nurturing, and may push back when she does not fulfill these narratives.

A Latina faculty member at my institution was read by students as cold and distant because she resisted taking on a nurturing role and demanded hard work from her students (Lee).

Many times students are unaware of the stereotypes they project onto their instructors. As instructors, we need to anticipate and work with both conscious and unconscious projections that are at play in the classroom. In particular, we need to be aware of how participants' projections can trigger our vulnerabilities around competency and authority. Without consciously examining how we deal with the reactions from others, we may be susceptible to internalizing external constructions as who we are.

Given this pitfall, it is important to explore our own internalized oppression (i.e., internalized racism, sexism, classism, etc.). Instructors from subordinated groups may adopt the dominant group's ideology and accept their subordinated status as deserved, natural, or inevitable (Joseph & Williams, 2008; Niemann, 2012; Tappan, 2006); as a result, they may have too limited a view of themselves and their abilities, or second-guess what they have to offer or their pedagogy. For example, a faculty member who is a first-generation academic may struggle with the "imposter phenomenon" (Clance & Imes, 1978) and exhibit self-doubt and a lack of confidence, or unconsciously utilize their power in the classroom in overbearing and ineffective ways.

I have colleagues who earned an advanced degree, who are from low-income backgrounds and the first in their families to go to college. They are particularly vulnerable to self-doubts about being smart enough or belonging in academia when they get critical feedback on a manuscript or a class didn't go well (Diane).

Instructors from dominant groups may question their right and legitimacy to speak about social justice issues. Instructors need to continually try to distinguish between what is true about ourselves and what are participant assumptions and projections.

In addition, many courses that are identified as having social justice content are seen as less rigorous and often characterized as "soft science" (DiAngelo & Sensoy, 2014). Instructors who teach social justice-related courses often note that students come into the classroom expecting an "A" or have the misconception that the course will be "easy." Students who feel entitled to a particular grade may challenge the instructor's authority to assign grades, particularly a grade that the student does not want to accept. Faculty who hold privileged identities may be challenged less than other faculty members.

INSTITUTIONAL AND COMMUNITY CHALLENGES AND SUPPORT

One of the concerns about teaching from a social justice perspective is the response from the institution or organization when we depart from traditional formats and content. As we engage with social justice issues and change our classrooms accordingly, we often come

into conflict with institutional norms of professed objectivity, authority, and professorial distance in ways that can undermine our confidence, and in some cases jeopardize our positions. Instructors who are female and instructors of color often receive lower evaluations in courses, and those who teach courses about social justice often receive lower ratings than those who teach traditional courses (Lazos, 2012; Messner, 2000; Pittman, 2010; Tusmith & Reddy, 2002). Faculty who most often choose to and/or who are asked to teach social justice courses are commonly from underrepresented groups and frequently untenured. Thus, the most vulnerable groups take on the most difficult and institutionally risky teaching. Instructors from marginalized groups often face heightened challenges and frequently receive less institutional support than colleagues from dominant groups.

- *A student's mother complained to the dean that her daughter's Latina professor (my colleague) was a bad teacher and that if she did not get the grade she "deserved" (wanted), the mother would take it up the chain of command. What was striking about this example was that while the dean was ultimately supportive, the faculty member felt interrogated and that she had to "prove" herself in ways not expected of her white colleagues (Lee).*
- *An African American instructor was accused of racial harassment and formally reprimanded for sharing with her Communication class her critique of the all-white college newspaper staff and pointing out a historical trend where the voices and stories of white men were centered.*

(Gibney, 2013)

These dynamics and risks are not limited to academe. In other contexts, such as human service and community or business organizations, leaders of social justice training can be invalidated as too "touchy feely" or "too political." Experiential approaches may be devalued as inappropriate or not serious, and the judgment and expertise of the facilitator may be questioned, especially when the facilitator is from a marginalized group. Facilitators who do not have traditional credentials or organizational status, or come from a lower socio-economic group than others in the organization, may be discounted as having "only personal experience" to offer.

Beyond the classroom or organization, instructors may have experiences within the community that further challenge their legitimacy. The following story exemplifies the difficulties instructors with multiple marginalized identities face. When relocating to a small town that was not racially diverse, a faculty member of color who was read as male because of her gender expression experienced difficulties from the day she arrived. The day before her first class, she was pulled over by a white police officer who refused to believe she was a faculty member and cited her for a minor driving violation. She had to consider who she could call on for support in a predominantly white institution and community where she did not know anyone, and had to cancel classes while she negotiated the possible legal and criminal justice consequences of this arrest (Patton, 2014).

How does this instructor manage the burden of knowing that she is perceived first by her race, skin color, and gender expression rather than her talents, credentials, and the valuable contributions she can make? What are the vulnerabilities she navigates if she decides to share her story with peers and students as an example of profiling? What are the costs of sharing such a narrative in class or publicly? How does not sharing what happened to cause her to cancel her first class create space for students to make assumptions or judgments about the instructor and judge her abilities to instruct them? Finding ways to name systemic inequities when they occur and discern what is true about ourselves are critical in order to cope and thrive. All faculty, but especially those from marginalized groups, need mentors who can help them navigate institutional challenges.

Being aware how we are constructed in the classroom, institution, and community can prepare us for some of the dynamics and challenges to our competency and authority. Self-knowledge about our own vulnerabilities and how we typically react to these challenges can enable us to develop ways to respond more skillfully and confidently and be more self-affirming. It is useful to recognize that we do not have to be all-knowing or perfect, that we do not operate independently of the contexts in which we work. Projections and judgments are inevitable, and we need and deserve a network of people who can help us sort through the feedback we receive, discern what is useful, and support our ongoing growth and development as facilitators.

CO-FACILITATION ISSUES

Issues related to our social identities and social location, perspectives and teaching styles, sense of authority and competency, and institutional and community context also affect how we co-facilitate with others. Not only is self-knowledge critical to what and how we teach, it impacts co-facilitation relationships as well. Our self-awareness affects how effectively we collaborate with another instructor, especially when we represent different identity groups and dominant/subordinated statuses. How we behave in a classroom or workshop is at least as important as what we say. Our self-awareness affects whether and how well we can model for participants equitable and respectful dynamics with our co-facilitator.

As we plan with our co-trainer, we can stay mindful of the impact of our personal and cultural styles, social locations, and preferred training approach to ensure that each person is having equitable input into developing the course or workshop. In the design process, we can watch for how we may be playing out power dynamics related to our social identities. We can assess if the design reflects and balances each other's styles, perspectives, and strengths and limitations (Maxwell, Nagda, & Thompson, 2011; Ouellett & Fraser, 2005; Zúñiga, Nagda, Chesler, & Cytron-Walker, 2007). When we are co-facilitating with people who have different dominant and subordinated identities, we can pay attention to how we may be enacting internalized dominance and internalized oppression (DiAngelo & Flynn, 2010). For example, people with dominant group identities may jump in unnecessarily, interrupt their co-facilitator, or take more time for their parts than was planned. Or they may overcompensate for their identities by "playing small."

I co-facilitated with a white man around the topic of sexism on campus where I felt like I was an impatient and overbearing facilitator. In checking in with my co-facilitator about what was going on, he realized that his fears of being seen as dominant was getting in his way of being authentic and speaking up (Rani).

People with marginalized identities may hold back due to a lack of confidence, or let the other facilitator routinely take the lead, or back off from handling more challenging moments. Given that facilitators have an intersectional mix of privileged and marginalized identities and may be addressing more than one form of oppression, these dynamics are not necessarily simple.

I have co-facilitated with men of color who were mindful of engaging in sexist behaviors while I was conscious of playing out my white privilege (Diane).

Instructors also need to be aware of when they may be colluding with participants' biases—for instance, by not addressing situations where students are talking to the man and ignoring the woman in a male/female team, or when participants accept information from the white person but challenge the information presented by the person of color in a mixed-race team. Moreover, when we know what gets us and our co-facilitator triggered, we can be prepared to support each other in handling a tension-filled moment.

Our internalized sense of competency and authority, and how we are seen by students/participants, colleagues, and the institution, affect the risks that different facilitators may be willing to take in terms of content shared, personal disclosure, and challenging of students.

For example, a colleague of mine, a younger, less experienced Latina, felt somewhat institutionally protected by regularly co-facilitating with a high-status, older white male faculty. The trust and knowledge built by their ongoing co-teaching relationship also allowed them to address and work through their interpersonal dynamics (Diane).

Knowing oneself and knowing one's co-facilitator allows for mutual support and the ability to model respectful and equitable dynamics.

CONCLUSION

Knowing ourselves as instructors and facilitators in social justice education is an ongoing process of exploration, challenge, new insights, and personal and professional growth. Self-examination about the effects of our socialization and experiences within systems of inequality ensures that we never take for granted the challenges of understanding systems of oppression and keeps us tuned into the struggles our students may be facing. We are continually reminded that we all have areas of limited awareness, particularly where we are members of the advantaged group(s) and where we have not yet explored how our intersecting identities position us vis-á-vis other groups and contexts. We need consistent vigilance and self-reflection to challenge internalized oppression and discern what is true about ourselves. Networks of support and mentoring relationships help guide and sustain us in this process. When we can stay open to ongoing learning, and accept the inevitable mistakes as we uncover new areas for growth, we show our students they can do this as well. Most crucially, self-reflection and self-awareness help us to take the long view needed to sustain our commitments and not retreat from this difficult but essential work.

Note

* We ask that those who cite this work always acknowledge by name all of the authors listed rather than either only citing the first author or using "et al." to indicate coauthors. All collaborated on the conceptualization, development, and writing of this chapter.

References

Adams, M. A., & Love, B. J. (2009). A social justice education framework for a post-Grutter era. In K. Skubikowski, C. Wright, & R. Graf (Eds.), *Social justice education: Inviting faculty to transform their institution* (pp. 3–25). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Amos, Y. T. (2014). To lose is to win: The effects of student evaluations in a multicultural education class on a Japanese faculty with a non-native English Accent. *Understanding and Dismantling Privilege*, 4(2). Retrieved from http://www.wpcjournal.com/article/view/12220

Banaji, M., & Greenwald, A. (2013). *Blind spot: The hidden biases of good people*. New York: Random House Publishing.

Bell, L. A. (2010). *Storytelling for social justice: Connecting narrative and the arts in antiracist teaching*. New York: Routledge.

Brookfield, S. (2012). *Teaching for critical thinking: Tools and techniques to help students question their assumptions*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brookfield, S., & Preskill, S. (2005). *Discussion as a way of teaching: Tools and techniques for democratic classrooms*, (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brown, E.B. (1997). What has happened here: The politics of difference in women's history and feminist politics. In L.J. Nicholson (Ed.), *The second wave: A reader in feminist theory* (pp. 272–288). New York: Routledge.
Clance, P. R., & Imes, S. (1978). The imposter phenomenon in high achieving women: Dynamics and therapeutic intervention. *Psychotherapy theory, research and practice, 15*(3), 1–8.
Collins, P. (2008). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness and the politics of empowerment*. New York: Routledge.
Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. In *University of Chicago Legal Forum 1989: Feminisms in the law, theory and practice* (pp. 139–167). Chicago: University of Chicago Legal Forum.
Crenshaw, K. (1993). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review, 43*(6), 1241–1279.
DiAngelo, R. (2011). White fragility. *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy, 3*(3), 54–70.
DiAngelo, R., & Flynn, D. (2010, Aug.). Showing what we tell: Facilitating anti-racism education in cross-race teams. *Understanding and Dismantling Privilege, 1*(1).
DiAngelo, R., & Sensoy, O. (2014, Winter). Leaning in: A student's guide to engaging constructively with social justice content. *Radical Pedagogy, 11*(1). Retrieved from http://www.radicalpedagogy.org/radicalpedagogy.org/Leaning_In__A_Students_Guide_To_Engaging_Constructively_With_Social_Justice_Content.html
DuPraw, M., & Axner, P. (1997). *Working on common cross-cultural communication challenges*. Retrieved from http://www.pbs.org/ampu/crosscult.html
Gibney, S. (2013, Nov. 30). Teaching while black and blue. *Gawker*. Retrieved from http://gawker.com/teaching-while-black-and-blue-1473659925
Gonzalez, C. G., & Harris, A. P. (2014). Continuing the conversation. *Berkeley Journal of Gender, Law & Justice, 29, 183–194.*
Gutierrez y Muhs, G., Niemann, Y. F., Gonzalez, C. G., & Harris, A. P. (Eds.). (2012). *Presumed incompetent: The intersections of race and class for women in academia*. Boulder, CO: University Press of Colorado and Utah State University Press.
Huber, L.P., & Solórzano, D.G. (2015). Racial microagressions as a tool for critical race research. *Race, Ethnicity and Education, 18*(3), 297–320.
Jean-Marie, G., Grant, C. M., & Irby, B. (2014). *The duality of women scholars of color: Transforming and being transformed in the academy*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
Joseph, V., & Williams, T.O. (2008). "Good niggers": The struggle to find courage, strength, and confidence to fight internalized racism and internalized dominance. *Democracy and Education, 17*(2), 67–73.
Lazos, S. R. (2012). Are student teaching evaluations holding back women and minorities? The perils of "doing" gender and race in the classroom. In G. Gutierrez y Muhs, Y. F. Niemann, C. G. Gonzalez, & A. P. Harris (Eds.), *Presumed incompetent: The intersections of race and class for women in academia* (pp. 164–185). Boulder, CO: University Press of Colorado, Utah State University Press.
Maher, F.A., & Tetreault, M. K. (2001). *The feminist classroom: Dynamics of gender, race and privilege*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
Maxwell, K. E., Nagda, B., & Thompson, M. C. (2011). *Facilitating intergroup dialogues: Bridging differences, catalyzing change*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.
Messner, M. A. (2000). White guy habitus in the classroom: Challenging the reproduction of privilege. *Men and Masculinities*, 2(4), 457–469.
Niemann, Y. F. (2012). The making of a token: A case study of stereotype threat, stigma, racism, and tokenism in academe. In G. Gutierrez y Muhs, Y. F. Niemann, C. G. Gonzalez, & A. P. Harris (Eds.), *Presumed incompetent: The intersections of race and class for women in academia* (pp. 336–355). Boulder, CO: University Press of Colorado and Utah State University Press.
Obear, K. (2013). Navigating triggering events: Critical competencies for social justice educators. In L. M. Landreman (Ed.), *The art of effective facilitation: Reflections from social justice educators*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.
Ouellett, M. L., & Fraser, E. C. (2005). Teaching together: Interracial teams. In M. L. Ouellett (Ed.), *Teaching inclusively: Resources for course, department and institutional change in higher education*. Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press.
Patton, S. (2014, Apr. 21). *When diversity doesn't come easy*. Vitae. Retrieved from https://chroniclevitae.com/news/455-when-diversity-doesn-t-come-easy

Pittman, C. T. (2010). Race and gender oppression in the classroom: The experiences of women faculty of color with white male students. *Teaching Sociology*, *38*(3), 183–196.

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

Staats, C. (2013). *State of the Science: Implicit Bias Review 2013*. Kirwan Institute. Retrieved from http://kirwaninstitute.osu.edu/implicit-bias-review/

Staats, C. (2014). *State of the Science: Implicit Bias Review 2014*. Kirwan Institute. Retrieved from http://kirwaninstitute.osu.edu/implicit-bias-review/

Sue, D. W. (2010a). *Microaggressions and marginality: Manifestations, dynamics, and impact*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Sue, D. W. (2010b). *Microaggressions in everyday life. Hoboken*, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Sue, D. W., Lin, A.I., Torino, G. C., Capodilupo, C. M., & Rivera, D. P. (2009). Racial microaggressions and difficult dialogues on race in the classroom. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *15*(2), 183–190.

Sue, D. W., & Sue, D. (2013). *Counseling the culturally diverse* (6th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Tappan, M.B. (2006). Reframing internalized oppression and internalized domination: From the psychological to the sociocultural. *Teachers College Record*, *108*(10), 2115–2144.

Tuitt, F., Hanna, M., Martinez, L.M., Salazar, M., & Griffin, R. (2009). Teaching in the line of fire: Faculty of color in the academy. *The NEA Higher Education Journal: Thought & Action*, *25*, 65–74. Retrieved from http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/HE/TA09LineofFire.pdf

Tusmith, B., & Reddy, M. T. (2002). *Race in the college classroom: Pedagogy and politics*. Rutgers, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Young, V. (2011). *The secret thoughts of successful women: Why capable people suffer from the Imposter Syndrome and how to thrive in spite of it*. New York: Crown Publishing Group.

Zúñiga, X., Nagda, B.A., Chesler, M., & Cytron-Walker, A. (2007). *Intergroup dialogues in higher education: Meaningful learning about social justice*. ASHE-ERIC Report Series, Volume 32(4). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.