AILACTE
Journal

Volume XV, Number 1, Fall 2018

The official journal of the
Association of Independent Liberal Arts
Colleges for Teacher Education

AILACTE 2019 Journal, Volume XVI
Call for Manuscripts

Each year the Association of Independent Liberal Arts Colleges for Teacher Education (AILACTE) publishes a peer-reviewed journal. The goal of the journal is to disseminate scholarly work that will enhance the work of all education professionals and particularly those in liberal arts higher education departments of education. Manuscripts may address any issue that pertains to the liberal arts context for: teaching and learning, pre-service and in-service education, research and practice related to the preparation and development of teachers, teacher leadership, administration, public policy and legislation, recruitment and retention, advising candidates, candidate and program assessment, and other relevant topics. Project descriptions, research reports, theoretical papers, papers espousing a point of view, and descriptions of activities or issues pertinent to the education and professional development of educators at the local, state, or national level would be appropriate topics for the journal. The 2019 journal will not be theme-based; all topics are welcome. We look forward to reading your work and learning from your experiences, ideas, and research.

Jacqueline Crawford and Elizabeth Leer serve as your new editors of the 2018 *AILACTE Journal*.

Submission Criteria

As you are preparing your manuscript for submission, please follow the guidelines below. In February 2019 please check our journal website for additional information about journal submissions. Please note that requirements may vary slightly depending on the type of manuscript you are submitting.

- Submit electronically by **June 21, 2019**
- Use *The Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (APA), Sixth Edition* (2010) for format and style, including 12-point font, Times New Roman style, and 1" margins
- Limit manuscript to no more than 20 pages, double-spaced
- Include a reference list that follows APA style guidelines exactly (not part of the 20 page maximum)
- Include a running head (no more than 50 characters) and page number on subsequent pages (following APA style)
- Submit in MS Word or compatible software for Windows XP *and* as a PDF
- Submit manuscripts to jackie.crawford@simpson.edu by June 21, 2019

Watch for additional information on the AILACTE webpage coming in February 2019.

Table of Contents

From the Editors

Greetings from Jackie Crawford and Elizabeth Leer, your new editors of the 2018 *AILACTE Journal*. For our inaugural issue, we solicited manuscripts that spoke to the theme **Civil Discourse in Difficult Times: The Power of Words**. This timely theme is grounded in Quality 1 of AILACTE's Models of Excellence for teacher education that addresses the moral and ethical dimensions of a preparation program's learning community. Exceptional AILACTE institutions view teaching as a moral activity, explained in part as "a way of acting in relationship to others." At the heart of this moral activity is effective communication. One cannot be in true relationship with others if clear, respectful, reciprocal communication does not exist. In this age when public discourse is increasingly vitriolic, it is incumbent upon teacher education programs to model and teach candidates how to use words to foster an understanding of differences and to forge peaceful compromises. Further, AILACTE asserts that exemplary moral institutions create "an intellectually safe environment that promotes dignity and respect for all people within the academic community." Promoting civil discourse is essential if our institutions and programs are to become and remain safe spaces where all of our teacher candidates—and their future students—both give and receive respect.

The first three articles in Volume XV offer theoretical frameworks for the creation of classrooms that foster civil discourse. Kimberly Crosby argues that "civil discourse becomes the outward manifestation of democratic principles" and that teachers can nurture classrooms that reinforce these democratic principles by attending to the classroom community, critical engagement with content, and student collaboration and choice. Theresa Hickey explores the paradigm of deliberative pedagogy in teacher education as a way to prepare students to skillfully engage with others over complex problems in our society. Using the framework of cultural proficiency, Ronald Byrners and Michael Hillis assert that building classroom environments conducive to civil discourse first requires student self-exploration to move through barriers to productive engagement with people who hold different worldviews than themselves.

Drawing on her personal experience as the instructor of a course on diversity, equity, and inclusion, Emily Huff reminds us that teaching about power and privilege is not easy work. Because of our limited worldviews, self-awareness and humility are essential qualities for faculty leading such courses. Rebecca Smith and her colleagues Nicole Ralston and Jacqueline Waggoner describe encouraging results from a study exploring preservice teachers' abilities to generate and apply culturally responsive teaching strategies. Finally, a study conducted by Kevin Thomas, Elizabeth Dinkins, and Imari Hazelwood reveals the prevalence of microaggressions experienced by Black teacher candidates at a predominantly White institution and the need to engage in civil discourse focused on issues of race.

We want to thank our Editorial Review Board who make this journal possible. We also appreciate the work and support of Jackie McDowell, publications editor; Kathy Gann, technical editor; and Barbara Grinnell, graphic designer. In closing, we offer sincere thanks to Amelia Hindi-Trail who has worked tirelessly on the review board for over 15 years and as the editor since 2011. We are indebted to Amelia for her careful, detailed, and excellent work.

Jacqueline Crawford, Simpson College
Elizabeth Leer, St. Olaf College

Fostering Civil Discourse within the Democratic Classroom

Kimberly D. Crosby, Ed.D.
Lyon College

Abstract

Educating 21st century students to participate in reasoned, civil discourse is a moral imperative. A strong democracy depends upon the ability of its citizens to hear and consider opposing views, to view others as partners rather than adversaries, to cooperate and compromise when addressing important issues, to collaborate in order to accomplish shared goals and solve problems, and to communicate skillfully and respectfully as a means of consensus building. These democratic habits of thought and behavior are unlikely to develop without careful, intentional nurturing. Teachers must create democratic classrooms in which students learn how to develop effective and respectful relationships, how to think critically about diverse ideas, how to make reasonable and ethical choices, and how to communicate civilly with those whose understandings or opinions differ from theirs. This article proposes a framework for creating such a classroom and suggests approaches which reinforce democratic principles and promote civil discourse.

According to Edelstein (2011), the school is the only institution that allows opportunity for all students to experience democratic principles and processes in action and to cultivate democratic habits. Fostering democratic habits requires a multi-dimensional approach to "learning democracy" (p. 130) that extends beyond merely learning *about* democracy. Students must also learn *through* democracy by engaging in a school community that models democratic ideals and practices and that fosters common interests and shared experiences. Wraga (1998) identified five democratic principles that should be evident in the democratic classroom. *Popular sovereignty* is promoted when students participate in decisions that affect them. *Freedom* is experienced when students have the opportunity for reflective thinking and informed decision-making. *Equality* is demonstrated when students receive fair and equal treatment and have equal opportunity to contribute. *Individualism* is encouraged when student interests are valued in a climate that fosters self-discipline and self-direction. *Social responsibility* is evident when students practice group problem-solving and recognize the benefits of collaborating. In order to cultivate these principles in the classroom, the teacher must create a teaching and learning environment that intentionally fosters civil discourse within a community where all are respected and are expected to contribute ideas and effort toward a common purpose or for the common good. When creating such an environment, the teacher may find it useful to consider a framework that emphasizes community, content, choice, and collaboration as critical components supporting democratic habits and civil discourse.

Community: Establishing Mutual Respect, Understanding, and Purpose

In his discussion of democracy as "primarily a mode of associated living, of conjoint communicated experience" (1916, p. 50), Dewey underscored the significance of recognizing shared common interest and communicating freely as a means of readjusting or negotiating the common good. In a democratic community, shared interests and experiences are negotiated through diverse perspectives, made possible by the breaking down of cultural barriers that tend to separate individuals within the community, and individual actions are both independent and interdependent as each member influences the group and the group influences each member. In classrooms as in society, community is essential to a robust democratic environment.

Fostering a sense of community is one of the foundational elements in establishing a democratic classroom. McMillan and Chavis (1986) defined *sense of community* as "a feeling that members have of belonging and being important to each other, and a shared faith that members' needs will be met by the commitment to be together" (p. 9). They posited that sense of community develops when individuals have a feeling of belonging, a sense of mattering, a belief that their needs will be fulfilled through membership, and a shared emotional connection with others in the group. Sapon-Shevin (2010) likewise emphasized belonging and shared emotional connections in her description of the characteristics of community in the school setting, as well as feeling safe to be oneself, communicating freely and openly, and having shared goals or objectives. A classroom environment in which a strong sense of community exists is one in which the democratic principles of individualism and social responsibility may flourish.

Cultural competence is another foundational element of the democratic classroom community. For a community to be sustained, its members must demonstrate mutual acceptance and respect. In a culturally diverse classroom community, the understandings, values, and experiences of the home-community culture must be integrated into the teaching and learning environment within the classroom, and teachers must be non-judgmental and inclusive (Brown-Jeffy & Cooper, 2011). In order to achieve cultural competence, teachers must avoid using their own culture-based cognitive schemata as a "cultural yardstick" (Plata, 2011, p. 118) by which to measure students' appearance, patterns of behavior, language or speech patterns, or academic achievement against expectations based on mainstream culture. According to Plata, cultural yardsticking, given authority by the power that the

teacher holds in the classroom, often adds weight to negative cultural stereotypes, heightens the perception that cultural difference is a deficit to be overcome by adapting to the mainstream culture, and undercuts the sense of community. Instead, the teacher must reinforce students' understanding and valuing of cultures other than their own and must establish norms that support inclusivity and recognition of shared values and experiences, thus creating a democratic environment which provides "participation in its good of all its members on equal terms" (Dewey, 1916, p. 55).

A classroom with a strong sense of community provides a fertile field for the growth of a more focused learning community, or pedagogical community. Wong, Remin, Love, Aldred, Ralph, and Cook (2013) outlined three elements of pedagogical community: partnership, mutual engagement, and mutual accountability. This definition of pedagogical community is linked to situated learning theory with its emphasis on the shared nature of learning within the social context of a specific learning situation (Lave & Wenger, 1991), to constructivism with its emphasis on the creation of shared meanings constructed through meaningful and authentic learning activity in real contexts (Hung, Tan, & Koh, 2006), and to collaborative learning with its roots in sociocultural theory and its emphasis on learning through interactions with others within the social environment. In a pedagogical community, individual members engage mutually by making "distinct and diverse contributions" (Wong et al., 2013, p. 285) in pursuit of a common goal or purpose that, when realized, benefits all members, and members are mutually accountable for one another, for the work, and for the outcomes. This joint accountability and shared benefit foster the democratic principles of equality and social responsibility among the members of the classroom community.

Content: Teaching Democratic and Critical Thinking

Within an inclusive and democratic community, framing the content focus with curricula and pedagogical approaches that require students to engage with diverse perspectives and complex concepts challenges them to think beyond their own cultural views

and experiences and to develop dispositions and skills that reflect democratic principles and practice. According to Dewey (1916), a democratic curriculum embodies social interaction and collective effort, supports equality for all members, and combines abstract ideas, practical skills, and application. In practice, such a curriculum is inclusive of diverse voices and perspectives and incorporates a participatory approach (Hopkins, 2014). While both Dewey and Hopkins were addressing curriculum in the broad sense, teachers can apply those ideas within the confines of their classrooms as well by selecting texts that reflect a variety of voices and perspectives and by applying critical approaches to their study of those texts. In so doing, they promote the principles of freedom, individualism, and equality as students engage in discussion around diverse perspectives and think reflectively about their individual experiences, beliefs, and attitudes.

Critical literacy is one approach to incorporating a variety of voices into course content. Soares (2013) has proposed a framework by which preservice teachers may "foster fairness and create a democratic classroom culture of acceptance" (p. 71). Her framework consists of four themes: examining multiple perspectives, finding authentic voice, recognizing social barriers, and finding one's identity. This approach asks that students question social issues related to democracy, freedom, power, and social justice by looking within texts for multiple meanings that spring from diverse beliefs, values, and viewpoints. In doing so, students develop an awareness that no one version tells the complete story and that absent voices carry meaning. Students also identify conflict or contradictions within the text, detect which voices have power and which do not, and reflect on how it might feel to be one of the characters in the work. These tasks are undertaken as a means of developing students' ability to examine society from multiple perspectives and to participate in the critical dialogs that are necessary to a democratic way of life.

Introducing essential questions is an approach to encouraging deeper thinking about course content and to developing habits of thought and discourse suitable for participating in a democratic

society. According to McTighe and Wiggins (2013) an essential question (1) is *open-ended*, (2) is *thought-provoking* and *intellectually engaging*, (3) calls for *higher-order thinking*, (4) points toward *important, transferable ideas*, (5) raises *additional questions*, (6) requires *support* and *justification*, and (7) *recurs over time* (p. 3). The teacher may design essential questions to guide thinking and discourse around subject matter in ways that strengthen students' ability to examine ideas from multiple perspectives, that foster critical thinking about complex issues or events, and that demonstrate the relevance of content to students' lives. Thus, this approach fosters higher-order thinking and communication skills that are needed in the democratic classroom and that may translate into life in a democratic society.

Collaboration: Fostering Mutual Engagement and Accountability

Collaborative learning environments can provide opportunities for students to activate democratic principles and practices in pursuit of a common goal or purpose, often with an emphasis on achieving outcomes aimed at the common good. Dillenbourg (1999) described four processes by which teachers may increase the probability that the desired interactions will occur. First, the teacher should carefully design the initial conditions by determining the group size and criteria for membership and considering the physical and material resources necessary for the group to pursue its work. Second, the teacher should establish clear and specific roles and responsibilities for group members to assume as they carry out their work. Third, the teacher should specify interaction rules as a means of fostering productive communications among group members. Fourth, the teacher should serve as the facilitator to monitor and regulate the ongoing interactions. Attention to these four processes will increase the likelihood that learning will indeed occur and will support the development of behaviors associated with the principles of equality, individualism, and social responsibility.

Cooperative learning is a collaborative approach that is designed to foster social interdependence and individual accountability for the success of the group in achieving its desired outcomes (Johnson, Johnson, & Smith, 2007). Schul (2011) has argued that "the greatest promise of cooperative learning for the 21st century, therefore, lies in its ability to enhance social relationships that support an expansive view of democratic citizenship" (p. 91) and that developing concern for others, participating in peaceful confrontation, and building diverse relationships are integral to both cooperative learning and a democratic society. Schul discussed four cooperative approaches that teachers can incorporate: think-pair-share (Lyman, 1981), the Jigsaw technique (Aronson et al., 1978), small group teaching (Slavin, 1980), and group investigation (Sharan & Sharan, 1992). Hendrix (1996) identified several benefits of cooperative learning that support democratic practice in the classroom. It fosters positive cross-cultural relationships among students as they experience equal status, close interpersonal contact, and pursuit of a common goal; and it allows for peaceful confrontation and negotiation within student groups. In providing opportunities to practice collaborative skills, cooperative learning builds students' interpersonal and cultural competence and their confidence in their ability to work successfully with peers on complex tasks.

Problem-based learning (PBL) is a collaborative approach in which "problems serve as the context and the stimulus for students to learn course concepts and metacognitive skills" (Major & Eck, 2000, pp. 1–2). In PBL, students work in teams to solve complex real-world problems by first defining the problem and then conducting research to collect the information and evidence necessary to solve it. In the final stage of PBL, students communicate their findings in a manner appropriate to the area of research. Several of the essential characteristics of PBL, as identified by Barrows (1986), are likewise essential in developing democratic thinking and skills: authenticity, student-centeredness, self-directedness, and skill directedness. Students with experience in PBL are likely to be able to think critically, analyze and solve complex problems, find and utilize appropriate and credible resources, work

cooperatively with peers, demonstrate strong communication skills, and transfer knowledge and skills across disciplines and problems (Davidson & Major, 2014). As with cooperative learning, this approach provides opportunities for developing collaborative skills as it also promotes shared responsibility for outcomes through joint problem-solving and decision-making.

Choice: Nurturing Autonomy and Decision Making

When teachers create opportunities for students to make meaningful choices about what and how they learn, they are likewise supporting the self-directed, reflective thinking and informed decision-making that support freedom, individualism, and, ultimately, popular sovereignty. Evans and Boucher (2015) have considered *choice* in two distinct ways: first as a noun to indicate the presence of options, and second as a verb to indicate the act of choosing. They argue that by providing multiple options, teachers are equipping the learning environment to meet the "widest possible range of learners" and that "it is the act of choosing itself that fosters an individual's sense of free will" (p. 88). According to Ryan and Deci (2000), an individual's sense of autonomy grows out of opportunities in which self-direction is practiced. Self-direction occurs when an individual sets goals based on personal values and interests, makes decisions regarding the steps needed to achieve those goals, and initiates action leading to achievement of those goals.

Evans and Boucher (2015) have proposed three criteria for effective student choice. First, choice must be relevant and meaningful to the chooser. In order to establish relevance and meaning for students, the teacher must provide a variety of options and support student autonomy by demonstrating or explaining the relevance of the available choices to the students' interests and goals. Second, choice should be competence-enhancing. In other words, it should present the optimal amount of challenge to the students as indicated by each student's abilities and developmental level (Katz & Assor, 2007). Providing a range of choices with varying degrees of difficulty and varied resources is a good way to ensure that optimal challenge is available for every student. Third, students must be

offered the right amount of choice in order to avoid *choice overload* that results in students feeling incapable of choosing.

Universal Design for Learning (UDL) provides a framework for utilizing choice in curriculum development and in addressing a wide range of student needs, interests, and skills (Evans & Boucher, 2015). The UDL framework is constructed on three principles. The first principle addresses recognition learning networks (the *what* of learning) by providing learners with a range of choices for accessing content with multiple options for comprehension; for languages, expressions, and symbols; and for perception. The second principle addresses strategic learning networks (the *how* of learning) by providing multiple means of action and expression with a variety of options for executive functions, expression and communication, and physical action. The third principle addresses affective learning networks (the *why* of learning) by providing multiple means of engagement with options for self-regulation, sustaining effort and persistence, and recruiting interest (CAST, 2011).

Civil Discourse: Manifesting Democratic Principles

In a democratic classroom, civil discourse becomes the outward manifestation of democratic principles. Emphasizing civil discourse in the classroom community promotes student engagement and provides opportunities to practice critical thinking and self-discipline. According to Moore (2012), teachers play a critical role in educating students for moral and civic responsibility in a democratic society. By his definition, civility "goes far beyond politeness, respectful language, and good manners" and is "a moral imperative linked with other democratic virtues, such as respect for differing opinions, listening skills, self-control, rationality, and tolerance, that must form a foundation for acceptable public discourse" (p. 141). Moore has suggested several teacher behaviors that are critical in establishing a climate of civility in the classroom. First, teachers must serve as role models for civility by demonstrating professionalism, creating a safe space for students to express themselves, using language that conveys respect, and responding to incivility with civility. Second, the teacher must

demonstrate respect for differing views and ideologies by ensuring that personal beliefs and biases do not contribute to incivility and that controversial issues are approached in an ideologically balanced manner. Third, the teacher must establish clear expectations for civil classroom speech and behavior with fair and consistent enforcement of those expectations. Fourth, the teacher must teach students how to disagree respectfully by focusing difficult discussions on the subject matter rather than on the individuals and by teaching students to look for ways to compromise. Fifth, the teacher must include content that exemplifies the desired civil virtues.

Marini, Polihronis, and Blackwell (2010) have proposed a series of exercises aimed at building positive, civil learning relationships among students. The exercises begin with students developing consensus around a shared definition for "civility." Students then operationalize civility based on their shared definition by identifying and discussing associated behaviors and co-create a "communal declaration of civility" (p. 92) to serve as a guiding statement for the group and as a contract for sustaining civility in both peaceful and contentious times. Johnson and Johnson (1988) proposed a discussion model called structured academic controversy that defines controversies as "interesting problems to be solved rather than as win-lose situations" (p. 59). The goal is for small groups of students to consider various perspectives and reach consensus regarding a controversy or conflict. In this model, the students define the controversy, form groups, research a position and present it, reverse perspective and advocate for the opposing position, work together to arrive at a consensus, and then debrief the *process* rather than the outcome. This model provides opportunity for students to consider issues from multiple perspectives, to make decisions based on expanded perspective, and to manage controversy in an appropriately civil manner.

Conclusion

In establishing a democratic learning environment, then, teachers must be prepared to embrace and model democratic principles,

to create a sense of community that recognizes and removes cultural barriers to learning while identifying shared interests and concerns, to engage students critically with the content, to invite student participation through collaboration and choice, and to promote discourse that is thoughtful, respectful, and tolerant. In preparation for this role, preservice teachers must develop their knowledge, dispositions, and skills in several key areas: (1) deepening knowledge of self and identifying personal biases, (2) acquiring knowledge of and demonstrating acceptance of others, (3) understanding and respecting cultural diversity, (4) nurturing belongingness, (5) understanding and embracing democratic principles, and (6) embedding democratic processes within the classroom culture. Within the resulting pedagogical community, learning can become a shared endeavor as students pool their curiosity, experiences, intellect, and skills to expand their knowledge and to solve problems.

Just as citizens both shape and are shaped by society, students both shape and are shaped by the classroom environment. Democratic principles can and should be cultivated in every classroom. Furthermore, while electing to incorporate one or two strategies into one's classroom practice is a beginning—a truly democratic classroom will develop only if the teacher takes a holistic view and saturates the classroom environment with words and actions that give life and meaning to democratic principles, thereby cultivating democratic habits of thought and behavior. In the classroom as in life, community connects, content informs, collaboration unites, choice liberates, and civility respects. Teachers who embrace democratic principles become agents of change, fostering success in the classroom and readying their students for the complexities and civic responsibilities inherent in a democratic society.

References

Aronson, E., Blaney, N., Sikes, J., Stephan, C., & Snapp, M. (1978). *The jigsaw classroom*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Barrows, H. S. (1986). A taxonomy of problem-based learning methods. *Medical Education, 20*, 481–486.

Brown-Jeffy, S., & Cooper, J. E. (2011). Toward a conceptual framework of culturally relevant pedagogy: An overview of the conceptual and theoretical literature. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 38*(1), 65–84.

CAST. (2011). *Universal Design for Learning Guidelines version 2.0*. Wakefield, MA: Author.

Davidson, N., & Major, C. H. (2014). Boundary crossings: Cooperative learning, collaborative learning, and problem-based learning. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching, 25*(3&4), 7–55.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York: Macmillan.

Dillenbourg, P. (1999). *Collaborative learning: Cognitive and computational approaches*. Amsterdam: Pergamon Press.

Edelstein, W. (2011). Education for democracy: Reasons and strategies. *European Journal Of Education*, (1), 127. doi:10.1111/j.1465-3435.2010.01463.x

Evans, M., & Boucher, A. R. (2015). Optimizing the power of choice: Supporting student autonomy to foster motivation and engagement in learning. *Mind, Brain, And Education, 9*(2), 87–91.

Hendrix, J. (1996). Cooperative learning: Building a democratic community. *The Clearing House, 69*(6), 333–336.

Hopkins, N. (2014). The democratic curriculum: Concept and practice. *Journal of Philosophy of Education, 48*(3), 416–427. doi:10.1111/1467-9752.12088

Hung, D., Tan, S., & Koh, T. (2006). From traditional to constructivist epistemologies: A proposed theoretical framework based on activity theory for learning communities. *Journal of Interactive Learning Research, 17*(1), 37–55.

Johnson D. W. & Johnson, R. T. (1988). Critical thinking through structured controversy. *Educational Leadership, 45*(8): 58–64.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Smith, K. (2007). The state of cooperative learning in postsecondary and professional settings. *Educational Psychology Review, 19*, 15–29.

Katz, I., & Assor, A. (2007). When choice motivates and when it does not. *Educational Psychology Review, 19*, 429–442. doi:10.1007/s10648-006-9027-y

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Lyman, F. T. (1981). The responsive classroom discussion: The inclusion of all students. In *Mainstreaming Digest*, ed. A. Anderson, 109–113. College Park: University of Maryland Press.

Major, C. H., & Eck, J. C. (2000). Connecting goals, methods, and measures: A problem for problem-based learning. *Assessment Update, 12*(1), 1–2.

Marini, Z., Polihronis, C., & Blackwell, W. (2010). Academic in/civility: Co-constructing the foundation for a civil learning community. *Collected Essays on Learning and Teaching, 3*, 89–93.

McMillan, D. W., & Chavis, D. M. (1986). Sense of community: A definition and theory. *Journal of Community Psychology, 14*(1), 6.

McTighe, J., & Wiggins, G. (2013). *Essential questions: Opening doors to student understanding*. Alexandria, VA, USA: ASCD.

Moore, J. (2012). A challenge for social studies educators: Increasing civility in schools and society by modeling civic virtues. *Social Studies, 103*(4), 140–148.

Plata, M. (2011). Cultural schemata—yardstick for measuring others: Implications for teachers. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 38*(2), 117–123.

Ryan, R. M. and Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist, 55*, 1, 68–78.

Sapon-Shevin, M. (2010). *Because we can change the world: A practical guide to building cooperative, inclusive classroom communities*. Corwin Press.

Schul, J. E. (2011). Revisiting an old friend: The practice and promise of cooperative learning for the twenty-first century. *Social Studies, 102*(2), 88. doi:10.1080/00377996.2010.509370

Sharan, S. & Sharan, Y. (1992). *Group investigation: Expanding cooperative learning*. New York: Teacher's College Press.

Slavin, R. E. (1980). Cooperative learning. *Review of Educational Research, 50*(2): 315–342.

Soares, L. B. (2013). The education students deserve: Building a democratic classroom in teacher education. *Critical Literacy: Theories & Practices, 7*(2), 69–78.

Wong, A., Remin, R., Love, R., Aldred, R., Ralph, P., & Cook, C. (2013). Building pedagogical community in the classroom. *Christian Higher Education, 12*(4), 282–282.

Wraga, W. G. (1998). Democratic leadership in the classroom: Theory into practice. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED427998.

• • •

Kim Crosby serves as Assistant Professor of Education and Director of Teacher Education at Lyon College. Her research interests include public school policy, equity in education, and social justice. She has spent the last 25 years as an educator, first teaching at the secondary level, then directing an Upward Bound program, and finally preparing teacher candidates to become teacher leaders.

Preparing Students to Collaborate Across Divides: Deliberative Pedagogy, Communication, and Community

Theresa Hickey, Ph.D.
St. Martin's University

Abstract

Democracy—with its complicated problems, multiplicity of positions, and often deeply held convictions—has always been messy. How do we prepare students to participate meaningfully in this type of world, where issues are complex and opinions vary widely? Knowledge about democratic ideals and development of civic dispositions is important, but for students to fully participate in democratic life, they also need skills to use when collaborating around difficult problems. This essay explores the educational paradigm of deliberative pedagogy as understood through its origins in the political idea of deliberative democracy. It discusses the difficult transition of deliberative democracy into educational practice, and suggests deliberative pedagogy might be more seamlessly incorporated. It also considers implications of this pedagogy for teacher preparation programs. Finally, it suggests ways in which this paradigm supports the mission of liberal arts institutions, especially as it concerns discourse, community, and life within a democratic society.

Shouting, sensationalism, and name-calling all exemplify what might be described as an increasingly hostile culture of communication (Gerhart, 2009; Leskes, 2013; Potthoff, Mantle-Bromley, Clark, Kleinsasser, Badiali, & Baugh, 2009). When engaging with complex problems and differences of opinion, our habits of communication appear to be growing more contentious. But is this discord really worse than in the past? Possibly not; our democratic history is filled with moments of conflict and belligerent communication. To think that current toxic behaviors are "products of the modern era" negates a long history of struggles within our democratic past (Leskes, 2013).

Democracy—with its complicated problems, multiplicity of positions, and often deeply held convictions—has always been messy (Gerhart, 2009; Gutmann & Thompson, 2004). One current condition that might be intensifying discord is the constant and instantaneous barrage of noise, opinion, misinformation, and incivility afforded by ubiquitous social media (Gerhart, 2009; Leskes, 2013). However, this discord also might be due to our own limitations. We might simply be ill equipped to meaningfully engage with challenging social problems—weak in skills such as listening and reasoning, and lacking the capacity to communicate respectfully across chasms of differing opinion.

Whether the climate of discord is worse now or then is unclear. But as educators and especially as teacher educators, this divisive discourse raises a serious question: how do we prepare students to participate meaningfully in this type of world, where issues are complex and opinions are widely divided? It is a difficult question with uncertain answers, and it requires consideration of both the theoretical and practical dimensions of politics, language, and education, as well as an awareness of where these realms might intersect (Gutmann & Thompson, 2004; Robertson, 2008).

Institutions of higher education are increasingly being considered as essential sites for exploring this question, in part because of their capacity to integrate ideas, skills, and practices in a multidimensional way—through classes, forums, community service, and lectures, to name a few (Longo, Manosevitch, & Shaffer, 2017; National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement, 2012). This, along with their ability to unite students and community, has led some to consider them "among the nation's most valuable laboratories for civic learning and democratic engagement" (National Task Force, 2012, p. 2). Teacher education programs are important sites as well, with their purpose of educating future teachers who will, in turn, help future students to develop civic capacity (Robertson, 2008).

But both institutions and teacher education programs have struggled with addressing all of the elements needed for civic participation. The practical skills and democratic dispositions needed for collaborative decisions (which involve difficult problems and divergent interests) prove especially challenging to address. An institutional focus on service learning, for example, does not necessarily develop these skills in students. These projects tend to be oriented toward participation, not problem solving (Stitzlein, 2010). Likewise, teacher education programs that relegate all of the "democracy talk" to history of education or foundations classes can fail to create modes of practical discourse. These stand-alone courses might focus on important ideas and attitudes, but they lack a wider, integrated context as well as the development of practical skills and practice. Knowledge about democratic ideals and development of civic dispositions is important, but for students to uphold their responsibilities for full participation in democratic life, they will also need skills that can be put to use when collaborating around difficult problems (National Task Force, 2012).

Deliberative democracy—discussed more fully in the next section—seems to offer a way for schools to develop the knowledge, skills and dispositions needed for students to fully participate in civic life. It focuses on complex problems and the use of reasoning and deliberation for collaborative decision making. But this approach—firmly rooted in political philosophy and theory—has transitioned unevenly into educational practice (Robertson, 2008; Samuelsson & Bøyum, 2015). Its ideas remain firmly enmeshed in political theory, causing educators to struggle when implementing it in educational settings. This has led to inadequate translations of

ideas and situations where theorists and educators "talk past each other, to the detriment of both" (Samuelsson & Bøyum, 2015, p. 76). In the end, this approach has been imperfectly realized in practice, unable to bridge the significant gap between political conceptions and educational practice.

Deliberative pedagogy might be the answer to bridging this divide. It is founded on deliberative democracy and political ideas, yet it also locates itself firmly within both educational theory and practice. Its framework provides both a way of teaching and a means of developing a deliberative character (Matthews, 2017). Most important, it builds the deliberative skills and dispositions necessary for engaging respectfully with others over difficult problems.

This essay explores the educational paradigm of deliberative pedagogy as understood through its origins in the political idea of deliberative democracy. It discusses the difficult transition of deliberative democracy into educational practice, and suggests that the framework of deliberative pedagogy might be more seamlessly incorporated. It also considers implications of this pedagogy for teacher preparation programs. Finally, it suggests ways in which this paradigm supports the mission of liberal arts institutions, especially as concerns discourse, community and life within a democratic society.

Deliberation—Process, Skills, and Dispositions

Deliberation is a process of reasoning at the center of both deliberative democracy and deliberative pedagogy. It shares characteristics of civil discourse, but engages participants in different ways. Civil discourse could simply be described as a reasoned, mutually respectful conversation (Leskes, 2013). It involves no structure and has few requirements other than the necessity of respectful speaking and listening. Participants use civil discourse to learn about issues; and using it builds skills in critical analysis, logical thinking, respectful engagement, and listening (Leskes, 2013). Although deliberation shares many of these basic functions, it has important differences.

Deliberation, unlike civil discourse, involves reason-giving and the justification of positions (Gutmann & Thompson, 2004). It requires careful analysis of positions and weighing of alternatives and is focused on "questions affecting the public good" (Robertson, 2008). Additionally, it can have a transformative effect on participants who might experience new awareness of the complexities of a problem after sharing with and listening to others (Gutmann & Thompson, 2004). Deliberation also involves a decision, one considered the "best" decision given the available perspectives and problem. Unlike debate, deliberation is not about winning, convincing, or even necessarily compromise. Rather it moves participants to greater insights and toward a collectively determined decision that will best serve the common good (Gutmann & Thompson, 2004).

In addition, unlike civil discourse, deliberation relies upon elements of character that will compel deliberators to engage fairly and consider the public good when making decisions. Virtues such as respect, civility, a "willingness to listen to others who disagree" and an openness to different perspectives all underlie the deliberative process (Robertson, 2008).

Understanding deliberative pedagogy requires an understanding of deliberation and of deliberative democracy (the approach from which it derives). It also is necessary to consider the ways in which deliberative democracy has been imperfectly realized, as it has moved from idea into practice so that the benefits of deliberative pedagogy might be more apparent.

Deliberative Democracy

Deliberation and democracy have been long-time partners in politics—as early as fifth-century Athens and involving Pericles and Aristotle, by one account—but the meanings and roles of each have changed as political theories have evolved (for a brief history, see Gutmann & Thompson, 2004). "Deliberative democracy" unites both terms and refers to a conception of democracy where participants struggle toward a decision over a complicated problem in a way that involves reasoning between people, justifying

positions, and the consideration of options and trade-offs. This guarantees that participants have the opportunity to speak and be listened to in a mutually respectful manner (Gutmann & Thompson, 1996; Shaffer, Longo, Manosevitch, & Thomas, 2017).

Deliberative democracy requires participants to make a decision amidst a tangle of considerations and differing opinions, and while members move toward a "best" solution, it does not mean that their personal positions are the same or even aligned in the end. It merely requires a common agreement upon and support of a decision deemed to be in the interests of the common good. Even though there may be continued disagreement, the process promotes respect for the collective decision, and in the end it serves to legitimize the collective decision-making process (Gutmann & Thompson, 2004).

This conceptualization of democracy situates deliberation at the center of democratic life, and it took shape in the 1980s out of dissatisfaction with prevailing democratic practices (Barker, McAfee, & McIvors, 2012). By one account, these popular practices treated citizens as vote-holders whose preferences could be manipulated using democratic processes, an approach which elevated special interest groups and engendered aggressive competition for votes (Barker et al., 2012). General frustration with this paradigm and a desire for greater inclusion of everyday citizens in decision-making processes led to a shift away from this "voting-centric" interest group politics and a movement toward local political processes and participation (Barker et al., 2012). Deliberative democracy provided a new political paradigm, one that focused on citizen voice and emphasized participation through deliberation (Barker et al., 2012).

Over time, this political paradigm matured, especially with regard to the idea of deliberation and what this term should entail. Early critics of deliberative democracy, for example, often focused on the ways in which the term "deliberation" was problematic or limiting in nature (Barker et al., 2012; Robertson, 2008). These critics took issue with what they perceived to be an overly narrow definition of deliberation, one that restricted the practice of deliberation to engagements of reasoned discourse. According to

critics, this narrow understanding favored impartial accounts and made no room for emotion or other forms of expression, a restriction that by its very nature excluded certain voices and privileged others (Barker et al., 2012). However, proponents of deliberative democracy viewed these early criticisms of deliberation as oversimplifications. Regardless, the process of deliberation as defined by recent work explicitly involves wide parameters and includes elements such as storytelling, personal accounts, and emotion (Barker et al., 2012).

Deliberation also matured with regard to purpose. Early understandings of the goal of deliberation focused on reaching consensus, but current conceptualizations express a different goal. Deliberation is used to advance members toward a decision that functions best for a given problem, even if this solution does not align with all members' beliefs and even if members continue to hold differing positions after their decision (Barker et al., 2012; Shaffer, 2017). It employs discussion and justification of positions, along with considerations of the public good, with a purpose of minimizing differences between positions to arrive at an agreed-upon result (Gutmann & Thompson, 2004). This expansion of the purpose of deliberation is more sensitive to the complexity of problems, the depth and breadth of stakeholder positions, and the nature of disagreement (Barker et al., 2012; Shaffer, 2017).

These clarifications in definition and purpose helped solidify the paradigm of deliberative democracy and more clearly illuminate its benefits. For instance, the deliberative process necessitates that people provide justifications for their own understandings, a process which often clarifies their positions. It provides a forum for the expression of multiple positions and voices, which offers listeners an opportunity to refine their thinking (Shaffer, 2017). The multiplicity of ideas and voices that are present during deliberation even helps to clarify the problem being considered, as it reveals perspectives that may not have been visible initially. Deliberation also helps to bring differing opinions together using a process dependent upon respect. It "cannot make incompatible values compatible, but it can help participants recognize the moral merit in

their opponents' claims when those claims have merit" (Gutmann & Thompson, 2004, p. 11). In short, the deliberative process uses discussion, listening, and reasoning to elevate the careful consideration of challenging issues. The diversity of positions that emerge enable members to weigh a variety of options as they move toward an agreed-upon course of action.

The current conceptualization of deliberative democracy is situated in political theory, but it intersects with education in important ways. First, it requires a set of reasoning and communication skills and a refinement of thought that must be taught, leading one theorist to claim that the educational system is "the single most important institution outside of government" for developing deliberative capacity (Gutmann & Thompson, 1996, p. 359). When considering the list of characteristics that make up a deliberative nature—careful listening, critical thinking, and clear articulation of ideas, for instance—it becomes clear that many are already being cultivated in schools in one form or another (Samuelsson & Bøyum, 2015). Those that may be less present in schools, such as opportunities to engage "respectfully with views different from one's own" (Samuelsson & Bøyum, 2015) and to participate in the "give and take of moral argument with a view to making mutually acceptable decisions" (Guttmann & Thompson, 1996) still clearly align with many educational aims.

From Political Conceptions to Educational Practice— a Difficult Transition

These overlaps make it relatively easy to theorize about the intersection of deliberative democracy and education, but the reality of implementation is more difficult. The research involving deliberative democracy as it pertains to education consistently aligns on two points—on what the practice of deliberative democracy should look like and that the development of a deliberative nature requires explicit instruction and practice (Samuelsson & Bøyum, 2015). Beyond these two points, however, myriad disagreements occur, especially regarding the scope and purpose of the deliberative process (Samuelsson & Bøyum, 2015).

Problems specifically arise when the purpose of deliberation moves away from a means of minimizing differences—when the purpose moves to unrelated goals like "taking responsibility for the consequences of one's actions" or "anger management" (Samuelsson & Bøyum, 2015). Educators make research connections such as these in an attempt to connect political theory with educational practice, but these connections move too far away from the meaning and purpose of deliberation as expressed in political theory. In essence, the two groups use the same term, but they define it in fundamentally different ways. Political theory assigns a very specific definition and scope to the term, but educators often rely on a commonly understood definition. As a result, the research findings from educational studies are not aligned in meaning with the findings from political studies, which results in a collection of seemingly disparate research, none of which builds on itself (Samuelsson & Bøyum, 2015).

Implementing deliberative democracy through service learning opportunities provides another example of the uneven transition of this idea into educational practice. While the service learning approach might align with the requirements of deliberative democracy in some elements (e.g. where students are involved in settings which offer a variety of perspectives and which expose students to different communities, perspectives, and concerns), there often is little opportunity for collaboration and even less opportunity for real issue engagement (Stitzlein, 2010). In addition, an attitude of volunteering—viewing the work as an outsider coming in—often prevails, instead of a desire to function and learn within the community in full (Stitzlein, 2010). Service learning opportunities provide some civic interaction, but the overall experience, process, and purpose differs substantively from deliberative democracy.

Understanding the idea of deliberative democracy and the imperfect ways it has been realized in educational practice provides a fuller context for the idea of deliberative pedagogy. It also provides some issues to be aware of when enacting this pedagogy in practice.

Deliberative Pedagogy

Deliberative pedagogy derives from deliberative democracy and subsequently shares many similarities. But unlike deliberative democracy, which focuses on reaching a collective decision benefitting the common good, deliberative pedagogy focuses within the realm of education and its extended community (Longo et al., 2017). Deliberative pedagogy is both a process involving deliberation and a pedagogical approach. This dual functioning makes it not only a set of skills and dispositions to be taught, but also a model of how to teach them (Longo et al., 2017).

As with deliberative democracy, deliberative pedagogy "encourages students to encounter and consider multiple perspectives, weigh trade-offs and tensions, and move toward action through informed judgment" (Longo et al., 2017, p. xxi). The overarching purpose of deliberation in deliberative pedagogy is for its use in achieving civic and democratic ends, not for building discrete skills. It also can move students and universities into more active encounters with their community through its emphasis on bringing groups together to take part in deliberative opportunities (Longo & Gibson, 2017).

In addition, deliberative pedagogy sets forth a pedagogical approach that aligns with established educational theory and philosophy. In its reliance upon democratic conceptions; its process which equates learning with school as well as community; its preference for active, collaborative learning; and its orientation away from the "banking" model of education, for example, it aligns clearly with the educational conceptions of Dewey and Freire (1970) Deliberative pedagogy also bears elements of engaged pedagogy (hooks, 1994) in its challenge of the current pedagogical paradigm of higher education (Longo et al., 2017, p. xxv). Deliberative pedagogy privileges holistic, "collaborative, participatory, and democratic approaches" in the classroom instead of traditional methods of information conveyance (Longo et al., 2017, p. xxv). Because of these connections, deliberative pedagogy situates firmly within the realm of education.

Successful enactments of this pedagogy take a variety of forms in both higher education campuses and classrooms, but all implementations share the fundamental element of engagement. Genuine engagement "opens people's perspectives and tends to make them more aware of issues occurring across groups," which "makes them more likely to get involved in civic efforts organized to address the unsolved issues" (McTighe Musil as quoted in Kozma, 2013, p. 7).

Deliberative pedagogy relies on "high impact practices" to promote this engagement. These practices—such as first-year seminars, common intellectual experiences, learning communities, undergraduate research, and diversity/global learning—engage but also accelerate student learning (Association of American Colleges and Universities [AACU], 2018). When used in conjunction with a variety of perspectives and voices, they also can "disrupt the norms" (McTighe Musil as quoted in Kozma, 2013, p. 7). In practice, deliberative pedagogy might look like "reciprocal partnerships" that bring community and students together in shared engagement (Longo & Gibson, 2017, p. 38). It allows for "the co-creation of shared spaces for dialogue and collaborative action in the community." In some schools, deliberative pedagogy has taken the form of "intergenerational learning circles with new immigrants, forums with community members on public issues, and multi-year civic-engagement courses" (Longo & Gibson, 2017, p. 38).

Locations for engagement may vary, from conference spaces to dorm spaces, gathering spots on campus or within the local community—anywhere that will facilitate engagements, deliberation, and practice (Shaffer, 2014). And, deliberative pedagogy functions as a resource for any group on campus to use, not just students—available also to members of student affairs, residence life, and administration, for example (Shaffer, 2014).

In classrooms, deliberative pedagogy can be implemented as the focus and purpose of an entire course—from syllabus construction to a final deliberative forum involving class, campus, and community members (Brammer, 2017; Shaffer, 2014)—or it can be a guiding focus for the curriculum within a discipline—e.g.,

communications studies (Drury & Carcasson, 2017) or science (Drury, 2017). Within schools of teacher education, it can help students develop greater capacity for meaningful engagement in their school communities, and it can guide them in developing the practical skills needed to build and sustain their own learning communities. For teacher educators, it moves democratic ideas and values out of theory and into meaningful action in schools and communities.

Although there will be inevitable tweaks and adjustments to focus and language as this pedagogical approach matures, it has a strong foundation and is assembling a growing research base (Thomas, 2017). Its deep ties to democracy and clear integration within education's theoretical and pedagogical tradition make this pedagogy a viable option for use within and across disciplines and at every institutional level. And, in those institutions that have embraced it, this pedagogy brings civic and academic worlds together, diminishing the disconnect between what happens in the classroom and what happens in the "public square" (Thomas, 2017). Deliberative pedagogy seems to be emerging as a viable paradigm, helping students "to engage with others in democratic, inclusive, and respectfully discursive practices" (Doherty, 2012).

Implications for Teacher Preparation Programs

Incorporating deliberative pedagogy into teacher preparation programs has a number of clear benefits—for both the programs and teacher candidates. With regard to preparation programs, the use of deliberative pedagogy has the potential to move these programs in a direction directly counter to the forces that are pushing them toward over-standardization. There has been much discussion in the literature about the ways in which preparation programs have begun to narrow in response to current standardized teacher assessments. Both course content and student focus have shifted in an attempt to align with these assessments, a shift that often has resulted in the replacement of rich discussions about community, learning, and experiences with courses and conversations focused on mechanics, procedures, and the interpretation of

assessment rubrics needed for passing the professional portfolio assessment (Alfaro, 2008; Denton, 2013; Greenblatt & O'Hara, 2015). Embracing deliberative pedagogy in preparation programs counters this narrowing and standardization because of its essential use of dynamic interactions with community, content, and learners. Engaging with communities and individuals in this way challenges teacher candidates to "go beyond the mechanics of the practice" and teaches them how to engage directly and meaningfully with their communities in real-world settings (Alfaro, 2008). Deliberative pedagogy also grounds teacher preparation programs firmly in the greater mission of building and sustaining community.

Deliberative pedagogy in teacher preparation programs also benefits teacher candidates, as it provides candidates with a set of real skills that emerge organically from experience. These skills are dynamically derived, and their grounding in human interactions and in community makes them deeply meaningful to candidates. For example, teacher candidates can read case studies about the need to listen, but this skill takes on new depth of meaning when candidates participate in community forums and in this way come to recognize "the wisdom of community voices" and the fact that these voices are "legitimate sources" of knowledge (Longo, 2013, p. 8).

In addition, teacher preparation programs that train their candidates using deliberative pedagogy have the potential to produce future teachers who are deeply in tune with the nature and complexities of the communities in which they will teach. Teacher candidates are able to connect in a real way with the communities that they might become a part of, which aligns them more directly with the strengths, issues, and concerns that are important to the community and their learners.

These experiences also highlight the necessity and benefits of involving diverse community voices in the educational process. One teacher who enacted deliberative pedagogy in a K–6 teacher preparation classroom found that many of the graduated teachers continued to practice deliberative pedagogy once they had entered into their own classrooms and actively sought to build connections

with families and communities. (For a full description of delibera-tive pedagogy as enacted in one K–6 teacher preparation setting, see Alfaro, 2008.) These teachers also brought their community commitments into teacher leadership roles that allowed them to further the work of involving the community in learning. Understanding the value, role, and potential of community engage-ment is a vital part of teacher preparation, and it is among the more difficult parts to realize when developing future teachers. Teacher candidates who experience the benefits of community engage-ments firsthand will deeply appreciate the significance of this component.

Who Will Lead the Way?

The dispositions and skills needed for meaningful deliberation are not innate and must be taught (Matthews, 2017, Robertson, 2008). As noted earlier, institutions of higher education seem the logical choice to lead the way in this effort to build deliberative capacity in students given their educational capacity, resources, and reach (Robertson, 2008; National Task Force, 2012). Liberal arts institutions, especially those with teacher education programs, might be compelled to lead the way for another, more deep-seated reason—mission.

The democratic practice of deliberation aligns with the overall mission of liberal arts institutions because deliberation requires more than process or skills—it involves an ethical dimension as well (Robertson, 2008). Deliberation relies upon dispositions and character traits that will guide participants to act in the interests of the common good and of community. The establishment of community lies at the center of the mission of liberal arts schools, especially those with teacher education programs.

One mission statement—from an association of liberal arts institutions with teacher preparation programs—illustrates the fun-damental importance of community for these schools. The mission statement of the Association of Independent Liberal Arts Colleges for Teacher Education (AILACTE) mentions community explicitly in three of the five mission points that it encourages its members

to emphasize. The mission statement highlights "the importance of community," "the obligations that individuals have in com-munity," and "the role that individuals and communities have in a democratic society" (Association of Independent Liberal Arts Colleges for Teacher Education [AILACTE], 2018). These institu-tions recognize that principles such as respect and openness, and behaviors such as the willingness to consider other viewpoints and to act with others' interests in mind are foundational to communi-ties of learning. These not only align with mission-specific goals involving community and democratic engagement, but they are the same principles needed for deliberation.

There is no question that engaging in the work of democracy, with its plurality of opinion and complex problems, is difficult. If we are to fully uphold our civic and community responsibili-ties, we must be able to proceed in the face of this complexity in a way that upholds standards of respect and democratic values. For liberal arts institutions—especially those with teacher preparation programs—leading the way in this effort to build deliberative and civic capacity in students provides a way to move mission into the forefront, making it both a prominent and integral part of all that is done within the educational community.

References

Alfaro, C. (2008). Reinventing teacher education: The role of deliberative pedagogy in the K–6 classroom. In J. R. Dedrick, L. Grattan, & H. Dienstfrey (Eds.), *Deliberation and the work of higher education: Innovations for the classroom, the campus, and the community* (pp. 143–190). Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation Press. Retrieved from https://www.kettering.org/sites/default/files/product-downloads/CristinaAlfaroReinventing_0.pdf

Association of American Colleges & Universities [AACU]. (2018). *High-Impact educational practices: A brief overview.* Retrieved from https://www.aacu.org/leap/hips

Association of Independent Liberal Arts Colleges for Teacher Education [AILACTE]. (2018). *Constitution*. Retrieved from http://ailacte.org/Constitution

Barker, D. W. M., McAfee, N., & McIvors, D. W. (2012). *Democratizing deliberation: A political theory anthology.* Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation Press.

Brammer, L. R. (2017). Deliberative pedagogy as a central tenet: First-year students develop a course and a community. In T. J. Shaffer, N. V. Longo, I. Manosevitch, & M. S. Thomas (Eds.), *Deliberative pedagogy: Teaching and learning for democratic engagement* (pp. 51–60). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.

Denton, D. W. (2013). Responding to edTPA: Transforming practice or applying shortcuts? *AILACTE Journal 10*(1), 16-36. Retrieved from http://www.ailacte.org/resources/journals

Doherty, J. (2012). Deliberative pedagogy: An education that matters. *Connections*, 24–27.

Drury, S. A. M. (2017). Deliberative pedagogy in undergraduate science courses. In T. J. Shaffer, N. V. Longo, I. Manosevitch, & M. S. Thomas (Eds.), *Deliberative pedagogy: Teaching and learning for democratic engagement* (pp. 79–88). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.

Drury, S. A. M., & Carcasson, M. (2017). Deliberative pedagogy in the communications studies curriculum. In T. J. Shaffer, N. V. Longo, I. Manosevitch, & M. S. Thomas (Eds.), *Deliberative pedagogy: Teaching and learning for democratic engagement* (pp. 71–78). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum.

Gerhart, A. (2009, October 11). In today's viral world, who keeps a civil tongue? *Washington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/10/10/AR2009101002366.html?noredirect=on

Greenblatt, D., & O'Hara, K. E. (2015). Buyer beware: Lessons learned from edTPA implementation in New York State. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 42*(2), 57–67. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1072124

Gutmann, A., & Thompson, D. (1996). *Democracy and disagreement*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gutmann, A., & Thompson, D. (2004). *Why deliberative democracy?* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Kozma, C. (2013). A crucible moment and the current state of engagement: A conversation with Caryn McTighe Musil. *PRISM: A Journal of Regional Engagement, 2*(1). Retrieved from https://encompass.eku.edu/prism/vol2/iss1/1

Leskes, A. (2013). A plea for civil discourse: Needed, the academy's leadership. *Liberal Education, 99*(4). Retrieved from https://www.aacu.org/publications-research/periodicals/plea-civil-discourse-needed-academys-leadership

Longo, N. V. (2013). Deliberative Pedagogy in the community: Connecting deliberative dialogue, community engagement, and democratic education. *Journal of Public Deliberation, 9*(2), Article 16. Retrieved from: http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol9/iss2/art16

Longo, N. V., & Gibson, C. M. (2017). Talking out of school: Using deliberative democracy to connect campus and community. In T. J. Shaffer, N. V. Longo, I. Manosevitch, & M. S. Thomas (Eds.), *Deliberative pedagogy: Teaching and learning for democratic engagement* (pp. 37–50). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.

Longo, N. V., Manosevitch, I., & Shaffer, T. J. (2017). Introduction. In T. J. Shaffer, N. V. Longo, I. Manosevitch, & M. S. Thomas (Eds.), *Deliberative pedagogy: Teaching and learning for democratic engagement* (pp. xix–2). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.

Matthews, D. (2017). Foreword. In T. J. Shaffer, N. V. Longo, I. Manosevitch, & M. S. Thomas (Eds.), *Deliberative pedagogy: Teaching and learning for democratic engagement* (pp. ix–xii). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.

National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement (2012). *A crucible moment: College learning and democracy's future*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities. Retrieved from https://www.aacu.org/crucible

Potthoff, D., Mantle-Bromley, C., Clark, R., Kleinsasser, A., Badiali, B., & Baugh, S. (2009). *Finding a common purpose for schooling in the United States: Why do we educate in a democracy?* Retrieved from http://www.ieiseattle.org/AEDScholars_CommonPurpose.pdf

Robertson, E. (2008). Teacher education in a democratic society: Learning and teaching the practices of democratic participation. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feinman-Nemser, & D. J. McIntyre (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 27–44). New York, NY: Routledge.

Samuelsson, M., & Bøyum, S. (2015). Education for deliberative democracy: Mapping the field. *Utbildning & Demokrati, 25*(1), 75–94.

Shaffer, T. J. (2014). Deliberation in and through higher education. *Journal of Public Deliberation, 10*(1), Article 10.

Shaffer, T. J., Longo, N. V., Manosevitch, I., & Thomas, M. S. (Eds.). (2017). *Deliberative pedagogy: Teaching and learning for democratic engagement*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.

Stitzlein, S. M. (2010). Deliberative democracy in teacher education. *Journal of Public Deliberation, 6*(1), Article 5.

Thomas, M. S. (2017). Preface. In T. J. Shaffer, N. V. Longo, I. Manosevitch, & M. S. Thomas (Eds.), *Deliberative pedagogy: Teaching and learning for democratic engagement* (pp. xiii–xviii). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.

• • •

Theresa Hickey is an Assistant Professor in the College of Education and Counseling at St. Martin's University. Interests include statistics, math, and science education, especially as they intersect with language, and all aspects of teacher preparation. She is also interested in curriculum writing, educational data analysis, and program evaluation. Fun includes creating and running school/community celebrations where robots and math run wild.

Creating an Environment for Civil Discourse in the Classroom

Ronald S. Byrners, Ph.D.
Pacific Lutheran University

Michael R. Hillis, Ph.D.
California Lutheran University

Abstract

In this paper, we discuss how we attempt to build classroom environments that are conducive to positive civil discourse. Utilizing the framework of cultural proficiency (Lindsey, Robins, and Terrell, 2009), we argue for an inside-out approach through self-exploration to help deconstruct worldviews we develop through the years. In coupling this approach with the benefits of a liberal arts education, we are then able to provide preservice teachers with a deeper sense of how to move critical conversations forward within their work.

In the history of U.S. public schooling there has been a long and healthy tension between those who advocate for self-regarding, utilitarian, and economic purposes of schooling versus those who argue for more other-regarding, humanitarian aims focused on democratic citizenship. As the nation's political pendulum has swung every decade or two, so too has thinking about whether schools should first and foremost help people improve their economic prospects or maintain a vibrant democracy. In the recent past, as evidenced by even a cursory analysis of the Obama administration's education speeches (Byrnes, 2012), the pendulum appears stuck in the former, where students are viewed mostly as future employees and consumers.

We stubbornly hold onto the belief that K–12 educators should think more about their students as future citizens in a pluralist democracy. We know today's students will inherit many complex, seemingly intractable challenges from our generation—escalating school violence, environmental degradation, terrorism, and economic inequities—that require significant thoughtfulness to combat. If they are nott taught the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to converse across ever-increasing political and identity lines, even modest progress on these issues is unlikely (Lauka, McCoy, and Firat, 2018).

In a recent TED talk, Julia Galef (2016) framed part of this issue as the difference between a soldier versus a scout mindset. A soldier mindset, she argues, is ultimately concerned with winning and being right. A person with this mindset seeks information to confirm their position, rather than striving to find information that may provide a more complete view of reality. Someone with a scout mindset, on the other hand, tries to remain curious about whatever issue is under debate. As a result, a person with a scout mindset will pursue additional information no matter where it may lead.

Of course, an important question is how do individuals arrive at either a soldier or scout mindset? For even as Galef acknowledges, most of us adopt the soldier mindset because it does not require us to challenge our previously held positions. And if adopting a scout mindset is difficult for us, then how are we to

help others do the same?

The argument that we will make in the subsequent pages of this essay is that the process can begin through education and be further developed in our work with preservice teachers. Utilizing the lens of cultural proficiency (Lindsey, Robins, and Terrell, 2009), we will argue for an inside-out approach and suggest that a liberal arts education can be an instrumental first step in preparing new teachers. We will conclude with examples of how we work specifically with preservice teachers to foster K–12 classroom environments that are conducive to civil discourse.

An Inside-Out Approach

"Central to what you see in someone is what you are looking for."
Herbert Kohl, 1994, p. 44

The field of cultural proficiency offers a hopeful approach to deepening our understanding of one another and creating more open environments. Rather than trying to first learn about each other, cultural proficiency advocates for an inside-out approach (Lindsey, et al., 2009). The basic premise of the field, which "acknowledges and validates the current values and feelings of people, encouraging change without threatening people's feeling of worth" (p. 23), is that as people engage in self-exploration, more meaningful dialogue can be facilitated.

The Development of Schemas

The focus of cultural proficiency is placed on exploring the multiple, and often competing, values, ethics, and positions one develops through the years. For example, as privileged white males, the authors acknowledge that we have been formed by positions of power, economic stability, and an existence rooted in a patriarchal, primarily Anglo-Saxon society. The result is that we, personally, have developed worldviews that originate from this upbringing and are informed by predominantly white male power structures within U.S. society.

As children, we are constantly absorbing the environment around us in our attempts to make sense of the world. Ideally, our evolving worldviews would be rational and information-based; however, the reality is that they emerge from a complex set of experiences, fragmentary knowledge, and self-determined conclusions. Consequently, idiosyncratic schemas emerge to help create subjective perceptions of reality (Arbib, 1995; Green, 2010).

For example, a young man grows up in an economically privileged home with a mother, father, and two siblings. The mother, who happens to be a corporate lawyer, and the father, an entrepreneur in the technology field, raise their children according to the old maxim, "God helps those who help themselves." Now as parents ourselves, this adage may be a laudable framework in which to raise children who, as a result, will understand the value of hard work and the opportunity for growth and advancement (although, granted, this outcome is never guaranteed). This type of an upbringing would help to codify certain behaviors and norms within a child to create what they come to believe as "normal," "expected," or "common sense."

However, we must also recognize that others raised in different circumstances would in all likelihood arrive at a different set of conclusions. Suppose, for example, that our young man grows up as a child in the foster care system. Abandoned at birth, the child's upbringing could be one of instability and scarcity—both emotionally and physically. As the child navigates the school system, he might be unable to receive the needed support at school or home and experience frustration and failure as a result. The schema that he develops might be mistrustful of anyone who says to him, "Just pull yourself up by the bootstraps." Unable to see the opportunities before him, he would understandably be more focused on survival than some tenuous future.

While these are two dramatically different mindsets, the reality is that we are all in the process of creating unique identities based upon distinct life experiences. Politics, religion, gender identification, socioeconomic status, family dynamics, etc., impact all of us and frame conceptions of ourselves, each other, and the world around us. Everyone constructs their worldview differently, which contributes to our many divides—divides that must first be addressed through a process of self-reflection.

Barriers of the Self

As Lindsey, et al. (2009) note in their work on cultural proficiency, the difficulty with self-reflection is that there are barriers that must be confronted to move us towards each other relationally. These barriers are persistent and reoccurring, which makes it a challenge to be open and aware of how others perceive the world. The following is a brief synopsis of these barriers and how an exposure to the liberal arts can ameliorate them.

A resistance to change: The authors argue that an initial barrier to confront is one's resistance to change. As noted above, the emergence of schemas tends to normalize experiences and understanding. Furthermore, if these schemas have proven efficacious for an individual, especially in helping form positive relationships with other like-minded people, a logical question would be, "Why would I want to change?"

One of the benefits of working in a college/university setting is that many students come with an openness to change. Higher education is seen as an opportunity to gain new skills, expand one's knowledge, and engage in new experiences. We often hear first-year students comment about "reinventing themselves" after high school. Within a liberal arts environment, this message of possibility is continually reinforced to students. At our respective institutions, both of the mission statements reflect this:

California Lutheran University: *The mission of the University is to educate leaders for a global society who are strong in character and judgment, confident in their identity and vocation, and committed to service and justice.*

Pacific Lutheran University: *The University seeks to educate students for lives of thoughtful inquiry, service, leadership and care—for other people, for their communities and for the Earth.*

Other liberal arts institutions similarly identify future-oriented goals to direct the work of the organization.

Being unaware of a need to adapt: In addition to having a resistance to change, Lindsey, et al. (2009) suggest that people are often unaware of a need to adapt to a changing context. This lapse is further exacerbated by our tendency to associate with people of similar background, orientations, heritage, etc. (Garmston and Zoller, 2018). When our associations remain limited and our world views stay small, it can create a static view of one's self and those with whom we engage. However, with personal mobility being a significant factor in society, there is less chance that people will reside in their originating communities. As people move from place to place, it is likely that they will experience new sets of mores and differing degrees of cultural, ethnic, and political diversity.

One of the strengths of a liberal arts education is that it provides students with a deepened awareness of their own limitations (Taylor, 2010). Having typically only been exposed to fairly traditional high school content in English, history, civics, etc., in high school, a university will often present content that creates a more intellectually rigorous and challenging experience; content infused with gender perspectives, systemic oppression, epistemology, etc. can be both welcomed and jarring. As we will explore later in this article, teacher education needs to capitalize on this challenging content as a way to help preservice teachers gain empathy and more complete perspectives of others (Andrews, Richmond, Warren, Petchauer, and Floden, 2018).

A failure to acknowledge systemic oppression: Gaining knowledge and skills to be able to adapt to the changing world is an important step; however, Lindsey, et al. (2009) also argue that to become culturally proficient, it is imperative to acknowledge that U.S. society has systemically oppressed various groups of people throughout its history and that this continues today. Historical examples of this oppression are clear: indigenous groups who were decimated through disease and war; captured Africans brought to the U.S. and enslaved to work the fields; and women who were not allowed to vote and denied educational and employment opportunities for many years. Additionally, there continues to be striking

examples of systemic oppression in modern society as well: the plight of young black males who have alarmingly high rates of school expulsion (Howard, 2018); the ongoing fight for the recognition of transgendered people (Nicolazzo, 2017); and the continued sexual harassment and abuse of women as highlighted by the Me Too Movement.

As scholars have noted throughout the last 30 years (e.g., Loewen, 1995; Takaki, 1993; Zinn, 1980), the history and experiences of non-dominant groups in society have often been omitted from the curriculum. Consequently, it is not surprising that some people have a difficult time recognizing the systemic oppression that has and does exist in U.S. society. While simply teaching about historically marginalized people will not address all of the reasons why someone might deny the existence of oppressive practices in society, it is an area that needs attention; a liberal arts education is one place where this consciousness raising can begin.

One's own benefits arise from positions of power and entitlement: A final barrier articulated by Lindsey, et al. (2009) is that for many people, the benefits derived from their positions of relative power and entitlement inhibit their willingness to change. As we are all aware, power is not often willingly conceded and the result is that power structures are difficult to dislodge (see e.g., King, 1986). As individuals of the dominant culture, we are aware of this challenge and recognize that we have benefited greatly from our backgrounds and affiliations. For example, both of us come from families where a college education was expected as part of our maturation process. Consequently, even though there were challenges in this process for each of us, we were provided with a vision of this path and how to make it happen. Contrast this with first generation college students who may not have this expectation or a well-defined understanding of how best to achieve it (Adams, 2015).

So the question becomes, how do we help students who attend our universities acknowledge this same reality? For it is the case that many of the students we work with at private, liberal arts colleges will have also benefitted from the current system and how it

allocates power and privilege. However, the force of demograph-ics is creating new constellations of student bodies. California Lutheran University, for example, is now a federally recognized Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) and has a greater percentage of students who are Catholic than Lutheran. As a consequence, questions are emerging on the historically white campus that are impelling students, faculty, and staff to consider the intersection of power and privilege. Questions such as: Why do we seek people that "fit in" with the existing culture? How do we move from being a Hispanic enrolling institution to a Hispanic Serving Institution? Why doesn't our faculty and administration have comparable demographics to the student population? While simply asking the questions will not produce change, at least it forces people to con-sider the perspectives that have given rise to the issues.

By reflecting on and moving through these barriers that keep us from greater cultural proficiency, we are hopeful that preservice teachers will be able to take critical steps toward more productive engagement with people who think differently than them. By doing so, we are then able to pivot to the challenging work of creating environments for civil discourse.

Developing Classroom Environments

Teaching preservice teachers to reflect on and move through these aforementioned barriers is critical to helping them thought-fully resolve conflict with their increasingly diverse students, students' families, and colleagues. Before turning to a few teacher education practices we find helpful in teaching about cultural profi-ciency, here are some key assumptions we adhere to in our work.

Working Assumptions

First, whether teaching cultural proficiency to prospective undergraduate teacher candidates in a "Multicultural Perspectives in the Classroom" course or graduate preservice teachers in "Sociocultural Foundations of Education," we're keenly aware of the limits of teacher-directed instruction, or what Freire (2008) described as a banking model of instruction. When teachers see

themselves as depositors of knowledge and view students as passive receptors, students lack the autonomy to rationalize and conceptualize knowledge at a personal level. Preservice teach-ers gain cultural proficiency though conversation; questioning; and the repeated, respectful sharing of competing interpretations. We are most successful in broadening our preservice teach-ers' worldviews when we orchestrate classroom experiences that enable them to learn about the broader context of their differences through direct interaction. Important in this context is the work that admission teams do to recruit candidates with varied life experiences. From our perspective, the more culturally and eco-nomically diverse preservice teacher classes are, the greater the opportunity for the candidates to discover how their backgrounds and identities impact and frame their conceptions of themselves and others (see e.g., Arshavskaya, 2018).

Additionally, we emphasize the importance of cultural profi-ciency not only in working with K–12 students, but also in teaming effectively with colleagues and partnering positively with families (Terrell and Lindsey, 2009). We continually remind our preservice teachers that conflict resolution knowledge, skills, and dispositions, especially with questioning and active listening, are helpful tools not only in their classrooms, but in resolving challenging colleague and family related disagreements as well.

A third point we make when teaching cultural proficiency is to emphasize what Wong (2017) describes as "the inherent advan-tages of self-compassion as compared to the more popular notion of self-confidence." Wong writes that self-compassion "…encour-ages you to acknowledge your flaws and limitations, allowing you to look at yourself from a more objective and realistic point of view." Preservice teachers need continual reminders that becoming skilled at civic discourse is a long-term process. Since missteps are inevitable, perfection is an unrealistic and unhelpful goal.

Lastly, in our focus on cultural proficiency, we are conscious that we are modeling how to initiate and constructively engage in difficult conversations about controversial topics upon which reasonable people routinely disagree. Consequently, we seek to

normalize conflict and help students become more comfortable with it by addressing both students' hurt feelings directly and contemporary controversies (e.g., the National Football League players' protests of the national anthem) through open-ended questioning. We simultaneously encourage open and honest discussion through patient, active listening and share the missteps we have made in our journeys towards becoming more culturally proficient.

Approaching Preservice Teachers

With that context, the following types of educational activities have proven especially effective in deepening our preservice teachers' cultural proficiency through the years. First and foremost, we strongly encourage studying away from campus, especially in markedly different cultural contexts, whether in the United States or abroad. When studying away, students who are often overwhelmed with cultural differences, may learn how problematic it is to make rushed, negative judgments about the host culture. For example, one of us lead a study abroad program at Sichuan University in Chengdu, China, that involved an emergency trip to Hong Kong for a gamma globulin shot for a student who had been scratched on the nose by an aggressive monkey. Upon returning to Chengdu, our "single entry" visas needed renewing. What we imagined would be a simple errand ended up being a long, challenging series of obstacles, including finding the right building and needing new photos and more money. For the student, everything about the morning's frustrations was abnormal. His sense of "the normal way things are supposed to be done" was tested at every turn. The student was incensed and was frustrated by the entire incident.

Expectations about what's normal also impacted all the group's academic experiences. Specifically, last-minute schedule changes were a source of frustration throughout the semester. In the students' thinking, all universities should publish the schedule of classes weeks and months in advance; consequently, they wanted to know the logistical details of their class schedule shortly after arriving on the Sichuan University campus. However, Chinese institutions do not organize classes in the same manner; as a result, the students struggled to adapt right up until the semester began. Instead of viewing more spontaneous decision-making as a flaw in the Chinese character, gradually, some students learned to accept it as not better or worse than what they were most accustomed to, but just another cultural difference.

When preservice teachers realize people organize their lives in culturally distinct ways that work perfectly well for them, they become more sensitive to the myriad ways their students' families organize their daily lives and the differing degrees of importance they place on formal academic achievement. Consequently, they may be less likely to generalize from their own experience and thereby earn the respect of culturally diverse students and families.

A second, relatively simple educational activity that has proven helpful in advancing our preservice teachers' cultural proficiency is Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie's TEDGlobal Talk, "The Danger of a Single Story" (2009). In the talk, the Nigerian novelist poignantly describes how our lives and cultures are composed of many overlapping stories and warns that if we hear only a single story about another person or country, we risk critical misunderstandings. Upon watching it, preservice teachers often reflect on how they have been "single storied" at times, thus creating a new determination to avoid that common cross-cultural pitfall.

Another short video, a peek inside Mary Stewart's New Haven, Connecticut, kindergarten classroom, is a third educational activity that helps preservice teachers better understand cultural proficiency—watching an accomplished teacher skillfully implement it in her classroom (Southern Poverty Law Center, 2008). While Stewart helps the class build a wheel chair accessible ramp for a future wheel-chair-bound guest, she gracefully engages her 25 culturally diverse kindergarteners in matter-of-fact discussions about disabilities. Through a series of hands-on activities, including learning sign language and using wheel chairs, Stewart helps the students become more familiar with, and comfortable around, disabled people. While starting construction on the ramp, a student abruptly tells Ms. Stewart she can't use a hammer "because she's

a mom." Ms. Stewart reveals that not only can she use a hammer, but she was in the Army too; a "single story" error that can be highlighted for preservice teachers as they develop their cultural proficiency.

Stewart is also asked in the video why she didn't pre-drill the holes in the wood so that students could hammer the nails into place more easily. Reiterating the importance of active learning, she explains, "I didn't want it to be easy." Preservice teachers are also typically struck by Stewart's default teaching strategy whenever her students express misconceptions of differently abled people—questioning, or more specifically, asking why they believe, for example, someone in a wheel chair is going to die. Socrates-like, Stewart convincingly models how to use questions to deepen classroom conversations about cultural differences and build an environment of openness.

Lastly, teacher-student case studies are imminently helpful in teaching cultural proficiency, cases like one by Jen Stivers (1991) titled "Leigh Scott." The case is about a high school social studies teacher who gives a higher-than-earned grade to a mainstreamed student on the basis of the boy's effort and is confronted by another student who received a lower report card grade. This activity is set up by first pairing preservice teachers to role-play the teacher and the student and then followed by the disgruntled parent of the student and the teacher. Almost like attorneys, when playing the role of Leigh Scott, most approach the simulated conferences far too much as an all-or-nothing argument to be decisively won.

Afterwards, students were asked what percentage of the total talking was done by each person playing the various roles. Many beginning teachers are chagrined to realize they tended to dominate the discussion when role-playing the teacher. This creates a perfect segue to teaching explicit active listening prompts designed to open up the discussion. One particularly valuable question for parents is, "What would you like me to know about your son/daughter that I most likely don't?" When debriefing this case, preservice teachers often reflect on their tendency to get defensive and listen impatiently for a break in the action so that they can continue

to press their points. This approach being in contrast to an openness for change and listening patiently for genuine understanding of the other. Through this and similar cases, beginning teachers begin to see the value in flipping the conversation balance, thus increasing the likelihood of students and families feeling heard and understood, which is often what they most want.

A Move to Wholeheartedness

Sibbet (2016) has argued that in order to improve the democratic discourse in our classrooms, there must be an emphasis on what she terms "wholeheartedness." As she writes, "Wholeheartedness arises from humans' essential impulse to care….(W)holeheartedness engages thoughtfully, deliberately, and in good faith with the available evidence, listening generously to those perspectives that contradict our own views" (p. 8). As we work with preservice teachers to develop deeper levels of cultural proficiency, we seek a result that would reflect this concept—an approach to building a classroom environment focused on curiosity, compassion, and acceptance of others. Through this approach, we are hopeful that we can help future teachers re-imagine their work to help break down the divides that continue to drive us apart—divisions that may have their beginning in K–12 classrooms.

References

Adams, C. J. (2015). 'Melting' off the path to college. *Education Week, 34*(37), 1-13.

Adichie, C. (2009). The danger of a single story [Video file]. Retrieved from https://www.ted.com/talks/ chimamanda_adichie_the_danger_of_a_single_story

Andrews, D. J. C., Richmond, G., Warren, C. A., Petchauer, E., & Floden, R. (2018). A call to action for teacher preparation programs: Supporting critical conversations and democratic action in safe learning environments. *Journal of Teacher Education, 69*(3), 205-208.

Arbib, M. (1995). The schema theory of minds. In R. F. Goodman & W. R. Fisher (Eds.), *Rethinking knowledge: Reflections across disciplines* (pp. 207-217). State University of New York Press: Albany, NY.

Arshavskaya, E. (2018). Promoting intercultural competence in diverse U.S. classrooms through ethnographic interviews. *Teaching Education, 29*(2), 194-210.

Byrnes, R. (May 18, 2012). Stop linking school improvement, economic improvement, and national greatness. Teachers College Record. Retrieved at https://www.tcrecord.org/content. asp?contentid=16773

Freire, P. (2008) The "banking" concept of education. D. Bartholomae & A. Petrosky (Eds.), *Ways of reading* (pp. 242-254). Boston, MA: Bedford-St. Martin's.

Galef, J. (2016). Why you think you're right—even if you're wrong [Video file]. Retrieved from https://www.ted.com/talks/julia_ galef_why_you_think_you_re_right_even_if_you_re_wr ong

Garmston, R. & Zoller, K. (2018). Respectful disagreement closes the gap between points of view. *Learning Professional, 39*(1), 16-18.

Green, B. A. (2010). Understand schema, understand difference. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 37*(2), 133-145.

Howard, T. C. (2018). Capitalizing on culture: Engaging young learners in diverse classrooms. *Young Children, 73*(2), 24-33.

King, M., Jr. (1986). Where do we go from here: Chaos or community? In J.M. Washington (Ed.) *A testament of hope: The essential writings of Martin Luther King, Jr.* (pp. 518-554). San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row.

Kohl, H. (1994). *"I won't learn from you": And other thoughts on creative maladjustment*. New York, NY: The New Press.

Lauka, A., McCoy, J., & Firat, R. B. (2018). Mass partisan polarization: Measuring a relational concept. *American Behavioral Scientist, 62*(1), 107-126.

Lindsey, R. B., Robins, K. N., & Terrell, R. D. (2009). *Cultural proficiency: A manual for school leaders*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Loewen, J. W. (1995). *Lies my teacher told me: Everything your American history books got wrong*. New York, NY: Touchstone.

Nicolazzo, Z. (2017). *Trans* in college: Transgendered students' strategies for navigating campus life and the politics of inclusion*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.

Sibbet, L. A. (2016). Toward a transformative criticality for democratic citizenship education. *Democracy & Education, 24*(2), 1-11.

Southern Poverty Law Center. (2008). Starting small film kit and teacher's guide. *Teaching Tolerance*. Retrieved from https://www.tolerance.org/classroom-resources/film-kits/ starting-small

Stivers, Janet. (1991). An introduction to case use in teacher education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service Number ED 348 366).

Takaki, R. (1993). *A different mirror: A history of multicultural America*. Boston: Little, Brown.

Taylor, M. C. (2010). *Crisis on campus: A bold plan for reforming our colleges and universities*. New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf.

Terrell, R. D. & Lindsey, R. B. (2009). *Culturally proficient leadership: The personal journey begins within*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Wong, K. (2017, December 28). Why self-compassion beats self-confidence. *The New York Times*, Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/28/smarter-living/why-self-compassion-beats-self-confidence.html

Zinn, H. (1980). *A people's history of the United States*. New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers.

• • •

Mike Hillis is Dean and Professor of the Graduate School of Education at California Lutheran University. Mike has been a Fulbright Scholar in Norway, the site director for a study away program in Trinidad & Tobago, and the AILACTE president from 2014–18. His writing and research interests include mimetic theory and leadership, the moral assumptions of multicultural education, and the development of community partnerships.

Ron Byrnes is an Associate Professor of Education at Pacific Lutheran University. He teaches first year writing seminars as well as multicultural education and cultural foundations courses to preservice teachers. His commitment to pluralism and inclusion, guarded views of nationalism and materialism, belief in the equality and dignity of the entire world's people, and cross-cultural sensibilities are all traceable to having visited or worked in Mexico, Ethiopia, Kenya, Ghana, Japan, and China.

**Learning With and From Our Students:
The Need for Humility in Race and Equity Work**

**Emily Huff, M.A.
Seattle Pacific University**

Abstract

This point of view paper explores the power of words to build respect and understanding around issues of diversity, equity and inclusion. As instructors in our courses who work to build self-awareness and unpack systems of power and privilege for ourselves and for our students, there are many lessons we can learn to make teaching and learning more powerful and inclusive for our learning communities.

This past year, our department chair extended an offer to the School of Education faculty to teach another section of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion for our teacher candidates. While I am a white woman, I considered a number of ideas I might bring to such a class because of my intentional reflections on my own life the past few years, reading a number of books, and trying to unpack more of what it means to be White in America. In addition, I had joined a White Faculty Accountability Group on campus in the past year and was grateful for growing self-awareness and perspective through these conversations. The invitation for the faculty group (below) accurately represents our work we have engaged in together:

For white faculty committed to anti-racist and anti-oppressive education, it is necessary to develop a critical consciousness that interrogates the spectrum of internal and external responses within teachers and students alike to such education. It is also critical for white faculty to unpack their racialized identity without burdening faculty of color, which ultimately hinders efforts at solidarity in working for diversity, equity and inclusion. This faculty learning and growth group, tailored particularly for any interested white faculty, (although faculty of color are always welcome), will have a twofold aim. The first will be to work together to select and discuss literature that helps unpack the dynamics involved in teaching topics such as understanding and dismantling privilege, analyzing and mobilizing for social equity and inclusion, and responding to classroom dynamics when white supremacy is named and called out. The second is to be accountable with other white faculty, in non-judgmental relationships, as we grow in understanding our roles both in perpetuating systemic racism and in dismantling it.

I volunteered to teach the class and proceeded to plan the curriculum using content I'd read and advice from numerous conversations with faculty group members and faculty members of color whose perspective and feedback I valued. For my first Diversity, Equity and Inclusion class, I showed up to a classroom filled with ten white women, one Alaskan Native woman and one Indian American woman (she was the first child of parents who emigrated from India).

I began with a prayer written in honor of Martin Luther King, Jr. Day: "Show us the lies that are still embedded in the soul of America's consciousness. Unmask the untruths we have made our best friends. For they seek our destruction. And we are being destroyed… Reveal the ways the lies have distorted and destroyed our relationships… Give us courage to embrace the truth about ourselves and you and our world…. Give us faith to believe: Redemption of people, relationships, communities and whole nations is possible! Give us faith enough to renounce the lies and tear down the walls that separate us with our hands, with our feet, and with our votes!" (Harper, 2012).

We then proceeded to set group norms, discuss and agree on basic definitions of race and racism, and self-reflect on how race has shaped our lives up to this point. In previous classes, when I used a similar prompt asking about how race has shaped students' lives, one of my university students wrote, "I don't think that much about my race. It just kind of is what it is." This prompt about how race has shaped our lives is such a powerful prompt and offers a key and gateway to the course, opening the door to authentic conversation, intimacy, and greater understanding of diverse backgrounds. I asked students to write down responses and was planning for students to reference their responses later in the quarter after more discussion and readings had been shared. I then shared some quotes from Robin DiAngelo's (2012) observations after using this prompt. In retrospect, this would have been a great opportunity for students to share stories, but out of concern for time, I simply had students do personal reflection through the free write. As I'll discuss in the events that followed, I now realize the importance of protecting time for students to share their responses and thoughts as a key opportunity for them (and me) to begin understanding one another and to speak from our own truths.

Because some lack of awareness around race has been a frequent

response from many of my white students through the years, I followed this reflection with an experience to deepen self-awareness called the "Color Line Activity." I have done this several times in other race and equity workshops, and it has been an effective tool to develop an understanding of white privilege on a personal level while also seeing how our experiences matched up with our peers. This activity is based on Peggy McIntosh's well-known article "*White Privilege: Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack*" (1989). For this activity, students filled out a survey based on Peggy McIntosh's article, totaled their scores and then lined up next to their corresponding number. I gave the students opportunity to turn and talk with each other to process this activity and to unpack ideas around privilege together. The class then moved on to discussion about the syllabus and the assignments for the quarter before dismissal.

In a resource guide for this activity created by Cultures Connecting, the following was written for the facilitator: "This understanding of a collective experience is crucial in understanding the way racism and privilege operates. Ultimately, participants should also begin to think about how their collective experiences are related to institutional white supremacy in the United States. Due to emotions and reactions this activity can evoke in participants we recommend this activity be facilitated by at least one experienced facilitator." I had read this before and thought I had enough experience to guide the discussion based on previous experience; I did not anticipate seeing how some of my own blind spots could turn this activity into a very painful experience for one of my students. The resource guide also noted, "Because People of Color and White people process this activity in very different ways, it is best when co-facilitated." Another part explains: "Everyone is influenced by the dynamics of White privilege within the United States, and this activity makes people feel this on a very personal level. It brings up a great deal of emotion related to experiences of privilege and oppression…. With that in mind, it is vital to allow the time and space needed to process. You may want to do this in caucus groups."

Based on class discussions and my own observations of the class, I left feeling like it had gone pretty well, but I knew that one of the weaknesses was certainly trying to fit way too much into the class period. The next day, I received a call from a colleague who had been in touch with my Indian American student from the class who was struggling deeply with emotions that the first class discussions had generated for her. When we met the next day to discuss her concerns, she very graciously shared her perceptions and experience of the class. She discussed how I had framed ground rules for discussion but that some of the quotes about race I had shared were not explained with enough context. At the beginning of class when I asked students to participate in some self-reflection about how race has shaped their lives, I had not allowed space for them to process this together as a class, and she shared how she felt frustrated by the time limitations. As she shared about her experience with the Color Line activity, she (being one of the only teachers of color in the room) felt alienated because her scores were different than the others in the room. This activity primarily focused on black/white racial differences, and each of the statements in the color line activity brought up painful memories for her of being the only child who was Indian American. She shared with me that as a child, she did not fit in with the black students, and she did not fit in with the white children. As a child from Indian immigrants to the U.S., her family had to drive over two hours on the weekends to connect with other Indian families, but when she would return to school each Monday, she was isolated again. The pain of this disconnectedness surfaced in our class when she was standing apart from her peers on the color line.

This activity, which was designed to build self-awareness and collective understanding, may have done that for some of my students; but for one student, it highlighted the differences and fostered an environment that reinforced exclusion rather than inclusion. I was saddened to see that in this first effort in this course on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion that I had been an unintentional perpetrator of a microaggression, in that I had unwittingly highlighted differences between class members without providing space for the group to understand them together. It highlighted to

me how, when we are talking about issues of diversity, equity and inclusion, we must be aware that we are navigating ever complex terrain as students bring multi-layered experiences and narratives to the table; and these topics must be addressed with sensitivity, humility and ample space to listen and learn. It also showed me how my best intentions and efforts had generated emotions I couldn't yet understand or anticipate.

My student's emotions were not unusual, nor was her desire to want to be alone and process what she was feeling. Based on this experience, I now have the following strategies in mind for future experiences like this: 1) Be aware that certain activities/resources may evoke strong emotion in certain students. 2) Don't expect students of every background to react the same way, or assume specific reactions. 3) Try to create a safe space (time, privacy, etc.) for students to encounter and process their emotions, then a place for them to share as they feel led. My student shared that she actually would have preferred to do the first part of the exercise—the numbering—at home, and then she would have been open to talking about it in class.

Ironically, I had shared the following quote in class by Ijeoma Oluo (2018) in regard to conversations about race, and it was true about me: "You are going to screw this up. You're going to screw this up royally. More than once. I'm sorry, I wish I could say that reading this book would guarantee that you'd never leave a conversation about race feeling like you've gotten it all wrong and made everything worse. But I can't. It's going to happen. It's going to happen, and you should have these conversations anyway" (p. 47).

As we talked, I took some time to reflect, and I owned up to the pain that I caused due to my lack of structure and my own blind spots about the possible impact of the Color Line activity. This brings another key point for instructors that we need to be ready to hear unexpected viewpoints and difficult feedback and to take responsibility for my own actions. While I was thankful that my student was courageous enough to come to me and share her experience, I grieved that my learning opportunity came at such a great expense to her. While I think that this activity is still powerful,

I believe that, depending of the make-up of the class, it does not need to be acted out in front of everyone. It could be assigned for students to do before class; then a follow-up discussion could come out of this after some time has been given for self-reflection. And more structured time and space is certainly needed for reflection. The experience taught me the risk of using activities like this if we are not careful in their preparation, but it also reinforced the power of relationships to deepen our understanding of one another.

The remaining sessions in the class were much different as I worked hard to respond to her feedback. I intentionally left much more space for students to reflect and share their perspectives and stories, and I did not try to fit in as much direct instruction. My student helped me to see that we could learn best in our small class about diversity, equity, and inclusion by learning from each other. As we broadened our perspectives from hearing more of the personal narratives in the group, we grew together as a community and gained much needed experience of practicing civil discourse around topics that can be so divisive in our society at large. This is another key point that I will keep building on as an instructor to continue to be flexible, and be willing to incorporate new ideas, especially those from within the class community. Allowing students to help shape the class encourages diversity of perspective, student engagement, and mutual respect.

I have asked this student to co-teach this same course with me next year. We have managed some messy conversations with humility and grace, and we have grown in our respect and care for each other. She has expertise and life experience that will continue to add to the richness of the conversations and will help future students grow in their own journeys in learning about these important topics of diversity, equity and inclusion. This reinforces the lesson for me to not be afraid of conflict as it's never the end of the story. If we remain committed to conversation and understanding of one another amidst conflict (and, yes, it is inevitable with complex topics such as these), it can ultimately enable us to learn, forgive, gain courage, and walk closer to the complete reconciliation we all desire.

Debbie Irving (2014) writes this in her conclusion of her book

Waking Up White: **"Self-examination and the courage to admit to bias and unhelpful inherited behaviors may be our greatest tools for change.** Allowing ourselves to be vulnerable enough to expose our ignorance and insecurities takes courage. And love. I believe the most loving thing a person, or a group of people, can do for another is to examine the ways in which their own insecurities and assumptions interfere with others' ability to thrive. Please join me in opening your heart and mind to the possibility that you—yes, even well-intentioned you—have room to change and grow, so that you can work with people of all colors and ethnicities to co-create communities that can unite, strengthen and prosper" (p. 249).

Respect and understanding of issues around diversity, equity, and inclusion are simply words until they are played out in the very fabric of our relationships and communities. I am a white woman on a journey of unpacking systems of power and privilege, and I am grateful for grace to begin again and learn from mistakes when my blind spots are revealed. Our words hold incredible power, and it is important for us to use them to deepen connections and to help others feel seen and heard.

References

Brandon-Felder, T. (2017, March 9). *Exploring Race and Privilege*. Retrieved from http://spu.edu/~/media/academics/school-of-education/Cultural%20Diversity/Exploring%20Race%20and%20Privilege.ashx

DiAngelo, R. J. (2012). *What does it mean to be white?: Developing white racial literacy*. New York: Peter Lang.

Harper, L. S. (2012, January 13). *Martin Luther King Day: Healing Prayer and the Lies We Believe*. Retrieved from https://sojo.net/articles/martin-luther-king-day-healing-prayer-and-lies-we-believe

Irving, D. (2014). *Waking up white: And finding myself in the story of race*. Cambridge, MA: Elephant Room Press.

McIntosh, P. (1983, July/August). White privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack. *Peace and Freedom Magazine*. (pp. 10-12).

Oluo, I. (2018). *So you want to talk about race*. New York, NY: Seal Press.

• • •

Emily Huff is the Director of Field Placements and Clinical Instructor in the School of Education at Seattle Pacific University. She has been on the faculty at SPU for six years.

Impact of Culturally Responsive Teaching Workshop on Preservice Teachers: How to Teach Columbus from Multiple Perspectiives

Rebecca Smith, Ed.D.
Nicole Ralston, Ph.D.
Jacqueline Waggoner, Ed.D.
University of Portland

Abstract

This qualitative case study examines the impact of a workshop on culturally responsive teaching on preservice elementary teacher candidates' ability to conceptualize and apply culturally responsive instruction. The *Rethinking Columbus* workshop teaches students to read critically as text detectives, asking questions such as, "Whose voices are being heard, and whose are not, and what are the hidden messages in the text and illustrations?" Overall, it appears that preservice teachers who participated in the workshop were able to generate numerous culturally relevant instructional strategies that directly aligned with the conceptual framework presented in the workshop. Students were also able to extend their learning by creating new and innovative strategies to engage elementary students in learning that were not discussed during the workshop. This paper describes the workshop model for teaching preservice teachers to be culturally responsive educators and includes numerous participant-generated examples of how to teach with a culturally responsive lens.

In the United States, P–12 schools are becoming more diverse, and our teaching practices must adapt to meet the needs of our culturally rich student population. Teacher preparation programs must do more to prepare culturally competent teachers to better serve our students. According to the U.S. Department of Education (2005, 2015), the White student population decreased from 58% in 2004 to 50% in 2014, and it is projected to further decrease to 45% by 2026. In contrast, the Hispanic/Latino student population increased from 19% in 2004 to 25% in 2014, and it is projected to further increase to 29% in 2026. Despite these changing demographics, the teacher population has remained a steady contrast at around 82% White, 7% Black, and 7% Latino (U.S. Department of Education, 2016). This demographic disparity is unfortunate given that research shows that there are academic benefits for students who are educated by teachers who look like them. For instance, Egalite, Kisida, and Winters (2015) analyzed data from the Florida Department of Education for Grades 3 to 10 and found significant positive effects in reading and math when students had teachers that looked like themselves.

This discrepancy in teacher-student demographics is also pervasive in higher education, and the impact is reflected in a survey of 100,000 higher education students by Times Higher Education (Harris, 2013). The survey measured student perceptions of the institution's inclusion of students from poorer backgrounds, with a possible score of 100 that indicated students believed their institution was highly inclusive of students from poorer backgrounds. In comparing liberal arts and non-liberal arts universities, it was found that liberal arts colleges averaged a score of 24 points out of 100 possible points, while non-liberal arts universities averaged a score of 45 points out of 100 possible points. Student participant comments regarding their perceptions of their university's inclusion of students from diverse backgrounds included, "It is very White and kind of a bubble" and "There is so little diversity and it makes me sad to think that some of the other students may have never been around people different from themselves" (para. 6). This lack of inclusion is doubly important when preparing preservice

teachers, who need not only role models of inclusive practices but strategies for how to provide culturally responsive instruction to diverse classrooms. While increasing the diversity of both the student and teacher populations remains a high priority at liberal arts colleges and universities, changes to curriculum and instruction are also essential for building inclusive classrooms. Changes must be made in the way we prepare teachers, no matter their backgrounds, for diverse classrooms.

Culturally Responsive Pedagogy

One way to improve inclusivity and continue to promote equity in Teacher Preparation Programs (TPPs) that may lack racial diversity in their student and faculty populations is to diversify the curriculum and integrate multiple perspectives in course readings and materials. A growing research base shows Culturally Relevant Pedagogy (CRP) positively impacts student learning (e.g., Ladson-Billings, 2009; Sleeter & Cornbleth, 2011). Siwatu (2007) calls on TPPs not only to prepare future teachers to *be* culturally responsive educators but also to ensure teachers *believe in* the positive outcomes of teaching with culturally responsive practices. Further, Paris and Alim (2017) call for critiquing the White-gaze that accommodates attempts at culturally responsive practices that may still marginalize students of color as 'other.' If teachers lack the belief in the value of CRP and view students of color within a deficit pedagogy, then they may not use these practices in their classrooms (Bandura,1997; Paris & Alim, 2017; Siwatu, 2007).

Teaching future educators to use CRP brings its own challenges, as there are numerous characteristics and strategies associated with CRP. Culturally responsive teaching requires the teacher to possess the following: (a) awareness of self; (b) acknowledgement of the broader context of the community with whom she or he works; (c) key attitudes, such as empathy, caring, and connectedness; and (d) specific abilities and expertise (Applin, 2008; Howard, 1999; Ladson-Billings, 1995). These skills can include combatting racism in schools (Bennett, 1995), advocating for students (Howard, 1999), engaging with outside perspectives (Noel, 1995),

and using culturally competent classroom management (Weinstein, Tomlinson-Clarke, & Curran, 2004). Gay (2010) further advocates for culturally responsive instruction that involves teaching to the learning styles of diverse students, providing ethnocentric instruction, engaging students in cooperative learning approaches, being knowledgeable and reflective as a teacher, understanding and studying the cultural nuances beyond your own, and actively engaging students from an affective domain.

Course content, in addition to pedagogical approaches, impacts the efficacy of CRP. One strategy to improve CRP is to examine textbooks and class materials for biases prior to teaching lessons (Wiggins, Follo, & Eberly, 2007). Furthermore, it is important to build relationships with students and seek to understand how our differences impact teaching and learning. It is also critical to seek an understanding of student perceptions of their teachers' cultural responsiveness for student engagement, teacher perceptions of student self-worth, and teacher expectations for student academic outcomes (Gregory, Bell, & Pollock, 2014; Griner & Stewart, 2012).

There is limited research on CRP related to TPPs. One empirical study (Wiggins, Follo, & Eberly, 2007) of preservice teacher candidates (n = 62) found targeted field placements, support from peers and teachers, and meaningful coursework led to significant increases in self-reported cultural responsivity. The participants were mostly White female students from suburban areas, but even those who had little or no experience in diverse cultural settings prior to student teaching showed improvement.

Another study investigated the self-efficacy surrounding CRP with 275 preservice teachers at two teacher education programs in the Midwest (Siwatu, 2007). Teachers completed three surveys measuring their cultural competence and beliefs as they related to teaching. Results indicated that preservice teachers were more confident in their ability to make students feel like valued members of the learning community than they were at communicating effectively with English Language Learners, which is an element of CRP. This research again highlighted that preservice teachers need

effective models of *how* to implement CRP in their classrooms (Siwatu, 2007).

Challenges to CRP

There are many potential challenges to implementing CRP. These can include a struggle with honest self-reflection and in becoming aware of assumptions and beliefs that impact behavior and teaching (Gregory et al., 2014). Additionally, it can be difficult to become familiar with the culture of students in your classroom and how students' backgrounds impact teaching and learning (Griner & Stewart, 2012).

Teachers must be committed to examining their own assumptions, beliefs, and values that may be different from those of the students they teach (Rudd, 2014; Wiggins et al., 2007). Furthermore, teachers must be aware of implicit biases towards culturally and linguistically diverse students and their families (Kirwan Institute Issue Brief, 2014). Finally, teachers must maintain high expectations for student learning, despite their differences in culture and/or linguistic backgrounds (Seidl, 2007). Emdin (2011) calls for advancing cultural and critical pedagogies to *reality pedagogy*, which "allows teachers to identify with and make connections to the experiences of oppressed youth despite the fact that teachers may not have experienced the same things as their students" (p. 287). Literary critiques of CRP surround racial and experiential challenges in the lived experiences of teachers and students from different backgrounds. The increasing diversity in the student population, combined with the lack of racial diversity among teachers, calls for more research to guide TPPs in helping teachers utilize diverse curricula and instruction to meet the needs of all students. This research study reveals one method for teaching culturally responsive pedagogy to undergraduate education students and utilizes qualitative data from preservice educators to illustrate the impact.

Case Study: Culturally Responsive Workshop

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to investigate the

impact on undergraduate elementary preservice teacher candidates of a workshop on culturally responsive teaching practices, designed to demonstrate to future educators how to teach history from diverse perspectives. This workshop on culturally relevant pedagogy specifically focused on teaching about Christopher Columbus. The course was a Curriculum and Instruction class for preservice undergraduate juniors. The entire class (n = 18) self-identified as female. The self-identified ethnicity of the class included: 56% (n = 10) White, 22% (n = 4) bi-racial, 11% (n = 2) Hispanic/Latino, 6% (n = 1) Filipino, and 6% (n = 1) Unidentified.

Demonstration of CRP

The workshop, titled "Rethinking Columbus," involved an invited expert speaker, Bill Bigelow, who co-authored a book with the same title (Bigelow & Peterson, 1998) and also published an article titled *Once upon a Genocide: Christopher Columbus in Children's Literature* (Bigelow, 1992). Bigelow taught high school social studies for nearly 30 years, and he is currently the curriculum editor of *Rethinking Schools* magazine and co-director of the Zinn Education Project. Bigelow's work to create and critique school curriculum through a social justice lens is widely acclaimed.

Workshop format. Bigelow began the workshop with an overview of what he called the "Columbus Myth." He provided an introduction to the politics and foreign policy of the time of Columbus, including an overview of the cultural, religious, and racial clashes of the time.

Debunking the myths of children's literature. Next, Bigelow introduced the concept that children's literature teaches students a "grammar of inequality," which he then illustrated with numerous pictorial images from children's texts and course textual excerpts that promoted inequities from the author's perspective, specifically surrounding the history and mythologies of Christopher Columbus.

Becoming text detectives. Next, Bigelow engaged the class in the exercise of becoming *text detectives*, or critical readers who read between the lines. This hands-on learning experience engaged the preservice teachers in the same type of learning experiences in which we want them to engage their students. As a text detective, there are several questions you can ask:
- What are the values that are being imparted?
- What is the conceptual or moral architecture you are getting from literature?
- According to this text, who is worth paying attention to and who is not?
- Who is talked about, and who gets to talk?
- Whose stories and whose voices are heard?
- What are the hidden messages in the text and the illustrations?

As text detectives, the reader reads for the silences and asks, what is not there? Bigelow encouraged us to read like an activist, not a consumer.

Truth-tellers. After students engaged in the investigative journey of being text detectives, they shared what they had discovered with each other in small groups. Then the class created a *collective text*, or a group critique of what the groups heard in common. With this new insight, the class was then able to be *truth-tellers*, rewriting history in a new, more authentic and honest way.

Findings: Preservice Teacher Participant Feedback from Workshop

To investigate the effects of this demonstration of CRP, qualitative feedback from students regarding the impact of the experience on their ability to conceptualize culturally responsive instruction was analyzed. At the conclusion of the course, approximately one week following the workshop experience, students were given a scenario which asked them to apply the instructional strategies learned during the workshop. The prompt was:

> You are responsible for covering a chapter in your elementary social studies textbook that discusses Christopher Columbus as the founder of the new world with no mention of the cultural challenges surrounding that time in history. What are two instructional strategies you might use to help your students be critical thinkers regarding this topic?

Student data were deductively coded based on the key elements of Bill Bigelow's Rethinking Columbus workshop, including: 1) empower the voiceless, 2) pay attention to hidden messages, and 3) whose values are included, and whose are not?

Empower the voiceless. The most common theme from the participant data was "Empower the Voiceless," as demonstrated in one student's comment:

> I would allow the students to read all the material and have them identify from which perspectives the story is being told and if they notice any information that is left out or not covered consistently through all the different accounts.

Students contributed numerous ideas about how to give voice to the Native American tribe, whose perspective was entirely absent from the texts that we read as a class. For instance, one student suggested writing about Columbus's expedition from the perspective of the native people, and another suggested students write speeches about what the Taino people would say to Columbus if they had the chance to warn him about the consequences of his actions. This idea of discussing the unforeseen consequences of our choices would help students not only think critically but also think culturally about how different people may respond to or be impacted by our actions. Additional ideas within this same theme of empowering the voiceless can be seen in Table 1 (*facing page*).

Pay attention to hidden messages. The next theme that aligned with the suggested culturally responsive instructional strategies was having students pay attention to hidden messages within the text or images. One student suggested having students do a research project to answer the question, "Is this text reliable?" Another stated:

> I would want students to tell me what they already know about the story of Columbus, then I would ask questions like, 'What were Indians named before they were called that? Did he discover the land or were there already people living there?'

This suggestion overlaps with the prior theme about whose voices are being highlighted. However, the nature of these questions the

Table 1: Preservice Teacher Examples of How to Empower the Voiceless	
Theme	**Activities**
Empower the Voiceless	First, I would have them ask and answer questions like "Whose side is this written by? Who do we not hear from? How would we feel if we were the Native Americans?" I would also make sure to have multiple types of texts for them to read so that they can observe and think about the differences on their own and form their own opinions.
	I would first assign reading about the Taino culture, so students start from the side of the silenced and perhaps affiliate more with this group. Then, I would introduce Columbus and his mission. Students would then be able to relate to both sides of the conversation and perhaps gain a sense of empathy.
	I would remind my students that they are text detectives! To this end, I would also remind them that even the history textbooks leave out some things, just like we do when we tell stories over and over again. I would challenge them to think about who has a voice or perspective in the story and who does not...why do they think that is?

preservice teacher planned to use with students helps guide students in discovering the first theme on their own.

Awareness of whose values are portrayed. The final pre-coded theme for the qualitative feedback was, 'Whose values are included, and whose are not?' One preservice teacher suggested having students read a text and highlight language used to describe both Columbus and the native people, then ask questions such as, "Is one more positive than the other? Why or why not?" Another student suggested a unique approach to teaching Columbus from a different perspective, focusing on cultural values and feelings:

> I would start by providing scenarios…about ownership, possession, and theft. Students will be able to come to their own conclusions about how they feel about those topics, and then transfer their opinions of them to the topic of Columbus. This should help them to understand more about how the Taino people may have felt.

Another preservice teacher suggested asking students to identify who is missing from the text. Finally, one student suggested rereading the chapter but changing it to read from the perspective of the

Native Americans. Several students suggested providing multiple texts that offer different perspectives on the historical event and comparing and contrasting the examples.

Instructional Strategies for Implementing Culturally Responsive Pedagogy

The qualitative data from preservice teacher responses to the same final assessment prompt mentioned above were then coded into types of instructional strategies: group and individual activities. This coding method was used as a way to differentiate implementation strategies for culturally responsive instruction for practitioners. The outcomes of the activities were also identified, whether the outcome was mentioned directly by the preservice teacher participants or implied in the activity itself. Knowing the outcome of the strategy can aid teachers using measurable learning targets for instructional planning.

Group activities. Table 2 below summarizes the group work activities mentioned by the students. Activities included discussions and a mock trial. These types of activities can lead to critical reflection, critical thinking, and perspective-taking on the part of the elementary students, promoting inclusive conceptions of people from different cultures, such as the Taino tribe in the Columbus story.

Table 2: Group Work Ideas and Outcomes	
Participant Identified Sample Activity	Potential Outcome
Have groups discuss a series of prompts like "What people were involved?" "How do you think that each party felt in this situation?" "Why do you think that this happend the way that it did?"	Critical Reflection
I would have them talk in small groups to look at the advantages and disadvantages of the trip.	Critical Thinking
I might allow my students to do an activity such as hold a trial to see who is responsible for the destruction Columbus caused, or rewrite books to explore both sides of the story so students become actively engaged with the knowledge and become critical thinkers.	Perspective-taking

Individual activities. Suggestions for individual activities promoted similar outcomes, including perspective-taking and empathy building. The individual instructional activities included both writing and research, such as writing a letter to Columbus from the Native American perspective or applying the scenario to a real-life situation that could happen to them. See Table 3 for specific ideas.

Table 3: Individual Student Work Ideas and Outcomes	
Participant Identified Sample Activity	Potential Outcome
I would have students pretend to be Native Americans and write Christopher Columbus an honest letter about how they felt.	Perspective-taking
One strategy I would use is to have the students try and find information on the Native Americans and Islanders that Columbus interacted with to see what their side of the story is. The kids will learn that there are always two sides to a story, but winners write the history books.	
Another strategy I would use is to ask my students to rewrite the story from another person's perspective. Asking them to rewrite the whole story seems a bit much, so I would probably ask them to rewrite a short passage of a Christopher Columbus text which paints him in the most positive light.	
I would also have them to think about if this happened today and someone came to take their house how would they feel/react. Once they see how the other side might feel, read through it again, and see if there might be more stories to tell. Students can then create a project and change the story/create a story that they feel fits the events better.	Empathy-building

Discussion and Implications

Overall, it appears that preservice elementary teacher candidates who participated in the Rethinking Columbus workshop were able to generate numerous culturally relevant instructional strategies that directly aligned with the conceptual framework presented by the expert speaker. Students were also able to create new and innovative strategies that were not discussed during the workshop to engage elementary students in learning. In the course evaluations

from students who participated in the Rethinking Columbus workshop, student feedback was positive. One student said, "This class gave me many new strategies on how to be an inclusive teacher and support my students." Another said, "I also loved the speakers you brought in! They were fantastic and it was nice to have multiple perspectives!" A final comment discusses the practical application of the learning content:

> I think we all really benefited from the speakers who came to visit like Rethinking Columbus and I found all the information to connect nicely with my field experience and what I have been experiencing in the classroom! The environment was safe and welcoming to all ideas and opinions, and the tips and tricks I acquired will serve me well in the future.

The workshop model, including bringing in an outside expert voice whose experience was different than that of the classroom teacher (in this case, a White female instructor) also seemed to influence student learning with positive outcomes.

There are several limitations to this study that must be addressed. The limited time frame of the culturally responsive training and data collection, in addition to the lack of true classroom implementation, provide a lack of generalizability of the findings. Additionally, this strategy for helping preservice educators learn culturally responsive teaching practices through a hands-on workshop is only one method for increasing critical pedagogy. New teachers need a toolbox full of strategies, in addition to consistent self-reflective practices, to develop into implementers of critical pedagogies. Despite the limitations, however, this study reveals the impact on preservice teachers of diversifying curriculum, especially supporting values and ethical behaviors.

Future Research

In the future, it would be useful to have the preservice teachers not only provide an example of a culturally responsive teaching strategy, but also identify the outcomes of the strategies they suggested. If they were asked to identify the learning outcomes, then the critical thinking would go even deeper from both the teacher candidate and undergraduate student perspective, and learning targets and assessments would be more measurable. A follow-up study could also ask these teachers if and how they actually taught their students about Columbus when they were in-service teachers and whether they integrated text detective, truth-telling strategies regularly in their classrooms beyond lessons about Columbus.

Although limited in its scope due to a small sample size and the limited nature of the data collection, this study still provides a framework for teachers at all levels for integrating culturally responsive practices into their classrooms. We can all ask ourselves and our students, whose voices are being heard? Whose voices are being left out?

References

Applin, J. L. (2008). Skills, knowledge, and attitudes of culturally responsive teachers. *Kentucky Teacher Educator, 8*, 18–23.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York, NY: W. H. Freeman and Company.

Bennett, C. I. (1995). Preparing teachers for cultural diversity and national standards of academic excellence. *Journal of Teacher Education, 46*, 259–265.

Bigelow, W. (1992). Once upon a genocide: Christopher Columbus in children's literature. *Language Arts, 69*(2), 112–20.

Bigelow, B., & Peterson, B. (1998). *Rethinking Columbus: The next 500 years* (2nd ed.). Milwaukee, WI: Rethinking Schools.

Egalite, A., Kisida, B., & Winters, M. (2015). Representation in the classroom: The effect of own-race teachers on student achievement. *Economics of Education Review, 45*(C), 44– 52.

Emdin, C. (2011). Moving beyond the boat without a paddle: Reality pedagogy, black youth, and urban science education. *The Journal of Negro Education, 80*(3), 284–295.

Gay, G. (2010). Cultural congruity in teaching and learning. In G. G. Editor (2nd ed.). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 174–213). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Gregory, A., Bell, J., & Pollock, M. (2014). How educators can eradicate disparities in school discipline: A briefing paper on school-based interventions. *Discipline Disparities Series: Interventions, March*.

Griner, A. C., & Stewart, M. L. (2012). Addressing the achievement gap and disproportionality through the use of culturally responsive teaching practices. *Urban Education, 48*(4), 585–621.

Harris, M. (2013). *Understanding institutional diversity in American higher education* (ASHE higher education report, v. 39, no. 3). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Periodicals.

Howard, G. R. (1999). *We can teach what we don't know: White teachers, multiracial schools*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally responsive pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal, 32*, 465–491.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2009). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Noel, J. R. (1995). Multicultural teacher education: From awareness through emotions to action. *Journal of Teacher Education, 46*, 267–273.

Paris, D., & Alim, H. S. (2017). *Culturally sustaining pedagogies: Teaching and learning for justice in a changing world* (Language and literacy series). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Rudd, T. (2014). Racial disproportionality in school discipline: Implicit bias is heavily implicated. Columbus, OH: *Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity*.

Seidl, B. (2007). Working with communities to explore and personalize culturally relevant pedagogies: "Push, double images, and raced talk." *Journal of Teacher Education, 58* (2), 168–183.

Siwatu, K. O. (2007). Preservice teachers' culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy and outcome expectancy beliefs. *Teaching and Teacher Education: An International Journal of Research and Studies*, 23(7), 1086–1101.

Sleeter, C., & Cornbleth, C. (2011). *Teaching with vision: Culturally responsive teaching in standards-based classrooms*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

U.S. liberal arts colleges 'exist in a wealthy, white bubble'. (2017, January 12). *The Times Higher Education Supplement:* The Times Higher Education Supplement: Jan. 12, 2017, Issue 2288.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2005, 2015). Common Core of Data (CCD). "Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey," 2004 and 2014–15.

U.S. Department of Education. (2016). Data file. Retrieved from https://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/highered/racial-diversity/state-racial-diversity-workforce.pdf

Weinstein, C. S., Tomlinson-Clarke, S. & Curran, M. (2004). Toward a conception of culturally responsive classroom management. *Journal of Teacher Education, 55*, 25–38.

Wiggins, R. A., Follo, E. J., & Eberly, M. B. (2007). The impact of a field immersion program on preservice teachers' attitudes toward teaching in culturally diverse classrooms. *Teaching and Teacher Education: An International Journal of Research and Studies, 23*(5), 653–663.

• • •

Rebecca Smith teaches and learns from future teachers as an Assistant Professor in the School of Education at the University of Portland in Portland, Oregon. After educating high schoolers for 10 years, she earned her Ed.D. from the University of Portland, and she now teaches methods and research courses to undergraduate and graduate students. Her research areas include teacher education, assessment, teacher professional development and learning, and educational partnerships.

Nicole Ralston is an Assistant Professor in the School of Education at the University of Portland in Portland, Oregon. She received her Ph.D. in educational psychology with an emphasis in measurement, statistics, and research design from the University of Washington. An elementary school teacher at heart, she now teaches educational research and assessment courses to undergraduate and graduate students. Research areas include diagnostic assessment, algebraic thinking, and teacher coaching models. She also co-directs the Multnomah County Partnership for Education Research.

Jacqueline Waggoner is a Professor in the School of Education at the University of Portland. She received her bi-university Ed.D. from the University of Oregon and Portland State University in Public School Administration and Supervision and has worked in higher education and public P–12 education for over 25 years. Research areas are teacher education, measurement, instrumentation, assessment, and data-driven decision making.

Racial Microaggressions: Stories of Black Candidates in a Teacher Preparation Program at a Predominately White Institution

Kevin M. Thomas, Ph.D.
Elizabeth Dinkins, Ph.D.
Imari Hazelwood, M.A.
Bellarmine University

Abstract

This qualitative study examined the perspectives and experiences of ten Black students at a predominantly White institution in order to understand if they were recipients of microaggressions, what impact microaggressions had on them, and how they coped with the microaggressions. Findings indicate that all but one of the participants experienced microaggressions that were perpetrated by peers, professors, and/or institutional cultures, with microinsults and microinvalidations being most frequent and microassaults less prevalent. Relationships with mentors, peers, and community organizations supported students and countered the experience of microaggressions. While participants rejected the role of spokesperson as it perpetuated their lack of individuality, they acknowledged the challenge of talking about race as the only Black student in a class. Findings highlight the need to develop and utilize civil discourse to stem the prevalence of microaggressions experienced by Black candidates in teacher preparation programs.

Effective teacher preparation programs (TPPs) model for candidates the moral and ethical dimensions of teaching. One method TPPs employ to achieve this goal is the use of civil discourse, defined as "robust, honest, frank and constructive dialogue and deliberation that seeks to advance the public interest" (Brosseau, 2011). Certain forms of racism undermine this goal. For Black students, college campuses are often "hostile, alienating, and culturally insensitive" (Karkouti, 2016, p. 59). A 2015 study of racism at the University of Illinois Urbana campus found that 51% of students experienced microaggressions (Harwood, Choi, Orozco, Browne Huntt, & Mendenhall, 2015). Boysen and Vogel (2009) report that 40% of professors report microaggressions in the classroom. Microaggressions are subtle insults that are usually unintentional. So slight are these offenses that recipients are often unsure if they experienced a microaggression and do not react for fear of being perceived as overly sensitive. Likewise, perpetrators are usually unaware of their transgression (Sue et al., 2007). As a result, these microaggressions are not identified and discussed, which may create a negative racial climate (Harwood et al., 2015) and negatively impact students' academic performance (Bair & Steele, 2010).

The purpose of this study was to discover if Black candidates in our TPP experienced microaggressions, their impact, as well as how candidates responded to them. Findings will inform TPPs about ways to educate students, faculty and staff about microaggressions, how to address them, and how to support recipients.

Literature Review

Theoretical Framework

This study uses critical race theory (CRT) as an analytical framework for examining microaggressions in a Teacher Preparation Program (TPP). Adhering to the first tenet of CRT, we assert that racism permeates all aspects of TPPs. One way racism manifests itself in TPPs is through microaggressions—"every day, commonplace, and often ambiguous forms of racism faced by people of color" (Grier-Reed, 2010, p. 182) which "stem from

unconscious attitudes of White superiority and constitute a verification of Black inferiority" (Davis, 1989, p. 1576).

This study gives voice to the Black candidates who have experienced microaggressions from their professors, classmates, and institutional structures. Ladson-Billings (1998) maintains that telling one's stories can "lead to the realization of how one came to be oppressed and subjugated" and be a "medicine to heal the wounds of pain caused by racial oppression" (p. 14). Furthermore, hearing these stories can affect the oppressor by serving as a catalyst to disrupt dysconscious racism—a form of racism that tacitly accepts White norms and privilege. These stories can assist the oppressor in understanding the intricacies of racism and begin a process of redress (Ladson-Billings, 1998, p. 14; King, 1991, p. 135). Stories from Black candidates can provide insight to guide civil discourse and support the development of more socially just TPPs.

Microaggressions

Pierce (Pierce, Carew, Pierce-Gonzalez, & Wills, 1977) defined microaggressions as "subtle, stunning, often automatic, and nonverbal exchanges which are 'put downs' of blacks by offenders" (p. 66). Microaggressions are insults so slight that the perpetrator and recipient are often unsure of their occurrence. Naming these offenses and characterizing their nature and impact reveals the hidden insult and has the potential of providing both the recipient and perpetrator with linguistic tools for recognition and atonement.

There are three types of microaggression: microinsult, microassault, and microinvalidation. A microassault is an "explicit racial derogation characterized primarily by a verbal or nonverbal attack meant to hurt the intended victim" (Sue et al., 2007, p. 274). For example, students may use the word "ghetto" to mean "bad." Microassaults are overt actions while microinsults and microinvalidations have a subtler tone. A microinsult demeans a person based on their race, culture, or identity (Boysen, 2012). A microinsult could be a teacher complimenting a Black student for being articulate, thus implying that the Black student was expected to be inarticulate. Finally, microinvalidations "exclude, negate, or nullify

the psychological thoughts, feelings, or experiential realities of a person of color" (Sue et al., 2007, p. 274). A microinvalidation could be when a teacher states "I don't see color in my classroom," thus erasing student identity and experience. Identifying the types of microaggressions can facilitate nuanced understanding of racial oppression and support civil discourse on the topic in TPPs.

Impact of Microaggressions

Microaggressions by definition are small, but the impact of microaggressions on Black candidates in TPPs can be significant. Microaggressions can create a negative racial climate leaving recipients frustrated, isolated and full of self-doubt (Solorzano, Ceja, & Yosso, 2000), create psychological stress (Mercer, Zeigler-Hill, Wallace, & Hayes, 2011), and negatively impact academic performance by impeding their ability to process information (Bair & Steele, 2010). Furthermore, Sue, et al. (2007) believe the subtle nature of microaggressions creates a degree of internal conflict as the recipients attempt to determine if they experienced a microaggression before determining if and how they should react. Perpetrators are often unaware of their transgression and the offense is perceived to be so slight that any response is considered "overreacting" and responding with anger can confirm existing stereotypes (Sue, et al., 2007). Solorzano, Ceja and Yosso (2000) maintain that any discussion of racial microaggressions must include the examination of racial stereotypes and their impact.

Purpose of the Study

To ensure that candidates have the necessary knowledge, skills, and dispositions to be effective teachers, TPPs engage students in civil discourse involving an "informed, frank exchange of ideas, along with an understanding of complexity and ambiguity" (Brosseau, 2011, para. 7). However, the subtlety and ambiguity of microaggressions means they are often ignored and unaddressed through civil discourse. While microaggressions may be subtle insults, the harm they do can be significant—creating a hostile and culturally insensitive climate that negatively impacts the emotional

and academic well-being of Black candidates.

The purpose of this study was to examine Black candidates' experiences in a TPP at a predominately White institution (PWI) through the following research questions:

1. Are Black candidates experiencing microaggressions?
2. What impact are microaggressions having on candidates?
3. How are victims responding to microaggressions?

Method

Participants

This study used a qualitative interview approach. Data was derived from a 2016 study (Dinkins & Thomas, 2016), examining the persistence of Black students in a TPP at a PWI, wherein researchers noticed participants reporting experiences of microaggressions. The current study resulted from reanalyzing the original data. Participants were selected from Black students who enrolled as education majors from 2005 to 2015. This purposeful sampling yielded 20 possible participants. Ten Black students, seven females and three males, agreed to participate. Pseudonyms are used throughout this report.

Data Collection and Analysis

Data consisted of hour-long, individually conducted semi-structured interviews. Researchers inquired into participant backgrounds, reasons for selecting the PWI, curricular and social experiences on campus, and factors that influenced participants to leave or remain in education. Data analysis utilized a three-phase process. The first phase involved deductive readings of the entire data corpus to identify instances and contexts of microassaults, microinvalidations, and microinsults. The second phase used an inductive approach to determine the ways in which participants were impacted by and responded to the microaggressions. Researchers identified patterns across participants, yielding ten possible themes. The final phase identified three themes capturing participants' experience of and responses to microaggressions.

Findings

Data analysis substantiated the pervasive experiences of micro-aggressions across participants, as well as strategies used in response.

Experiences of Microaggressions

All but one student experienced microaggressions perpetrated by peers, professors, and/or institutional cultures, with microinsults and microinvalidations being most frequent and microassaults less prevalent. Six students experienced microaggressions as part of their on-campus experience while three students experienced microaggressions as enmeshed with their K–12 experience. Table 1 (*facing page*) displays the experiences in a university context, and Table 2 (*page 84*) displays the experience in K–12 contexts. Robin did not report a direct experience of microaggression, but described adhering to an "unwritten code, which means that 'we've got your back' just by looking at them. It's not just Black students. It's anybody that's not white"; thus, implying a shared identity and protectiveness within the PWI.

University-based microaggressions were perpetrated by peers, professors, and staff. The microinsults, all perpetrated by peers, reflect a lack of awareness that left participants stunned. Jennifer was puzzled by the motivation behind her peer's comments that made her uncomfortable throughout the class. Daria ascribed the comments to lack of experience, while recognizing the dissonance of a future teacher using "inappropriate" language. Multiple members of the university community perpetrated microinvalidations, with professors named as offenders by two participants. Tiffany's and Tamara's identities were literally ignored. Tiffany's professor did not see her racial identity, leaving her feeling invisible while Tamara was denied her right to represent Blacks in the membership of an otherwise all White student group. Michael's experience demonstrates the overlap between microaggression types. The professor's refusal to address his questions shifted from a micro-insult about writing ability to a microinvalidation that ignored his needs. The microinvalidation experienced by Monique reflects

Participant	Examples of Experiences	Microaggressions Type & Offender
	Table 1: Participant Experiences of Microaggression in a University Context	
Daria	…there was some inappropriate use of terms … like certain terms like 'oh that's so ghetto' and certain things like that. …And that was kind of one of the things that made me scratch my head when I heard my peers in the education department saying it.	Microinsult perpetrated by peers
Monique	One of the girls, an education major, was like, 'Well, I posted all lives matter' and then they got mad at me when I was like, 'You just don't understand.'	Microinvalidation perpetrated by peers
Jennifer	I'm sitting next to a girl and she looked over at me and told me that she'd never been to school with a black person before. For the life of me, I don't remember what prompted that or why she would even disclose that. I just remember feeling so awkward and thinking, 'How is that even possible and why would you blurt that out?' … After that I felt like I was under a micro-scope for the whole class.	Microinsult perpetrated by a peer
Tiffany	One teacher …was giving the demographics of the class. He said, 'We don't have any African American students in here.' I was like, 'What? I'm here.' I had to speak up and that was kind of awkward. I had to speak up in the middle of the class and everyone was kind of looking at me like, 'Oh my God, did she just come out in class?' He apologized the next class, but the damage was kind of done.	Microinvalidation perpetrated by a professor
Tamara	I was in the [first generation] program and I saw that they had a picture and they posted it and the whole picture was white. Like how did I miss this? Like I was in it. Why didn't I get invited to the program? I emailed the lady and she was like, "Oh, sorry. We just forgot to invite you." I could have been in the picture. I could have represented, you know? But everybody looks at that picture and thinks, 'Oh, these are the only people who represent this.'	Microinvalidation perpetrated by a staff member
Michael	I had one professor—my papers would come back terrible. She'd paint them in red ink. I've always had a pretty high regard for my writing based on the feed-back from other teachers and professors. So, I started taking my papers for other people to look at including the writing center. They'd still come back bloody. Once I tried to have a conversation with her about it after class. She didn't care to address the issue and was say-ing that I needed to come back later. I went to her after class to talk about it. I wasn't getting anywhere so I struggled through the class and let it end.	Microinvalidation perpetrated by a professor

the university context and the larger context of race in America, implying Monique had to explain her anger.

Table 2: Participant Experiences of Microaggression in K–12 Context		
Participant	Examples of Experiences	Microaggressions Type & Offender
Kevin	I didn't want to be a disciplinarian. I didn't want to be wanted by the school because I was a tall guy and I was a black guy and I could intimidate students into acting better. It seemed that that was the only value they saw in me as a black male, was that I could scare someone into acting right the rest of the day and I just didn't want to do that, you know? … And I had a friend who was a teacher's assistant and whenever a child acted bad, they sent them to him. The stigma of, 'OK, you're a black male so you must have friends that act this way.' I wasn't up to that task.	Microinsult perpetrated by K–12 institutional culture
Brandie	There's such a negative connotation towards African American children just in terms of the misbehaving of children and how they disrespect their elders and stuff like that.	Microinsult perpetrated by K–12 institutional culture
Lawrence	The students that I talked to in a specific way, or that I acted a specific way that I was kind of acting white. I kind of explained to them that there is no way to really act white or black. This is my personality. You can either take it or leave it.	Microinvalidation perpetrated by K–12 students

Microaggressions experienced in the K–12 setting reflect institutional cultures. For Kevin, Brandie, and Lawrence these experiences reflect stereotypes of particular behavioral expectations. Kevin's and Brandie's experiences reflect Black children as discipline problems in schools. The microinsult Kevin experienced speaks to the expectation that he, as a Black male, would embody a 'scary' persona intimidating students into compliant behavior or automatic understanding for students who struggled. Both reflect damaging stereotypes about Black males. Brandie's experience encapsulates the microinsult that Blacks are expected to act in particular negative ways. Lawrence was denied his identity as a Black male because he was expected to act differently than White students. A common theme across these participants is the manner

in which racial stereotypes permeate experiences in K–12 schools.

Four participants reported microassaults. Brandie and Tiffany attended an on-campus event when an anonymous social media network was flooded with insults disparaging Black students' place at the university. Monique reported having a roommate "who kept saying the n-word." In these overt actions of racism, peers used language to demean. In the K–12 context, Daria reported witnessing Black students being "written up" for language White teachers interpreted as disrespectful while she "might understand it as a sign of respect because of the cultural background, and I understand where he's coming from versus not understanding." The disciplinary action functioned as a microassault that penalized the students for their cultural background. For these four participants, microassaults served to marginalize students and disempower their position in educational settings.

Seeking Support

Relationships with mentors, professors, peers, and community organizations supported students and countered the experience of microaggressions. All but one student reported strong relationships that provided safe spaces where participants felt encouraged and supported. For Tiffany, Brandie, and Robin these were campus-based peer relationships. Tiffany described the Black Student Union as providing "a family aspect" with students of color. Brandie described a "diverse" peer group that fostered a strong sense of community: "A couple of them come from small towns and I've been able to broaden them culturally. It's very weird but it's very cool. Our differences brought out our similarities." For five participants, professors acted as mentors by facilitating positive discussions about race and privilege. Robin appreciated talking about "how your identity influences how you teach and where you teach." Tamara found discussions about race in K–12 classrooms provided "a hope" for supporting students that "may be going through troubles at home and need extra push or motivation." Monique valued classroom conversations led by a Black professor that pushed students to think about the role of Blacks at the PWI:

"Representation is so important. When we come on campus, liter-
ally, mostly all the people of color are making bagels or changing
the trash … I wish that class was a requirement for all students
because it was great." Participants valued opportunities to chal-
lenge the dominant culture on campus and in education.

Rejecting the Role of Spokesperson

While valuing discussions about race, participants rejected the
role of spokesperson for the Black community, with five students
speaking directly to this tension. Brandie described, "I'm usually
the only African American student,…It would bother me if some-
thing came up directly related to race and they directly asked me. I
understand they want my opinion, but there's kind of a fine line for
that." Tiffany and Tamara acknowledged how this tension erased
their individuality. Tamara reported: "You kind of feel yourself
getting eyed out…It's just the expectation that since you're a black
person you can speak to how all black people feel and you're not
regarded as an individual." In these situations, Tiffany clarified,
"I'm not speaking for every African American. I'm just speak-
ing from my viewpoint. We are all gonna believe totally different
things." While only three participants reported having a Black
professor, this tension was made more palatable by their presence.
Jennifer described how a Black professor led an activity, designed
to make privilege visible, which involved students stepping
forward or back depending on advantages and obstacles. She and
another student of color wound up at the back of the room as inad-
vertent representations. Jennifer recalled, "When he started his
questions,…I thought 'I'm going to end up at the back of the room'
so you tuck whatever you feel and do the activity." She explained
that because she "understood he was trying to convey to the class
that other people grew up differently" she was "okay with it."

Discussion and Implications for Practice

It is not surprising that all but one participant experienced racist
microaggressions in the TPP program at our PWI. As noted by
Davis (1989), the "cognitive habit, history and culture" (p. 1576) of

White privilege makes faculty, staff, students unable to hear such
utterances. Educating faculty, staff, and students about microag-
gressions has the potential to disrupt the pattern Davis notes. TPPs
can take steps to reduce their occurrence and impact.

TPPs can start by increasing faculty, staff, and student aware-
ness of their own biases and recognition of microaggressions.
Naming these racist acts begins the process of eliminating them.
When microaggressions occur, they must be confronted. However,
faculty are ill-prepared to facilitate these difficult discussions (Sue,
Lin, Torino, Capodilupo, & Rivera, 2009). Boysen (2012) found
that faculty and students believed that it is imperative that faculty
respond to these incidents. Furthermore, while students felt the
most effective way to address microaggressions was speaking to
students outside of class, both students and faculty indicated that
faculty-led discussions were an effective response. This finding
was supported by additional research; Sue et al. (2009) found that
students wanted teachers to address microaggressions through
civil discourse in the classroom. Students stated that professor-led
discussions legitimized dialogue about race and validated their
feelings (Sue et al. 2009, p. 188). TPPs should add questions about
racial climate to course evaluations to assist in monitoring their
occurrence and identify opportunities for additional training and
education. TPPs should also include faculty "diversity engagement"
in the promotion and tenure process (Harwood et al., 2015, p. 16).

TPPs can also take steps through civil discourse to reduce
microaggressions perpetuated by students. Properly trained fac-
ulty can create safe classrooms that enable difficult discussions.
Students indicate that faculty facilitated discussion is imperative to
successfully addressing microaggressions, and research indicates
that confronting microaggressions can reduce the microaggressors'
future use (Czopp, Monteith, & Mark, 2006). Acts of microaggres-
sion by students can also be reduced through education. Diversity
and inclusion courses can be developed and included as part of
candidates' required program of study. Finally, TPPs can provide
ongoing workshops, training, and brochures on microaggressions
to assist students in identifying when they happen and how to

address them (Harwood et al., 2015, p. 16).

To reduce the impact of microaggressions, TPPs can make students aware of safe spaces including Black student and Greek organizations, and other organizations that serve Black students (Solorzano et al., 2000). Safe spaces provide a place for Black students to engage in civil discourse with others and "(a) make sense of their experiences on campus and determine whether a racial microaggression has even occurred, (b) find support and validation for their experiential reality, and (c) identify alternative ways for responding to such incidents" (Grier-Reed, 2010, p. 183). Furthermore, safe spaces connect Black candidates with individuals who share their experience and provide a sense of belonging, which are important for retention (Grier-Reed, Madyun, & Buckley, 2008). TPPs should also ensure that Black candidates are assigned mentors who share similar experiences. Research indicates that mentors can guide them in successfully managing microaggressions and assist them in learning from them (McCabe, 2009).

Participants' stories provide insight into the lived experiences of Black students in a TPP in a PWI. Future research should focus on how Black education students would like to see microaggressions addressed in university and K–12 classrooms. Future research should also explore the lasting impact of microaggression on candidates. Additional studies may also examine the interactions between recipients of microaggressions and offenders and how civil discourse could foster more socially just education.

This study, along with previous research, (Boysen, 2012; Harwood et al., 2015; Sue et al. 2009) affirms the need for higher education to enact civil discourse focused on issues of race. Faculty, staff, and students should be trained to identify and address racial microaggressions through increasing awareness about bias, challenging stereotypes, and strategies to engage in difficult conversations. Safe spaces for students of color should be established so that they share their experiences and foster relationships with others. Additionally, campuses need to provide and communicate pathways for students to report incidents of bias and microaggression. These reports should be tracked and examined to document trends over time to inform stakeholders on appropriate courses of action.

References

Bair, A. N. & Steele, J. R. (2010). Examining the consequences of exposure to racism for the executive functioning of Black students. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 46*, 127–132.

Boysen, G. (2012). Teacher and student perceptions of microaggressions in college classrooms. *College Teaching, 60*(1), 122–129.

Boysen, G. A., & Vogel, D. L. (2009). Bias in the classroom: Types, frequencies, and responses. *Teaching of Psychology, 36*, 12–17.

Brosseau, C. (2011). Executive session: Civil discourse in progress. *Frankly Speaking*, Retrieved from http://nicd.arizona.edu/newsletter/october-2011#125.

Czopp, A. M., Monteith, M. J., & Mark, A. Y. (2006). Standing up for a change: Reducing bias through interpersonal confrontation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*(5), 784-803.

Davis, P. (1989). Law as microaggression. *Yale Law Journal, 98*, 1559–1577.

Dinkins, E. & Thomas, K. (2016). Black teachers matter: Qualitative study of factors influencing African American candidates' success in a teacher preparation program. *AILACTE Journal, 13*(1), 23–40.

Grier-Reed, T. L. (2010). The African American student network: Creating sanctuaries and counter spaces for coping with microaggressions in higher education settings. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education and Development, 49*(1), 181–188.

Grier-Reed, T. L., Madyun, N. H., & Buckley, C. G. (2008). Low Black student retention on a predominantly White campus: Two faculty respond with the African American student network. *Journal of College Student Development, 49*, 476–485.

Harwood, S. A., Choi, S., Orozco, M., Browne Huntt, M., & Mendenhall, R. (2015). Racial microaggressions at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign: Voices of students of color in the classroom. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Karkouti, I. M. (2016). Black students' educational experiences in predominantly White universities: A review of the related literature. *College Student Journal, 50*(1), 59–70.

King, J. E. (1991). Dysconscious racism: Ideology, identity, and the miseducation of teachers. *The Journal of Negro Education, 60*(2), 133–146.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1998). Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a nice field like education? *Qualitative Studies in Education, 11*(1), 7–24.

McCabe J. (2009). Racial and gender microaggressions on a predominately White campus: Experiences of Black, Latina/o and White undergraduates. *Race, Gender and Class, 16*(1), 133–151.

Mercer S. H., Zeigler-Hill, V., Wallace, M., & Hayes, D. M. (2011). Development and initial validation of the inventory of microaggressions against Black individuals. *Journal of Counseling Psychologist, 58*(4), 457–469.

Pierce, C. M., Carew, J. V., Pierce-Gonzalez, D., & Wills, D. (1978). An experiment in racism: TV commercials. *Education and Urban Society, 10*(1), 61–87.

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

Sue, D. W., Capodilupo, C. M., Torino, G. C., Bucceri, J. M., Holder, A. M. B., Nadal, K. L., & Esquilin, M. (2007). Racial microaggressions in everyday life: Implications for clinical practice. *American Psychologist, 62*(4), 271–286.

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

• • •

Thomas, Dinkins, and Hazelwood

Kevin Thomas is an Associate Professor of Instructional Technology at Bellarmine University in Louisville, Kentucky. His research examines the integration of mobile devices in the classroom. He has also published works on dispositional and racial issues in teacher preparation programs. Prior to entering higher education, Dr. Thomas taught high school English for 15 years in Knoxville, Tennessee.

Elizabeth Dinkins is an Associate Professor and the Interim Dean of the School of Education at Bellarmine University. Her research focuses on critical perspectives in education including LGBTQ issues and identities in classroom instruction and the use of young adult literature to engage students. Previously, she taught English language arts and coordinated school-wide literacy instruction in an urban middle school.

Imari Hazelwood is a doctoral student in the Ph.D. in Education and Social Change program at Bellarmine University in Louisville, KY. Her dissertation utilizes the racial identity development theory as a theoretical framework to examine race through dialogue. She currently works for TRiO Student Support Services as an Academic Counselor for low income, first generation college students at Western Kentucky University.