CRITICAL INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION PEDAGOGY

EDITED BY
AHMET ATAY
SATOSHI TOYOSAKI

Critical Intercultural Communication Pedagogy

Critical Intercultural Communication Pedagogy

Edited by
Ahmet Atay and Satoshi Toyosaki

LEXINGTON BOOKS
Lanham • Boulder • New York • London

Published by Lexington Books
An imprint of The Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group, Inc.
4501 Forbes Boulevard, Suite 200, Lanham, Maryland 20706
www.rowman.com

Unit A, Whitacre Mews, 26-34 Stannary Street, London SE11 4AB

Chapter 12: Gloria E. Anzaldúa (2015)

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Information Available

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data Available

ISBN 978-1-4985-3120-7 (cloth : alk. paper)
ISBN 978-1-4985-3121-4 (electronic)

∞™ The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992.

Printed in the United States of America

Contents

Introduction vii

SECTION I: LOCATING CRITICAL INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION PEDAGOGY 1

1 Demarcating the "Critical" in Critical Intercultural Communication Studies 3
Rona Tamiko Halualani

2 Making a Place: A Framework for Educators Working with Critical Intercultural Communication and Critical Communication Pedagogy 11
Jennifer Sandoval and Keith Nainby

3 Intercultural Communication, Ethics, and Activism Pedagogy 27
Leda Cooks

SECTION II: DOING CRITICAL INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION PEDAGOGY 47

4 (Critical) Love is a Battlefield: Implications for a Critical Intercultural Pedagogical Approach 49
Bernadette Marie Calafell and Robert Gutierrez-Perez

5 Engaging Historical Trauma in the Classroom: Ethnoautobiography as Decolonizing Practice 65
S. Lily Mendoza

6 Pedagogies of Failure: Queer Communication Pedagogy as Anti-Normative 81
Benny LeMaster

7 Pedagogy of the Taboo: Theorizing Transformative Teaching-Learning Experiences that Speak Truth(s) to Power 97
Mark P. Orbe

SECTION III: UNDERSTANDING THROUGH CRITICAL INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION PEDAGOGY 113

8 Obstructing the Process of Becoming: Basal Whiteness and the Challenge to Critical Intercultural Communication Pedagogy 115
Gust A. Yep and Ryan M. Lescure

9 Performing Otherness as an Instructor in the Interracial Communication Classroom: An Autoethnographic Approach 137
Tina M. Harris

10 Encountering *Karma*: The Transgressive Adventures of a Korean-born TCK Pedagogue in the US South 159
Jieyoung Kong

SECTION IV: THINKING THROUGH CRITICAL INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION PEDAGOGY 177

11 Mediated Critical Intercultural Communication 179
Ahmet Atay

12 Addressing Cultural Intersections: Critical Feminist Communication Pedagogy 195
Amy Aldridge Sanford and Jennifer V. Martin Emami

13 Dialogue and Intercultural Communication Pedagogy 217
Alberto González and Linsay Cramer

14 Critical Intercultural Communication Pedagogy from Within: Textualizing Intercultural and Intersectional Self-Reflexivity 227
Satoshi Toyosaki and Hsun-Yu (Sharon) Chuang

Index 249

About the Editors and Contributors 257

Introduction

Critical Intercultural Communication Pedagogy

Satoshi Toyosaki and Ahmet Atay

We began our journeys (separately and together) with intercultural communication long before we took our first intercultural communication courses in the late 1990s and the early 2000s, and of course long before our conceptualization of this book. It is not accidental that our intercultural encounters within and outside of the United States, particularly in the higher education, led us to a particular path, a particular type of scholarship. We found cultural spaces in our intercultural communication courses wherein we were able to articulate our experiences and issues in relation to race, ethnicity, nationality, gender, sexuality, class, ability, and linguistic privileges. The more we learned about the critical intercultural communication and its commitments to uncover social and cultural inequalities and unmask oppressive systems and domination, the more committed we became to interrogating the hegemonic discourses, practices, and systems in our society, particularly in the US higher education.

Over the years, we read and worked with critical intercultural communication and critical communication pedagogy pedagogues, some of whom are featured in this book. Their ideas, individually and collectively, have been guiding us as we pave the pathways of this book. In essence, we wanted to create a fusion of critical intercultural communication and critical communication pedagogy. Hence, critical intercultural communication pedagogy borrows from these two separate but overlapping areas of scholarship.

In November 2014, after a hectic day at National Communication Association's annual conference, we met to talk about our frustrations with issues we had been facing in our classrooms, current and future directions in intercultural communication and communication pedagogy research, and finally the lack of scholarship that bridges the gaps in critical intercultural communication and critical communication pedagogy. That day, we outlined

the basic premise of this book: Looking at the different directions or turns in critical intercultural communication pedagogy. We sketched out the four critical turns or pillars of critical intercultural communication pedagogy as we conceptualized the present and the future directions of our scholarship: Postcolonial, Queer, Feminist, and Mediated turns. We wanted to address issues of intersectionality, whiteness, languagism, race, nationality, gender and sexuality, and other identity categories or markings that impact one's being and learning in the classroom and higher education. The main question that guided us was, what are the ways in which we can use the tools of critical intercultural communication studies in the classroom as pedagogical tactics to unmask and uncover oppressive systems in our classrooms, our own teaching, and beyond educational walls?

For this collection, we borrow the two most important commitments of critical communication pedagogy (Fassett & Warren, 2007), dialogue and self-reflexivity. This collection conceptualizes them as the heart of critical intercultural communication pedagogy. In order to empower marginalized voices, and perhaps bring those voices of the peripheries to the center, we employ auto-methods and narrative-based research. Finally, in our envisioning, critical intercultural communication pedagogy is a dialogic, self-reflexive, performative, decolonizing approach that aims to highlight oppressive systems, even in our own thinking and teaching, promotes civility, and commits to social justice and activism to create positive change.

GENERAL GOALS OF THIS BOOK

Recent critical intercultural communication researchers' efforts are collected and found in *the Handbook of Critical Intercultural Communication* (Nakayama & Halualani, 2010) and other anthologies (Gonzalez & Chen, 2015; Sorrells & Sekimoto, 2016). A recent publication of *Critical Autoethnography: Intersecting Cultural Identities in Everyday Life* (Boylorn & Orbe, 2014) exemplifies intercultural communication researchers' ongoing efforts in capturing, understanding, and possibly changing social worlds from the critical and intersectional perspectives. Critical intercultural communication research continues to gain its momentum and legitimacy in the field of intercultural communication, advancing our understandings of plural, diverse, and political social worlds. Despite some of the abovementioned examples, monographs or edited collections in critical intercultural communication are far and between while some journals, such as *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication*, are open to critical work.

In order to create a space for critical discussions and to conceptualize pedagogy(ies) that emerges out of and/or is informed by critical intercultural

communication theories and research, we edit this anthology. Earlier works done by Cooks and Simpson (2007) and Warren (2003), among others, have paved this path. We along with the authors in this collection hope to continue the labor. The general goals of this collection are:

- This book opens and nurtures a space for pedagogical discussions and innovations informed by and informing critical intercultural communication studies.
- This book locates critical intercultural communication pedagogy on the ongoing scholarly discussions of critical intercultural communication studies, critical communication pedagogy, and critical pedagogy.
- This book shows embodied practices of critical intercultural communication pedagogies.
- This book identifies emerging challenges from (critical) intercultural communication classrooms and explore pedagogical responses to them.
- This book also makes various approaches and guidance/cautions of critical intercultural communication pedagogies available to those who are new to and continuously innovate their implementations of critical intercultural communication pedagogy.

CRITICAL INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION PEDAGOGY

Critical intercultural communication pedagogy is a field simultaneously of interdisciplinary research and practice, founded, envisioned, and struggling at the productively intertwined intersections among critical intercultural communication studies (Nakayama & Halualani, 2010), critical pedagogy (Freire, 1970), critical communication pedagogy (Fassett & Warren, 2007), critical theory, feminist theory, postcolonial theory, and many others. We agree with Jones and Calafell (2012) that critical intercultural communication pedagogy focuses on "discussions of power in our scholarship and teaching" (p. 961). Critical intercultural communication pedagogy aims to understand, critique, transform, and intervene upon the dynamics of power and domination embedded inside and outside classroom walls through careful, complex, nuanced, and intersectional analyses of educational practices and our identities.

In so doing, critical intercultural communication pedagogy moves back and forth among multifaceted and interdependent layers of macro, meso, and microanalyses. In other words, critical intercultural communication pedagogy embraces an opportunistically interdisciplinary approach while locating the communicative as modes of analyses, interpretations, transformations, and interventions. Our disciplinary focus on the communitive in critical intercultural communication pedagogy is important exactly because "power . . . is a

human accomplishment, situated in everyday interaction and drawing on both interactional activities and structural forces" (Anderson, Bentley, Gallegos, Herr, & Saavedra, 1998, p. 276). That is, if we want to study power, we need to be interdisciplinary and multifaceted in our research, teaching, and learning; we need to make various interdisciplinary efforts to catch power in its working even though there is limit in how holistic and interdisciplinary we can be. There is no purely and only communicative moment in human experience; communication reverberates through multiple disciplines, and multiple disciplines through communication. Critical intercultural communication pedagogy needs to be an interdisciplinary and complex inquiry-and-practice with the critical focus on the communicative.

Critical intercultural communication pedagogy works both inside and outside of educational walls by blurring the demarcation between them. First, critical intercultural communication pedagogy understands that social and cultural politics influences and helps institutionalize education, educational practices, and educational values. Everyday educational practices are both cultural and political. "The curriculum tends to reflect the dominant culture (middle class, male, European-American, heterosexual, able bodied, etc.) . . .; a hierarchical system is reproduced through the student-teacher relationships, evaluation procedures, and so on" (Anderson, Bentley, Gallegos, Herr, & Saavedra, 1998, p. 276). Jones and Calafell (2012) observe that neoliberal ideologies permeate in education and sustain cultural hierarchy through legitimating cultural othering. Mohanty (2003) argues that education produces what she refers to as "the race industry," which manages, commodifies, and domesticates race on American campuses (p. 196). Even critical labor to transform education may often become legible and validated only within whiteness ideologies and "the Eurocentric construction of 'democracy' and 'ethics'" (Richardson & Villenas, 2000, p. 260). Education functions sometimes as a fluid, social, and colonial conduit to reproduce the cultural hierarchy. In critical intercultural communication pedagogy, we are tasked to "uncover and examine authoritative discourses" (Anderson, Bentley, Gallegos, Herr, & Saavedra, 1998, p. 275) that systematically subjugate Other knowing and to "decolonize" everyday practices in which educational participants engage (Mohanty, 2003).

Second, critical intercultural communication pedagogy ought to connect simultaneously the outside and the inside of educational walls through complex and nuanced studies of our everyday cultural identity performances and intersectional ways of knowing (Boylorn & Orbe, 2014; LeMaster, 2016; Yep, 2010). Mohanty (2003) offers her vision of a public culture of dissent and its pedagogical aim. She writes:

> A public culture of dissent entails creating spaces for epistemological standpoints that are grounded in the interests of people and that recognize the

> materiality of conflict, of privilege, and of domination. Thus creating such cultures is fundamentally about making the axes of power transparent in the context of academic, disciplinary, and institutional structures as well as in the interpersonal relationships (rather than individual relations) in the academy. It is about taking the politics of everyday life seriously as teachers, students, administrators, and members of hegemonic academic cultures. Culture itself is thus redefined to incorporate individual and collective memories, dreams, and history that are contested and transformed through the political praxis of day-to-day living. (p. 216)

Thus, critical intercultural communication pedagogy aims to reach beyond our academic hegemonic walls and "make . . . a difference and touch . . . people outside those walls in an accessible and meaningful way" (Jones, 2010, p. 124). Critical intercultural communication pedagogy labors like "rich patches of rhizomes" (p. 124) in various communities where students and teachers belong to, reside in, and work within and across.

Focusing on the communicative, we ought to be accountable in negotiating "an inherent power. . . that comes with the position that [we occupy] in the institutional hierarchy" (Anderson, Bentley, Gallegos, Herr, & Saavedra, 1998, p. 275) and ways in which we may become "complicit in neoliberal ideologies" in educational contexts (Jones & Calafell, 2012, p. 963). We pedagogues are accountable for our intersectional reflexivity (Jones, 2010; Jones & Calafell, 2012) that we learn from and with our students in our intercultural classrooms. Otherwise, we risk at regenerating "another oppressive discourse substituted for one that precedes it" (McPhail, 1996, p. 39). Jones (2010) writes, "So, this is the call I bring to you: acknowledge your privilege, be self-reflexive, and jump into the messiness. Put your body in spaces where you are at risk, because doing so may create a safe space for someone else" (Jones, 2010, pp. 124–125). This book is our attempt to jump into the messiness through critical intercultural communication pedagogy.

ORGANIZATION OF THE BOOK

We editors struggled to organize these chapters into recognizable sections in this book. These chapters are beautifully intertwined to capture the complex, plural, and nuanced terrain of critical intercultural communication pedagogy. We thought of not having sections since each chapter below takes its complex approach to research, theorize, practice, and evaluate critical intercultural communication pedagogy. However, for accessibility and our gesture to welcome scholars and pedagogues who are relatively new to the ideas and praxes of critical intercultural communication pedagogy, by adhering to the book's general goals mentioned earlier, we have made four general sections and

organize the following chapters by identifying their significant contributions in charting critical intercultural communication pedagogy. Those sections are: "Locating Critical Intercultural Communication Pedagogy," "Doing Critical Intercultural Communication Pedagogy," "Understanding through Critical Intercultural Communication Pedagogy," and finally "Thinking through Critical Intercultural Communication Pedagogy." Even though these chapters are organized according to these sections, we observe that all chapters contribute simultaneously to locating, doing, understanding, and thinking about critical intercultural communication pedagogy.

Section I: Locating Critical Intercultural Communication Pedagogy

Section I collects chapters that help locate critical intercultural communication pedagogy in and at the intersections of various disciplines, such as intercultural communication studies, critical intercultural communication studies, critical pedagogy, critical communication pedagogy, communication ethics, and communication activism.

In her chapter "Demarcating the 'Critical' in Critical Intercultural Communication Studies," Rona Tamiko Halualani explains how critical intercultural communication studies has been developing in the field of intercultural communication. She understands that critical intercultural communication pedagogy faces a problematic of a skills-based, pragmatic, and applied focus. She encourages critical intercultural communication pedagogues to reflexively examine our communal commitment to the "critical" and its larger goals-of-focus, such as societal transformation and social justice.

In their chapter titled "Making a Place: A Framework for Educators Working with Critical Intercultural Communication and Communication Pedagogy," Jennifer Sandoval and Keith Nainby theoretically locate critical intercultural communication pedagogy at the intersection of critical intercultural communication studies and critical communication pedagogy. They identify three dimensions of communication in order to theoretically map critical intercultural communication pedagogy. They are: communication as contingent, contiguous, and contested. At the intersection, critical intercultural communication pedagogy emerges as an educational practice that attends to complex and nuanced understandings of identity, culture, and the constantly shifting worlds.

Leda Cook, in her chapter "Intercultural Communication, Ethics and Activism," takes a different perspective and reminds the need for the inclusion of ethics and activism-oriented pedagogical approaches in intercultural communication scholarship and practice. In her chapter, Cooks sees the classroom as a space for social justice–oriented work. In her words, "The chapter expressed concern over the climate of college campuses in the United States … ." Her concerns are about everyday microagressions.

Section II: Doing Critical Intercultural Communication Pedagogy

The chapters in this section focus on critical communication pedagogy in various educational contexts and relationships. These authors meaningfully struggle to conceptualize, embody, implement, and self-reflexively examine their own unique approaches to critical intercultural communication pedagogy. Such approaches include critical love in mentor-mentee relationship, ethnoautobiography, queer communication pedagogy, and pedagogy of the taboo. Each chapter below pays careful and vigilant attention to the significance of the context in which they implement their approaches to critical intercultural communication pedagogy.

For example, in their chapter "(Critical) Love is a Battlefield: Implications for a Critical Intercultural Communication Approach," Bernadette Calafell and Robert Gutierrez-Perez offer critical love between teachers/mentors and students/mentees as an approach to theorize one of the dimensions of critical intercultural communication pedagogy. Their co-constructed autoethnographic accounts delve into the role of marginalized identities in mentoring processes and how these identities come in to play.

In her chapter "Engaging Historical Trauma in the Classroom: Ethnoautobiography as Decolonizing Practice," S. Lily Mendoza offers ethnoautobiography as a method and pedagogical approach to explore questions of identity. In her chapter "Engaging Historical Trauma in the Classroom: Ethnoautobiography as Decolonizing Practice" Mendoza argues that ethnoautobiography helps students and instructors to reflect on their positionality, be reflexive about history, particularly colonial history, and the ways in which their lives are impacted by it. Through personal narratives she unpacks how ethnoautobiography can be utilized as a critical intercultural communication pedagogical approach.

Benny LeMaster offers their chapter entitled "Pedagogies of Failure: Queer Communication Pedagogy as Anti-Normative." LeMaster dismantles the normative as fabricated and offers queer communication pedagogy, specifically a praxis of queer failure, as a mundane resistive politic that challenges the normative and aims at social justice. They, autoethnographically, explore their queer communication pedagogy in context.

Mark Orbe in "Pedagogy of the Taboo: Theorizing Transformative Teaching-Learning Experiences that Speak Truth(s) to Power" focuses on critical and cultural pedagogies behind teaching taboo subjects. In his autoethnographic piece he theorizes pedagogy of the taboo. Hence, his goal in this chapter is to create "transformative relationships among educational participants" where he can interrogate and change power dynamics in educational contexts to encourage dialogue and self-reflexivity.

Section III: Understanding through Critical Intercultural Communication Pedagogy

This section is entitled "Understanding through Critical Intercultural Communication Pedagogy." The authors in this section interrogate emerging challenges from intercultural communication classrooms and interactions and attempt to understand and/or respond to them organically through critical intercultural communication pedagogy. These chapters attend to the complex and nuanced ways those challenges emerge in classrooms and understand them carefully.

For example, Gust A. Yep and Ryan M. Lescure in their chapter titled "Obstructing the Process of Becoming: Basal Whiteness and the Challenge to Critical Intercultural Communication Pedagogy" employ a queer methodology in order to capture slippery, elusive, contradictory, and messy whiteness they experienced in their team teaching. Using their experiences, they carefully capture and theorize "basal whiteness," a particular form of whiteness performatively materialized through white hegemonic masculinity with racist, sexist, classist, homophobic, and nationalist overtones while not being perceived crude. They offer "a pedagogy without a map" to interrogate the content and process of the ever-changing whiteness, such as basal whiteness.

In her chapter titled "Performing Otherness as an Instructor in the Interracial Communication Classroom: An Autoethnographic Approach," Tina Harris focuses on how instructors perform "otherness" in the classroom, particularly in an interracial communication classroom. Through her autoethnographic writing, she presents interrelated stories about her "othered" experiences as well as the ways in which she performs her intersecting racial and gender identities in the classroom.

JieYoung Kong, in her chapter titled "Encountering Karma: The Transgressive Adventures of a Korean-Born TCK Female Pedagogue in the US South," draws from her rich international experiences in different educational contexts to reflect on her experiences at her new institution. As a "mobile pedagogue" she analyzes the ways in which her body is marked, perceived, racialized, marginalized, and often asked to stand for or speak for cultures other than hers due to her Asianness.

Section IV: Thinking through Critical Intercultural Communication Pedagogy

In this section the authors contemplate theoretically. Critical intercultural communication pedagogy does not have a particular set of instructional cookie-cutter practices, manuals, and models that teachers can employ. The

authors in this section offer their particular and theoretical approaches to envision critical intercultural communication pedagogy, ranging from mediated critical intercultural communication and critical feminist communication pedagogy to dialogue and pedagogy from within. These chapters may function as some sort of guidance for those who are interested in trying out, exploring further, and/or researching critical intercultural communication pedagogy.

In his chapter "Mediated Critical Intercultural Communication," Ahmet Atay offers mediated critical intercultural communication pedagogy, wherein he combines aspects of media literacy and critical (intercultural communication) pedagogy to create a fusion. He argues that Mediated Critical Intercultural Communication Pedagogy (MCICP) can be used to unmask cultural dimensions of mediated communication, the ways in which media forms create or alter intercultural communication encounters, and finally illuminate power structures in mediated intercultural experiences.

Amy Aldridge Sanford and Jennifer V. Martin in their chapter "Addressing Cultural Intersections: Critical Feminist Communication Pedagogy" call for a feminist turn in critical communication pedagogy. Hence, in their chapter, they outline different dimensions of feminist pedagogy and critical communication pedagogy to create a fusion. Their goal is to promote intercultural and intersectional dialogue built on feminist approaches.

In their chapter titled "Dialogue and Intercultural Communication Pedagogy," Alberto Gonzalez and Linsay M. Cramer theorize dialogue, not as a particular type of communication, but as a range of contingent possibilities that emerge from various relationships that are nurtured in a classroom community. When theorized as relational and contingent possibilities, dialogue exerts potentiality to carry difficult topics. The authors offer recommendations and cautions for dialogue.

In their chapter, "Critical Intercultural Communication Pedagogy from within: Textualizing Intercultural and Intersectional Self-Reflexivity," Satoshi Toyosaki and Hsun-Yu (Sharon) Chuang envision pedagogy that is "from within," which critically interrogates, critiques, and transforms cultural politics from within our intersectional identities, relationships, classrooms, and education. They focus on praxis of intercultural and intersectional self-reflexivity. Giving pedagogical texture to intercultural and intersectional self-reflexivity is difficult and contextually contingent; however, they attempt to take upon the task of textualizing intercultural and intersectional self-reflexivity and of theorizing pedagogy "from within" in their chapters.

REFERENCES

Anderson, G., Bentley, M., Gallegos, B., Herr, K., & Saavedra, E. (1998). Teaching within/against the backlash. In R. Chávez Chávez & J. O'Donnell (Eds.), *Speaking the unpleasant: The politics of (non)engagement in the multicultural education terrain* (pp. 274–323). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Boylorn, R. M., & Orbe, M. (Eds.). (2014). *Critical autoethnography: Intersecting cultural identities in everyday life.* Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Cooks, L. M., & Simpson, J. S. (Eds.). (2007). *Whiteness, pedagogy, performance: Dis/placing race*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Fassett, D. L., & Warren, J. T. (2007). *Critical communication pedagogy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gonzalez, A., & Chen Y. W. (Eds.). (2015). *Our voices: Chapters in culture, ethnicity, and communication* (6th edition). New York: Oxford University Press.

Jones, R. G., Jr. (2010). Putting privilege into practice through "intersectional reflexivity:" Ruminations, interventions, and possibilities. *Reflections: Narratives of Professional Helping,* 16(1), 122–125.

Jones, R. G., Jr., & Calafell, B. M. (2012). Contesting neoliberalism through critical pedagogy, intersectional reflexivity, and personal narrative: Queer tales of academia. *Journal of Homosexuality,* 59(7), 957–981.

LeMaster, B. (2016). *Queer intersectionality: Queering the limits of identity studies in critical intercultural communication research* (unpublished doctoral dissertation). Southern Illinois University Carbondale, Carbondale, IL.

Mohanty, C. T. (2003). *Feminism without borders: Decolonizing theory, practicing solidarity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Nakayama, T. K., & Halualani, R. T. (Eds.). (2011). *The handbook of critical intercultural communication*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Richardson, T., & Villenas, S. (2000). "Other" encounters: Dances with whiteness in multicultural education. *Education Theory,* 50(2), 255–273.

Sorrells, K., & Sekimoto, S. (Eds.). (2016). *Globalizing intercultural communication: A reader*. Los Angeles: Sage.

Warren, J. T. (2003). *Performing purity: Whiteness, pedagogy, and the reconstitution of power*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Yep, G. A. (2010). Toward the de-subjugation of racially marked knowledges in communication. *Southern Communication Journal,* 75(2), 171–175.

Section I

LOCATING CRITICAL INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION PEDAGOGY

Chapter 1

Demarcating the "Critical" in Critical Intercultural Communication Studies

Rona Tamiko Halualani

"Thank you, Professor Halualani for such a great class. You have given us the knowledge and skills to be more interculturally aware and able to interact with different groups."

"I now have what I need to be more interculturally effective in my job."

"I will take this class with me across all settings and be a better intercultural communicator."

"I will never look at the world the same again. You have given me a new way to look at culture and identity and this has enlightened me. I have the necessary tools to communicate with cultures."

"The tools you shared with us—those are keepers for all of my intercultural exchanges and travels."

The intercultural communication classroom space is not just a setting to carry out my day job. This space directly (and inexorably) gives shape to and activates the theoretical dilemmas and urgencies that constitute an important area of intercultural communication study for me: critical intercultural communication studies. In essence, critical intercultural communication pedagogy (or the ways in which I conceptualize and frame the act and praxis of teaching, learning, and dialogic constitution in the classroom) provides an important reflexive mirror for critical intercultural communication studies in this specific current historical and political moment. It pushes us to rethink what we truly mean by the "critical" in critical intercultural communication studies and the role it serves in society.

Having had the distinct privilege of being an intercultural communication instructor for the last 22 years, I am always grateful for working with and learning from all of my talented undergraduate and graduate students. They often leave me with sweet farewell notes and items about what they gained, some of which are displayed at the beginning of this chapter. However, these

gestures of appreciation and gratitude often highlight the "dilemma" I face as a critical intercultural communication scholar and what I refer to as the next juncture in critical intercultural communication studies. In 2009, S. Lily Mendoza, Jolanta A. Drzewiecka, and I identified the key junctures that led to the development of critical intercultural communication studies in the field of intercultural communication (Halualani, Mendoza, & Drzewiecka, 2009). Toward the end of that essay, we concluded that "critical intercultural communication studies" would "give way to new problematics, new objects of study, and new terrain for the conduct of research in this new critical tradition" (p. 16). Indeed, while this has happened, there still remain several key introspective questions related to "who we are as critical scholars" and "what our larger goal is" beyond the continued development of this area and more specifically, in terms of everyday life and critical praxis and the spaces of engaged learning (classroom and the community).

Moreover, as a way to identify new problematics, methodologies, and lines of study, in the *Handbook of Critical Intercultural Communication*, Thomas Nakayama and I (2011) proffered an exciting collection of critical intercultural scholars who shared work that constituted the "contours" and ever-changing "shape" of critical intercultural work. While outlining the growing range of critical intercultural work, this handbook had yet to fully address the differential roles we need to take up as critical intercultural scholars: as community members and educators.

In this chapter, I highlight a core problematic that we face at this juncture in critical intercultural communication having to do with the larger goals of our critical work in terms of classroom and community learning spaces (and our commitment to a larger critical intercultural communication pedagogy): that is, a limiting and even dangerous skills-based focus in intercultural communication diminishes the "critical" in critical intercultural communication studies. We, as a community, have not fully immersed ourselves in this dilemma or concretized specific modes of action in response. I argue that critical intercultural communication scholars have spent the vast majority of our time justifying the need for a "space" or the "existence" of critical intercultural communication in the first place (in a kind of apologetic and deferential "dance" to pay homage to traditional intercultural communication work) and then, contributing work to fill that outlined space, that we have not engaged the "obvious" conundrum related to an overly pragmatic focus in intercultural communication. (I also suspect that this could be due to the tendency to privilege scholarship over teaching and pedagogical matters.) I focus specifically on a conundrum that relates specifically to pedagogy. However, similar to the insights from critical intercultural/communication pedagogy scholars (Fassett & Warren, 2006), I assert that pedagogy (and in this case, critical intercultural communication pedagogy) is a central vehicle that shapes critical intercultural

communication studies and makes it accountable in terms of its larger goals, commitments, theorizings, concepts, and actions.

A LINGERING PROBLEMATIC/CONUNDRUM: REPRODUCING DOMINANT SYSTEMS OF POWER THROUGH A SKILLS-BASED OR PRAGMATIC FOCUS

A core problematic that lingers and thwarts our growth as a critical intercultural community is our default reliance on the inherited skills-based or pragmatic focus of our discipline and field. Indeed, this problematic hinders our critical commitments and roles as critical intercultural communication scholars/educators/community members. With regard to this conundrum, I pose the following questions:

- How does a skills-based or pragmatic focus obfuscate the "critical" path of critical intercultural communication studies?
- To what extent does having a discipline largely associated with a skill and a field that has followed that notion of skills/competencies/techniques, diminish our capacity to realize the "critical" in critical intercultural communication studies?
- How do our courses and trainings on intercultural communication not go far enough to truly represent a critical paradigmatic stance?
- To what extent are we overly focused on symptoms of unequal intercultural relations (interpersonal and or group micro-episodes of interaction) as opposed to structural conditions, historical legacies of power, and interlocking power systems?

Skills-based disciplines often underscore the one-to-one relationship between the disciplinary foci of study and a set of behaviors or practices for applied contexts or professions. The Communication discipline has traversed and also surpassed this skills-based trajectory by incorporating a critical orientation to the notion of "skills" and "tools" (Deetz, 1992; Deetz & Mumby, 1990; Hardt, 2008; McKerrow, 1989). However, public speaking, interpersonal and intercultural communication theories and perspectives are still often reframed and watered down as "necessary skills" in terms of the micro-level of one-on-one, face-to-face communication. The field of intercultural communication is especially susceptible to this turn given the preponderance of intercultural, cross-cultural, and diversity trainings that emphasize "skills" in corporate business and public sector settings. Likewise, the focus on "intercultural competence" and "global skill sets" dominates various professions (international business, international relations, health fields, education, among others) and

in turn, frames the imperative for intercultural communication. An "applied focus" then gets pushed out front and center as business highlights the need for more internationally competent employees so as to secure more global businesses, and schools and colleges promote the development of a future global workforce. Application begets both discursive and material gain for specific power interests.

Taking this further, intercultural communication textbooks (ones that even I am working on) emphasize the skills/application route which ultimately shapes the curricula (and the first point of "contact" on intercultural communication matters) for students across the country. Even critically infused texts feel the pressure to translate high-level concepts and theories about culture, power, and structure to skills, techniques, and staged-out processes. What potentially gets lost amid this "skills/applications" discourse is that the push for individuals to learn about other cultures in order to become more aware, understanding of, and skilled in interactions with those cultures, may NOT do anything to transform unequal, disproportionate, and unjust intercultural relations. It may in fact feed into the notion of fixed, ahistorical, and "sacred" cultures that should be immune from critique, challenge, and reconstruction. Putting the spotlight on cultural exchange and understanding, intercultural dialogue, and appreciation for diversity, may not only be insufficient but it may actually maintain and reinscribe prevailing colonial, racial, gendered, and classed hegemonies and thus not represent a critical spirit or positionality (Gorski, 2008). According to Aikman (1997), this type of intercultural education "maintains the distribution of power and forms of control which perpetuate existing vertical hierarchical relations … Thus, this interculturality remains embedded in relations of internal colonialism" (p. 469).

Renowned critical education scholar Paul Gorski (2008) argues this sentiment in his important essay: "Good Intentions Are Not Enough: A Decolonizing Intercultural Education:"

> Unfortunately, my experience and a growing body of scholarship on intercultural education and related fields (such as multicultural education, intercultural communication, anti-bias education, and so on) reveal a troubling trend: despite overwhelmingly good intentions, most of what passes for intercultural education practice, particularly in the US, accentuates rather than undermines existing social and political hierarchies . . . . This is why the framework we construct for examining and encouraging intercultural education reveals, among other things, the extent and limits of our commitments to a genuinely intercultural world. The questions are plenty: do we advocate and practice intercultural education so long as it does not disturb the existing sociopoliticalorder?; so long as it does not require us to problematize our own privilege?; so long as we can celebrate diversity, meanwhile excusing ourselves from the messy work of social reconstruction? (p. 516)

Gorski (2008) argues that today's widespread intercultural education often engages the easiest and safest areas of culture and interculturalism and even perhaps, "symptoms of oppressive conditions (such as interpersonal conflicts) instead of the conditions themselves" (p. 519). Thus, our core intercultural communication curriculum—even from a critical vantage point—may highlight more of the symptoms or effects of intercultural injustices that occur at larger and deeper levels.

Where this leads us today is a stark self-introspection as a community of critical intercultural scholars for our commitment to the "critical": to unveiling, confronting, and dismantling power inequalities, and systems and structures of power and domination in our communities, lives, and classrooms. If we were to rethink our critical intercultural communication stance as teachers through a decolonized educational lens (Alexander, Arasaratnam, Durham, Flores, Leeds-Hurwitz, Mendoza, Oetzel, & Halualani, 2014; Battiste, 2017; Barongo-Muweke, 2016; Gorski, 2008) and one centered on intercultural justice as opposed to the mythic one-to-one equivalence between cultures (as if groups are on an equal plane), then what would our curricula and classrooms be like? How might we as a community (including our students) be transformed to feel vulnerable in our privileged/dominant positions and then equipped to fight intercultural justice from a genuine place? What would our area of critical intercultural communication studies be like and how might this "free" us up to explore systemic and macro aspects of power as cultural-historical-political projects, without the need to justify its purpose and scope? (I suspect this is why critical organizational communication studies has had an incredibly productive trajectory in fulfilling critical commitments in that it already stems from the notion of systems of domination and oppression and the constitutive communication practices of those systems of power.)

This next juncture requires us to engage in deeply reflexive views of what we do, study, and teach and what we mean by the "critical" in critical intercultural communication studies in terms of the larger goals-of-focus. If the goal is societal transformation and change, we ought to discuss the arduous path to approach it in our roles as scholars, community members, and educators. Similar to the literature on diversity pedagogy in higher education, remaking our intercultural communication curricula from the principal notion of social justice (which highlights inequities that are historically persistent and culturally/globally reproduced)should be seriously reconsidered (Sorrells, 2015). I often wonder: How would a justice-oriented focus change the architecture of our intercultural learning spaces? I even wonder if we started with these concerns related to pedagogy (and our spaces of learning) in terms of demarcating critical intercultural communication studies, if our trajectory in critical intercultural communication studies would be different. As Paul Gorski (2008) so eloquently states, this work "is difficult

work—transcending hegemony, turning our attention away from the cultural 'other' and toward systems of power and control. Those of us who choose this door must acknowledge realities we are socialized not to see. We must admit complicity. But how can we do otherwise, risking the possibility that our work may devolve into sustenance for the status quo, and still call ourselves intercultural educators?" (p. 522) We must ask the following and either reconstruct our critical commitments or act upon them: What do we proffer to our students, peers, and community members in terms of a critical sensibility from which to remake not just their conceptualizations of the world but the ways in which we work to transform the world and the larger systems of power? Indeed, as beacons of hope, critical intercultural communication pedagogy (and the further development of this line of inquiry and praxis) and all of the vibrant critical communication pedagogy will help us navigate this question at this absolutely pivotal juncture.

REFERENCES

Aikman, S. (1997). Interculturality and intercultural education: A challenge for democracy. *International Review of Education,* 43(5), 463–479.

Alexander, B. K., Arasaratnam, L. A., Durham, A., Flores, L., Leeds-Hurwitz, W., Mendoza, S. L., Oetzel, J., & Halualani, R.T. (2014). Identifying key intercultural urgencies, issues, and challenges in today's world: Connecting our scholarship to dynamic contexts and historical moments. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication*, 7(1), 38–67.

Battiste, M. (Ed.). (2017). *Decolonizing education: Nourishing the learning spirit*. Saskatoon, Canada: Purich Publishing.

Barongo-Muweke, N. (2016). The need for localizing research–decolonization of knowledge generation. In Battiste, M. (Ed.), *Decolonizing Education* (pp. 239–247). Saskatoon, Canada: Purich Publishing.

Deetz, S. (1992). *Democracy in an age of corporate colonization: Developments in communication and the politics of everyday life*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Deetz, S., & Mumby, D. K. (1990). Power, discourse, and the workplace: Reclaiming the critical tradition. *Communication yearbook,* 13(1), 18–47.

Fassett, D. L., & Warren, J. T. (2006). *Critical Communication Pedagogy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gorski, P. C. (2008). Good intentions are not enough: A decolonizing intercultural education. *Intercultural Education,* 19(6), 515–525.

Halualani, R. T., Mendoza, S. L., & Drzewiecka, J. A. (2009). "Critical" junctures in intercultural communication studies: A review. *The Review of Communication,* 9(1), 17–35.

Hardt, H. (2008). *Critical communication studies: Essays on communication, history and theory in America*. London, UK: Routledge.

McKerrow, R. E. (1989). Critical rhetoric: Theory and praxis. *Communication Monographs*, 56(2), 91–111.

Nakayama, T. K., & Halualani, R. T. (Eds.). (2011). *The handbook of critical intercultural communication*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Sorrells, K. (2015). *Intercultural communication: Globalization and social justice* (2nd edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Chapter 2

Making a Place

A Framework for Educators Working with Critical Intercultural Communication and Critical Communication Pedagogy

Jennifer Sandoval and Keith Nainby

We agree with Hooks (1994), who asserted:

> As I worked to create teaching strategies that would make a place for multicultural learning, I found it necessary to recognize […] different "cultural codes." To teach effectively a diverse student body, I have to learn these codes. And so do students. This act alone transforms a classroom. (p.41)

We find that learning, with our students, the "cultural codes" that shape classroom communication can be a transformative, even a transgressive act. Engaging our immediate learning environment as a shifting, power-laden community, and posing questions about that community, can call into question taken-for-granted assumptions about why and how we learn; it can help us explore who might benefit from what we learn; and it can work against social injustice and toward change by challenging the status quo.

Yet this engagement with "cultural codes," even those codes taken up by the students with whom we work, does not happen sui generis if we are communication instructors. Learning and teaching communication must take place within communication contexts and through communicative acts, which means that as communication instructors we are always already engaging the very material we are studying together—using it, working with it, reshaping it, and being reshaped by it even as we strive to better understand it. Communication and our beliefs about it precede our efforts to learn and, thereby, inevitably constrain these efforts. If we are communication instructors, intercultural communication research perspectives necessarily shape what many of us know, or think we know, about cultures and cultural codes in pedagogical relationships—even if that shaping is something our forms of knowledge react against rather than affirm. This view of active, culturally

particular knowledge production in learning relationships is grounded, in part, in the assumptions founding the Critical Intercultural Communication (CIC) research perspective; a perspective we sketch in greater detail below. This view is also grounded, in part, in Critical Communication Pedagogy (CCP) scholarship, a body of work borrowing from the discipline of educational foundations that has deeply influenced research on the learning and teaching of communication; a perspective we also sketch in greater detail below.

In this chapter, we synthesize concepts in CIC and CCP research, offering a common framework fusing these research perspectives that educators might use as a resource in learning situations. We propose a framework indexing three communicative dimensions we find especially significant—dimensions that help us attend to the complex ways students and instructors engage ideas in the culturally rich environments of university classrooms:

1. Communication is contingent
2. Communication is contiguous
3. Communication is contested

As a means of situating the impact of these three dimensions for educators working with students in learning environments, we then identify three specific ways that the CIC and CCP research vectors are meaningfully intertwined and manifest themselves in relationships with particular students:

1. Pedagogical work is both communicative and cultural
2. Critical intercultural communication research is pedagogical
3. Critical intercultural communication research involves attention to dynamic, partial, shifting engagement across identities and communities engaged in knowledge creation

We explore the underpinnings of this framework in the body of this chapter, describing the shape and the direction of the CIC and CCP research vectors through the lens of particularity and showing how a concern with the particular differentiates contemporary critical research from previous scholarly approaches such as cross-cultural communication and instructional communication.

NOTES ON ONE POTENTIAL FRAMEWORK FOR EDUCATORS

As scholars committed to the insights offered in both CCP and CIC research, we hold that teachers can work most effectively in learning relationships when we orient to each engagement with students with the three "Cs" we

noted above as guiding principles of communication—that communication is contingent, contiguous, and contested. This involves a significant shift from traditional pedagogical models in which teachers arrive as fully formed experts who impart our knowledge, to students who are nominally alike as subject matter novices, within a clearly bounded learning environment, with an incremental set of progressive learning goals.

Within this guiding framework, as communication educators we instead engage learning topics that implicate us and the students with whom we work. Like them, our identities as contingent are thrust into relief in shifting, dynamic ways each time we engage ideas—sometimes much is at stake, and the risk of face-threat is high, for particular students or even for us as teachers, and our obligation as educators with power is to take a leading, supportive role in helping the learning community navigate these shifting, dynamic identity relationships rather than eliding them in the service of underlining an "expert–novice" hierarchy. Our communication processes in education, moreover, stretch out well beyond the course, the class meeting, or the student–teacher relationship within this guiding framework, as systems of power that precede the learning moment and that will survive it are always in play in the overlapping circles of dyads, groups, classes, schools, neighborhoods, regions, and states in which we learn and teach. Finally, our learning and teaching are not smooth or predictable despite our most careful preparation, and within this guiding framework we welcome conflict and contest as critical moments in which knowledge formation and relationship possibilities are prominent, exposed, and compelling. These are the tripartite dimensions of the framework we advocate here. As instructors we are socialized into the academic system in our own training and we can operate on autopilot, even when it contradicts our individual philosophies. We are tasked with recognizing the politics of speaking about culture from various locations of privilege. We must interrogate our own positionalities from below so that we may meet students where they are, an especially complex undertaking given that educators ourselves hail from a diverse range of cultures, personal trajectories, and subject positions—meaning that instructors from historically marginalized communities may often disproportionate engage in critical intercultural and/or critical pedagogical work, which would follow in the theory of politics and subjectivity offered by Hill Collins (2000).

Our first claim is that communication, specifically communication about culture and difference, is *contingent*. Both the CCP and CIC research strands suggest that historicizing forces and contextual particularities each shape our senses of identity, knowledge, and interaction (Collier et al., 2001; Fassett & Warren, 2007; Halualani, 2008; Orbe, 2004). In this view meanings are not transcendent, nor are subjectivities, nor are approaches to moving toward mutual understanding. Students enter our classrooms, and into relationship

with us and the space itself while inundated with messages about the value of their identities. Necessarily both CIC and CCP define experience as socially constructed. Communication brings things into existence, and it is this assumption that allows the examination of power, privilege, and identity in our understanding of both the classroom and of culture.

Both the CCP and CIC research strands suggest that we are enmeshed in micro-, meso-, and macro-level interrelationships that create/sustain culture and that produce differential forms of knowledge—so that power and privilege are always in play and cannot be bracketed in an effort to adopt "relativistic" or "neutral" understandings of culture (Allen, 2007; Freire, 1970/2000; Sorrells, 2010; Sprague, 1993). Communication, in this sense within these research strands, is *contiguous*. In this view learning about culture, and about all communication, is a political act with material consequences.

Both the CCP and CIC research strands suggest that when we communicate we are always engaged in negotiated, partial sense-making that is tentative, situated, and dynamic—thus, communication is *contested* (Flores, 1996; Moon & Holling, 2015; Sprague, 2002). In this view ruptures in our efforts to learn about communication and culture are generative rather than prohibitive. Difference is at the heart of cultural exploration where culture is often contradictory and ambivalent.

In the remainder of this chapter, we trace the contours of both the CCP research vector and CIC research vector, then explore the underpinnings of the framework we have articulated here. We do so in an effort to provide scholarly support and potential paths of exploration for readers interested in better understanding how these ideas developed over time, by offering a synthesis of these two research vectors.

LOCATING THE CRITICAL COMMUNICATION PEDAGOGY VECTOR

CCP initially developed as a distinct disciplinary perspective within communication studies, as several scholars described and reacted against a narrow dichotomy in communication pedagogy scholarship. We characterize that dichotomy, briefly and following Sprague (1993), as the diverging scholarly paths of Instructional Communication and Communication Education.

Instructional Communication research primarily involves examination of the complex relationships between two types of variables: communication behavior variables and instructional outcome variables (outcome variables are sometimes quantified by direct assessment of student performance and sometimes quantified by responses to self-report surveys). This research is almost always methodologically driven by post–positivist, social, scientific

analysis of variables, while the scope of this research includes, purportedly, any instructional context in which communication behaviors might be operationalized.

The scholarly path specifically known as Communication Education research, in contrast to Instructional Communication, primarily involves the study of discipline-specific practices appropriate to the teaching and learning of communication. This research varies methodologically but historically includes empirical, interpretive, and critical approaches, while the scope of this research incudes any instructional context in which communication is the subject matter foregrounded within a learning relationship.

CCP emerged, as most fresh research trajectories do, in fits and starts, but one convenient starting point is Sprague's (1992) interrogation of the ontological, epistemological, and axiological entailments of the Instructional Communication paradigm. Her analysis emphasizes the historicized, dynamic nature of human communication and the concomitant imperative, for communication pedagogy scholars, that we attend to students' and teachers' subject positions—without using research methods that treat those people as if their learning-based engagements with one another can be described using variables that are removed from history and easily measured. Sprague (1993; 1994; 2002) subsequently continued to promote discussion of how scholars—in order to interrupt and challenge the long-sedimented and often-unexamined dichotomy between Instructional Communication and Communication Education—needed to work together to clarify how identity, power, and privilege shape the totality of extant knowledge of, and future projects within, pedagogy research in our discipline. Subsequent germinal studies advanced this CCP focus on identity, power, and privilege in learning contexts by addressing gender (Cooks & Sun, 2002), race (Hendrix, Jackson & Warren, 2003), and sexuality (Heinz, 2002).

As a result of these burgeoning efforts to problematize the rigid topical and methodological frames of both instructional communication and communication education, scholars began increasingly reaching outside the discipline for resonant connection with educational research that addresses identity, power, and privilege and that emphasizes the interactional dimensions of learning relationships. Critical pedagogy research resonated in these ways. We rely, as many do, on the ideas of Friere (2001) that call for transformational pedagogy that begins with students and teachers in dialogue.

Summarizing the emerging CCP research trajectory, Fassett and Warren (2007) acknowledge the difficulty in succinctly defining what distinguishes such research, cautioning that "critical communication pedagogy, as both a field of study and a pedagogical practice, is somewhere in the nexus of the overlapping areas of interest [instructional communication, communication education, and critical pedagogy]" (p. 38). In an effort to honor these

complex, interwoven threads, the two authors describe 10 central commitments that guide CCP-driven research and teaching (p. 39–56). While we strive to honor this complexity, for our purposes in this chapter we synthesize across these 10 commitments to locate at least one significant site of intersection along the contemporary research vectors of CCP and CIC: concern with the particular in interactions. By "particular" in these two research vectors we mean:

- Concern with communicators who engage one another from distinct subject positions that shape, and are shaped by, contexts;
- Concern with communicators with diverse histories and perspectives that continue to evolve even as we strive to study their interactions, and indeed who are directly affected by our research;
- Concern with communicators whose interactions are vastly more complex and dynamic than can be meaningfully captured in a single study (let alone reliably replicated in future studies); and
- Concern with communicators whose interactions necessarily take up discourses and relational orientations that reflect inequitable power, divergent forms of agency, and binary logics of unearned privilege and undeserved marginalization.

Our naming of these four concerns as focal points in this chapter leads us to derive the first of three ways that research strands in CIC and CCP are woven together: *Pedagogical work is both communicative and cultural.*

LOCATING THE CRITICAL INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION VECTOR

The complex relationship of transformative pedagogies to diverse disciplinary research in intercultural communication is a notable theme (among many others) in a recent special dialogic forum issue among critical intercultural communication scholars in the *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication* (Alexander et al., 2014). In the final essay in this forum, Yin attends to instructors' need to support diverse students by drawing upon what we are learning about culture and communication, paralleling Hooks (1994) by writing, "It is the responsibility of educators to help students explore different histories and cultural traditions as sources of strength and inspirations" (p. 77). Alexander et al. (2014), questions the very demarcation of a disciplinary area titled "intercultural communication" by highlighting the ways that cultural positions and linkages imbue all of our research and all of our pedagogical efforts (p. 75).

For this group of communication scholars, whenever we produce knowledge about communication and culture we are already doing pedagogical work, whether in or out of the classroom, by thematizing our subject matter and thereby ushering in the ontological, epistemological, and axiological entailments associated with knowledge production. In short, when we produce knowledge about communication and culture we place value on those forms, and those methods, of knowledge. We derive from this a second way that research strands in CCP and CIC are woven together: *Critical intercultural communication research is pedagogical in that such research creates and defines new forms of knowledge and offers specific pathways for developing and refining these forms of knowledge*.

We contend that this is true regardless of whether the intercultural communication knowledge is itself framed as explicitly "critical;" like the scholars in the special issue we hold that any claims about culture and communication speak into a history of power and privilege that marshals discourses and identity positions in distinctive ways. We define the "critical" dimension of intercultural communication research, then, as research that explicitly acknowledges how it marshals discourses and identity positions, and to what ends; in other words, CIC is research that recognizes, and attempts to at least partially trace, its power. This definition follows Ono (2011), who maintains that "redefining critical in terms of power not only leads to a broader project inclusive of quite possibly radically different critical contexts, contributors, and hence questions, but it also allows us to address changing dynamics within the field of communication" (p. 95).

We argue that one key component of this definition of CIC research is, as Alexander et al. (2014) suggest, the figuration of all interaction as simultaneously culturally situated and culturally productive. Within this definition, all of us—scholars and research participants—are engaged in cultural communication. This is a change from the roots of intercultural research as delineated by Martin and Davis (2001), who note that scholars "who were studying and teaching intercultural communication at its inception were primarily white, middle-class U.S. Americans, [and] 'others' became defined as those who were not white and not American, resulting in an absence of interest in 'white' communication patterns" (p. 298–9).

CIC instead broadens the discipline's historical focus on "special" moments of interaction that might be ruled in as "interaction across cultures." A significant benefit of CIC, then, is a sharper focus on the dynamic, complex character of subject positions and their role in knowledge creation, as Halualani, Mendoza, and Drzewiecka (2009) note: "Regularities and patterns in communicative expressions can be interrogated in terms of historical moments and power interests so as to prevent the overlooking of shifts in group belonging, sense-making, and identity formation" (p. 31). Thus, a third

way that research strands in CCP and CIC are woven together is: *Critical intercultural communication research involves attention to dynamic, partial, shifting engagement across identities and communities engaged in knowledge creation*.

UNDERPINNINGS OF OUR FRAMEWORK: COMMUNICATION IS CONTINGENT

At the time of this writing, the United States is facing a tipping point across tensions that revolve around race, class, gender, sexuality, and other embodied identities. People have unprecedented access to difference through technology, social media, and a 24-hour news cycle. However, we are able to observe a response of withdrawal to one's own circle as these tensions are manifesting themselves unpredictably in a time of unprecedented political and sociocultural terror. As Moon and Holling (2015) argue, such tensions often mean that intercultural communication "…requires drawing attention to the absences that enable inequities and inequalities to persist in society and in our scholarship" (p. 1). CIC research has worked to shift the intercultural conversation away from topics that serve the interests of the dominant groups toward a recentering of marginalized experiences. In this current moment, we may be accused of being "overly political" in the classroom; however, engaging the difficult conversations about race, state violence, and access to well-being are not merely political, but rather embodied realities that must be explored.

For students who would believe we are in a post-racial moment or who have never interrogated their own positions of privilege, this practice is uncomfortable. For critical intercultural scholars the classroom is often seen as a unique opportunity to provide that moment of reflection and a way to engage an authentic pedagogy that invokes the very nature of a constructionist approach to identity. Allen (2007) reminds us of the importance of engaging race as an artificial category and the performative socialization we experience as a result.

Artificial though they may be, many identity categories are part of experiences inexorably linked to the very body one inhabits in any particular moment or context (Sekimoto, 2012). This is particularly salient given the 2013 report from the National Center for Education Statistics that shows 79 percent of full-time faculty in degree-granting postsecondary institutions are White. The lack of representation across identity categories can create a problematic environment for students to interrogate the construction of such dynamics; particularly when they cannot identify with most individuals who are teaching them. However, CCP offers a framework for disruption of the

status quo and the content of intercultural communication courses inherently invite such opportunities.

Identity is a concept that has been largely explored in CIC and CCP and is embedded in even more traditional notions of intercultural communication scholarship through that field's historical emphasis on ethnicity, nationhood, migration, and linguistic communities. But as Chavez (2012) has stated, "Individuality challenges the field's emphasis on singularity, by revealing singularity to always already be a fiction…" (p. 25). An intersectional approach that foregrounds the ways our multiple, overlapping, and mutually linked subject positions are always already in play within each interaction can address the known complexity of embodied and communicated identity.

No student or instructor is any one thing in the classroom. Some aspects of identity may be more salient in that context than others, but it is ultimately the combination of those characteristics of self that impact the communication across difference about difference. Each of the authors of this chapter works at an extremely accessible state institution with a diverse population and Hispanic Serving Institution status. While both authors come from low socioeconomic statuses and families with low educational achievement the identity of one as Latina becomes particularly meaningful in classrooms that are 30–50 percent Hispanic or Latinx. For both of us the tension is to create a safe space that allows for meaningful identity expression, discussion of privilege, and self-awareness without alienating the groups we ourselves do not represent.

The very context of the classroom itself is contingent in its own way. No one enters those spaces a blank slate as it were. Yet, frequently discussions of those differences are often absent from our scholarship. As Hendrix and Wilson (2014) identified in their analysis of articles in *Communication Education* from 2000 to 2013, "Typical publications presume white classrooms and white professors unless otherwise identified" (p. 406). According to Gilchrist and Jackson (2012), race affects not only who publishes communication scholarship but also how that scholarship itself is codified and rendered into racialized spaces within our discipline:

> The sociopolitical and academic conditions in which we work fortify an I–Other dialectical tension that must be acknowledged as the elephant in the room as we uncover why the paradigms and intellectualism of non-Whites have rarely been shared or only intermittently surface in the classroom and beyond. (p. 244)

The Academy itself can be a site of power, a place where the dominant groups' status is reified, and for hegemonic discourses to maintain what is a historically white, heterosexual, male space.

UNDERPINNINGS OF OUR FRAMEWORK: COMMUNICATION IS CONTIGUOUS

How does one teach about power when embodying said power in the position of instructor? How do you examine colonialism and conquest a room where students are adorned in the latest "Native fashion trends" or "neouveau Navajo"—style clothing? How can you encourage resistance to limited conceptualizations of culture from within a system that has erased the experiences of people of color and women for centuries? These are the challenges of invoking CCP when we define communication as contiguous. It is as Carillo Rowe (2011) has said, "slippery." The slippery nature of culture, the flow of cultural histories, and positions among the complex communicative paths of interpersonal dyads, social, and professional groups, institutional structures and geographic and affiliative movements, textures pedagogical interactions of all kinds, even when culture is not directly acknowledged or treated as a topic of investigation within a classroom. Those of us committed to taking up cultural relationships as a project in critical pedagogical work are thus embracing a vocational practice of co-creating, in learning situations, a purposeful but always limited, tentative, and partial map of a temporary cultural topography. From these perspectives, the ways in which we enact our critical pedagogy and engage intercultural content should reflect awareness of the complex layers that create that slippery terrain.

Basic expectations of student conduct are culturally bound and often problematic. One such example of pedagogical choices we make is how we treat "classroom participation" and silence. Covarrubias and Windchief (2009) were interested in this very issue when they interviewed 34 Native American and American Indian students about their cultural use of silence and how it was evaluated by their instructors. They argue, "Indeed, silence is a rhetoric within which human agency is expressed and within which real-time fresh realities are created in the world" (p. 348). Even the most well intentioned instructor may find it difficult to disentangle from the communication norms associated with higher education practices. It is a system that creates relational conditions that perpetuate power differentials and dominant discourses. It is in these micro interactions that we can disrupt the nature of those exchanges and reach across power lines to form nuanced and intersectional alliances (Carrillo Rowe, 2008).

Our classrooms are themselves intercultural, with students coming from diverse local and global standpoints. Sorrells (2010) argues, "As we confront the callous challenges and mobile the creative potential of the context of globalization, we need to re-imagine the field of intercultural communication as a site of intervention, democratic participation, and transformation" (p. 183). This is where the political acts of communication become so crucial

at all levels of discursive construction. We are always operating within the historical moment. In 2017, in the United States we are challenged with how to navigate a climate that is increasingly hostile to many of our students' identities while asking students to themselves interrogate the rhetoric in the public sphere.

One scholar whose research attempts to recover some of the ways that culture shapes communication contiguous at multiple levels is Halualani (2008), whose examination of "globalized Hawaiian identity" as a communication construct found that "there are risks and consequences associated with the signification of a globalized Hawaiian identity. […] What will Hawaiian identity stress as the common ground that connects and binds all Hawaiians to one another? Ancestry? Descent? Genealogy? Blood quantum?" (p. 18) This study highlights how communication in such arenas as conceptual discussions of native rights for Hawaiian people, and political actions in favor of sovereignty and economic decisions involving land and resource use are meaningful only when particular identity-indexing interactions among people moving within and without various social institutions and forms of association. Similarly, Cheng (2008), exploring Chinese migrant experiences in El Paso, Texas, explains, "Such a construct inevitably essentializes a highly interactive, fluid, and polyvocal space lived by peoples of diverse backgrounds" (p. 258).

We draw two implications from this research: first, that racialized and nationalized identity constructs are insufficiently particular, in many cases, to account for impact on day-to-day interactions and their material consequences, and second, that such constructs are nevertheless tactically engaged by communicators within day-to-day interactions and for good material reasons. These two implications both exemplify critical educators' need to engage students' cultural knowledges in particular, situated contexts.

Another reason power and privilege are always in play in pedagogical settings, and that those settings are marked by differential rather than unitary knowledges, is that instructors' own subject positions are not only distinct from students but also not unitary themselves. Orbe (2007), in discussing Fassett and Warren's (2007) *Critical Communication Pedagogy*, reflects on his own socialization processes as a professor: "Critical Communication Pedagogy helped remind me to resist the largely unconscious socialization that has come with becoming a professor—especially when that socialization contradicts why my personal convictions" (p. 300).

Following Orbe, we suggest that educators informed by both CIC and CCP are energized in their pedagogical projects by students,' and their own, differential knowledges—knowledges that include, but are certainly not limited to, CIC and CCP research; international, national, regional and local sociopolitical contexts; and unfolding classroom interactions and histories. These

energies cannot be separated by one another, but instead flow contiguously within educational acts.

UNDERPINNINGS OF OUR FRAMEWORK: COMMUNICATION IS CONTESTED

According to Moon (2002) culture is "a contested zone in which different groups struggle to define issues in their own interests" and "where not all groups have equal access to public forums to voice their concerns, perspectives, and the everyday realities of their lives" (p. 15). One way CIC scholars take up the notion of ongoing contest as a generative pedagogical dimension, rather than a teleological pathway toward closure, is by tracing the efforts of people in decentered subject positions to tactically grapple with fresh, non-normative sense-making projects. Eguchi (2015) autoethnographically examines his romantic relationships and observes, "the intercultural potentiality of queer Asian–Black relationality complicates the hegemonic racial distribution of power"(p. 37).

Part of this critical work is moving people from object to subject and creating a discursive space of difference (Flores, 1996). It is the responsibility of communication scholars and instructors to continue to question and call for critical readings of the nature of vocality and the positioning of the various actors and agents presented in academia. The state of globalization complicates the nature of cultural relationships and critiques of the discourses surrounding current practices. As Shome and Hegde (2002a) explain,

> The shifting fault lines of economic and cultural power in our current time, and the scale and speed at which these lines are re/shifting, are producing new forms of articulations and disarticulations, new configurations of power and new planes of dis/empowerment that cannot be equated with any other period in history. (p. 175)

Students have never had this level of access to information, perspectives, and narratives from different people, positions, and places. However, the paradox lies in the decision to access difference. At a time when it may feel safer to reside in one's own bubble it is more critical than ever to engage in difficult dialogue. This does not merely apply to students, as instructors we too have a responsibility to explore beyond what is known and find a way to sit with discomfort.

Communication about culture often excludes the complexity and the struggle in an attempt to define it. Collier et al. (2001) argue that "[a]ny act of defining culture should not forget political questions such as the following: Whose interest is served by this definition? What definitions are left out or unimagined?" (p. 229) Postcolonial critique can inform investigation and the recognition of

the colonial legacy that continues to influence the global relationship between West/North and East/South. "Postcolonial scholarship is concerned with phenomena, and effects and affects, of colonialism that accompanied, or formed the underside of, the logic of the modern, and its varied manifestations in historical and contemporary times" (Shome & Hegde, 2002a, p. 258).

Agency in postcolonial theory is the ability to speak for oneself and not be spoken for or about. Shome and Hegde (2002b) argue that agency is imbedded in the politics of identity and the structures that define the categories people are placed in. The conversation about agency has been giving scholars reason to consider "who can research whom," and thus reshaping the very nature of communication research. Large-scale inequities continue to exist both domestically and internationally based on gender, race, class, religion, and sexual orientation. We believe that by personally grappling with the tensions of CCP and CIC our classrooms can be emancipatory and minimize domination. It can raise consciousness about oppressive structures. CIC instructors are burdened with a particular kind of cultural agency that allows us the position to select the information students will be exposed to in our courses. Dialogic approaches that recognize this tension between our convictions and the system where work can remind us to recognize this responsibility.

Efforts to raise consciousness or similarly focus on student empowerment in learning contexts are also contested because historically, notions of what counts as awareness, agency, and action are themselves the products of normative discourses. Nakayama (2012) observes contested communication in the setting of an international ACT-UP event and suggests that "republican universalism may simply be a form of assimilation into whiteness, rather than a forward looking model of multiculturalism. My point here in the last lesson is that there is no last lesson" (p. 106–107). In this view, CCP and CIC are not vectors that have a reachable endpoint in a socially secured framework of justice; instead, these vectors are perpetually energized, without end, by the ruptures of communication in contexts of scarcity, suffering, and diversity.

CCP projects are certainly not limited to discursive engagement of students' immediate, material experiences as material for CIC work in learning environments. LeMaster (2011) offers a queer reading of a mainstream film text with characters whose subjectivities are staged in the spaces between fixed identities of sexuality and gender, in addition to other identities such as mortal/immortal and child/adult: "As such, liminality is a feature of texts that assumes instances of resistance to oppression always already exist; however, those instances need finding and articulation" (p. 118). Finding and articulation as LeMaster describes them does not imply explicit verbalization, and the contested communication that we consider generative in both CCP and CIC is not reflected only in struggles that are immediately recognizable to teachers. CCP and CIC scholars and practitioners conceptualize learners

as both learning *about* contested communication processes and as learning *through* these processes, and struggles themselves are vital dimensions of learning intercultural communication.

CONCLUSION

In this chapter we have located the vectors of Critical Communication Pedagogy and Critical Intercultural Communication at three cross sections. When describing p*edagogical work as both communicative and cultural* we define teaching spaces as cultural spaces where the history and experience of instructors and students come together to create a specific climate. We encourage all teachers to examine the nature of history and power in their specific contexts. We see work in this content area as inherently affecting pedagogical choices and requiring an important commitment to the underlying philosophies of critical engagement. This leads to a perspective that *critical intercultural communication research is pedagogical*. Finally, by claiming *critical intercultural communication research involves attention to dynamic, partial, shifting engagement across identities and communities* we are acknowledging that our work is incomplete and never static. It requires a continuous commitment to reflection.

We have also described communication at contingent, contiguous, and contested. When engaged in intercultural classrooms we are faced with the work of complexifying experiences and acknowledge the nuance of identity and perspective. This work is inherently challenging as we recognize the constant shifting dynamics of our global and connected worlds. CCP and CIC ask us to work in the paradox of a safe environment that promotes discomfort. Discomfort with the status quo, with limited understandings of self, and with ignorance of the marginalization of others.

Several additional key concepts are centered frequently in critical intercultural work including identity, agency, praxis. Freire (1970) shaped the concept of "praxis" in his discussion of the multiple dialectics that exist in a world of colonizers vs. colonized, oppressors vs. oppressed, and objectivity vs. subjectivity. He defines praxis as, "reflection and action upon the world in order to transform it" (p. 51). His explanation of this kind of action has informed some current understandings of agency and influenced critical pedagogy across disciplines. Freire believed that humans are beings of praxis who have the ability to transform the world in which they live. Movement from the position of object to that of subject involves the oppressed in their own revolution and gives them a sense of empowerment of personal choice. It is this shift into subject that rehumanizes those who have been exploited and who have lacked access to ways to resist. This shift is possible through CCP and CIC as they intersect in dynamic and important ways.

REFERENCES

Alexander, B. K., Arasaratnam, L. A., Durham, A., Flores, L., Leeds-Hurwitz, W., Mendoza, S. L., & Halualani, R. (2014). Identifying key intercultural urgencies, issues, and challenges in today's world: Connecting our scholarship to dynamic contexts and historical moments. *Journal of International & Intercultural Communication*, 7(1), 38–67. doi:10.1080/17513057.2014.869527

Alexander, B. K., Arasaratnam, L. A., Avant-Mier, R., Durham, A., Flores, L., Leeds-Hurwitz, W., & Halualani, R. (2014). Defining and communicating what "intercultural" and "intercultural communication" means to us. *Journal of International & Intercultural Communication*, 7(1), 14–37. doi:10.1080/17513057.2014.869524

Carrillo Rowe, A. (2008). *Power lines: On the subject of feminist alliances*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Chávez, K. R. (2012). Doing intersectionality: Power, privilege and identity in political activist communities. In N. Bardhan & M. P. Orbe (Eds.), *Identity research and intercultural communication: Reflections and future directions.* Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Cheng, H. I. (2008). Space making: Chinese transnationalism on the U.S.-Mexican borderlands. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication,* 1(3), 244–263. doi:10.1080/17513050802101815

Collier, M. J., Hegde, R. S., & Lee, W. et al. (2001). Dialogue on the edges: Ferment in communication and culture. In M. J. Collier (Ed.), *Transforming Communication about Culture: Critical new directions, International and Intercultural Communication Annual* 24, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Covarrubias, P. O., & Windchief, S. R. (2009). Silences in stewardship: Some American Indian college students examples. *Howard Journal of Communications*, 20(4), 333–352. doi:10.1080/10646170903300754

Eguchi, S. (2015). Queer intercultural relationality: An autoethnography of Asian–Black (dis)connections in white gay America. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication,* 8(1), 27–43. doi:10.1080/17513057.2015.991077

Fassett, D. L., & Warren, J. T. (2007). *Critical communication pedagogy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Flores, L. A. (1996). Creating discursive space through a rhetoric of difference. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 82(2), 142–156.

Freire, P. (1970/2000) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (30th Anniversary Ed.). Trans. M. B. Ramos. New York: Continuum.

Gilchrist, E. S., & Jackson II, R. L. (2012). Articulating the heuristic value of African American communication studies. *Review of Communication,* 12(3), 237–250. doi: 10.1080/15358593.2012.666670

Halualani, R. T., Mendoza, S. L., & Drzewiecka, J. A. (2009). "Critical" junctures in intercultural communication studies: A review. *Review of Communication*, 9(1), 17–35. doi:10.1080/15358590802169504

Halualani, R. T. (2008). "Where exactly is the Pacific?": Global migrations, diasporic movements, and intercultural communication. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication,* 1(1), 3–22. doi:10.1080/17513050701739509

Hill Collins, P. (1990/2000). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness and the politics of empowerment* (2nd Ed.). New York: Routledge.

Hooks, B. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. London: Routledge.

LeMaster, B. H. (2011). Queer imag(in)ing: Liminality as resistance in Lindqvist's *Let the Right One In*. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies,* 8(2), 103–123. doi: 10.1080/14791420.2011.566277

Martin, J. N., & Davis, O. I. (2001). Conceptual foundations for teaching about whiteness in intercultural communication courses. *Communication Education,* 50(4), 298–313. doi:10.1080/03634520109379257

Moon, D. G. (2002). Thinking about "culture" in intercultural communication. In J. N. Martin, T. K. Nakayama and L. A. Flores (Eds.), *Readings in Intercultural Communication: Experiences and Contexts*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Moon, D. G., & Holling, M. A. (2015). A Politic of disruption: Race(ing) intercultural Communication. *Journal of International & Intercultural Communication*, 8(1), 1–6. doi:10.1080/17513057.2015.99107

Nakayama, T. K. (2012). Act Up-Paris: French lessons. *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* 98(1), 103–108. doi:10.1080/00335630.2011.638663

Ono, K. A. (2011). Critical: A finer edge. *Communication and Critical/ Cultural Studies,* 8(1), 93–96. doi:10.1080/14791420.2011.543332

Orbe, M. P. (2004). Negotiating multiple identities within multiple frames: An analysis of first-generation college students. *Communication Education,* 53(2), 131–149. doi:10.1080/0363452040100016824O1

Orbe, M. P. (2007). Critical reflections from a resistant boiled frog: Striving toward a critical communication pedagogy as articulated by Deanna Fassett and John Warren. *Review of Communication,* 7(3), 298–302. doi:10.1080/15358590701480812

Sekimoto, S. (2012). A multimodal approach to identity: Theorizing the self through embodiment, spatiality, and temporality. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication,* 5(3), 226–243.

Shome, R., & Hegde, R. (2002a). Culture, communication and the challenge of globalization. *Critical Studies in Media Communication,* 19, 172–189.

Shome R., & Hegde, R. (2002b). Postcolonial approaches to communication: Charting the terrain, engaging the intersections. *Communication Theory,* 12, 249–270.

Sorrells, K. (2010). Re-imaging Intercultural Communication in the context of globalization. In T. K. Nakayama & R. T. Halualani (Eds.), *The Handbook of Critical Intercultural Communication.* Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Sprague, J. (1992). Expanding the research agenda for instructional communication: Raising some unasked questions. *Communication Education,* 41(1), 1–25. doi:0.1080/03634529209378867.

Sprague, J. (1993). Retrieving the research agenda for communication education: Asking the pedagogical questions that are "embarrassments to theory." *Communication Education,* 42(2), 106–122. doi:10.1080/03634529309378919

Sprague, J. (2002). Communication education: The spiral continues. *Communication Education,* 51(4), 337–354. doi:10.1080/03634520216532

Chapter 3

Intercultural Communication, Ethics, and Activism Pedagogy

Leda Cooks

In September 2015, *The Atlantic* essay, "The Coddling of the American Mind" (Lukianoff and Haidt) sparked a good deal of controversy among faculty, students, administrators, and the wider public. The essay expressed concern over the climate of college campuses in the United States where, it seems, educators, are "coddling" our students by teaching them to identify and respond to instances of daily bias (microaggression), and using trigger warnings to identify potentially difficult or stress-inducing materials. Though the essay expressed the worry that teaching and learning about oppression trapped students in a morass of shame and victimage, at the same time, activist students around the country painted quite a different picture. Across the country, from Harvard to University of Missouri, university students were naming and protesting racism and other forms of oppression, from microaggressions, to structural racism embedded in university policies enforced by administrations, and to the global politics that perpetuate colonization in the name of Capital.

After many years of teaching about race and whiteness in courses from intercultural communication, to dialogue and deliberation, to media literacy, I have seen many shifts in the ways White students, in particular, identified themselves ethically in relation to race as structure and discourse. Increasingly, to even speak about race in a predominantly White university (PWU) is to risk being labeled a racist. And after years of conducting university, high school and community dialogues on culture, identity, and power with teachers as well as students, I have observed that anti-racist educators I know are increasingly hesitant to discuss racial privilege for fear of triggering White (and students of color) anger as well as conflict in the classroom, anger that they feel they are ill-equipped to handle. These factors and others, at least

on my campus, have led to a decline in the depth and amount of discussions about whiteness even as #BlackLivesMatter Movement has become a focal point of empowerment for some student groups on campus.

In this milieu of "coddling" and activism, with a history of protest in response to racist incidents on our own campus and no longer-term commitments to conversations about social justice, I held a series of three dialogues with communication and social justice activist educators on the topics of teaching about cultural identity and social justice in the fall of 2015. The focus of the conversations was on teaching about race and whiteness in particular, and although it is not my intent here to discuss the dialogues in any depth, the ethical dilemmas that underlay our conversations are the impetus for this chapter. Two findings from surveys and transcripts of the discussions are worth noting here: (1) While racial inequities seemed to raise pedagogical imperatives for social justice for the participants, the *personal* imperatives to address race and privilege were not mentioned and seemed (at least in conversation) to go unnoticed in the groups of primarily White, also including mixed international and domestic faculty; (2) Activism, too, was seen as a pedagogical tool or example of possibilities for change, but at a remove from the classroom. In other words, activist efforts such as (at that time) #BlackLivesMatter were seen as informational pedagogical examples, rather than as potential catalysts for getting students involved in change. With a couple of exceptions, the participants were concerned about the consequences of social justice activism, for themselves and their careers as well as for those of their students. It struck me at that time that there was both an ethical obligation for anti-racist educators to address race and whiteness in the context of intercultural education about social justice and, equally a sense that to do would risk "triggering" all involved, thus violating a version of the educator's Hippocratic Oath.

Given these seemingly crippling dilemmas, the question at the heart of this chapter is, how do we as critical educators address students as moral agents in a context where there is an (inter)cultural imperative to act responsively and responsibly? And, furthermore, how/do we define activism and our role as critics and advocates in an increasingly polarized political climate of (racial and cultural) discourse and performance? In addressing these questions I take license in viewing educators and courses beyond those taught in critical intercultural communication to include educators who teach about culture, power, and identity with the goal of social justice activism. This focus is both quite broad in including educators across a variety of disciplines and subdisciplines in Communication and narrow in its emphasis on the ways ethics and activism are described in the classroom and in our research. In what follows, I first address the paradigm shifts in intercultural communication research and teaching that have led to a more prominent focus on social group

identities, power, and position, and the models of communication ethics that pose implications for our pedagogy.

RESEARCH AND PEDAGOGY IN INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION

Research and teaching in the field of intercultural communication has long been driven by the concepts haunting the study of all communication: questions inherent in contact and those connected to control. In the early years of intercultural research, given the research mandate post-World War II to study different cultures in order to categorize and define interactional behaviors for Foreign Service personnel preparing to go overseas (Martin and Nakayama, 1999), there was little scholarly motivation to understand relationships across cultures in contexts other than business, politics, or diplomacy, and on levels other than superficial greetings and conversation. The need to control perception, studied cross-culturally through influential concepts such as Uncertainty Reduction Theory (Gudykunst, Yang & Nishida, 1985) also expressed a center from which control (over information as well as interaction) was assumed. Contact, where it was discussed in early intercultural texts and teaching, was unidirectional in its purpose (White, male, middle-class U.S. citizen interacting usually in some business or government transaction) and disinterested in relational and contextual meanings. The ethical implications of contact were thus addressed, if at all, in primarily economic and political terms from the perspective of dominant culture (Sorrells, 2012).

As global flows of contact have shifted direction and multiplied, locations for both contact and control have become contested and complicated. Likewise, teaching intercultural communication has required movement across paradigms of functionalism, interpretivism, critical/radical, etc. as the locus for studying intercultural contexts shifts from control, to contact, to critique, and social justice (DeVoss et al., 2002; Martin, Nakayama & Carbaugh, 2012). Throughout these shifts, a major focus of the field has been cultural identities and interaction, whether constituted in interaction or as fully formed. While it is important to note that both functional and critical paradigms are alive and well in intercultural texts and research, where the functional paradigm concerned itself with power in terms of fully formed cultural identities understanding present rules and patterns of interaction (Gudykunst, 2005; for critique see Mendoza, Halualani, & Drzewiecka, 2009), the critical paradigm has often focused on power as related to the creation and performance of cultural identities and social (economic, political, etc.) justice (Sorrells, 2012).

INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION ETHICS AND RESISTANCE

Given the emphasis on social justice and change in critical intercultural communication research and teaching, this chapter on critical intercultural communication activism pedagogy starts with several assumptions: namely, that authors and readers of this book do, or are curious about critical, engaged teaching (by implication, activism itself) in the field of intercultural communication; that communication has a special relationship to this type of work; and that such interventions place moral obligations on those who act with, for, and on behalf of others.[1] Many scholars have noted that activist courses in intercultural or interpersonal communication, public relations, public speaking, and others demand a look at, if not a code of, ethics due to the relational level at which interventions occur (Arnett, Fritz, & Bell, 2009; Cheney, 2000; Frey & Carragee, 2007b, see also essays in Buzzanell, 2000). The intercultural communication curriculum should reflect an ethical stance on intervention within the context and content of the course, as well as students, community members, university, and other populations marginalized or dehumanized through injustice in contexts that include but move far beyond the classroom.

Ethics are morals, values, and beliefs that can be formalized or informally patterned into systems, theories, and codes. Arnett et al. (2009) considered ethics to be "practices that enact or support a good, a central value or values associated with human life and conduct" (p. xii). Ethics point to actions taken or not taken, with consequences for selves and societies. Ethics also imply locations: bodies in times and spaces intertwined with notions of identity, change, and mobility. Western perspectives on ethics and communication now often characterize the postmodern age as one grounded more in difference than in a sense of a shared moral identity. Arnett et al. (2009) characterized the current era as one where "commonsense" no longer is common and, consequently, ethics must be grounded in different stories of "the good." Whether difference or the end of commonsense is celebrated, deplored, tolerated, or refused, the sense of accompanying loss says more about the cultural location of scholars writing about ethics than those who have always realized the difference that difference makes.

Still, for many critical teachers and scholars, the grounding of ethics in difference and in changing sets of values allows real social justice for marginalized groups to be perpetually postponed. For some, an urgent need to alleviate suffering and imbalances of material resources justifies deference to (essential) difference. If all ethics is relative, they argue, anyone's actions, regardless of how heinous, can be justified by their personal sense of justice. They advocate for a system of ethics grounded in universal principles of

right and wrong (such as the 1948 United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights). Although certainly a focus on the outcome of human rights principles (policies) is imperative, we must be reflexive about ways that these codes, too, are situationally and relationally negotiated.

Attention to outcomes over processes often results in the sense that embedded moral principles take precedence over actual negotiations of everyday life. Diversi and Moreira (2009), for instance, pointed to how the process by which street children in Sao Paulo, Brazil negotiate their everyday survival (e.g., through "finding" food and a means to buy illegal drugs to numb other pains) becomes less important than the "fact" that they are violating the law through loitering, begging, stealing, and using illegal drugs. In this manner, a focus only on outcomes (ethical codes) finds its way into the sanctions that simplify: street children harm themselves and others, and, consequently, must be remanded into custody.

If relativity is not viewed as (whimsically) personal but, rather, as social and relational, a situational ethics resides in ways that people negotiate their everyday relationships in light of goals and outcomes that they perceive as being just. In other words, to live socially is to live in relationships and in situations that neither dissolve into terminal uniqueness nor assume a universal system of (e)valuation. What have these relationships to do with the ethics of a critical and an intercultural pedagogy? Critical intercultural pedagogy works to explicate (educational, political, economic, etc.) systems, and their interconnected institutions, discourses, and performances. Teaching from this perspective moves beyond the abstract, however, to show how these connected systems are oppressive culturally and thus relationally, among bodies in (always, already) intercultural interaction. How can we offer an account of ethics, even as our/my body is privileged in this accounting? Although it is important to identify critical/activist pedagogical practices that are inclusive and effective toward a more just society, a communication approach to these issues also demands (in my thinking) that we pay attention to interactions and performances in contexts that never are totally predetermined by categorical differences of age, class, gender, mobility, nation, race, and sexuality. We are, after all, more than the sum of our identities, perceptions, and even our interactions. We constantly are (re-, de-, in-, per-)forming change, although the mobility and consequences of those changes across spaces and times are differently located.

When ethics are discussed in communication research about activism, it has been within the larger moral frame of social justice and social change. Rarely within this work is the other type of activism addressed: that associated with fringe groups or with largely conservative efforts to maintain traditions of religious or social group dominance. For the sake of scope and space, I, too, deal solely with activism identified with the social justice goal of changing relations of domination and oppression in current society.

This chapter offers a place from which to ask questions (a) of ourselves (positioned as teachers and learners who are gendered, raced, etc.), our pedagogies, and the contexts in which they take place; and (b) about ethics and moral positions relative to language, bodies, and their performances. I first outline several approaches to communication ethics and then utilize communication ethics literacy (Arnett et al., 2009) to ask several questions about current maps and metaphors for communication, activism, and pedagogy. I do so to provide a framework through which to question the underlying ethical narratives of communication activism pedagogies, by differentiating communication ethics from a communication ethics literacy. I then explore intercultural communication activism pedagogy through an ethical literacy lens.

THE ETHICS OF *COMMUNICATION* ACTIVISM

To act or not to act

To discuss communication ethics, some starting locations for narratives of communication itself are in order. Histories of the communication field primarily draw from the ideology of communication as messages containing information that is transmitted and received across spaces and within people (models by Berlo, 1960; Shannon & Weaver, 1949). From that perspective, messages (fully formed) can either keep or lose their authenticity in the course of transmission and reception (Reddy, 1979). These definitional narratives locate the history of the field in the modern age, where fully formed selves commit wholeheartedly to understanding one another fully. These narratives, placed in the early days of media, industrialization, and invention, influenced the mechanical shape that communication processes would take. As Carey (1993) and Peters (1999), and others have observed, the mechanistic metaphors of communication survive and thrive today amid stories of message transmission across space and in time, with fidelity and authenticity a continued concern. Although postmodernism long has signaled the end of "Truth," the quest for authenticity remains a central value in communication scholarship on activism and in popular wisdom about the same.

Both Carey (1993) and Peters (1999) identified a second metanarrative of communication that stresses its communal aspects. For Carey, the ritual aspect of communication stresses its culture-forming characteristics—the humanity of sociability for Peters, a somewhat different metaphor emerges—that of dialogue. The dialogue metaphor emerged alongside the earliest (Sophistic and Socratic) debates over democracy and representation. Both metaphors (ritual and dialogue) engage an ethical narrative of sharing and

community, although more through common process and presence with another than through the replication and standardization of Truth.

The ethical implications of these metanarratives have an important bearing on the development of communication ethics and their relationship to social justice activism and pedagogy. Arnett et al. (2009) outlined six perspectives on communication ethics, each of which values different aspects of communicative practice. The first approach, *democratic communication ethics*, draws from Habermas's (1984) ideal of public dialogue to promote and protect rational and collective processes of decision making (Pusey, 1987). The second approach, *universal–humanitarian communication ethics* draws from the Enlightenment and presumes an ideal of rationality and reasoned decision making as the means to the Truth. The third approach looks for *communication ethics codes, procedures, and standards* through which appropriate conduct is named and assessed for the good of an organization or profession. Fourth, *contextual communication ethics* focus on particular circumstances under which ethical decisions are made. The fifth perspective of *narrative communication ethics* assumes that humans are storytelling animals who live their lives by stories they tell about themselves and others. Last is *dialogic communication ethics*, which looks for meaning in what emerges when people engage together in communication and community rather than in meanings assumed to be within individuals. Within each approach, Arnett et al. (2009) observed that different stories of the good are protected and maintained.

Drawing from dialogic communication ethics, Arnett et al. (2009) discussed a model for communication ethics literacy that provides a useful basis for looking at the underlying ethical narratives in approaches to intercultural communication, activism, and pedagogy, and their various applications in teaching and research. Central to their model is the connection between the *why* of communicative practices, which they linked to a tradition of communication philosophy, and *how* to apply communication theory and practice to everyday life. Beyond the connection to philosophy and applied communication, however, Arnett et al. (2009) were concerned with the multiple ethical stories that exist simultaneously in a postmodern setting where difference increasingly is the only commonality among people. Within this setting, they argued, the primary ethical questions that communication researchers, teachers, students, and activists should ask are: (a) What are the underlying narratives of the good in existence in any given moment? (b) What is the *learning* that emerges when people and their narratives come together? As Arnett et al. noted,

> This era places before us a pragmatic demand—to learn about our own sense of the good and the reality of difference manifested in the beliefs and actions

> of others. Learning requires understanding a position or framework for viewing the world and how our viewing shapes our understanding of any given set of data or facts. (p. 19–20)

With these questions in mind, I examine below some common ethical positions and narratives of intercultural communication activist teaching with the goal of social justice.

THE ETHICS OF COMMUNICATION *ACTIVISM*

Fraser and Honneth (2003) characterized the conflict over approaches to social justice among various cultural groups in terms of recognition and redistribution. *Recognition* seeks social justice through the recognition of the Other in all their/our humanity. The goal of recognition is inclusion, and through inclusion, a sense of connectedness. Those who advocate recognition are careful to distinguish the appreciation for and acceptance of difference from that of treating all persons as if they were the same. *Redistribution*, alternatively, looks for social justice through material equity—determining how societal benefits and resources might be spread over diverse and currently oppressed groups.

Scholars (Ayers, 2004; Gewirtz, 1998), have argued that neither approach can achieve social justice in isolation; either some combination of those two means or a third way is needed to appreciate the care, connection, and structural/material changes needed to meet sustainable social justice goals. This third way, which aligns with a *transformative* approach, advocates a rethinking of current structures and means of addressing social injustices. Such an approach critiques the language of recognition for its focus on individual care to the exclusion of institutional and structural patterns of inequity, and it critiques redistribution for its lack of attention to different ways in which people construct meaning relationally in their lives. Dialogic approaches look for emergent meanings in the spaces in-between current structures of language, for identities constructed in relation to others, and for new ways of performing social change.

Tracing the metaphorical journey of intercultural communication activism scholarship, the theoretical and methodological treatment of dialogue and dissemination equate dialogue with recognition, dissemination with distribution, and *dialogism* with transformation. Of the various approaches to communication ethics outlined by Arnett et al. (2009), narrative and contextual perspectives on ethics align with *recognition*, whereas democratic, codes/procedures/standards and universal–humanitarian approaches connect with redistribution. Transformative approaches to social justice, alternatively, can

be linked to dialogic communication ethics, connecting the social and rhetorical with the economic/material.

UNDERLYING STORIES OF THE GOOD IN INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION ACTIVISM

Although mapping these relationships can lead to a confusing set of locations, their connections are important to note, both for the strange pairings they produce and for their underlying ethical narratives. For instance, both critical and democratic approaches to social justice activism often contain ethical stories of social change through redistribution of material resources, although redistribution of recognition (through the right to vote, for instance) may be the goal of democratic activism, while redistribution of equity and power may be the focus of critical approaches. Arnett, Arneson, and Bell (2006) connected democratic recognition with dialogue, or the ability both to speak one's truth and to be open to hearing different truth(s) of Others. Mapping critical perspectives on social justice and activism onto these points creates an equation with distributive approaches, and a concern for the larger frameworks of power as they work on oppressed populations. We ask not only how stories of the good are told but *who tells* those stories and to whom, whether they are assumed, how they are received/heard, and with what consequences. The combination of distribution of equity and dissemination of justice foregrounds the activism of scholars (researchers and teachers, in Boyer's, 1987, terms) in ensuring the recognition of injustices and remedying of oppression and false consciousness. *Power* and its misuse or abuse must be adjusted to benefit those who have been marginalized, and the outcome of the process works toward social justice and social change.

The foregrounding of critical researchers in activist scholarship has been criticized elsewhere by a host of feminist, qualitative, activist scholars in anthropology, communication, education, and other disciplines whose concern has been the *empowerment* of oppressed populations (Simpson, 2014). These scholars claim that critical and cultural activist studies of oppressed populations, despite (sometimes) good intentions, have ignored several essential questions; namely, who sets the agenda for this research, who benefits from this research, how do they benefit, and where is power located in this process? (Fassett & Warren, 2007; Lather, 1991) From an ethical standpoint, dialogue and dialogic methods most often are called for, with the assumption that conversation and voice are the vehicles for equality in the research process. However, the equating of dialogue with equality—indeed, with democracy—assumes a sense of community among participants, of voices that represent diverse identities, educational experiences, and political

involvement in a manner that is never reflected in everyday society. Rancière (1995) went so far as to place the impossibility of democracy on the equation of community with dialogue and the assumption that one can be achieved through the other. Rabaka (2010) agreed, noting that colonization requires work prior to dialogue, and that before oppressed peoples engage in liberation, they must engage in process of decolonization. In the field of intercultural communication, McPhail (2004) has questioned whether dialogue can realistically address injustice when racial essentialism is so deeply rooted in the symbolic address of bodies. Whiteness, too, must be "raced," especially in historically white institutions where Whites must "continuously negotiate their recognition that race matters with their denial that race exists" (Bush, 2004, p. 98).

Critical intercultural educators and advocates of social justice dialogue begin with the assumption that any hope of learning across differences requires prior work in understanding one's multiple identities as privileged or targeted social group categories. Although the privileged and/or targeted status associated with various identities in the social world is crucial to understanding of power, a limited focus on the power of the categories often misses the larger point of daily interaction: the power of communicative practices in interaction with one another. Just as coddling is not the same as (attempting to) protect vulnerable students from material that can be traumatizing, establishing more supportive spaces for marginalized groups to express their anger, weariness, sadness, and critique of the many challenges of everyday life does not, on its own, encourage any of us to engage dialogically in difference. As I see it, the work of a critical, intercultural pedagogy is negotiation among and between ethical and relational matters of embodiment.

THE ETHICS OF INTERCULTURAL ACTIVISM *PEDAGOGY*

For many years, I have negotiated the tensions between course content on culture, identity, and power and application of those ideas in activism with students and community members who inevitably have different stakes in both change and outcome. Pedagogical and ethical challenges abound inside but especially outside the intercultural communication classroom, when partnerships and projects that foreground culture and identity have differential impacts (symbolic, material) as does the intercultural itself.

The stakes of teaching students to be activists must be assessed as well. In my graduate courses often students questions the intellectual and ethical value of activism: *What does it mean to be an activist for social justice? What does it mean to be a critical (inter)cultural scholar? Can we be both?* Each semester, as we discuss what it means to enact a commitment to social

justice in our work, we always seem to get to questions of the good (academic) life. So much seems to be at stake, not only personally and politically but relationally. Social justice is a moral good, of course, but should it be a moral imperative for scholarship in communication? If so, how might that be enacted professionally?

Indeed, the community-based research assignments (required or optional over the years) in my courses seem to divide us over what constitutes social justice activism in intercultural contexts, and ways that communication scholars and teachers (should) take up activist teaching and research. Although Frey and Carragee (2007b) were careful to note that social justice work in communication is not activism per se (or vice versa), the distinction remains fuzzy for many students entering academia steeped in critical theory. Some defend their work in postcolonial theory and film, say, as activism because it serves as a call to consciousness; others see their teaching as activism. For many students interested in critical intercultural or postcolonial studies, community-based teaching and research cannot produce the changes they want to see, and, as such, might reify the very inequities they wish to eliminate. Of course, such changes are produced more easily in theory than in everyday life, as many critical pedagogy and cultural studies scholars admit. Though a good deal of research and writing has been done on the role of communication activism and community service-learning in undergraduate courses, less has been said about the preparation of our graduate students as future teachers, activists, and scholars studying and acting in a diverse, increasingly connected, and unjust, world (Applegate, 2002).

Some critical scholars in communication, education, and elsewhere have described this distinction as the "knowledge-action" divide (Ellsworth, 1997; Gewirtz, 1998; Parker, 2003; Pearce, 1989), which (perhaps unfairly) pits those who believe that it is the particular role of teacher-activists to analyze and critique social inequities to help students understand social and cultural systems of injustice against others who believe that the teacher-activist role extends outward into the communities whose existence and livelihoods are implicated in our work. Although few social justice advocates believe that university teacher-activists actually do one or the other, these questions consistently arise among students in my graduate courses and always move beyond the implications of to what use we put our work, to personal–political questions of the moral *goodness* of academia. The long tradition of academic insecurity in communication often leads to a scholarly emphasis on theoretical knowledge and understanding, even in critical-cultural activist work (Grossberg, 2015). Among some graduate students in my courses, the privileging of theoretical knowledge expected in graduate programs in Communication leads to a disparagement of activism as lacking the theoretical sophistication of (the latest) critical-cultural or postcolonial or new materialism theory.

Divisiveness over the social-scientific merit of activist scholarship, too, places those who do this work in the difficult position of establishing their qualification as objective researchers while advocating for a group or issue. According to Frey and Carragee (2007b), communication scholar–activists traditionally have responded to this pressure for legitimacy by conducting "third-person-perspective" research *about* activist groups; Frey and Carragee (2007b) argued, instead, that communication activism scholarship necessitates first-person-perspective research, in which researchers intervene to promote social justice with activist individuals, groups, organizations, and communities studied, and, thereby, demand accountability for activism as action among communities struggling for social justice. Still, Frey and Carragee's (2007b) demand for a shift from third- to first-person accountability does not necessitate rethinking the direction of intervention (from scholar to community) nor the ways that first-person accounts might recenter researchers as interpretive subjects.

The knowledge-action, theory-experience divide is reproduced, too, in the evaluation of communication activism scholarship. Often when activist projects are evaluated, even by other activist scholars (Curry Janson, 2008), their value rests in two distinct yet artificially separated areas: the moral and the scientific. When assessment of the quality of communication activism rests on its validity and reliability, its ethical commitments to objectivity, neutrality, and rigor are maintained. Standardization or normative behaviors are privileged over the particularities of performances, bodies, and moments written into science only as deviations and variability. Alternatively, when assessment resides in conformity to the narrative of social change and social justice, the moral imperative of the righteousness of researchers rarely is acknowledged. In either case, evidence that is represented in one fashion belies the moral forces that contribute to the narrative.

These academic narratives of activism, whether about the scholarly merit of theory or research, separate mind (knowing) from body (action) and being from doing. *Moral* value is assigned to academic knowledge, whereas embodied experiences of activism are denied academic legitimacy. This story of scholarly legitimacy, which continues to predominate social-scientific discourse, also assigns a position of objectivity to theoretical knowledge that activism cannot achieve. Still, few would assert that intellect without practical application realizes the aims of social justice. The connection of the personal and the political should be unpacked to address students' and teachers' fears and desires—everyday actions—as these responses/behaviors reflect and contradict dominant, oppositional, or other knowledges.

When pedagogy is addressed in communication activism work, scholars primarily have drawn from critical pedagogical (Freire, 1970; Giroux, 1997;

McLaren, 1997), and community-based learning (Horton, 1990; Morton, 1996). Critical pedagogy offers communication activism a critical theoretical perspective on schooling that places the material and institutional commitments of education at the forefront of any understanding of pedagogy in the production of knowledge. Critical pedagogy asks questions such as, "What is the central purpose of schooling in a capitalist society? What goods are being produced through education and to what uses? What is the role of teachers and students in this production?" Within the communication discipline, critical pedagogy scholars combine a concern with the structural and institutional dynamics of power, and the ways that bodies and language intersect to enact teaching, student-ing, and learning (Cooks, 2010; Fassett & Warren, 2009; Simpson, 2014).

Ethical questions at the heart of critical intercultural communication pedagogy overlap with other critiques of the social sciences that view neutrality and objectivity as central to the enterprise of both science and education. The commonality of values in both is not coincidental, according to critical pedagogy scholars (Lather, 1991). Still, moral stories of the good of recognition, different knowledges and bodies, and of difference sometimes conflict with the morality of redistribution, which requires attention to the macro-level—to policy and politics that travel beyond the realm of classroom interactions and teachers. Other tensions arise within stories of redistribution when the goal of critical pedagogy is the removal of authority and the promotion of democracy. For some teachers who embody marginalized positions outside the classroom (e.g., disabled, queer, Latina, and/or working class), such power redistribution neither is immediately accessible nor an equalizing of power relations.

Community service-learning (CSL) combines learning in the classroom with learning based in community settings. CSL is careful to distinguish itself as a pedagogy in collaboration with community members and not simply as volunteerism or data collection from community members. CSL figures prominently in communication activism research (Frey & Carragee, 2007a), but the pedagogy of CSL rarely is discussed *as* communication activism. Several models of *learning* in CSL have been developed; most notably, Morton's (1996) continuum model from charity to projects in the community to partnerships for social justice and social change. Britt (2014) identified a three-part typology of CSL pedagogies (skills-based and reflectivity, civic values and citizenship, and social justice activism) based on earlier models and perspectives developed within CSL scholarship. Each approach can be identified with a particular ethical story of activist teaching and learning, and the good of both, and each approach points to the complexities of pedagogies that attempt to connect the often-divergent goals of universities and their communities.

Table 3.1 Potential Ethical Locations for Communication Activist Pedagogy

Terms	*Metaphors*	*Potential Ethical Positions*
Communication	Dialogue	Dialogic, Contextual Narrative
	Dissemination	Democratic, Humanist, Codes
Comm Activism	Recognition	Humanist
	Redistribution	Critical
	Transformative	Dialogic
Pedagogy	Knowledge, Being, Third Person "them"	Humanist Democratic
	Action, Doing, First Person, "I"	Critical Contextual

Mapping participants' locations within ethical narratives of teaching and learning is imperative for developing pedagogical approaches to intercultural communication and activism. Although Table 3.1 is just a guidepost, it is a beginning in mapping the complex discourses in pedagogies that take up intercultural communication, ethics, and activism. More important, however, it is a place to question the values that produce these stories and what or who is made present or absent in their telling. Nonetheless, the maps drawn throughout this chapter have missed a larger point, that is, resistance to social justice and activist pedagogies.

PEDAGOGY AND RESISTANCE TO THE ETHICAL NARRATIVES IN SOCIAL JUSTICE PEDAGOGY

Resistance to instruction or to pedagogy has been characterized within the instructional communication research as misbehavior by students requires behavioral alteration techniques and methods employed by teachers to discipline students (Kearney, Plax, Smith, & Sorensen, 1988; McCroskey & Richmond, 1992; Plax, Kearney, McCroskey, & Richmond, 1986). Resistance is portrayed in that research as a failure of compliance with teachers' authority and with institutional power, and, therefore, is seen as student failure. Critical communication pedagogy (Cooks, 2010; Fassett & Warren, 2007) has responded to this portrayal of power and resistance by posing an alternative story: that of student resistance to authoritarian power and to banking or transmission models of education that do not care for or relate to their lives, knowledge, and experiences. Indeed, there is a long tradition of critical pedagogical and feminist pedagogical scholarship (Ellsworth, 1997; Gore, 1992; McLaren, 1997) that poses resistance as desire (Gallop, 1995; Hooks, 1994; Kelly, 1997; McLaren, 1997), enfleshment (McLaren, 1997; Warren, 1999), embodied as subversive (Hooks, 1994; Karemcheti, 1995; Spivak, 1993), and transformative (Keating, 2007).

Other stories of resistance to social justice and activist pedagogies have emerged in scholarship on the topic. Higginbotham (1996) and Willingham (2010), for instance, have discussed social justice educators' and scholars' moral dogmatism and, consequentially, students' resistance to narratives of social justice. Students' resistance to uncomfortable knowledge about their privilege and social group identity has been characterized as self-serving, defensive, elitist, and similar adjectives (Applebaum, 2007; Bell, 1997; Berlak, 2004). Students may actively refuse to engage with classroom curricula on whiteness, for example, because it conflicts with other more salient narratives of racial equality and colorblindness in a "postracial" society. The discourse on "coddling," too, counters teaching about whiteness in the name of socializing both dominant and marginalized groups into the realities of an inequitable society.

However, Willingham (2010) observed that White students may also resist social justice narratives about race because of overriding family and social narratives of in-group loyalties that align with U.S. conservative values of minimizing selfishness and promoting social institutions. On the other hand, Willingham noted that liberal values, which center more on harm to marginalized peoples and fairness in treatment, are front and center in social justice education. Regardless of what is believed to be the truth of any interpretation of resistance, the importance of locating resistance in ethical stories of the good, as opposed to, for instance, personal defect or misbehavior, remains imperative to learning.

CONCLUSION: PEDAGOGICAL OPENINGS AMONG THE STORIES OF THE "GOOD"

Recently I was asked to speak on a panel on microaggressions and trigger warnings that were addressed to faculty on campus. After we spoke, the floor was opened to discussion. In an echo of earlier dialogues, I conducted, the faculty described teaching about social identities on a predominately White campus in a patriarchal structure, and the (ethical) dilemmas of including, speaking about or calling on students to speak about race or microaggressions. Again, the "problem" of speaking up is the problem of speaking into narratives, of semiotics of race and embodiment, of politics, rights and entitlement. For Bahktin, all language is dialogic "utterance," only understood through the narratives, contexts, and communities that precede it and those which follow. Dialogism locates the crux of communication between individuals, social worlds, and ideologies (Juzwik, 2004). Dialogic ethics requires that we look at the narrative world from which our dilemmas emerge (one in which language ties race, for instance, to marginalized bodies) and into which our stories are

made meaningful as social action with consequences to those bodies. In the panel on trigger warnings, as faculty pondered what materials deserved trigger warnings and when they would use them, they unwittingly reinstantiated the "coddling" (Lukianoff & Haidt, 2015) argument. They expressed fear of harming all students, but especially the one or two students of color in their predominantly White classrooms. The mention of racism seemed to provoke anxiety all round. While these dilemmas are not new, have been considered "wicked problems" with no solution, perhaps what has been overlooked are the semiotics of the story. What we weren't discussing in the forum or the classroom were why and how this language became attached to particular bodies, the embedded ness of the narratives and what might happen if we changed the terms by which we speak as a community? A panelist pointed out that the wider story of trigger warnings and of higher education more broadly these days is one of entitlement, when trigger warnings could be thought of instead as a means to empowerment, should faculty members and the university community present them as opportunities for reflection and agency. How might "triggers" in the classroom be viewed if they were presented not as a threat but as an opportunity? Where conversation is shut down or closed off by the threat of conflict, there might be the opportunity for growth that talk of difference (in an environment of respect and listening) can provide.

Returning to the first dialogic question that framed this essay: How do we as critical educators address students as moral agents in a context where there is an (inter)cultural imperative to act responsively and responsibly? I think it is first important that we fully experience this communal and collective imperative to act ourselves, before we assume such imperatives for our students. What that looks like for each of us might be vastly different, what is more important is that it becomes an affective part of how we teach about relationships-in-difference. Simply put, that means we embody the change we want to see through our communicative practices. Such a move does not require street protest, but could be as significant as the insistence of placing race on white bodies, of changing the signified. If different stories of the good are a starting place for dialogue about ethics, pedagogies, and activism are not predetermined but arise through thoughtful and reflexive conversation. Within this framework, "communication is not simply talk about change, but a move toward the making of realities and sets of relationships that are different than those of the status quo" (Simpson, 2014, 94). This means that people are situated within realms of ethical possibilities and have fairly stable stories of "good" activism or pedagogy in situations of difference. However, if our positions are understood as positions, we also see openings for change. When we hold dogmatically to our stories of the good in our teaching, we miss the subtlety, the rhythm of our communal life. More urgently, we miss the opportunity to create social change through collective learning.

NOTE

1. Caveat/Disclaimer: I want to pause at the beginning of this chapter to place a (non)assertion and a disclosure. First, the (non)assertion: In writing this chapter, I do not consider myself, nor should readers, to be an expert on ethics and their role in intercultural communication activism pedagogy. Rather, I share some of my experiences in doing this work and open some questions for consideration, regardless of readers' positions on activism, pedagogy, or communication, for that matter. Second, the disclosure: For me, ethics is a journey, albeit a self-reflexive and culturally and relationally conscientious one, and not always a destination.

It is a privilege to write in this space, among scholars I admire and in the absence of others (scholars, activists, and communities) not included. As a White, middle-class, heterosexual woman, schooled in the "integrated" Southern United States, I have many privileges yet to unlearn. I have, over the course of many years in the academy, fought to find a voice and a presence in a White, male, professional world, and, in doing so, I naively assumed that my speech did not trample over others. Now I struggle to hear those (Others, students, and non-academics) whose voices and silences are not presented to me. Moreover, I struggle to make space for those voices, because without them, we all cease to be. These are not trivial concerns, and, hence, as I continue, I hope to engage readers in a conversation not only about the many ways that activists construct ethics in pedagogic contexts but also about how we position ourselves in and out of this equation.

REFERENCES

Applebaum, B. (2007). Engaging student disengagement: Resistance or disagreement? In B. Stengel (Ed.), *Philosophy of education yearbook* (p. 335–345). Urbana, IL: Philosophy of Education Society.

Applegate, J. (2002). Skating to where the puck will be: Engaged research as a funding activity. *Journal of Applied Communication Research,* 30, 2–10. doi:10.1080/00909880216597

Arnett, R. C., Arneson, P., & Bell, L. M. (2006). Communication ethics: The dialogic turn. *Communication Review,* 6, 63–93. doi:10.1080/15358590600763334

Arnett, R. C., Fritz, J. M. H., & Bell, L. M. (2009). *Communication ethics literacy: Dialogue and difference.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ayers, W. (2004). *Teaching the personal and the political: Essays on hope and justice.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Bell, L. (1997). Theoretical foundations for social justice education. In M. Adams, L. Bell, & P. Griffin (Eds.), *Teaching for diversity and social justice* (p. 3–16). New York, NY: Routledge.

Berlo, D. K. (1960). *The process of communication: An introduction to theory and practice*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Berlak, A. C. (2004). Confrontation and pedagogy: Cultural secrets, trauma, and emotion in antioppressive pedagogies. In M. Boler (Ed.), *Democratic dialogue*

in education: Troubling speech, disturbing silence (p. 123–134). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Boyer, E. L. (1987). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate.* Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Britt, L. (2014). Service-Learning in the service of social justice: Situating communication activism pedagogy within a typology of service-learning topologies. In L. Frey & D. Palmer (Eds.), *Teaching Communication Activism.* New York: Hampton Press.

Bush, M. E. L. (2004). Breaking the code of good intentions: Everyday forms of whiteness. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Buzzanell, P. M. (Ed.). (2000). *Rethinking organizational and managerial communication from feminist perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Carey, J. W. (1993). *Communication as culture: Essays on media and society*. Winchester, MA: Unwin Hyman.

Cheney, G. (2000). Interpreting interpretive research: Toward perspectives without relativism. In S. R. Corman & M. S. Poole (Eds.), *Perspectives on organization communication: Finding common ground* (p. 12–46). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Cooks, L. (2010). The communication of (critical) pedagogy and the (critical) pedagogy of communication. In D. Fassett & J. T. Warren (Eds.), *Handbook of instructional communication* (p. 293–314). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Curry Jenson, S. (2008). Rethinking social justice scholarship in media and communication. *Communication Culture, Critique,* 1, 329–334. doi:10.1111/j.1753–9137.2008.00026.x

DeVoss, D., Jasken, J., & Hayden, D. (2002). Teaching intracultural and intercultural communication: A critique and suggested method. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 16, 69–94. doi: 10.1177/1050651902016001003

Diversi, M., & Moreira, C. (2009). *Betweener talk: Decolonizing knowledge production, pedagogy, and praxis.* Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Ellsworth, E. (1997). *Teaching positions: Difference, pedagogy, and the power of address*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Fassett, D. L., & Warren, J. T. (2007). *Critical communication pedagogy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fraser, N., & Honneth, A. (2003). *Redistribution or recognition? A political–philosophical exchange* (J. Golb, J. Ingram, & C. Wilke, Trans.). New York, NY: Verso.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M. R. Ramos, Trans.). New York, NY: Herder and Herder.

Frey, L. R., & Caragee, K. M. (Eds.). (2007a). *Communication activism* (2 Vols.). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Frey, L. R., & Carragee, K. M. (2007b). Introduction: Communication activism as engaged scholarship. In L. R. Frey & K. M. Carragee (Eds.), *Communication activism*, 2, 1–64. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Gallop, J. (Ed.). (1995). *Pedagogy: A question of impersonation*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Gewirtz, S. (1998). Conceptualizing social justice in education: Mapping the territory. *Journal of Education Policy*, 13, 469–484. doi:10.1080/0268093980130402

Giroux, H. A. (1997). *Pedagogy and the politics of hope: Theory, culture and schooling: A critical reader*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Gore, J. (1992). What we can do for you! What can "we" do for "you"?: Struggling over empowerment in critical and feminist pedagogy. In C. Luke & J. Gore (Eds.), *Feminisms and critical pedagogy* (p. 54–73). New York, NY: Routledge.

Gudykunst,W. B., Yang, S. M., & Nishida, T. (1985). A cross cultural test of uncertainty reduction theory. *Human Communication Research*, 11(3), 407–454.

Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of communication action* (T. McCarthy, Trans.). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Higginbotham, E. (1996). Getting all students to listen: Analyzing and coping with student resistance. *American Behavioral Scientist,* 40, 203–211. doi:10.1177/0002764296040002011

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

Horton, M. (with Kohl, J., & Kohl, H.). (1998). *The long haul: An autobiography*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Karamcheti, I. (1995). Caliban in the classroom. In J. Gallop (Ed.), *Pedagogy: The question of impersonation* (p. 138–146). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Kearney, P., Plax, T. G., Smith, V. R., & Sorensen, G. (1988). Effects of teacher immediacy and strategy type on college student resistance to on-task demands. *Communication Education,* 37, 54–67. doi:10.1080/03634528809378703

Keating, A. (2007). *Teaching transformation: Transcultural classroom dialogues*. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.

Kelly, U. (1997). *Schooling desire: Literacy, cultural politics and pedagogy*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Lukianoff, G. and Haidt, (2015, September). The coddling of the American mind. *The Atlantic* http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2015/09/the-coddling-of-the-american-mind/399356/. Accessed December 15, 2015.

Martin, J. N., Nakayama, T. K., & Carbaugh, D. (2012). The history and development of the study of intercultural communication and applied linguistics. In J. Jackson (Ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Intercultural Communication* (p. 17–36). New York, NY: Routledge.

Mendoza, S. L., Halualani, R., & Drzewiecka, J. A. (2009). Moving the discourse on identities in intercultural communication: Structure, culture, and resignifications. *Communication Quarterly*, 50(3–4), 312–327. doi: 10.1080/01463370209385666

McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1992). *Power in the classroom: Communication, control, and concern*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

McLaren, P. (1997). *Revolutionary multiculturalism: Pedagogies of dissent for the new millennium*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

McPhail, M. L. (2004). Race and the (im)possibility of dialogue. In R. Anderson, L. A. Baxter & K. N. Cissna (Eds.), *Dialogue: Theorizing difference in communication studies* (p. 209–224). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Morton, K. (1996). Issues related to integrating service-learning into the curriculum. In B. Jacoby & Associates (Eds.), *Service-learning in higher education: Concepts and practices* (p. 276–296). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Parker, W. C. (2003). *Teaching democracy: Unity and diversity in public life.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Pearce, W. B. (1989). *Communication and the human condition*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Peters, J. D. (1999). *Speaking into the air: A history of the idea of communication.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Plax, T. G., Kearney, P., McCroskey, J. G., & Richmond, V. P. (1986). Power in the classroom VI: Verbal control strategies, nonverbal immediacy and affective learning. *Communication Education,* 35, 43–55. doi:10.1080/03634528609388318

Pusey, M. (1987). *Jürgen Habermas*, New York, NY: Tavistock.

Rabaka, R. (2010). *Forms of fanonism: Frantz Fanon's critical theory and the dialectics of decolonization.* Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Rancière, J. (1995). *On the shores of politics* (L. Heron, Trans.). New York, NY: Verso.

Reddy, M. J. (1979). The conduit metaphor: A case of frame conflict in our language about language. In I. A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought* (p. 284–324). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Shannon, C. E., & Weaver, W. (1949). *A mathematical model of communication.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Simpson, J. S. (2014). Communication activism pedagogy: Theoretical frameworks, central concepts, and challenges. In L. Frey & D. Palmer (Eds.), *Teaching Communication Activism.* New York: Hampton Press.

Sorrells, K. (2012). Intercultural training in the global context. In J. Jackson (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of language and intercultural communication* (p. 372–389). London and New York: Routledge.

Spivak, G. (1993). *Outside in the teaching machine*. New York, NY: Routledge.

United Nations. (1948, December 10). *Universal declaration of human rights*. Retrieved from http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr

Warren, J. T. (1999). The body politic: Performance, pedagogy and the power of enfleshment. *Text and Performance Quarterly,* 19*,* 257–265. doi:10.1080/10462939909366266

Willingham, D. T. (2010, April 27). What do students have against social justice education? *Teachers College Record.*

Section II

DOING CRITICAL INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION PEDAGOGY

Chapter 4

(Critical) Love is a Battlefield

Implications for a Critical Intercultural Pedagogical Approach

Bernadette Marie Calafell and
Robert Gutierrez-Perez

A particular thing has started happening in my graduate classes in culture and communication: students have been appropriating the discourse of love to attack one another. I have started to expect it much like Kanye West's, "Yo Taylor, I'm gonna let you finish, but … ." However, the difference is I agree with Kanye and respect what he said (Calafell, 2015). At any moment in a classroom that is centered on culture and difference, there is the possibility of conflict—it can feel like a battlefield. We know this as instructors of intercultural communication and as instructors committed to a critical performance pedagogy. Given the possibilities and implications that exist in an intercultural classroom, in this chapter we explore the tensions of pedagogically performing critical love as a guiding theoretical framework and praxis that is central to critical intercultural communication pedagogy. We argue that critical love must be undergirded by a queerness that keeps it queerly accountable to intersectional power and cultural nuance.

To explore these issues, we draw on performative writing to enact multiple interactions or narratives from our varied experiences in the intercultural classroom and beyond. Bernadette, as a full professor with 18 years of teaching experience at four different universities, and Robert, as an assistant professor with eight years of teaching experience at three different universities, blend our narratives together in points of convergence that perform the nexus of our queer Chicanx experiences in the academy. Though our experiences have differences, our naming the similar points of oppression we encounter is important. Thus, you may read our narratives and immediately know who is who, other times, you may wonder, and we welcome this ambiguity and invite you to grapple with this performative writing choice. The narratives we provide are not meant to be drawn from or indicative of any one

classroom or class, rather they are demonstrative of each of our experiences across our time in academia.

Based on this, we argue critical love in the academy must be queer, and furthermore, it must be driven by a queer politics that holds it accountable to being intersectional, non-binary, and non-hierarchical. Holman Jones (2016) writes, "Queer theory and queering practices show us the 'critical' in critical autoethnography by putting theory into action" (p. 231). Thus, we take Holman Jones's (2016) words as a call to action in this chapter as we use performative writing to theorize through the body. Performative writing, like theories in the flesh, allows us to embody our Other experiences on the page. They implicate the reader through what we hope is an affective and "evocative" response (Pollock, 1998). Performative writing does something in the world; it is "consequential" (Pollock, 1998). Pelias (2005) further argues, "Performative writing turns the personal into the political and the political into the personal" (p. 420). By utilizing a critical and queer approach to love, we write the political implications of those who dare to love in the battlefield of academia, focusing especially on the bodies of those deemed monstrous (Calafell, 2015).

More than 10 years ago I came across bell hooks's (2001) book *All About Love: New Visions.* It came to me in a moment when I desperately needed it. I was trapped in a tenure track position that was literally killing me through daily assaults of racialized sexual harassment (Calafell, 2014; Calafell, 2015; Faulkner, Calafell, & Grimes, 2009). hooks (2001) inspired me to find spaces of refuge or homeplace, even in a space that was incredibly hostile (Calafell, 2007a). The mentoring relationships with my undergraduate and graduate students of color were my saving grace as I theorized the possibility and politics of love as an important and necessary part of the critical reciprocal relationship between faculty of color and students of color in the academy (Calafell, 2007a). These spaces, which became our homeplaces, were central to our survival in an academy not made for us. At the heart of my discussion of love and mentoring was vulnerability (Calafell, 2007a). As Oliver (2001) argues, "Opening a public space of love and generosity is crucial to opening space beyond domination" (p. 221). In the academy, a place that often reviles emotion, the act of love is revolutionary and resistive (Calafell, 2007a). In my essay, "Mentoring and Love: An Open Letter" (Calafell, 2007a), I quoted Oliver (2001) who writes, "Falling in love, the otherness of the other, is the greatest joy; and vulnerability in the face of the other is a sweet surrender, a gift rather than a sacrifice" (p. 224) (Calafell, 2007a, p. 438). I augmented Oliver (2001) by offering, "Given all I know now, I believe that falling in love with the Otherness not only of others *but of ourselves* is a sweet surrender" (Calafell, 2007a, p. 438). While I still believe this, I am aware of the naivety and hope that undergirded the writing at this time. I still have hope. I refuse to give up hope. However, it is more tempered and my trust is more guarded.

In addition to my commitment to love, I must also own and understand the productivity of anger as a source of strength and resilience.

The essay that came from that experience (Calafell, 2007a) has been by far the one that has received the most feedback, and it has been overwhelmingly positive. I wrote that essay during my first few years as an assistant professor, working solely with undergraduate and master's students. Now more than 10 years later, as a full professor having advised 12 doctoral students to completion, currently serving as the advisor for several others, and acting as a committee member and informal mentor in many cases, my views have been altered, as I have wondered at times if I was naive. Griffin (2012) extends my work (Calafell, 2007a) on love in the academy through her discussion of critical love. She argues that critical intercultural communication work demands what she terms "soul work" that requires practitioners to put themselves "out there in vulnerable, nerve-racking, and downright terrifying ways" (Griffin, 2012, p. 214). Griffin (2012) further states that the demands of soul work changes us. Undergirded by generosity, critical love is the act of practicing a critical intercultural communication identity that understands that "the validation of identity differences and the humanization of people is what swings the balance in the balance between love and apathy" (Griffin, 2012, p. 217). At its heart, critical love is about coalition building with students across difference (Griffin, 2012).

QUEERING CRITICAL LOVE

While jogging on the walking trail behind my house, I glimpse a peek of a white cottontail on the right side of the cement path that winds up a steep hill. I slow my pace as I gaze at the cottontail's feet facing toward me and the bunny ears facing the sounds of the high desert meadow. The cottontail is not white like the stereotypical illusion ingrained in us to represent innocence; no, this cottontail rabbit is black, brown, and grey to survive in his watershed mountain environment. His hue is marked with generations of experience and sacrifice, and like his ancestors before him, blood marks are on his neck. I can still see it oozing like syrup in my mind's eye. As if he *knows* that I *know* what is happening to him, the cottontail opens his eyes and *sees* me—we are connected. I am the only witness to his death. This is his homeplace, yet he is never safe. A part of me died with this cottontail in this moment. Is this queer? Is this critical love? Critical intercultural communication pedagogy must work to create homeplaces for queer people of color by building spaces of belonging that embrace and foster queer utopian politics.

Homeplaces are often not safe spaces for queer people of color in this historical and political moment. Whether looking at statistics that note LGBT

Latina/o youth's fears of familial abandonment because of their sexuality (Human Rights Campaign, 2012) or the public "is he" or "isn't he" dance in media reports of LGBT Latina/o celebrities (Calafell, 2007b; Sowards, 2000), being a queer Xicano in the face of a Trump presidency, or a queer Chicana in the face of unrelenting pressure from the modern/colonial gender system, our hearts begin to bleed and blur. Multiple layers of woundings and strivings have led to our *conocimiento* (understanding) that love in the academy *is* queer. Prompted by our queerness as an embodied experience and a (neo) colonial condition of our multiple interconnected communities, we cannot hide our anger "to spare your guilt, nor hurt feelings, nor empowering anger; for to do so insults and trivializes all our efforts" (Lorde, 2007, p. 130). Utilizing love and anger as an affective stylization is a conscious move to not hide from or within identity politics. Rather we believe that affect is a useful tool within the performative writer's tool belt to flesh out a theory from everyday lived experiences of monstrosity and marginalization.

We understand that critical love must not be driven by a yearning for spaces of belonging that are focused only on desires for racial connection. They must be undergirded by queerness. Love in the academy is itself queer. This queerness holds critical love accountable to an intersectional ethics that refuses to prioritize race over queerness. What we have witnessed is that critical love fails when it is tied to simplistic understandings of identities that demand others negate part of who they are at the service of coalition. This is certainly not a new critique. However, within the context of pedagogies of culture, power, mentoring, and classroom dynamics, we must find spaces of critical love that are driven by queerness and intersectionality. Lorde (2007) argues that any discussion of racism must include a discussion of anger. We agree, and suggest that any discussion of heteronormativity, must include a discussion of anger. Lorde's (2007) argument about the productive/generative power of anger guides us as it underscores our theorization of love. Critical love can be driven by a generative anger that demands better; a utopic politics that is always reaching for something more (Muñoz, 2009; Calafell, 2015). We want something better because we are tired of being treated like monsters.

Through mythos, imagination, art, and poetry, we are guided by Gloria Anzaldúa (2012) (Anzaldúa & Keating, 2000, 2009, 2015) who spent a lifetime theorizing the queer, embodied, and spiritual experience ascribed to being *una nepantlera*. These monstrous mediators are known to have a tolerance for ambiguity, and they often experience some combination of public shaming, gas lighting, surveillance, online slander, derogatory language, and/or *chismé* on a daily basis (Anzaldúa & Keating, 2015; Calafell, 2015). Marked as hopeless and unrespectable, town leaders whisper about how we will infect others, how our queer theories and performances are worthless, and how we are so angry that the villagers should scapegoat our Other bodies (Calafell, 2015). As

a beginning assistant professor, I feel like hands are on the windows looking into my most private moments and thoughts, and I can't help but crack under the pressure. Glass breaking everywhere, *nepantlera* scholars take up our generative anger and dive into the traumas that are breaking down our door. To imagine through aesthetics how queer worldmaking is always in process, always just on the horizon even when our homeplaces are kicked in (Muñoz, 2009), we embrace our monstrosity as an act of survival. When our queer of color bodies are pulled out to be sacrificed in the town square—again—we transform and escape not through violence and hate but through a critical intercultural communication pedagogy guided by love and vulnerability.

A PEDAGOGY OF VULNERABILITY AND LOVE

Our stories are not alone. In the past when telling colleagues and friends about some of the challenges I have faced from/with graduate students of color studying culture and communication, they have wondered if part of it was because of my pedagogical-based approach toward vulnerability and love. At conference panels and in hushed whispers of offices other queer and/or faculty of color share similar stories. Mentors of color have told me horror stories that led them to move to institutions that do not have graduate programs. Others find ways to persist and survive despite the continual assaults and microaggressions from colleagues and graduate students alike. Stories of students who wanted to use them for their names or professional recognition, but not any of the academic guidance they might offer, are frequent. Sadly, their stories and our conversations bring me comfort. They also remind me that, "Vulnerability can be a liability" (Bhattacharya, 2016, p. 310). The hurt and anger we have experienced by people we assumed would know better than to ask us to erase our queerness to solely focus on our race is at the center of this piece. Like Lorde (2007), I believe in the productivity of anger. She writes,

> anger expressed and translated into action in the service of our vision and our future is a liberating and strengthening act of clarification, for it is in the painful process of this translation that we identify who are our allies with whom we have grave differences, and who are our genuine enemies. (Lorde, 2007, p.127)

These experiences and conversations have caused me to question this pedagogical approach and what happens when the language of critical love and feminist ethics become weapons.

I've often wondered if the changes I'm witnessing are generational. Elsewhere, I have written about the insulted narcissist or the *aggravated*

entitlement of some of the current generation of students (Calafell, 2015), which led me to question what happens when the millennial, me, or selfie generation goes to graduate school? As a former graduate student of yours, I must admit that one of the many issues worked out through *our* mentoring relationship has been my own performances of insulted narcissist and *aggravated* entitlement. Was it our queerness that allowed this to happen? There was conflict, anger, and love in our relationship too. Although dominant narratives of Latinxs would have the reader believe that the gap between Latina and Latino is a short hop and a skip, this piece is a testament to the many labors of love that have built the bridge between us plank by plank. We had to overcome so much to get to the moment of writing together. A pedagogy of vulnerability and love is about bridge-building, which is never easy or automatic. How can I show not tell the reader how to navigate this battlefield called love in academia?

BRIDGING DIFFERENCE/BURNING BRIDGES

The culture and communication classroom brings together students from diverse perspectives. Some are more versed in critical theory than others. Some are social scientists that employ quantitative methods. The class also brings together diverse bodies and identities. All of whom have come together to think intersectionally by centering the voices of (queer) women of color, transfeminists, and transnational feminists. However, recently what has emerged is a continual working against my pedagogical choices. In my sometime role as a rhetorical critic, I have argued for understanding rhetorical texts on their own terms (Calafell & Delgado, 2004). This sentiment also makes its way into my classroom. I do not expect performances of owning one's privilege overnight. Instead, much like one of my former instructors, Della Pollock, I am interested in process; the change that happens incrementally throughout the course of a semester or quarter. I have tried to model vulnerability in my classroom, often drawing on my own processes and experiences. Like Bhattacharya (2016),

> I crave discourses of vulnerability, in which we unmask, allow ourselves to be genuinely seen, without the need to wield weapons for our safety. Discourses that enable us to work with honesty; to address prejudices, belief systems, and pain; and to discuss the possibilities for discovering a way forward based on connection, interrelatedness, and our shared humanity. (p. 311)

I frame the class and vulnerability through an ethic of love, specifically drawing on my previous work (Calafell, 2007a), work by my former advisee

Rachel Griffin (2012), and of course, hooks (2001). In doing this, I ask students to engage each other with compassion, consider the varied life experiences and identities we bring to the classroom, to be in dialogue with one another, and to meet each other where they/we are at. In the best-case scenario, it works. But what happens when discourses that are supposed to be empowering and loving are appropriated in the name of disciplining? What happens when calls for critical love lack compassion?

> *White/Chicanx/cisgender/straight student: "I'm saying this from an ethic of love…(insert attack, insult, and diversion from the discussion of queerness in the work of queer women of color so that race is prioritized)"*
>
> Translation: "I'm saying this in the service of the violence of heteronormativity and my own ego …"

C. Winter Han (2013) writes of the violence that can happen in queer communities when White gay men do not recognize their White privilege. He argues:

> Shared experiences of oppression rarely lead to sympathy for others who are also marginalized, traumatized, and minimized by the dominant society. Rather, all too miserably, those who should naturally join in fighting discrimination find it more comforting to join their oppressing in oppressing others. (Han, 2013, p. 94)

Sadly, his words ring true at times in the classroom. Although I have written extensively about how queer love is about embracing difference and how the particulars of our queer communities matter (Gutierrez-Perez, 2015a, 2015b), a White gay male student in a recent intercultural communication class tested my theorizations of love and the limits of my anger. I felt relieved when my guest lecturer on embodied migration and performance noted this same student when I asked her for feedback about her experience in the class. It wasn't just me.

During the 2016 campaign for the democratic presidential nomination, Chelsea Clinton visited our university on behalf of her mother, and this same student—on this very public stage—performed many of the same acts of insulted narcissism and aggrieved entitlement in his questioning that had driven me up the wall as his former teacher. Rather than feeling angry, I felt like I had failed this student. Here we were, the only queer people in the room in a university context where queerness becomes ascribed with monstrosity as a norm automatically, yet we could not create a bridge between each other. Griffin (2012) writes that critical love bears witness to difference and at times, conflict. I remember vividly how his performances of whiteness and masculinity were continuously creating violence onto other students and myself in the classroom space. Did he feel like his queer, brown, and working-class

instructor was disciplining and silencing his queer voice? Did he feel like I should have had his back even when he said *that?* Okay, so maybe I am angry. No, maybe I am pissed. I shouldn't be afraid to go to class as my whole self. I shouldn't feel the horror of White and/or upper-/middle-class students banding together to terrorize me. Why do you feel so entitled to speak over everyone anytime you want? Am I not serving you what you ordered? This is *your* first critical intercultural communication class, not mine. The bridge is burning. Now what?

In these classes we are bridging, or at least trying. Merla Watson (2014) argues that Anzaldúa's conception of bridging sees it as "both a metaphor of becoming and a political act of loving, as well as a tactical mechanism for fostering dialog across categories of difference. Bridging, in this way, promotes and paves the way for self-reflexive alliance and coalitional building, or revolutionary love" (p. 179). When I teach, I am offering my queer, Chicana self on the altar to center the voices of queer women of color who are also engaging in the act of bridging. Critical intercultural communication pedagogy asks that as instructors we are mindful of our own identities and our experiences as we engage our students. Bridging is a central pedagogical tactic in critical intercultural communication pedagogy. It models a desire to engage with the Other through humility and compassion, even when the Other reflects some aspects of our own identities.

Did you just (un)queer Cherrie Moraga or Gloria Anzaldúa? Why would you even want to? Who does this serve? Don't you know that the master's tools will never dismantle the master's house? (Lorde, 2007) "When did equality become a zero-sum game?" (Lorde, 2007, p. 98) Like Hooks (1996):

> I want there to be a place in the world where people can engage in one another's differences in a way that is redemptive, full of hope and possibility. Not this "In order to love you, I must make you something else." That's what domination is all about, that in order to be close to you, I must possess you, remake and recast you. (p. 122)

As Ghabra (2015) states, it is so much easier to own our oppressions than it is our own our privileges.

As a queer woman of color teaching classes in culture and communication that actively decenters canonical voices by creating syllabi centered on work by people of color, I know what Ghabra (2015) is saying quite well. Bridging across difference is hard. Merla Watson (2014) acknowledges the labor of bridging as it "enables individuals to connect to others so as to transform and shift the boundaries between self and other without effacing various histories, desires, and differences. Bridging, a labor of love, requires work and does not provide comfortable or safe spaces" (p. 180). Furthermore, bridging can

never be taken for granted. It is "demanding physically, intellectually, spiritually, emotionally" (Merla Watson, 2014, p. 181). Thus, as Merla Watson (2014) argues, "we cannot always participate in this process of connection: we cannot always be 'activists'" (p. 181). Like Anzaldúa (2012), I understand the Coatlicue space as a site of depression and renewal. My chair asks if I will teach a course I created on race and popular culture. I tell her that I need a break from the emotional exhaustion of a classroom that I know may bring a great deal of challenges. She understands and is supportive. My choice is an act of self-love. I tell her instead I will teach a course on women of color feminisms. Naively I thought it would be less challenging. Had I forgotten the horrors of the last time I taught the course almost seven years ago? I am always bridging, but I am not prepared to be walked on all over again.

(QUEER) LOVE IS A BATTLEFIELD

Do I want to open these old wounds? Am I sure that we are past this battle? hooks (2001) writes that love is "the will to nurture our own and another's spiritual growth" (p. 6) and that love "is most often defined as a noun, yet ... we would all love better if we used it as a verb" (p. 4). As a verb, love is an act that must be taught, proliferated, and embodied, and "to truly love we must learn to mix various ingredients—care, affection, recognition, respect, commitment, and trust, as well as honest and open communication" (Hooks, 2015, p. 5). I know that yours is a pedagogy of vulnerability that "is not only an ethical or normative question, but also a political one" (Petherbridge, 2016, p. 599), but how can I admit to the reader that when we first met I did not act toward you with love? How can I write (with you over my shoulder) knowing that I hurt you?

Throughout our mentoring relationship, I have both loved and hated how you give me everything I need, but not everything I want. How can I thank you enough? hooks (2001) explains that "patriarchal masculinity requires of boys and men not only that they see themselves as more powerful and superior to women but that they do whatever it takes to maintain their controlling position" (p. 40). As a doctoral student, I remember meeting with you in that first week to discuss my work and yours and how we could possibly work together on a project. I remember how you leaned into my ear before you left convocation to make the appointment; how I excitedly went over all the details with my husband that afternoon; and how I immediately used my male privilege and power to attempt to dominate your space. Falling into tropes of monstrosity, I projected centuries of racialized, classed, and sexualized stereotypes and tropes of women of color onto your body to reproduce systems of domination that daily oppressed you (Calafell, 2015). Years later,

we are writing this essay on mentoring, love, and intercultural pedagogy together—this did not just happen. It took acts of love that viewed yours and my own spiritual growth as mutually important. It took an acknowledgment that love is queer.

I wish I could show you (and the reader) how painful it was to be queer, poor, and brown in the harsh and unrelenting battlefield of academia without you as my mentor. Without your strategic advice, I was gaslighted into believing that the racial, classed, and homophobic micro- and macroaggressions I was experiencing were not real. When graduate students actively campaigned against my run for department service to "teach me a lesson" and to "knock me down a few pegs," I had no one to advocate for me from behind the closed doors or to tell me the *chismé* about who to trust and why. When no one wanted me as their advisee, when other graduate students avoided eye contact with me in the hallways, or when my queerness was disciplined, I knew that I had screwed up and that I needed to be deeply reflexive and not defensive in this moment. I needed to a new definition of love that acknowledge our queerness, our differences, and our spirits. I am not writing this to hurt you or to offer any excuses for the choices that I made because the actions that I chose created and contributed to a culture of lovelessness. I chose not to "cry or express hurt, feelings of loneliness, or pain," and instead, I decided that I "must be tough" and "mask true feelings" (hooks, 2001, p. 38). And now, I am choosing to stop pretending that I wasn't miserable without you. I cried alone staring at walls.

Because you believe that, "Vulnerability is a critical category that reveals the tensions and ambiguities as well as the richness and the perplexity of social relations" (Petherbridge, 2016, p. 601), we have reached a place where you now confide in me when another person betrays your love. I admit that I usually see a bit of myself and my own choices in these moments, yet from this side of the bridge, I see how vulnerability is courageous. It takes an unrelenting open-heartedness. I mean you believed in me even after learning that I had a lot to learn. You gave me a homeplace to be brown and poor and queer without judgment and without having to leave any of my identities at the door, and here is the thing—we *worked* for it. We chose to not let the bridge burn, and although we were vulnerable, we courageously got to the true labor of critical and queer love. I trusted you and you were committed to me; we treated each other with respect and mutual recognition; we performed acts of care and affection; and oh yes, we had some open and honest communication about (critical) love. How can I explain what a big deal it is that we are finally on the same page together? How can I show that I *still* have a lot to learn? Bridges need constant maintenance (Anzaldúa, 1990).

Critical love is a labor. Within the context of critical intercultural communication pedagogy, critical love requires a continual reflexive turn. It is not

enough as an instructor or mentor to say that you are bridging. Sometimes bridges need to be reinforced, pulled back, or rebuilt. Bridging is a reciprocal act; a delicate and necessary dance for critical intercultural communication pedagogues. It is a work in process that requires that we be constantly attentive, vulnerable, and critically queer. At times my relationship with you has been guided by my own insecurities and my failings. I often wish I could have been better. I wish I could have been strong enough to be there for you. Perhaps I read my insecurities and ego onto your body? I anticipated your arrival on campus with great enthusiasm. I made sure everyone saw your file. I excitedly advocated for you. You were the kind of student I dreamed of working with when I started teaching doctoral students. I wonder if my expectations for you were unrealistic? As you say, it took a while for us to get here. My anger at what I perceived to be slights were most likely driven by my uncertainty about myself in an environment where I constantly felt threatened and in some ways inauthentic. You were a mirror to me because of our similarities and because I imagined you reflected how others saw me. But the mirror transformed.

Lorde (2007) argues, "The angers of women can transform difference through insight into power. For anger between peers births change, not destruction, and the discomfort and sense of loss it often causes is not fatal, but a sign of growth" (p. 131). My anger and uncertainty were eventually transformed into beautiful growth. Perhaps we both needed to do our individual self-care and growth to be able to come together as we have? You were the only one who really saw me. You did not ask me to put aside part of myself because you knew the importance of being understood as a complex being whose identities defy easy categorization. For the first time in a long time, I was allowed to be me—a raised working class, queer, femme Chicana. Our bond was further forged and solidified in the constant battles we fought together against the heteronormativity that pervaded our shared spaces. Even when no words were spoken, only knowing glances exchanged, you made me feel safe. Two brown queers finally finding a space of mutual respect, possibility, and yes, critical love. Thank you for being patient and not giving up on me and the relationship that we have now made. I only wish we could have gotten here sooner, but I will always fight to keep the bond strong and protect it from others who want to destroy it.

SUEÑOS DE AMOR

We dream of an academy that exists without abuse. We dream of a space that allows us to grow rather than be crushed. We dream of departments where oppression is not so normalized that we become the problem when we

name it. We dream of colleagues that fight against the abuse and assaults we experience consistently. We dream of a space where all of our identities are honored. All of these dreams are undergirded by a desire for performances of critical love in the academy. In this chapter we have drawn on our experiences as queer Chicanx teachers and practitioners of critical intercultural communication and pedagogy. Through a revisiting of previous work in culture and communication that explores the possibility of love as a practical and theoretical framework, we have used our lived experiences to complicate critical love. We argue that critical love as a key aspect of critical intercultural pedagogy must be driven by queerness. Queerness moves discussions of culture and communication beyond a race-specific focus that has long dominated the field, and by centering intersectionality, which allows for non-binary and non-hierarchical understandings of identities, we shift to a coalition-based approach to understandings of power and privilege that resists the urge to play Oppression Olympics and/or critical despots in the intercultural classroom, in the academy, and everyday life.

Thus, we urge critical intercultural communication pedagogues to consider the role of critical love in the classroom and in mentoring relationships as a necessary manifestation of critical intercultural communication pedagogy. However, love must be critically queer and intersectional in order to consider power beyond simplistic binaries that reinforce oppositional politics. For example, Cohen (1997) asks us to consider how women of color who may be working-class single mothers have experienced the stigmatization of their sexuality similar to queers of color. She argues that we must move beyond simplistic understandings of the queer/straight binary to consider how we might come to understand each other and coalesce around our shared experiences of marginalization. Rather than seeing only our differences or asking each other to understand identity in terms of single-axis thinking, Cohen (1997) offers an approach that asks us to complicate intersectionality queerly. This move underlies our approach to critical love. As both Calafell (2007a) and Griffin (2012) argue, the practice of critical love is coalitional as it oscillates between the I and the we (as I/we have done in this essay) as it asks us to be actively reflexive about our relationship to power and possibility. Additionally, and importantly, a critical relationship to love as an intercultural pedagogical approach does not shy away from anger and conflict.

This anger and productivity is important in relationship forming and coalition building. Griffin (2012) rightly notes the role of conflict within critical love, and we have attempted to show this through our narratives by drawing on Lorde's (2007) work. By owning our anger and by productively working through it together, we model in the very writing of this essay an act of critical love. Further, it is important to explicitly note that it is women of color feminists who guide our thinking. These *mujeres de color* told us to

be vulnerable on the page and to tell our stories. They told us to enter that place of solitude and darkness—the Coatlicue state—which Anzaldúa (2015) describes as the underworld and/or the realm of the soul and the imagination. Do you not believe us when we tell you that the wind shifted from the East to the West? We heard *La Llorona* calling from the darkness for us to face our fears, our anger, and our depression. She wailed, *¡Ay, mis hijos!* (Moreman and Calafell, 2008, p. 314), and like good children, we listened. We went down to the river obediently. I remember watching her drown each one of us individually. I waited patiently for my turn. Under the water, we cried together and shared our pain, and we finally dealt with all the *mierda* between us. Critical love is a battlefield. A kind of borderlands space between us that rages with conflict but is full of possibilities for critical intercultural approaches to pedagogy and everyday life. If it helps, if it is comforting for you to know, we could not have written this essay without each other.

REFERENCES

Anzaldúa, G. (1990). Bridge, drawbridge, sandbar or island: Lesbians-of-color hacienda alianzas. In L. Albrecht & R. M. Brewer (Eds.), *Bridges of power: Women's multicultural alliances* (pp. 216–231). Philadelphia, PA: New Society.

Anzaldúa, G. (2012). *Borderlands/la frontera: The new mestiza (4th ed.).* San Francisco, CA: Aunt Lute.

Anzaldúa, G. & Keating, A. L. (Ed.). (2000). *Interviews/entrevistas.* New York: Routledge.

Anzaldúa, G. & Keating, A. L. (Ed.). (2009). *The Gloria Anzaldua reader.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Anzaldúa, G. & Keating, A. L. (Ed.). (2015). *Light in the dark/luz en lo escuro: Rewriting, identity, spirituality, reality.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Bhattacharya, K. (2016). The vulnerable academic: Personal narratives and strategic de/colonizing of academic structures. *Qualitative Inquiry,* 22, 309–321. Print. doi: 10.1177/1077800415615619

Calafell, B. M. (2007a). Mentoring and love: An open letter. *Cultural Studies ⇔ Critical Methodologies,* 7, 425–441. doi: 10.1177/1532708607305123

Calafell, B M. (2007b). *Latina/o communication studies: Theorizing performance.* New York: Peter Lang.

Calafell, B. M. (2014). Did it happen because of your race or sex?: University sexual harassment policies and the move against intersectionality. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women's Studies,* 35*,* 75–95.

Calafell, B. M. (2015). *Monstrosity, performance, and race in contemporary Culture.* New York: Peter Lang.

Calafell, B. M. & Delgado, F. P. (2004). Reading Latina/o images: Interrogating *Americanos*. *Critical Studies in Media Communication,* 21*,* 1–21. doi: 10.1080/0739318042000184370

Cohen, C. (1997). Punks, bulldaggers, and welfare queens: The radical potential of queer politics? *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies,* 3, 437–465. doi: 10.1215/10642684–3-4–437

Faulkner, S., Calafell, B. M., & Grimes, D. (2009). Hello Kitty goes to college: Poemsabout harassment in the academy. In M. Prendergrast, E. Leggo & P. Sameshima (Eds.), *Poetic inquiry: Vibrant voices in the social sciences* (pp. 187–208). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Ghabra, H. (2015). Through my own gaze: An Arab feminist struggling with patriarchal Arabness through Western hegemony. *Liminalities: A Journal of Performance Studies,* 11, 1–16.

Griffin, R. (2012). Navigating the politics of identity/identities and exploring the promise of critical love. In N. Bardham & M. Orbe (Eds.), *Identity research and intercultural communication: Reflections and future directions* (pp. 207–221). Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Gutierrez-Perez, R. M. (2015a). Disruptive ambiguities: The potentiality of Jotería critique in communication studies. *Kaleidoscope: A Graduate Journal of Qualitative Communication Research,* 14, 89–99.

Gutierrez-Perez, R. M. (2015b). Brown fingers ran down. In D. B. Goltz & J. Zingsheim (eds.), *Queer Praxis: Questions for LGBTQ Worldmaking* (pp. 41–54). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Han, C. W. (2013). Darker shades of queer: Race and sexuality at the margins. In S. Tarrant (Ed.), *Men speak out: Views on gender, sex, and power* (pp. 94–101). New York: Routledge.

Holman Jones, S. (2016). Living bodies of thought: The "critical" in critical autoethnography. *Qualitative Inquiry,* 22, 228–237. doi: 10.1177/1077800415622509

hooks, B. (1996). *Reel to real: Race, class, and sex at the movies.* New York: Routledge.

hooks, B. (2001). *All about love: New visions.* New York: HarperCollins.

Human Rights Campaign Foundation. (2012). Supporting and Caring for our Latino LGBT Youth. Retrieved from http://www.hrc.org/youth-report/latino-youth

Lorde, A. (2007). *Sister outsider: Essays and speeches.* Berkeley, CA: Crossing Press.

Merla-Watson, C. J. (2014). Revolutionary love: Bridging differential terrains of empire. In E. D. Hernandez & E. Rodriguez y Gibson (Eds.), *The un/making of Latino citizenship: Culture, politics, and aesthetics* (pp. 167–189). New York: Palgrave McMillian.

Moreman, S. T., & Calafell, B. M. (2008). Buscando para nuestros hijos: Utilizing La Llorona for cultural critique. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication*, 1(4), 309–326. http://doi.org/10.1080/17513050802344647

Munoz, J. E. (2009). *Cruising utopia: The then and here of queer futurity.* New York: New York University Press.

Oliver, K. (2001). *Witnessing: Beyond recognition.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Pelias, R. (2005). Performative writing as scholarship: An apology, an argument, an anecdote. *Cultural Studies⇔Critical Methodologies,* 5, 415–424. doi: 10.1177/1532708605279694

Petherbridge, D. (2016). What's critical about vulnerability? Rethinking interdependence, recognition, and power. *Hypatia: A Journal of Feminist Philosophy,* 31, 589–604. doi: 10.1111/hypa.12250

Pollock, D. (1998). Performative writing. In P. Phelan & J. Lane (Eds.), *The ends of performance* (pp. 73–103). New York: New York University Press.

Sowards, S. K. (2000). Juan Gabriel and audience interpretation: Cultural impressions of effeminacy and sexuality in Mexico. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 39(2), 133–158. http://doi.org/10.1300/J082v39n02_07

Chapter 5

Engaging Historical Trauma in the Classroom

Ethnoautobiography as Decolonizing Practice

S. Lily Mendoza

INTRODUCTION

One of the challenges in teaching multiculturalism is the affective/emotional fallout that results when undergraduate students are exposed—often for the first time—to U.S. multicultural history (beginning with the foundational trauma of native American genocide since 1492, the subsequent histories of slavery, immigration, the struggles around Civil Rights, and the entrenched and ongoing process of racial formation in the country). In particular, the connected histories of modern industrial culture and that of indigenous peoples around the globe present seemingly "unbridgeable cultural divides" and trigger intense and raw emotional responses that require more than just a purely cognitive approach to process effectively.

This study reports on the outcomes of a particular critical pedagogical approach to exploring questions of identity and difference in the twenty-first century, one intended to help facilitate movement in students' learning process beyond the stages of denial, defense, and minimization (as mapped out in intercultural communication scholar Milton Bennett's [1993] "developmental model of intercultural sensitivity"). Called "ethnoautobiography" (EA), this indigenously grounded approach enables critical acceptance, integration, and self-transformation in the encounter with narratives from the underside of history, in many ways constituting an innovative form of intercultural pedagogy. Orchestrating a disciplined self-exploration premised on the practice of reflexivity and process-oriented integrative learning, this report on the use of EA recounts the hopeful and dynamic process of resolutely engaging historical shadow material and the healing of colonial trauma as experienced in the classroom.

MULTICULTURAL COMMUNICATION AS TERROR

As I was contemplating on how to open with the subject of this chapter, news of yet another killing of an African American man in the United States came through the news broadcast, this time, that of 32-year-old Philando Castile, a school cafeteria worker shot four times in front of his girlfriend and her 4-year-old daughter in Falcon Heights, Minnesota after being stopped for a busted tail light (stopped 49 times in his entire driving career). Distinguished professor of African American Studies Marc Lamont Hill remarks in an interview that in the United States, it appears that Black bodies themselves are seen as dangerous; it doesn't matter what those bodies are doing. "If you stand still like Eric Garner, you get killed. If you run like Freddie Gray, you get killed. If your pants are down, like Trayvon, you die. If your pants are up, like Walter Scott, you die. It doesn't matter" (Democracy Now, July 16, 2016). Later that day, I was compelled to post the following on my Facebook page:

> There's a profound trauma that's lodged deep in this nation's psyche—a refusal to confront the boot on the neck that has simply been the norm for centuries in this country. Why even "well-meaning" white police without conscious racial animosity have a hairline trigger at the sight of a black face. And why the rest of us (non-black, non-white) are not exempt from having to do the work of unlearning the internalized terror at black faces.

I come to the subject of trauma having encountered the condition—not from exploring it abstractly in its vast theorization in the medical field and in other disciplines, but interestingly, in the classroom. I still recall that fateful day when I was called to a meeting yet again by our undergraduate program director. My student evaluations were one more time at rock bottom, way below the departmental average. But this time, there was also report of two students in my multicultural communication class having had to go for counseling for allegedly "having been traumatized" in my classes from being made to "feel bad" about themselves and from having their self-identities undermined. I had been hired to teach the staple course—multicultural communication (in addition to helping build a graduate program in the department). Prior to my current appointment, I had served as director of a doctoral program in Culture and Communication in another institution where I was a tenured faculty and had the privilege of primarily doing graduate teaching. Those were the days when I got mostly excellent student reviews.[1] But as life would have it, personal circumstances compelled me to make a change and move to my current institution, which did not yet have a graduate program—part of the deal in hiring me as I have mentioned. It meant however that I

would have to teach mostly undergrad courses until I could get the master's program up and running.

Undergrad teaching, I would find out, was an entirely different ballgame. It was the case that I was the only faculty of color in my department at that time teaching an especially politically charged course, multicultural communication. It was also the case that where others would teach *about* racial and cultural difference, I *was* racial and cultural difference personified. As a Philippine-born Filipina, not only my looks gave me away; my tongue also was undeniably "foreign."

Students, majority White, would often walk into the classroom expecting to learn about different cultures—what I call the fast-food type consumer version of diversity and multiculturalism. Expecting to be regaled with accounts of other cultures not their own, it doesn't take long before they realize they're in for something entirely different. From the moment they walk into the classroom, already ill at ease at the sight of someone like me, they soon realize that how I look and how I sound is the least of their worries. What I teach and what they are compelled to learn is the real deal. After just a week or so of preliminaries, I would walk them through the American Holocaust (what David Stannard calls the most horrific, most extensive genocide in history involving the decimation of 95 percent of an estimated 100–145 million native peoples living up and down the Americas); then on to the Atlantic Slave Trade, the legalized racist housing policy, to contemporary racism (what Michelle Alexander calls "the New Jim Crow"), then to the U.S. colonization of the Philippines (resulting in the massacre of half a million to a million Filipinos out of a total population of just 8 million in the course of its pacification campaign at the turn of the twentieth century), followed by a survey of the plight of indigenous peoples around the globe now threatened with extinction with the incursion of mining, logging, and other extractive industries into their territories. I end with ecophilosopher Derrick Jensen's book, *A Language Older than Words* (2000/2004), detailing the consequences of modern industrial culture's denial of sentience to all but the strictly human and calling for a recovery of relationship with all beings in nature. I explain that in order for us to have a clue as to what actually goes on in intercultural encounters, context—in particular, the context of history—is crucial to consider. For as intercultural scholar Milton Bennett (in Smith, 1966) reminds us, participants in the communicative event "are not free agents in the interaction process: they enter the engagement with culturally conditioned conceptions and expectations which influence communication and learning" (p. 597). Tracking the historical antecedents to those "culturally conditioned conceptions and expectations" enables us to critique their taken-for-grantedness, thus, opening up possibility for their displacement. History is important as well in drawing crucial interconnections. If, by the end of the course, all that students realize is our global interdependence

with the rest of the world and if they come to recognize the interrelationship between wealth and poverty, and between conditions of languishing and conditions of thriving, then our time would have been worthwhile. An indispensable route to this end is the investigation of the historical contexts of intercultural encounters particularly in the last 500 years and the understanding of the concept of privilege and ways of dismantling it (in relationship to race, class, gender, sexuality, human supremacy, etc.) as an ethical response to societal and ecological injustice and inequality.

For the longest time, I took for granted that the backlash I was getting was simply par for the course for women faculty of color like myself, aware of the vast literature on the chilling atmosphere in the classroom for women and minority faculty and the potential land-mines they have to learn to navigate if they are to survive in their careers.[2] Indeed, the interlocking disadvantages and minority status of many international and minority faculty hires in the United States are well documented in the literature (cf. Gutiérrez y Muhs, et. al., 2012; Harlow, 2003; Johnsrud & Sadao, 1998; Manrique, 2002; Stanley, 2006; Turner, Gonzalez, & Wood, September 2008; Vargas, 2002, etc.). As a person of color, however, what I had no clue about was how "traumatic" it actually was for mostly White suburban students to be exposed—often for the first time—to this kind of historical material. Their world had been "just fine;" they are flourishing (many of them, at least)—how dare I now suggest that underneath all their thriving is the undeniable debris of dead bodies, stolen wealth, and the enslavement of other beings, both human and non-human? What right had I, a foreign-born immigrant—whose very being shouts "otherness" and "non-belonging" (within the reigning doxa of unconscious, internalized racism, and White supremacy)—to even make such ludicrous claims about "the greatest nation in the world"? Having been well trained in Western modes of cognition that often did not include attention to affect and other subjective aspects of learning, I naively assumed that all that students needed in order to shift perspectives was exposure to the right kind of information. That is, until that fateful day when I got served notice of students having been "traumatized" in my class.

MY OWN ENCOUNTER WITH HISTORICAL TRAUMA

Come to think of it, I myself was not unacquainted with a similar experience of "trauma" from encountering the underside of history—a story that I narrate in a personal essay titled, "Tears in the Archive: Contesting and Surviving Empire" (2005/2006). U.S.-Philippine relations have once been described as "a conspiracy in mutual forgetting." A forgetting for the Philippines because the Philippine-American War ended in a humiliating defeat for the country;

and a similar forgetting for the United States because its ruthless pacification campaign (involving the slaughter of half a million to a million Filipinos, the burning down of whole communities, the use of torture tactics such as water boarding, etc.) all but served to unravel the nation's self-image as a freedom-loving ally to all independence fighters around the world. In fact, so traumatizing was the Philippine colonial experiment for the United States that it never again took on another formal colony in the aftermath, shifting its imperial strategy to more subtle forms of economic and cultural interventionism instead.[3]

In my "Tears in the Archives" piece, I recount how, growing up with the official narrative of U.S.-Philippine "friendly" relations (after all, General Douglas MacArthur did fulfill his promise to return and help "liberate" us from the Japanese occupation in World War II), I had little exposure, if any, to accounts of the Philippine-American War. I titled it "Tears in the Archives" because it was while researching in a university library as a first-year doctoral student in the United States that I chanced upon the colonial archives containing the transcripts of the U.S. congressional debates around whether or not to take the Philippines for the nation's own colonial possession. Those debates culminated in the now infamous speech of President William McKinley justifying his decision to annex the Philippines:

> I would like to say just a word about the Philippine business. I have been criticized a good deal about the Philippines, but don't deserve it. The truth is I didn't want the Philippines, and when they came to us, as a gift from the gods, I did not know what to do with them . . . . I thought at first we would take only Manila; then Luzon; then the other islands perhaps also. I walked the floor of the White House night after night until midnight; and I am not ashamed to tell you, gentlemen, that I went down on my knees and prayed Almighty God for light and guidance more than one night. And one night late it came to me this way—I don't know how it was, but it came: (1) that we could not give them back to Spain—that would be cowardly and dishonorable; (2) that we could not turn them over to France and Germany—our commercial rivals in the Orient—that would be bad business and discreditable; (3) that we could not leave them to themselves—they were unfit for self-government—and they would soon have anarchy and misrule over there worse than Spain's was; and (4) that there was nothing left for us to do but to take them all, and to educate the Filipinos, and uplift and civilize and Christianize them, and by God's grace do the very best we could by them... And then I went to bed, and went to sleep, and slept soundly, and the next morning I sent for the chief engineer of the War Department, and I told him to put the Philippines on the map of the United States, and there they are, and there they will stay while I am President! (Schirmer & Shalom [eds.], 1987, pp. 22–23)

Writing this now, tears still manage to well up in my eyes. Trauma is what happens when the entire foundation of your world crumbles from underneath you and you feel your very being threatened. I had come to the United States under

duress. My exile, driven by a confluence of personal crises, inevitably led to the only other country I knew and where I had family members already residing (as many scholars note, migration patterns tend to follow colonial routes, hence the saying, "We are here because you were there" (cf. Frankenberg & Mani,1996, p. 274). Even though I had already begun my decolonization process prior to coming to the United States in 1995, my long tutelage under a largely Western-style educational system of growing up has not really prepared me for the encounter with the deep shadow of racism that, I was to discover, dogged intercultural relations in the United States Couched in the noblest of intentions (i.e., "to spread the light of civilization to the rest of the world," "to Christianize the heathen," "to educate savages"), its normalization in the national psyche through the discourse of American Exceptionalism[4] seems to have made racial supremacy integral to the fabric of White mainstream society.

But whereas in my case, like in Hegel's slave in his master-slave dialectic formulation, my struggle against colonial epistemic violence has compelled me to labor unceasingly to produce a different basis for self-consciousness through willful indigenous reclamation, White subjects, shaped into being in their very subjectivity by a supremacist ideology, face the conundrum of needing to maintain that supremacy at all cost, else risk reduction to an empty cipher otherwise. For what is White identity without the learned superiority and entitlement (a *New York Times* op-ed piece termed it, "the toggle between nothingness and awfulness" [Painter, June 20, 2015])? To understand this truth about whiteness is to solve the mystery of the "trauma" that sent two of my students running for counseling to seek help and redress. For if presumed superiority is all the ground that White identity is based upon, what choice is there but for White students to fight tooth and nail to hang on to it when that superiority is challenged and finally deconstructed? To the extent then that critical communication pedagogy is not primarily about the acquisition of cultural knowledge about others, but about the capacity for self-transformation through reflexive understanding of the constitutive role of power—communicatively reinforced and reproduced—in the production of normative understandings about self and others, as Fasset & Warren (2007) suggest, it behooves intercultural communication educators to figure out a way to facilitate such critical process in the classroom. In the end, within critical intercultural communication pedagogy, cultural knowledge about others, far from being an end in itself, needs to be placed in service of promoting critical self-understanding through seeing the ways normative power operates to mask what are in fact interrelationships—not isolated phenomenon—of center (or mainstream) and margin, wealth and poverty, thriving and disempowerment, internalized oppression, and ongoing conditions of exploitation.

ETHNOAUTOBIOGRAPHY AND THE ENGAGING OF HISTORICAL TRAUMA

It was around the same time (as news of my traumatized students) that I learned of a particular approach to teaching multiculturalism from colleagues from another university in California that have been piloting a new method of teaching multicultural communication for a number of years in their classes and report meeting with tremendous success. The approach is called *ethnoautobiography* and is one that I find consistent with the principle articulated by my critical race theorist partner, James Perkinson, that is, "You cannot exit one cultural formation without entering another." In other words, to exit whiteness—a condition that turns exclusively on supremacist claims—one needed to find some other ground on which to stand as a person of European descent. I consider this approach to teaching multiculturalism, by all measure, a form of critical intercultural communication pedagogy. *Ethnoautobiography* (EA) is an indigenously grounded framework for identity formation. Now codified into a textbook, titled, *Ethnoautobiography: Stories and Practices for Unlearning Whiteness, Decolonization, Uncovering Ethnicities* (2013), EA is premised on the imperative of *decolonizing* the Eurocentered modern (i.e., White) mind through indigenous reclamation. What is called the "White mind" in the framework is a condition defined by *normative dissociation* where, in order to become a modern individual, we (and that includes people of color who have bought into the Eurocentric paradigm) have needed to disconnect from all that made up the formerly indigenous self: that is, ancestry, community, history, place/nature, sense of spirituality, mythic origins/stories, dreams, etc.; in other words, from the richly culturally embedded self in order to fit into the modern liberal notion of an abstract, sovereign, autonomous self, what is referenced in the construct "individualism." It is *normative* because the dissociation is mandated as a requirement if one were to qualify as a "modern" individual.

Alas, the result of *normative dissociation* is a *masterful, but empty, self*—"masterful" because it claims to be autonomous and self-sufficient, yet "empty" because it is effectively disconnected from all that makes life whole. The project then is the recovery of all those abjected aspects of the self disallowed under the modern/Western conception of the self. Thus, it raises the question, who are your ancestors? In the case of White students, in particular, what are the submerged ethnicities of your ancestors before they became homogenized into a White "European" identity?

Interestingly, engaging this question begins to surface the diversity underneath the seeming singularity of the identity "European"/White, thereby creating awareness of the ways diverse cultures have had to be erased in the name of cultural efficiency and bureaucratic legibility and control—values

inherent in the political project of modern nation-state building. For example, how many Italian, Irish, or Jewish immigrant ancestors have had to change their names to make them pronounceable, told to leave their "cultural baggage" behind and meld into the bland monochromatic stew of the putative cultural "melting pot"? One may even argue that behind those eschewed national cultures are other older, more local, indigenous cultures (e.g., Celtic, Sami, Scythian, Finno-Ugric, and other proto-Indo-European pastoral nomad cultures of Central Asia such as those of the Mongol, Hun, Turkic, etc.) that in fact were closer to sustainable in their local ecologies and more just in their human (and more-than-human) relations, thus relativizing modern industrial culture's exclusive claim to being the only human way to live. To the extent that the process of modern nation-state formation had required the disenchantment of nature, the breaking up of human communities for more politically expedient arrangements, and the subsumption of these more local cultures into a homogenized "national" whole, EA encourages recuperation of memories and fragments of those older, gentler, yet fiercer, ways of living as a means of decolonizing the self.

Such recuperation entails facing into and working through the debris of history's *shadow material* (e.g., the wars, the genocides, the takeover of indigenous lands legitimized by the dubious Doctrine of Discovery,[5] etc.) that invariably underwrote the destruction of indigenous ways of being in the establishment of the regime of modernity. Within EA, students can face into these difficult and often traumatic aspects of history because there is now provision in the framework for seeing *shadow work* as crucial to cultivating a healthy and more complete sense of self. It is this provision of a place to go with the grief of history's shadow material that invites openness and reflexivity (beyond the typical denial and defensiveness), as well as active participation in their own process of self-transformation—ideals that, together, constitute the pillars of critical pedagogy and transformative learning (Freire, 1990; Giroux, 2011; Kincheloe, 2011; O'Sullivan, 1999).

Overall, the decolonization framework used in EA allows for the decentering of the monopolistic logic and culture of modernity (rooted in possessive individualism, a mode of rationality exclusive of feeling, intuition, and embodied ways of knowing, and the values of efficiency, aggressive pursuit of material wealth, and private ownership) that leads to disconnection and encapsulation of the self (what Norbert Elias [1939] references in his concept of *homo clausus*) and the surfacing of other ways of being in the world. As articulated by the authors of the book,

> *Decolonizing* is thus not just the recovery of the memory traces of indigenous presences in all of us, but a creative psycho-spiritual, moral, political, and activist endeavor. It doesn't just join "the other" ("the natives," the "Third World," "the

> poor," etc.) in their struggles of decolonization. First and foremost, decolonization turns its gaze to the center of colonial processes, Europe, and its process of self-colonization. (Kremer & Jackson-Paton, 2013, from draft Chapter 1, n. p.)

The project of recovering an indigenous sense of self (referred to in the book subtitle as "uncovering ethnicities") allows for the decentering of whiteness as an exclusive defining identity for students of European descent (as well as for people of color who have bought into the modern Eurocentric/ White paradigm). Ultimately, this approach turns multiculturalism on its head. Whereas students expect the work to be mainly about "others" (i.e., expecting to discover other cultures that are easily consumable without themselves being implicated in the process), what they are led to encounter instead is a sense of accountability for what has shaped them historically, along with the repressed diversity within them underneath all that "whiteness." "Identity" then ceases to be a fixed and unyielding concept; instead, recuperation of the fluidity of indigenous ways of being (from the lack of the verb "to be" in most indigenous languages), gives way to a self that is dynamic, capable of transforming and engaging once more in nurturing conversations not only with other human groups, but also with other beings in nature.

This recovery of relationships and interconnections (with place, nature, ancestry, spirituality, and other abjected aspects of modern subjectivity) is what gives way to "an intricately storied self contextually apprehended and understood, not fixed into permanence or singularity." It is what heals the vacuous encapsulation and dissociation of modern subjectivity from all that makes up the thickly storied indigenous self—the past (ancestry/history), place (land/nature), memory and imagination (dreams/ instinct/ unconscious parts of self), mythical origins (collective storytelling), rites of passage/ ceremony (embodied communal celebrations), and, simply, a sense of awe, wonder, and mystery. Designed by Jurgen Kremer and Jackson-Paton (2014), two White male scholars, one German and the other English, who have had to undergo their own decolonization process, ethnoautobiography assists in the healing of the historical amnesia (pp. 21, 326) that the authors note is characteristic of all "WEIRD" cultures ("Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich, Democratic"), beginning with an awareness of what was gained (e.g., human mastery/supremacy through technology, material advancement, comfort and convenience, etc.) and what was lost (all the aforementioned losses of connection that have issued in racial hierarchy, loss of indigenous wildness, unbridled competition, separation from nature, splitting of self, etc.). This is called in the framework *ethno-accounting* (Jurgen & Jackson-Paton, 2014, pp. 10, 203–205). In contrast to mere autobiography, ethnoautobiography as a method of sense-making, uses a particular way of reenveloping the self in story that effectively (re-)connects atomized modern individuals to all that

they have lost, thereby healing the "dissociative and objectifying construction of self and reality" (Kremer, 2003, p. 2). This is a process that Kremer (2003) calls "storying the self in participatory visions" (p. 1). Quoting transpersonal psychology and integral studies scholar Jorge Ferrer, he refers to the process as a kind of "spiritual knowing [that] should be conceived as 'creative participation not only of our minds, but also our hearts, bodies, souls, and most vital essence'" (in Kremer, 2003, p. 4).

ETHNOAUTOBIOGRAPHY IN PRACTICE

Since learning of EA, I had sampled some of the exercises here and there, incorporating them in my multicultural classes. Then, when a sabbatical opportunity came up, I decided it was time for me to take the learning more seriously and asked permission to shadow two faculty at the Sonoma State University who collaborated on the EA project: Jurgen Kremer, lead author of the textbook, a professor of depth psychology who discovered he could throat sing by the age of 8, and only later, through his own decolonization journey as a White man, did he learn that he had Finno-Ugric and Sami ancestry where that innate ability to throat sing had come from; the other is a female Filipina professor Leny Mendoza Strobel who went through her own decolonization process and now heads a movement for decolonization and indigenization among Filipino Americans. By the time I resumed teaching, I was ready to go the whole hog and adopt the EA textbook, integrating my usual course material that now had an auspicious place in the framework as *historical shadow material* that can be engaged more productively.

Using the principles of transformative learning and self-discovery, EA employs *active listening, storytelling, genealogical imagination*, and *creative writing* in addition to the usual rationalistic methods of discourse and expository writing. It calls for the engagement of both the left and right hemispheres of the brain and valorizes intuition, emotion, and embodied knowing as equally important sources of knowledge. I usually have students sit in a circle instead of the usual rows and this allows them to be more fully present to each other. By the end of the semester, they would invariably report feeling like the classroom has become a community for them such that they are able to risk engaging in honest conversation around difficult topics such as race and the other shadows and traumas of history. As one student noted in her response essay:

> *When we initially told our stories of our "long bodies" and our heritages, I was amazed at the lives of the people sitting around me. As we continued to peel back layer after layer, I learned more and more about the people around me;*

people I would have never taken the time to know if it weren't for the facilitation of this class.

The concept of the *long body* keys off of the indigenous understanding of the self as historically and culturally embedded, where, as in the Haudenosaunee (Iroquois) tradition, decisions are made with the next seven generations in mind, and from the wisdom of seven generations past. In the book, one's long body "reaches beyond one's psyche, beyond one's skin, and is capable of reaching into other realms" (Kremer, 2013, p. xxiii).

The first time I adopted the framework in my multicultural class, I was immediately struck at the change in the classroom atmosphere. Where before it felt literally like walking into a war zone, with students' nerves taught and alert, desperately hiding behind a wall of defense while I—also desperately—searched for ways to break through the lines of defense, this time one could sense a more relaxed atmosphere, with curiosity and interest replacing the guardedness and defensiveness. To note some of the responses:

We all have shadows. By trying to not acknowledge our shadows we are using a lot of energy to repress them. Working with our shadows helps us come to a greater understanding of ourselves and makes us more whole.

For another:

Through awareness I have learned . . . that my iPhone was made in a factory that trivializes human life. I have learned that my clothing was likely stitched by a child. I have learned that the "harmless" life I lead is harmful for people I have never met. I have learned that those people have a story, and under different circumstances, they could have sat right next to me in this class. This class was like a four month long therapy session. Each response paper was like a journal entry. It's overwhelming to know that I've barely scraped the surface but it's exciting to see the horizon of a better way of living.

Day after day, I would watch the opening of hearts, the expressions of grief and outrage, but also the determination not to look away but to mobilize the painful realizations into a concrete response that they hope would make a difference in the world.

On the thorny issue of race, one White female student noted:

Before this class I most likely would have fought against the idea of a race problem. In fact the race section of this class was always the section I feared the most when enrolling into the course . . . . I never found the ability to grasp the ideas behind how a whole group [i.e., whites] could [be] singled out entirely and attacked, almost like large scale bullying on all levels. With this class I was

able to understand . . . the idea of white privilege and . . . I now see it as a major issue in today's society, an issue layered in denial, pain and ignorance.

What happens, too, is healing and reconnection on other levels, for example, in students' relationship with family members. As one student wrote:

Ethnoautobioagraphy gives you an opportunity to see things that were originally deemed unimportant, as meaningful. Things such as my ancestry were never considered before this textbook and now I find myself enthralled [by] not just the stories my grandmother has to share with me, but also the tears she has as she shares these stories of release for the first time in years. I can understand how pain and suffering can be inherited through family lineages and how it can also be ended by finding a way to heal through it.

For another:

EA and multicultural studies has changed me with this one simple activity. I now find myself craving for more history about my family. I am realizing that my family extends far past those I know. It reaches to my great grandparents, their parents and so on. I have never had such a longing to know about my family's history, or to meet and actually get to know my extended family members. Now, I cannot wait to sit and converse with them, to really get to know them like I do my parents, my cousins. I want to know my whole family.

Space is not enough for me to cover all the ways EA has been transformative of students' worldviews and understanding, but one aspect I don't want to miss reporting on is in its ability to help students reconnect with living nature as part of their indigenous self-reclamation. One student's reflection in this regard is particularly instructive:

As a biology major, I can relate to considering nonhumans as objects, but that is not how I think it should be. I work in a lab on campus . . . and in this laboratory our primary research involves rats. Rats that we must put down or "knock off" as [our instructor] puts it with an anesthesia and then harvest the eyes for corneal research at a cellular level . . . . I would love to keep my cultural eyeglasses on and keep telling myself that the docile, medium sized white rats are bred specifically for science and if I don't kill them someone else will in just a different research setting . . . .The other day in the lab I realized something, I was putting down a rat for an experiment and just as I always do I stood by the large, clear jar and wrapped my hands around it as the rat went down. Ever since I started in the lab I felt the need to do this simply because as the rat begins to breathe in the isoflurane and slowly goes to sleep I do not want them to be alone. I do not know if the rat is comforted by the idea of having me there or not, but I always just thought it would be able to feel my warmth or presence

and go to sleep more soundly. It wasn't until this book [by Jensen] that I thought of this action as more than simply pity, but respect . . . . The other student in [the] laboratory looked at me doing this last Thursday and said, "I wouldn't do that, you are going to get too attached." When he said this I thought of this book . . . . When Jensen stated, "it is an awful power to hold another's life in your hands (197)," I knew exactly what he meant. I hope one day as I continue in the lab to develop a "conversation of death." I would rather have the deaths be deeply emotional and let the animal leave with dignity, rather than without any emotion or respect as [my lab mate] suggested.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Since adopting ethnoautobiography in my multicultural classes, I have kept contact with my two faculty collaborators, Jurgen and Leny, reporting my experience with the method. To share just one excerpt from my email correspondence with them:

> *So—I had my last day with my two classes today . . . . I wish I had recorded their final sharings. Many remarked on their appreciation for working with the shadow material of history, noting it's what they found most challenging (in particular, realizing what their ancestors did to the Native peoples of the Americas and the cost of their lifestyle to other indigenous peoples and to nature—something they said they've never given thought to before). They were also grateful for being able to overcome their initial defensiveness at the notion of unlearning whiteness. They thanked each other for their respectful listening and noted how enjoyable it was to be bonded as a classroom community (they especially thanked those who risked sharing their cultural shadow [for extra credit]). One white girl who never really said much in class directed her thanks to me and said "I want to thank you, Professor, for not talking at us, but with us. That meant a lot to me." Another also said "thank you" for allowing them to experiment with creative writing so that the assignments became that much more enjoyable to do.* (Email communication, 12/7/15)

I never imagined that I would one day say this, but multicultural communication has now become my favorite course to teach. EA has literally transformed my classroom. By providing a safe context for dealing with the unprocessed grief and trauma of histories of slavery, genocide, dispossession, treachery, etc. the exploration does not simply lead to guilt and paralysis, but to a desire to heal and to no longer perpetuate the trauma. Through the work of indigenous reclamation, a lifelong process of self- and community-renewal is opened up and made possible. The preface of the book puts it eloquently:

> This is a book of hope in the face of profound personal, cultural, and environmental challenges. Such hope is not the shallow optimism that has been invoked again and again in recent years. [It is a hope that] stems from the potential that we humans can remember and work with ancient capacities built into each of us. We each carry the means to overcome individualistically-driven crisis responses by accessing and appreciating sources beyond the small selves of our personhood. From this rich and creative well at the roots of who we are, hope and inspiration for the future may arise. Expanding or deepening our sense of self is our hope for the future, our hope for the resolution of our current crises. (Kremer & Jackson-Paton, 2013, p. xxv)

It is this power to facilitate integrative, hopeful, and transformative learning in the encounter of difference that makes ethnoautobiography an excellent contribution to critical intercultural communication pedagogy. In grounding teaching and learning in the art of story and storytelling, it makes use of an innate, natural, and a very ancient form of human communication that returns creativity, intuition, imagination, and embodied knowing to the four walls of the modern classroom. And in its provision in the framework of space to do shadow work and recovery of repressed memory, it opens the way to healing and the possibility of new beginnings—especially for the traumatized subjects of very complex and interlocking histories.

NOTES

1. I should also note that I did have a more diverse classroom then, with the graduate program I helped design becoming known across the country and attracting a lot of graduate students of color.
2. See for example https://facultystaff.richmond.edu/~rnelson/ASAIL/profs.htm
3. The Bell Trade Act of 1946 passed by the U.S. Congress that extracted from the Philippines agreement to accord preferential tariffs on U.S. imported goods and parity rights for U.S. citizens and corporations equal to those of Filipinos to exploit the country's natural resources and to repatriate 100 percent of the profits from such is just one example (cf. Shalom, 1981).
4. That is, the "shining city on a hill," Manifest Destiny, White Man's Burden, and Benevolent Assimilation.
5. More accurately, the "Christian Doctrine of Discovery"—an arbitrary legal concept concocted and implemented through the issuance of Papal Bulls from the mid-fifteenth to the mid-twentieth century that gave right of possession to colonial powers of any land or territory not already claimed by a European Christian monarch (cf. Newcomb, 2008).

REFERENCES

Bennett, M. J. 1993. Towards ethnorelativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In R. M. Paige (Ed.), *Intercultural Experience* (pp. 1–8). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Elias, N. (1939). *The civilizing process: Sociogenetic and psychogenetic investigations*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Fassett, D. L., & Warren, J. T. (2007). *Critical communication pedagogy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Frankenberg, R., & Mani, L. (1996). Crosscurrents, crosstalk: Race, "Postcoloniality," and the politics of location. In S. Lavie & T. Swedenburg (Eds.), *Displacement, diaspora, and geographies of* identity (pp. 273–294). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Freire, P. (1990). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York: Continuum.

Giroux, H. A. (2011). *On critical pedagogy.* New York: Continuum.

Gutiérrez y Muhs, G. et. al. (Eds.). (2012). *Presumed incompetent: The intersections of race and class for women in academia*. Boulder, CO: Utah State University Press.

Harlow, R. (2003). Race doesn't matter, but…: The effect of race on professors' experiences and emotion management in the undergraduate college classroom. *Social Psychology Quarterly,* 66, 348–63.

Jensen, D. (2000/2004). *A Language older than words.* White River Junction, Vermont: Chelsea Green Publishing Company.

Johnsrud, L. K., & Sadao, K. C. (1998). The common experience of "otherness:" Ethnic and racial minority faculty. *Review of Higher Education*, 21(4), 315–342.

Kincheloe, J. L. (2011). Critical ontology and indigenous ways of being: Forging a postcolonial curriculum. In J. L. Kincheloe with k. Hayes, S. R. Steinberg, K. Tobin (Eds.), *Key works in critical pedagogy* (pp. 333–349). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Kremer, J. W., & Jackson-Paton, R. (2013). *Ethnoautobiography: Stories and practices for unlearning whiteness, decolonization, uncovering ethnicities*. Sebastopol, CA: Re-Vision Publishing.

Manrique, C. (2002). A foreign woman faculty's multiple whammies. In L. Vargas (Ed.), *Women faculty of color in the white classroom* (pp. 145–162). New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing.

Newcomb, S. (2008). *Pagans in the promised land: Decoding the doctrine of Christian discovery*. Golden, CO: Fulcrum Publishing.

Painter, N. I. (June 20, 2015). What is whiteness? *The New York Times.* https://www.nytimes.com/2015/06/21/opinion/sunday/what-is-whiteness.html?_r=0.&mtrref=undefined&gwh=E1864436838416EB4C592717A990E7E0&gwt=pay&assetType=opinion (Last accessed 10/31/2017).

Shalom, S. R. (1986). *United States and the Philippines: A study of neo-colonialism*. Quezon City: New Day Publishers.

Schirmer, D. B., & Shalom, S. R. (Eds.) (1987). *The Philippines reader: A history of colonialism, neocolonialism, dictatorship, and resistance*. Boston: South End Press.

Smith, A. G. (1966). *Communication and culture: Readings in the codes of human interaction*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Stanley, C. A. (Ed.). (2006). *Faculty of color: Teaching in predominantly White colleges and universities*. Boston, MA: Anker.

Turner, C. S. V., Gonzalez, J. C., & Wood, J. L. (September 2008). Faculty of color in academe: What 20 years of literature tells us. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 1(3), 139–168.

Vargas, L. (Ed.). (2002). *Women faculty of color in the White classroom: Narratives on the pedagogical implications of teacher diversity*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Chapter 6

Pedagogies of Failure

Queer Communication Pedagogy as Anti-Normative

Benny LeMaster

The late disability rights activist and lawyer Harriet McBryde Johnson (2003) pens, "It's not that I'm ugly. It's more that most people don't know how to look at me" (para. 20). From her positionality as a person living with a marked physical disability, Johnson illustrates a means by which subjectivity is realized: visual comparisons to normative formations. Queer folks, trans, and gender-variant folks, folks of color, fat folks, old folks, folks living with physical and/or cognitive disabilities, folks who are marked by non-normative religiosity, and other non-normative embodiments, identities, and subjectivities are familiar with the sting of the normative gaze.

Yep (2003) describes normalization, or the path to normativity: "the process of constructing, establishing, producing, and reproducing a taken-for-granted and all-encompassing standard used to measure goodness, desirability, morality, rationality, superiority, and a host of other dominant cultural values" (p. 18). The normative is a primary point of critical departure in my pedagogy. At this point, it is important to distinguish between a "norm" and a "normative" as they are often conflated. A norm is a common cultural pattern. When a norm has a dominant cultural value attached to it, it can be said to be normative. The effect includes a discursively constituted subjectivity rooted in questions of cultural value such that those who hold institutional/normative power are understood as valuable while those who do not are framed as valueless. In this way, normativity is a performatively constituted regime of regulatory power wherein temporally and spatially contextual cultural norms are rendered remarkable and used as a measure of value.

A normative subject—what Audre Lorde (2007) calls a "mythical norm"—is where "the trappings of power reside within . . . society" (p. 116). Indeed, those who most closely align with the mythical norm (e.g., White, young, thin, straight, cisgender man, Christian, U.S. citizen, able-bodied and able-minded,

and so forth) are less familiar with what many minoritarian subjects have come to know as a Truth: the "normative is violent" (Chávez, 2013, p. 86). Yep (2003) describes this violence further: "a symbolically, discursively, psychically, psychologically, and materially violent form of social regulation and control" (p. 18). Of course, intersectionality productively muddies the flow of power such that one can concomitantly embody normative (e.g., White, Christian) *and* non-normative (e.g., trans, physical disability) identities concurrently. In this way, context largely determines the intersectional ways in which a subject will have meaning attributed to their body effectively determining the relative privileges *and* disadvantages granted an individual. At the same time, because our present is constituted through our pasts Schrag (2003), suggests that while the immediate context matters, so too does our embodiment of histories of normative flows of power—including the ways those histories inform our performance of self in a given context.

The larger point: each identity vector is defined in relation to a presumed normative core that is made significant through performative iterations. This normative core disciplines bodily performance at intercultural, interpersonal, and intrapersonal levels. At the intercultural level, normative cultural scripts often inform our relative, mundane performances of self-embedded in culture (Warren, 2001). These cultural scripts can include any hegemonic formation: patriarchy, heteronormativity, White supremacy, and so on. That is, cultural power influences our mundane cultural performances. At the interpersonal level, the normative emerges as a disciplinary mechanism articulated through such systems of oppression as: heterosexism, cissexism, racism, sizeism, and/or ableism, for instance; these can manifest as "microaggressions" (Sue, 2010). At the intrapersonal level, the normative emerges through the internalization of these same systems of oppression wherein we self-regulate, self-discipline, and self-harm in pursuit of a more normative embodiment and experience.

Johnson's (2003) words—which open this chapter—mark a resistive, embodied politic that refuses the weight of normative entanglements. Specifically, Johnson recognizes that it is not her body that is the "problem" and more accurately the normative lens on which our interpellating lenses rely that are the "problem." In a similar way, a recent shift in trans discourse challenges the normative "born in the wrong body" narrative. For example, "trans/national queer activist" Alok Vaid-Menon (2014) writes, "This is not a story about being born in the wrong body. This is the story of being born in the *wrong world*. This is the story of being told who we are without our consent. This is a story of a gender that refuses to be defined by a body" (para. 2, emphasis mine). Here, Vaid-Menon rearticulates the onus of "wrongness" from non-normative embodiment and identity (e.g., trans, gender non-conformity) to a normative cultural violence (interpellation "without our consent") done to non-normative embodiments, identities, and subjectivities.

In this chapter, I champion the idea that queer communication pedagogy marks a mundane resistive politic singular that desires social justice through cultural transformation. More specifically, I define queer communication pedagogy as an embodied pedagogy that ruptures the performative sedimentation of normativity through a commitment to "intersectional reflexivity" (Jones, 2010). For Jones, intersectional reflexivity "requires one to acknowledge one's intersecting identities, both marginalized and privileged, and then employ self-reflexivity, which moves one beyond self-reflection to the often uncomfortable level of self-implication" (p. 122). Centering self-implication through embodied attentiveness to intersectional reflexivity as a pedagogical principle refuses modernist articulations of individualist identification in favor of a complex view of identification that affirms "relational selves produced in collusion and collision" (Fassett & Warren, 2007, p. 40). Through Fassett and Warren, a critical communication pedagogy (CCP) approach understands "identities as produced in cultural—and therefore inherently ideological—contexts" (p. 40). To desire self-implication is to desire recognizing one's own active perpetuation of potentially oppressive ideological structures in relational context.

Queer communication pedagogy's focus on self-implication through intersectional reflexivity develops CCPs understanding of cultural/ideological contextual identification by focusing our critical energies on the (re-) sedimentation of normativity in its perpetual performative becoming. Communication philosopher Calvin Schrag (2003) understands implication as constitutive of subjectivity. He writes of the subject who comes to be through relational contextual means:

> The subject is not a *pre*-given entity; so also it is not a *post*-given entity, simply the sedimented result of an objective convergence of the historical forces within discourse and action. It is not an entity at all, but rather an event or happening that continues the conversation and social practices of mankind and inscribes its contributions on their textures. (p. 121)

Given this framing, queer communication pedagogy focuses on the performative sedimentation of normativity and explores relational and contextual embodied means by which subjects might intervene and resist in its becoming. In this way, and to reiterate Schrag, queer communication pedagogy resists "continu[ing] the conversation and social practices of mankind" so long as those practices perpetuate the violence of normativity.

Queer communication pedagogy, thus, develops a form of *failure* in which a student "is unwilling or unable to reproduce a given ideology" (Fassett & Warren, 2007, p. 25). This labor is not easy. It requires the capacity to decenter our egos in order to consider the possibility that there is far more to the

cultural terrain than our limited normative frames will permit. It requires an ethic of care and compassion marked by "a kind of performance that resists conclusions, it is intensely committed to keeping the dialogue . . . open and ongoing" (Conquergood, 1985, p. 9). In this chapter, I offer queer failure as a critical means by which we might realize a queer communication pedagogy that "brings self and other together even while it holds them apart" (p. 9). To be clear, queer failure is not *the* means but *a* means by which we might realize queer communication pedagogy. This chapter functions as a call to critical cultural communication pedagogues to explore and elucidate the ties that can bind developments in queer studies to those in critical cultural communication pedagogy.

Four sections constitute the remainder of this chapter. First, I introduce the reader to queer failure. Specifically, I elucidate ties that bind critical cultural communication and queer studies in pursuit of a queer communication pedagogy. Second, I offer a performative autoethnographic recollection of a field exercise I utilize when working with trans and gender-variant students in order to illustrate an embodiment of queer communication pedagogy. Third, I take a moment to unpack the autoethnographic text so as to theorize the potentiality in queer-infused critical cultural communication pedagogy. And fourth, I offer closing thoughts that tie the chapter together.

QUEER FAILURE

The act of queering signals a number of potential twists and turns that scholars/activists can assume. That said, advances in "queer failure" provide the theoretical point of departure for this pedagogical exercise (Halberstam, 2011). Muñoz (2009) frames failure as a mode of escape that queer subjects can (and do) enact through mundane performances. "Escape," Muñoz assures, does not necessarily refer to "surrender" (p. 172). Rather, escape is akin to "a refusal of a dominant order and its systemic violence" (p. 172). Muñoz's apt analysis explicates performances of failure "as being something like the *always already* status of queers and other minoritarian subjects in the dominant social order within which they toil" (p. 173). That Muñoz frames queerness as "the *always already* status" of queers *and* other minoritarian subjects suggests that failure is constitutive of queerness specifically and, arguably, marginalization more broadly. Indeed, because life's expected trajectories are designed by and for (hetero)normative subjects, non-normative (e.g., queer) subjects are doomed to fail. Queer subjects enact failure on the basis of their/our idiosyncratic experiences with normative systems that privilege and disadvantage its subjects. However, McIntosh and Hobson (2013) remind us, "Embracing failure does not mean we accept it without change. Failure

alone is hurtful and unreflexive. Reflexive failure presses us to recognize that we will fail" (p. 19). Approaching failure reflexively allows one to consider the potentiality in failure as a critical point of departure for embodied cultural criticism. Indeed, attending to the ways in which queers perform failure sheds light on the ways that survival is embodied and realized despite rigid interpellating technologies. Said differently, queer failure highlights mundane performances that resist spatially and temporally immediate oppressive systems while leaning toward and imagining a future that has yet to arrive. Failure is, in this way, quite productive and rife with progressive political potentiality.

Similarly, Halberstam (2011) describes queer failure as "the refusal of legibility and an art of unbecoming" (p. 88). As an art, queer failure is strategic though not necessarily intentional. Thus, queer failure can be conceptualized as an embodied modality. Such performances may be mundane in that they reflect the ways in which non-normative bodies have come to perform self in spite of oppressive institutional demands. Studying queer failure, thus, marks a double move wherein the critic (1) seeks and describes institutionally imposed regulating technologies and (2) theorizes mundane performances of self that individuals enact as embodied responses to those regulating technologies. In this way, queer failure is anything but a failure. Rather, queer failure "is more nearly about escape and a certain virtuosity" wherein one's daily being and becoming is understood as a mundane, oft unintentional, act of defiance against normative regulating mechanisms (Muñoz, 2009, p. 173).[1]

Karma Chávez edited a recent special issue of *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication* titled "Out of Bounds? Queer Intercultural Communication." In it, a variety of scholars explored the links between queer studies and intercultural communication research, what Chávez (2013) refers to as "queer intercultural studies" (p. 83). The most explicit link between queer studies and intercultural communication can be summed up thusly: "The normative is violent" (p. 86). Normativity and normalizing regimes are a primary concern for queer theorists and critical intercultural communication scholars alike. Indeed, both camps explore and interrogate intersectionally constituted normative cultural mechanisms that regulate, order, and animate cultural contexts. Queer failure, as one manifestation of queer studies, highlights the ways systemic normative expectations are braided into the sociocultural including the ways in which individuals resist those expectations through mundane performative enactments that—often inadvertently—(un) braid those normalizing systems.

From the positionality of those who most closely embody the mythical norm, non-normative performances of self may be understood as enactments of failure. In this way, the normative constructs non-normativity as failing to meet (its own) dominant cultural values. This, however, is not queer failure. Queer failure is understood from the positionality of the non-normative.

In this regard, it is less that the non-normative subject has failed to meet normative standards and more aptly that normative culture has failed to make room for and to affirm non-normative embodiment, identification, and subjectivity. In this way, we could say that queer failure assumes a dialectical perspective that engages the space between enacting agency while bound by normalizing cultural mechanisms. A critical cultural communication approach could, thus, deploy queer failure in order to nuance, in part, the communicative constitution of minoritarian subjectivity as it chafes against normative expectancies in mundane iterations. Gust Yep (2003) argues healing from the violence of normativity requires "understand[ing], unpack[ing], and demystify[ing] its invisible power" (p. 26). And thus, this pedagogical labor necessarily requires working with students to name and unpack the means by which power is sedimented through mundane enactments of intersectionally constituted normative mechanisms.

From here, I turn our attention to my own embodiment of queer communication pedagogue engaged in a field exercise I conduct with trans and gender-variant students wherein we explore and elucidate the normative contours that constitute queer failure.

PERFORMING QUEER FAILURE

I watch the anxiety
melt
from their bodies
shift
to presence
as they recognize
"I'm not the problem."
For the first time.

At the university where I teach, I facilitate what I call "trans[2] empowerment groups," which seek to reshape embodied cultural traumas as critical points of departure. In essence, the trans empowerment groups are modeled after feminist consciousness-raising groups. I quote hooks (2015) at length who describes feminist consciousness-raising groups:

> It was the site where they [women] uncovered and openly revealed the depths of their intimate wounds. This confessional aspect served as a healing ritual. Through consciousness-raising women gained the strength to challenge patriarchal forces at work and at home.
>
> Importantly though, the foundation of this work began with women examining sexist thinking and creating strategies where we would change our attitudes

> and beliefs via a conversion to feminist thinking and a commitment to feminist politics. Fundamentally, the consciousness-raising group was a site for conversion. (p. 8)

Trans empowerment groups are informed through a transfeminist politic that nuances the links between transgender subjectivity, identity, and politics and feminist politics (Stryker & Bettcher, 2016). As a transfeminist project, members of the trans empowerment groups seek to unlearn and externalize internalized cissexism. Cissexism refers to the systemic privileging of cisgender and cissexual (non-trans people) identities, embodiments, and subjectivities (Serano, 2007). In this regard, our larger goal is to work collectively in marking the discursive limits of normative culture and the means by which it seeks to reassert itself by policing, disciplining, and surveilling non-normative embodiments; in this case, trans embodiments. We accomplish this goal through multiple, creative means. I will exhibit one practice: Trans Gazing.

Trans Gazing

Each month we decide on a collective outing. Together we ride the city bus to the chosen venue. This month: a movie located on a popular promenade. The heavier the foot traffic the more productive our discussions, the more effective our unlearning, and the scarier it is to simply be in our trans bodies in a cissexist, cisnormative culture. The potential danger does not escape us; though, the danger does not dissipate at the end of our exercise. As trans folks, our bodies serve as battlegrounds for other peoples' normative gender expectancies. This is an exercise in learning to be firm in our trans identities in public space by learning to mark and resist projections of cissexism to the best of our abilities.

Today, four students join me in our trans gazing adventure. We stand in a circle, taking in the surrounding context. They are nervous. As am I. These are never easy exercises. But, I remind myself, sharing the space with other trans people makes it easier—at least for me. I compose myself, remind myself of my role as facilitator despite the affirming impact these outings have on my own trans identity. I guide the students' focus, "Take note of who is staring. What are their faces doing? What about their children . . . ."

I'm cut off by Nolan,[3] "They appear to block their children." The others rigorously write observations in their field notes journals.

"How so?" I ask.

"Like, they position their bodies between us and their kid."

"What does this suggest to you?"

"That they're pieces of shit?" Sarah responds half joking. The students laugh. I do, too.

I add while still laughing a little, "let's try to avoid projecting our anger. While that *may* be true, it's largely *cissexism* running through their bodies, informing their mundane performance. So, let's think along these lines: What does this shielding of the children *as a cultural performance of cissexism* suggest to you?"

There is a pause. They are contemplating. We keep an eye out, watching the watcher; flipping the gaze. Aiden responds hesitantly, uncertain: "Does it have to do with the conservative bathroom arguments that keep circulating in news reports?" This question peaks the interest of the others who await my response.

"How so?" I ask, pushing them to think deeper, systemically.

All four contemplate possibilities. Gloria chimes in, "I think a lot of the so-called 'debate' deals with tired stereotypes that largely implicate gay cisgender men as pedophiles."

I nod adding, "an egregious stereotype to say the least. And this sexual perversion trope carries itself across queer and trans spectrums: we are all sexual perverts in the eyes of normative culture."

"Well, I *am* a sexual pervert," Gloria jokingly retorts. We all laugh.

Nolan asks excitedly refocusing our attention, "If that's the case, then these individuals probably see us as gay men in drag and all those related cultural practices?"

Sarah retorts, "Well, some of us anyhow."

"Can you unpack that a little further, Sarah," I ask.

"Sure. I'm a woman who is transgender. Most cisgender people don't know what or *who* a transgender woman is. What do they know? They know drag queens, RuPaul, all that." The students all nod in agreement. She continues by asking me, "and what did you call it, Benny? A post-Jenner era?"

I nod, half smirking. "Yeah, a 'post-Jenner era.' Caitlyn Jenner came out and mass media channels competed for the most, not the best, representation. So here we are, more people than ever have access to trans discourse but they have no idea how to use it or their confusions are all the more sedimented. It is a tumultuous time for trans people particularly because there is better access to language but there is no unlearning of normative bodily expectations; we have the language but not the relearning of a trans-affirming gender structure." I've talked too much. I shift the discussion, "Back to Sarah's point, if I am hearing you correctly, normative culture has an un-nuanced understanding of trans identification and embodiment?"

Sarah unconvincingly nods.

Nolan adds, "You're right, Sarah. This impacts you *and* Gloria differently than it does me as a transgender man."

"And me as a non-binary person," Aiden offers.

"And me as a non-binary person, too" I layer in my own positionality. "And yet to them, we are lumped together through larger stereotypes: pervert, villainous, and/or sick."

Gloria jumps in, "So, could we say that the blocking, the shielding functions as an intersectional point of oppression?"

My eyebrows arch in interest, "Go on, Gloria. Can you say more?"

"Sure. I mean, regardless of our individual embodiments, we are perceived as a collective. In this way, the shield metaphorically blocks a host of non-normativity: gender, sex, sexuality, race, class, religion, and so on from engaging their assumed-normative-children. As a transwoman of color, I deal with multiple systems of oppression—racism, heterosexism, cissexism, classism, and sexism—while you're all processing your own intersectional relations to the same shield. Serano (2007) uses transmisogyny to describe trans women's unique experience with these systems: 'when a trans person is ridiculed or dismissed not merely for failing to live up to gender norms, but for their expressions of femaleness or femininity' more specifically" (p. 11–12).

"Precisely," I exclaim and add asking, "Serano (2007) further suggests that these systems are propped up by larger systems: oppositional and traditional sexism. Do we recall these systems?"

Aiden offers, "Traditional sexism is the systemic 'belief that maleness and masculinity are superior to femaleness and femininity' while oppositional sexism refers to the systemic 'belief that female and male are rigid, mutually exclusive categories, each possessing a unique and nonoverlapping set of attributes, aptitudes, abilities, and desires'" (Serano, 2007, p. 14, 13).

Gloria jokes, "Um, did you memorize all that?" We all laugh.

Nolan adds, "And what about me as a trans guy or Aiden as a non-binary person?"

I flip the question, "What do you think? Why would they shield their children from *you*?"

"FUCKING FAGGOT FREAKS!" a man yells as he walks by clasping a kid's arm. A woman—his partner perhaps—walks at his side and snarls in our direction. We're silent for a moment, taking it in.

Aiden speaks up, "I mean, yeah. There it is. That man sees us as a group of 'faggots' or gay dudes or just plain ol' sexual perverts. But, something tells me he thinks anyone under the rainbow umbrella is a pervert."

"Normative thought is so boring. I mean, faggot? How about something new?" says Nolan. We all laugh. He continues, "But really, it seems that culture somehow stopped processing queerness at cisgender gay men. I'm a gay man who is trans, an actual 'fag' if you will. And yet, to this passing man, we are all the same."

Sarah offers, "In this way, resistance must be collective. That is, we are all fighting overlapping, messy systems."

A child walks up to Gloria and asks loudly, "Are you a boy or a girl?"

Gloria, a woman who is Black and trans, retorts, "Hi. I am a girl. What about you? Are you a boy, a girl, or something else?"

The little girl, who is White, responds, "I'm a girl, too." The little girl's smile, marking solidarity in gender identity, lights up the space and Gloria returns a smile. The little girl's mom marches over and grabs her daughter, dragging her away whispering, "I am *so* sorry." The students are silent. I'm saddened less by the little girl's question and more angry at the recognition that we are watching the active socialization of cissexism as it intersects with racism—of keeping transgender women of color away from presumably White cisgender children (cissexism is often marked by the assumption that one's child couldn't possibly be transgender as indicated by gender reveal parties during pregnancy—a public declaration of presumably stable gender identification). Too often these seemingly neutral questions ("are you a boy or a girl?," "what are you?") fall on the backs of those dubbed "failures" from a normative vantage, especially for trans women and trans women of color in particular. Woven into their/our subjectivity as queer failures is the understanding that in most contexts we will have to assert ourselves, fight to be affirmed on our terms of engagement. That is, we will have to constantly prove we are who we understand ourselves to be. It is exhausting.

CLICK. We are jolted out of our collective dissociation at the sound of a digital camera shutter. "FREAKS!" a 20-something yells at us. They will no doubt post the image of the freaks on social media. It isn't the first time. We are celebrities.

"Let's talk about the picture," I assert trying to externalize what is slowly turning inward. I add, "let's name it: *A. Stranger. Just. Deliberately. Took. Our. Picture. Without. Our. Permission. And. Will. Probably. Post. It. Maliciously. Online*. How can we make sense of this as a cultural performance of cissexism seeking to stamp out non-normativity?"

Nolan is surprised, "I never get this when I'm alone. I'm processing my own privilege as a trans person whose masculine embodiment does not endure this sort of . . . um . . . violation? I think it's a violation."

Gloria shakes away the drudge of cissexism and racism and says, "When I'm with my Black trans friends we get this all the time. Hell, even when I'm alone."

Sarah, a Latina, adds, "Same here. When I'm especially with my friends, who are mostly trans women of color, too, we are often gawked at; we have so many pictures taken without our permission we just pretend we're celebrities and they're the paparazzi. Though that doesn't change a thing about culture."

Gloria offers, "I see that. But, yeah, it doesn't change much. I mean, it doesn't make the situation any less dangerous. But at the very least I can refuse to let them think that their cissexist behavior is getting me down."

I suggest a framing mechanism we've discussed in prior meetings, "How does Audre Lorde (2007) articulate the ways we orient to difference in a capitalist culture?"

They think for a moment. Aiden, a mixed-race non-binary person, indicates they recall but are struggling to articulate it. They snap their fingers, eager to get the answer out. And then they declare with certainty, "I got it! Lorde (2007) observes we '[i]gnore [difference] and if that is not possible, copy it if we think it is dominant, or destroy it if we think it is subordinate'" (p. 115).

I affirm, "Yes! Anyone want to add?"

Sarah offers, "To be clear, Lorde (2007) argues that this is an institutionalized response to difference. So, it is a normative response, not a necessary response. I mean, we don't *have* to respond this way, right?"

"Correct," I respond, adding, "Lorde (2007) suggests, specifically, that this alienation is imperative in an exploitative culture, which 'needs outsiders as surplus people'" (p. 115).

Gloria jumps in, "So, is the unsolicited picture taking an example of copying, ignoring, or destroying difference?"

Sarah offers, "*Our*. Destroying *our* difference."

Gloria, "Right! Does the unsolicited photo, a breach of our agency, serve to copy, ignore, or destroy our difference?"

Nolan, a White trans man, offers an answer, "I think it's an act of ignoring our difference. I mean, I think that asking permission, asking for consent, affirms the humanity of another; that we are capable of making our own bodily choices. For me, the picture taking, without our permission, and clearly done with malice as indicated by what I read as insidious laughter, ignores our difference as trans and gender variant people."

I nod in agreement. The others do the same. Gloria adds, "I agree with that Nolan. Thank you. I hadn't thought of it that way. That the picture ignores my difference, my uniqueness. My me-ness. It means they feel so empowered to do with my body without my consent anything they please. OH! Now, I'm just mad."

I jump in, "Yes! Feel that anger. Don't ignore or suppress it. It is not okay that that happened to you or to us. It is not okay."

Aiden, a mixed-race person, adds to the discussion, "I think the picture taking was also an act of copying our difference *and* destroying our difference. In some regard, the act of taking our picture without our consent copies our difference by literally exploiting a representation of us for one's own social media gain through 'likes' and 'shares' and the like. They gain from our loss. It is exploitation justified through dehumanization!" They are worked up.

I jump in, "Let's take a big breath together. IN." We breathe in slowly. "OUT." We exhale collectively, releasing the tension. I continue, "This work is not easy. We are processing and unlearning some deep-seated systems of oppression. Aiden, did you have something to say about the picture taking destroying our difference, too?"

Sarah jumps in, "If I may, Aiden. I would like to try to answer this, maybe we're on the same page?" Aiden nods, Sarah continues, "I think the picture taking seeks to destroy our difference through the same exploitative lens Aiden is describing. It is an act of destruction in that we are effectively rendered non-human, walking jokes. These images, the offensive questioning, the demands that we account for our bodily choices at every turn, comments on our voices and bodily frames, these are all microagressive acts that serve a larger function of cutting us down."

Aiden jumps back in, "Of destroying our difference. Yes, precisely my thinking, Sarah."

I nod. The students nod. I say, "The goal, then, is to affirm difference. In this way, our socialized tendency to turn inward, to project these cissexist denials of difference on to our selves, is toxic. What we demand is affirmation on our terms of engagement."

Sarah corrects me, "What we *require* is affirmation. Our survival depends on this labor."

Gloria adds, "Until our differences are affirmed, minoritarian folks will continue to bear the brunt of systemic violence."

We nearly forget that our movie is about to start. We gather ourselves, take a deep collective breath, and exhale slowly—an intentional, routine practice. The employee working the entrance, taking tickets, is visibly uncomfortable at the approaching group of gender non-normative folks. The students are disinterested in the attendant's cissexist discomfort. "Good," I think to myself, "reject the normative gaze. Just be."

FAILING NORMATIVITY'S GRASP

Through this performative recollection of a field activity, I illustrate an approach to critical cultural communication pedagogy that centers principles from queer studies. Specifically, I exhibit an embodied means to critical cultural communication pedagogy that attends to the performative sedimentation of cultural normativity. Even more, I argue queer communication pedagogy—a queer approach to critical cultural communication pedagogy—promotes an embodied means of resisting the performative sedimentation of normativity in its becoming through a commitment to intersectional reflexivity, which centers self-implication as the primary means by which subjectivity emerges. Centering implication marks a desire for failure; that is, one seeks to fail normativity's grasp when one is implicated in it perpetuation. Indeed, implication emerges as a vital communicative potentiality. McIntosh and Hobson (2013) argue even though "relational failures are inevitable" it is *reflexive engagement* that "challenges us to not fixate on the failure but to

see these moments of relations as moments of pedagogical manifestations of alliance work" (p. 4). In this regard, a queer communication pedagogy thus champions reflexive engagements—commitment to cross-cultural alliance building—animated through a reflexive, intersectionally conscious approach to failure.

While our transgender and/or queer gender experiences serve as an initial binding mechanism, it is key to note that this activity, and one's purporting a queer communication pedagogical approach, do not focus on gender at the exclusion of intersecting cultural vectors of difference. Returning to Fassett and Warren's (2007) foundational text *Critical Communication Pedagogy* is useful on this point. They argue that CCP frames identity as constituted through communication. Moreover, culture is understood as "central" as opposed to "additive" to CCP (p. 42). Further, power is understood as "fluid and complex" (p. 41). Taken together, CCP highlights the relational tensions that emerge in communicative contexts across difference; these tensions provide the grounds for subjective identification through implication. That power is understood as complex and fluid highlights the simultaneity of privilege and disadvantage explicated through intersectional reflexivity such that one is always already navigating both privilege and disadvantage based on a given cultural context. The approach to queer communication pedagogy that I champion here brings awareness to our active perpetuation of power and disadvantage through our mundane enactments of culture. However, a queer communication pedagogy understands the moment of performative sedimentation as a site of potentiality in which we are equipped to intervene in the sedimentation of normativity and effectively work to mold that sedimentation into a form that is more affirming, equitable, and just. If, as Fassett and Warren argue, "it is the mundane communication practices in our lives that work to make larger social systems possible" then the capacity to shift those social systems is just as plausible as allowing those same systems to perpetuate as if they were inevitable (p. 45). The queer communication pedagogue works with students to grapple with their/our active role in maintaining (and changing) culture through mundane enactments. So conceived I implore critical communication pedagogues to explore the potentiality in implication as a point for resisting and critiquing normativity in mundane iterations both in and out of the classroom.

CLOSING THOUGHTS

In this chapter, I explore queer failure as a modality of queer communication pedagogy. Specifically, I argue queer communication pedagogy marks a resistive, embodied politic that ruptures the performative sedimentation

of normativity. Queer failure is understood as an embodied analytic that reveals the contours of normativity through systemic affirmation and erasure. That is, rather than minoritarian folks failing to meet normative standards, queer failure marks the systemic means by which normative formations *fail* to affirm non-normative cultural difference. In this way, the onus of failure is flipped from an internalized understanding of self-as-failure to an externalized empowerment that frames self as surviving and navigating normative-culture-as-failing-to-affirm-difference.

To exhibit queer communication pedagogy in play, I offer an autoethnographic recollection. The trans empowerment groups I facilitate are spaces in which internalized cissexism is marked, analyzed, externalized, and rejected. The trans gazing exercise is one field-based outing wherein I work with students in the "real world" (read: off campus; the University, too, is constituted through intersecting systems of oppression including cissexism) in order to mark cissexism in everyday life as less the result of one's own doing and more an effect of systemic oppression. Attending to the intersectional means by which difference within trans and gender-variant communities manifests is key to elucidating the complexity of failure. For trans folks of color, for instance, the violence of normativity includes not only internalized cissexism but also racism or White supremacy. In this regard, to understand cissexism is to grapple with racism, sexism, classism, and other intersecting lines of oppression that exacerbate feelings of failure informed from the vantage of the normative.

To reiterate, the *failure* in queer failure refers to the ways in which individuals fail to perform normative cultural expectations, which are defined in accordance with normativity. That those expectations are normative suggests two things. First, normative cultural expectations are imbued with a moral component framed as a compulsory obligation. That is, failing to perform normative expectations positions one as being at odds with hegemony and is thus found suspect. Second, normative cultural expectations reveal more about culture than they do about individuals failing or succeeding at performing culture. Thus, attending to performances of self that fail to meet normative demands reveals an awful lot about dominant cultural interpolating mechanisms including, specifically, the performative limits that attempt to confine and define individuals across time and through space. In the end, I turn to queer failure as a mode of queer communication pedagogy in order to highlight hegemonic cultural expectations enacted on all bodies regardless of subject position; how we fail or succeed at performing those normative scripts can mean the literal life or death of an individual or group. I urge critical cultural communication scholars and pedagogues to consider the ways individuals negotiate their own seemingly disparate, failing, identities in mundane performances of self. Indeed, future research and pedagogy should continue to elucidate the ties that can bind queer studies and theory to critical

cultural communication pedagogy. This unique melding engages questions of normativity, power, and embodiment through pedagogy.

NOTES

1. To reiterate Muñoz (2009), queer failure does not preclude non-queer-identified subjects; rather, it applies to queers *and* other minoritarian subjects Sedgwick (1990) describes two approaches to conceptualizing the efficacy of queer studies: a minoritizing view and a universalizing view. A minoritizing view maintains that a select few individuals are queer and, as a result, studying queerness only ever applies to that group of individuals. Conversely, a universalizing view assumes that studying queerness is important for a number of wide-ranging identities and for a variety of reasons. Like Sedgwick, I utilize a universalizing view.
2. In this chapter, I understand trans as an "umbrella term for persons who challenge gender normativity" (Johnson, 2013, p. 127).
3. Names are pseudonyms.

REFERENCES

Chávez, K. R. (2013). Pushing boundaries: Queer intercultural communication. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication,* 6, 83–95. doi: 10.1080/17513057.2013.777506

Conquergood, D. (1985). Performing as a moral act: Ethical dimensions of the ethnography of performance. *Literature in Performance,* 5(2), 1–13. doi: 10.1080/10462938509391578

Fassett, D. L., & Warren, J. T. (2007). *Critical communication pedagogy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Halberstam, J. (2011). *The queer art of failure*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

hooks, B. (2015). *Feminism is for everybody: Passionate politics*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Johnson, H. M. (2003, Feb 16). Unspeakable conversations. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2003/02/16/magazine/unspeakable-conversations.html

Johnson, J. (2013). Cisgender privilege, intersectionality, and the criminalization of CeCe McDonald: Why (critical) intercultural communication needs trans-analysis and transgender studies. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication,* 6, 135–144. doi: 10.1080/17513057.2013.776094

Jones Jr., R. G. (2010). Putting privilege into practice through 'intersectional reflexivity:' Ruminations, interventions, and possibilities. *Issues of Privilege in Social Work and Other Helping Reflections.* Spec issue of *Reflections: Narrative of Professional Helping*, 122–125.

Lorde, A. (2007). *Sister outsider: Essays and speeches*. Berkeley: Crossing Path.

McIntosh, D. M. D., & Hobson, K. (2013). Reflexive engagement: A white (queer) women's performance of failures and alliance possibilities. *Liminalities: A Journal of Performance Studies,* 9(4), 1–23. Retrieved from http://liminalities.net/9–4/reflexive.pdf

Muñoz, J. E. (2009). *Cruising utopia: The then and there of queer futurity*. New York: New York University Press.

Schrag, C. O. (2003). *Communicative praxis and the space of subjectivity.* West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press.

Sedgwick, E. K. (1990). *Epistemology of the closet*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Serano, J. (2016). *Whipping girl: A transsexual woman on sexism and the scapegoating of femininity* (2nd ed.). Berkeley, CA: Seal Press.

Stryker, S., & Bettcher, T. M. (2016). Introduction: Trans/Feminisms. *Transgender Studies Quarterly,* 3(1–2), 5–14. doi: 10.1215/23289252–3334127

Vaid-Menon, A. (2014, Oct 15). I don't identify as a boy or as a girl: This is my story. *Mtv News*. Retrieved from http://www.mtv.com/news/1962946/gender-non-conforming-identity-trans/

Warren, J. T. (2001). Doing whiteness: On the performative dimensions of race in the classroom. *Communication Education,* 50, 91–108. doi: 10.1080/03634520109379237

Yep, G. A. (2003). The violence of heteronormativity in communication studies: Notes on injury, healing, and queer world-making. *Journal of Homosexuality,* 45(2–4), 11–59. doi: 10.1300/J082v45n02_02

Chapter 7

Pedagogy of the Taboo

Theorizing Transformative Teaching-Learning Experiences that Speak Truth(s) to Power

Mark P. Orbe

During my 20+ years of teaching different communication courses, I have engaged a variety of taboo topics including those described as the most strictly avoided: race/ethnicity, sex/sexuality, and religion/spirituality (Evans, Avery, & Pederson, 2000). Over the past eight years, I have facilitated an upper-level undergraduate course entitled *Communicating About Taboo Topics* where we engage topics that carry a strong social prohibition (Ayers & Ayers, 2014). This particular course combines critical communication pedagogy (Fassett & Warren, 2007) and dialogic theory (Freire, 1990; Keating, 2007) to engage taboo topics whose power is retained and replicated as long as they remain cloaked in silence.

In this chapter, I embrace a critical autoethnographical approach (Boylorn & Orbe, 2014) for theorizing a pedagogy of the taboo. Specifically, my objective is to extend interdisciplinary work of others whose writings have informed a more critical approach to pedagogy (Freire, 1990; Hooks, 1994; Keating, 2007; Toyosaki, 2007). In particular, I work to create a conceptual/theoretical framework for those pedagogues committed to creating transformative relationships among educational participants where synergistic power (power with) replaces traditional power dynamics (power over) and becomes normalized as the optimal teaching-learning posture (Bate & Bowker, 1997).

This essay, in part, is a response to Fassett and Warren's (2007) question, "How does critical communication pedagogy look in the classroom?" (p. 111) It explores my experiences teaching *Communicating About Taboo Topics*— "how [I] succeed and, inevitably, fail in efforts to nurture and sustain critical communication pedagogy" (p. 111). Following the model of Fassett and Warren, I utilize autoethnography to create a "collage of moments" (p. 89) of successes and/or failures that capture the essence of a pedagogy of the taboo. Through a praxis-oriented autoethnography (Toyosaki, 2012), I work

toward a greater understanding of how teacher-scholars can engage taboo topics through dialogue (Freire, 1990).

***

I have always viewed my role in the college classroom as facilitator, not a "sage on the stage" but a "guide on the side." In many ways, my approach to teaching aligns with Freire's (1990) concept of teaching as more than the transmission of knowledge—teaching as empowerment, teaching as freedom, teaching as learning and learning as teaching. In 2008, I created and facilitated a "special topics" course in my school: Communicating About Taboo Topics. *My previous courses (*Intercultural Communication*,* Gender and Communication*, and* Interracial Communication*) provided multiple opportunities to engage socially taboo topics (e.g., racism, sexism, privilege), yet I found the process of creating, facilitating, revising, and offering the new course multiple times truly reflected Freire's connection between reflection, praxis, and action. Offered each Fall semester, and now currently in its eighth generation, the class has been transformative for myself and the students.*

***

CRITICAL COMMUNICATION PEDAGOGY

In the words of Fassett and Warren (2007), critical communication pedagogy involves "engaging the classroom as a site of social influence, as a space where people shape each other for better and for worse" (p. 8). The "critical" in critical communication pedagogy refers to the role of critical educators, individuals who act "with each other, not on, for, or to each other" (p. 27) to explore how truth(s) is connected to power. The process of discovery which "must be forged *with*, not *for*, the oppressed (whether individuals or peoples) in the incessant struggle to regain their humanity" (Freire, 1990, p. 33). As such, "critical" refers to "locating and naming the bad, the incomplete, the oppressive in a given instance;" yet it also means considering the possibilities, hoping for and imagining something better (Fassett & Warren, p. 26). This also involves a respect for students and teachers and "possible actions they can take, however small, to effect material change to the people and the world around them" (p. 8).

***

"That looks like a great book. …" I am at the Sage booth at the National Communication Association perusing new books and have picked up Critical Communication Pedagogy *(Fassett & Warren, 2007). I turn around and discover that the voice belongs to no other than John T. Warren, one of the authors of the book. We've known each other casually for several years and oftentimes catch up with one another at NCA each year. I congratulate him*

on the publication of the book and immediately order it. When it arrives in my office mail, I am in the midst of writing a book review for another book. With the deadline looming, I skillfully practice the art of avoidance behavior and start in on the Fassett and Warren text. From the very first page, I'm hooked. I devour the book, making all sorts of comments in the margins. In the end, I notify the editor that I've decided to write a review of Critical Communication Pedagogy *(Orbe, 2007).*

***

In *Teaching the taboo: Courage and imagination in the classroom*, Ayers and Ayers (2014), speak to the importance for teachers to "make a space of honest exploration and serious examination of the embodied lives gathered in classrooms" (p. 81). This particular text situates the best pedagogical practices as those that encourage "students to develop the capacity to name the world for themselves, to identify the obstacles to their full humanity, and to have the courage to act upon whatever the known demands" (p. 13). Teaching about taboo topics, as described by Ayers and Ayers, is a form of critical communication pedagogy. It is "always about opening doors and opening minds as students forge their own pathways into a wider, shared world" (p. 13). In this context, a "shared world" reflects a synergy that resists essentializing the "privileged" and the "oppressed" in learning environments (Freire, 1990). Such a rigid positioning is problematic and reduces the possibility for dialogic moments to emerge.

> Teachers are not invited to missionary work, charity work, among the oppressed in our society. Instead, we have an opportunity to be in the presence of tremendous, powerful, insightful young people. We can join in the dance with students and provoke them with questions, challenges, tools, and reflection, but we are only useful agents in their educations if we replace charity with solidarity, patronizing with respect. This requires a leveling of power in the classroom and a concerted search for generative topics, resources, and questions to pursue together. (Ayers & Ayers, 2014, p. 83)

With such a foundation, "each new classroom is a new horizon, a new beginning, a fresh start" (Fassett & Warren, 2007, p. 131), one which honors "diversity while building unity" (Ayers & Ayers, 2014, p. 106).

The "pedagogy" of critical communication pedagogy, according to Fassett and Warren (2007), is not "just a fancy way of saying 'teaching'…'pedagogy' is more open and potentially dialogic" (p. 48). The connection between pedagogy and dialogue is made explicit by Freire (1990) who asserted "The only effective instrument is a humanizing pedagogy in which the revolutionary leadership establishes a permanent relationship of dialogue" (p. 55). Specifically, he conceptualized "dialogue as essential communication" (p. 168) and explained how:

> Through dialogue, the teacher-of-the-students and the students-of-the-teacher cease to exist and a new term emerges: teacher-student with students-teachers. The teacher is no longer merely the-one-who-teaches, but one who is himself [*sic*] taught in dialogue with the students, who in turn while being taught also teach. (Freire, 1990, p. 67)

This characterization resists traditional conceptualizations of teacher as "giver" and student as "receiver" (Ayers & Ayers, 2014). Instead a process of communion-cooperation-fusion (Freire, p. 171) is invoked whereby "those who want to name the world and those who do not wish this naming" (Freire, p. 88) can synergistically strive toward a sense-making that transcends individual understanding (Ayers & Ayers).

***

This course epitomizes how a college classroom is comprised of life-long learners. From the outset, I positioned myself as a teacher-student among teacher-students, making an explicit, conscious choice to avoid the label of "expert;" instead I shared my own socialization around taboo topics and discomfort discussing many of the topics. In the first week of class, for instance, we generated individual and collective lists of the "Top Ten Taboo Topics." When one student suggested that masturbation was on their list, I repeated the word and facilitated a discussion about where (and if) the topic should be on our class list. We also discussed how the topic was more taboo for women, compared to men. Yet, at that very moment, I recall laughing and thinking to myself: [think Beavis and Butthead voiceover] "He-he-he, wow, I just said 'masturbation' in class." I immediately had reverted back to the first time in my adolescent years when I learned a label for the act. While I'm certain that the class couldn't discern my inner thoughts at that time, I shared the experience with them a couple of weeks later in order to demonstrate my parallel role in the process of teaching-learning.

***

The necessity of dialogic-based education is directly tied to creating a teacher-learning environment where taboo topics productively can be engaged (Ayers & Ayers, 2014). A central component is dialogic listening, wherein individuals realize that they "cannot think *for others* or *without others*" (Freire, 1990, p. 100). As we seek transformative experiences in the classroom, our need for collaborative teaching-learning

> points toward dialogue—everyone listening to others with the possibility of being changed, and everyone speaking up forcefully with the possibility of being heard. You must listen and speak, learn and teach. Without freedom of expression, we are doomed to accept current dogma, received ideas, prejudice and popular stereotypes. (Ayers & Ayers, 2014, pp. 96–97)

***

The first Communicating About Taboo Topics *course that I taught was not without its trepidations. The semester before a women's and gender studies professor at the university did not have their contract renewed after an undergraduate student's parents complained about some of the visual media used in a* Sexes and the Media *class. In my first course, student enrollment capped at 30 the first few days of registration, yet I suspected that most of the students had more interest in taking me as an instructor as opposed to the content of the course. Over the first few days of class, for instance, several students disclosed that they weren't exactly sure what the course was about. What evolved that first semester was—dare I say it—magical. In all of my years of teaching, I never experienced a teaching-learning environment so packed with vulnerability, passion, caring, fear, pain, joy, and community. We all progressed in our willingness, desire, and commitment to working toward dialogic moments around a number of topics deemed as taboo. And in doing so, we reclaimed some of the power that those issues had over our lives. I vividly remember on the last day of class sharing with the students just how special the class was…and how I was thinking about not teaching it again because there was no way that future classes could accomplish what we had collectively. I still have great respect and admiration for the "first generation of Taboo Topic students;" however, each subsequent generation—in its own unique way—has never failed to be just as magically transformative.*

***

A PEDAGOGY OF THE TABOO

A taboo (or tabu) is a Polynesian word that refers to a general ban on a particular object; alternatively, a taboo is "marked off"—implying that certain things are unsafe for causal contact. Taboo topics, then, refer to a strong social prohibition against words, actions, and discussions that are considered offensive and/or undesirable (Evans et al., 2000). A taboo can exist in the form of something that you should not do (the taboo is on the action), things that you do but do not discuss (the taboo is on the discussion), or things that you would not dare to do or even think about (the taboo is on the thought, label, and action). Taboo topics can vary depending on context (personal, relational, cultural, societal), but the commonalty is that all involve subjects that are perceived to be painful, embarrassing, and/or humiliating to self and/or others. Consistent with the ideas of critical pedagogy (Freire, 1990) and stigma message effects (Goffman, 1963), I would argue that labeling something as taboo can also be understood as a rhetorical strategy that works to control conversation, and in doing so, preserving the status quo.

***

Facilitating this particular course is simultaneously invigorating and exhausting. After the first offering, I've arranged to have it scheduled at the end of the school day so that I could utilize the drive home, and subsequent quiet time, to mentally process each class. What makes it so intense is my commitment—alongside the commitment of the class as a whole—to build a community where we can experience dialogic moments regarding difficult topics. True to Freire's (1990) vision, I begin the class as teacher-student and slowly reposition myself as student-teacher by the end of the semester. This is accomplished as I shift from facilitator of discussion to participant (joining in our small group discussions). The final third of the class is set up where students groups are charged to facilitate a class period on a taboo topic of their choice. The focus here is not on a group presentation (of information), but a facilitation (of dialogue). During these times, I never occupy the front of the room, and enter the class and sit with the other participants.

This shift in positionality is significant, but never easy—especially when students are facilitating on topics that I feel especially passionate about (e.g., race and racism). Yet, I remain mindful to participate as I would hope that others would when I was the primary facilitator. This includes engaging in thought-provoking exercises where I struggle with how much sharing/self-disclosure is "appropriate" given my official designation as university employee and instructor of record.

For instance, during the third generation of Taboo Topics*, one student group facilitated on the topic of "kinks and fetishes." After offering operational definitions of each concept, each participant was asked to list examples of personal kinks and fetishes that they enjoyed. With pen in hand, and paper directly in front of me, I sat a table with five other participants dumbfounded. I was not able to identify any particular fetishes in my sexual life; however, a few kinks immediately came to mind—each of which brought an immediate (joyful/nervous) smile to my face. Apparently my co-participants were having similar experiences as each of us was smiling and laughing nervously. In the end, I was inspired by the disclosures of others in my group and offered one example of a personal kink. Admittedly, it was (in my mind) the most common and socially acceptable on my list.*

***

"Teachers play a critical role in stifling or promoting the discussion of taboo topics" (Evans et al., 2000, p. 299). For instance, teachers must understand the importance of nurturing "safe spaces" to engage taboo topics, and simultaneously understand that the ultimate goal is for the "safe space" to facilitate "brave spaces" where individual and collective vulnerability is practiced and shared (Arao & Clemens, 2013). Yet, the scholarly literature for pedagogy and taboo topics is limited (Evans, Avery, & Pederson, 2000; Goodman,

1995; Hedley & Markowitz, 2001; Nash, Bradley, & Chickering, 2008), including that which is grounded in communication concepts and theories (Anderson, Kunkel, & Dennis, 2011; Baxter & Wilmot, 1985; Roloff & Johnson, 2001).

The field of communication has significant potential to make valuable contributions to engaging taboo topics. Fassett and Warren (2007) do not specifically use the label "taboo topics" yet their conceptualization of critical communication pedagogy offers an excellent foundation for such work. A pedagogy of the taboo is about "living the commitments" (Fassett & Warren, 2007, p. 58) of critical communication pedagogy—in one's teaching, research, and service to others. As such, it is ontological; "it is and must be a way of life" (p. 110). Within this section, I feature autoethnographical reflections to demonstrate how a pedagogy of the taboo "can be as much about failure as success" (p. 131).

***

Witnessing a classroom environment shift from "safe space" to "brave space" is a humbling experience. For me, the brave space typically captures the transformative power of teaching as freedom, and further cements student desire for "higher" educational spaces where they can express their authentic selves. When I reflect on successes of the class, I immediately think of my fifth generation of taboo topics—a community of teachers-students in every aspect of the phrase. Three years later, I can recall each of the 30 students and their unique contribution to our dialogic synergy. For the purpose of this autoethnographic reflection, I will focus on two people: Adam and Casey.

I first met Adam on the first day of class, and immediately, he impressed me as a smart, thoughtful, happy, and confident person. Tall and of medium build, his classroom contributions resisted any existing stereotypes associated with traditionally aged white male college students from a small town. During the third week of class, as we engaged the topic of religion/ spirituality, Adam shared his Wiccan faith with the class. His self-assuredness and respect for other faiths, coupled with his easy-to-understand descriptions of his own faith, provided a great lesson to those of us with little exposure to his earth-based spirituality. In comparison, Casey had been a student in my previous class. While some might be intimidated by his size and strength, most are brought in by his outgoing personality—honest, open, funny, and oftentimes loud (but not in a bad way). In many ways, he represented the type of student that I often find myself mentoring: An African American man, from the inner city, who has all that it takes for academic greatness but sometimes struggles with the realities of being on a predominantly white campus.

During one class toward the middle of the semester Adam, nurtured by the safe space of our community, shared with the class that he is

trans—something that, at the time, he had not shared with anyone else at the university. Immediately following his self-disclosure, he rested both of his elbows on his knees and placed both hands over his face. My immediate suspicion was that he was regretting his decision to identify publically as trans*, and I wanted to reassure him, but before I could do, the love that he received from others in the room was so palatable that he removed his hands. The joy/relief/gratitude that was on his face will forever remain captured in my mind. This one manifestation of brave space, and Adam's subsequent openness, recalibrated our teaching-learning community in ways that are difficult to describe without sounding idealistic, surreal, or "corny."*

The last day of the semester, we attempted to draw closure to the experience through several activities, including one where individuals share with others about what they are most grateful for. During this already emotional time, Casey took the opportunity to publically thank Adam and tell him how his courage to come out has forever changed his perception and understanding of trans people. This sentiment was echoed nonverbally by many others in the class. Not missing a beat, Adam shared with Casey a similar transformation: He stated how, before the class, he had stereotyped inner-city Black males into one of his biggest fears—in terms of negative reactions to being trans*. "Because of who you are, and being so open in this class, you have forever changed how I see African American men." Other students in the class went on to express their genuine gratitude in similar ways. During the final exam period, several students turned in their tests only to return to their seats and wait, taking in the last moments of the class as tears streamed down their faces. The sense of community was so strong that students simply refused to let the class experience end. Out-of-class gatherings, spontaneous and planned (like the group potluck at my house), continued to occur. Luckily for all of us, social media provides a communal space for us, despite physical distances. Our commitment to one another reflects the ideals of "teaching as friendship" (Rawlins, 2000), or in our case, "teaching as family" which invokes a multitude of familial relationships based on varying roles, levels of immediacy and intimacy, breadth and depth of communication.*

***

According to Ayers and Ayers (2014), classrooms are places of possibility filled with opportunities to hope, resist, explore, reflect, dream, and catch glimpses of what could be. Like these educators, I "want to think of classrooms as participatory places, kind and visionary, grounded in the lives of students, powered by their curiosities and imaginations and powerful sense-making capacities—critical, wondering, trembling and real" (p. 126). My teaching experiences have often felt far short of this sort of idealized classroom, however, teaching *Communicating About Taboo Topics* has provided just enough instances to believe in the power of the pedagogy of the taboo.

As such, I seek to advocate for "classrooms where queer questions are common, where seeking deeper understanding is the order to the day" (p. 126). As Ayers and Ayers confirm, these are classrooms where teacher-students and student-teachers feel "alive—imaginative, curious, experimental, skeptical" (p. 126) with one another.

***

On this particular day, the tears literally took my breath away as I sat unable to speak. The level of emotion uncontrollability was intensified because the topic of the student facilitation was death and dying, hardly a taboo topic for me—a self-identified person of faith who has accepted the premature/untimely death of both parents and other relatives and friends. For some facilitations, I prepare myself cognitively and emotionally before class knowing that my dis/comfort with the topic needs to be negotiated within the context of others. This was definitely not the case for a dialogue on death and dying, or so I thought.

Throughout the group facilitation, several individuals shared compelling and thought-provoking experiences regarding how death and dying had touched their lives. The vibe of the room was both remorseful and grateful, meaningful as we all contemplated the inevitable for ourselves and others. The final activity that the group planned cleverly involved randomly distributing specific instances where participants had to generate a communicative response to the death of a loved one. The card that I drew stated, "The pet of a close friend died. What would you say to that person?" Let me say right off the bat: I am not really a pet person, and have not ever fully understood the whole our-pet-is-part-of-our-family thing. It's just not me. When the facilitators asked people to share their responses with the entire class, their request was met with silence…so I offered my response that attempted—but as a non-pet person, never really got there—empathy and support. Others countered my response with more genuine messages, and the discussion continued until one student read her card: "Your young child drowns in a pool while you had the responsibility of watching them. What would you say to your spouse?"

As soon as I listened to the communication challenge, my mind generated images of my three children (simultaneously as young children and older in terms of their current ages) and their mother (my spouse). Attempting to apply this case scenario to my own life, as a father who firmly believes that no parent should have to bury their own children, immediately put me into an emotional tailspin. Students looked to me as the only parent in the room and I tried desperately to put into words the feelings of grief, shame, guilt, powerlessness, and despair that I was imagining. As I worked to articulate the thoughts, I began to cry and then uncontrollably weep. It's not like the class had not witnessed tears before (including my own). But this was the type of crying that triggered gasps of breath between tears and alarmed students to the point where they thought I was going to pass out. The support and caring

from the class was immediate, and several individuals also began to shed tears (although none to the extent that I was experiencing). The class period had already officially ended, but students stayed with me, sitting in silence as I tried to regain my composure.

***

When students ask about the *Taboo Topics* course, I always sing its praises, but also offer a caution: Not everyone is in the right space to maximize the opportunity that the class presents. After teaching the course for so many years, I have to protect against predicting which students are ready and which are not. Fassett and Warren (2007) remind us that "critical communication pedagogy as praxis, as a way of being in the world, in the classroom, means that often there are no easy responses to or understandings of power, of who has it and who doesn't" (p. 124). With this in mind, I must recommit myself to acknowledge the legitimate and expert power I bring to the *Taboo Topics* course and simultaneously affirm (and nurture) the power of students. This must include listening to students:

> Though it might be tempting to tell ourselves that certain students are naïve or confrontational or even deluded, we must work to listen to our students, to understand why they consider some topics inappropriate or irrelevant, so that we and our students might more fully understand each other (Fassett & Warren, p. 43).

A more full understanding of self and other only may occur during dialogic moments, however rare and sporadic. In the end, we consider how these moments make "possible other reflections, other actions; we must consider the ways th[ese] moment[s are] metonymic of an ongoing process" (p. 125).

***

Offered as an undergraduate elective course each Fall semester, the Taboo Topics course typically attracts a diverse group of students. Each year the class fills up during the first days of registration, and more often than not, students with priority registration (e.g., resident assistants, student-athletes, and those in the university honor's college). Typically enrolled students are eager to take the course based on the recommendations of past participants. The curriculum of the course has remained fairly consistent (with minor adjustments each year), yet the experience differs significantly based on the unique dynamics of the class community. Some years, our most difficult dialogues center around issues of race and racism, other times we struggle with cautious interactions involving spirituality, self-harm/suicide, and death and dying.

Since the class with Adam and Casey, for example, several other trans students have enrolled in the class. Catherine introduced herself to me the*

first day of class, alerting me that "despite the name on the official class roster, I identify as Catherine and all that it entails." Unlike Adam's, her trans identity was acknowledged, but never explicitly engaged as a topic in the class. This was not the case for Darla the following year.*

Darla is a student who had been in class with me, and her female romantic partner, before. Despite the size of the mass lecture, both individuals stood out as diligent students and student activists regarding LGBT issues on campus. Consequently, I was excited to have Darla in Taboo Topics. *During the first day of class, she was quick to check my gendered assumptions (e.g., referring to absent students as "him" or "her" based on their names). I welcomed the lesson, and acknowledged it as the first, of hopefully many, such opportunities in the class. During a subsequent class session, Darla explained her queer identity to the class—noting their identity as gender queer and gender non-conforming and preferred pronouns (e.g., she/her/hers and they/their/theirs). But, their "explanation" took the form of a lecture and I could see that many in the class became defensive. Throughout the class, Darla was typically the first to participate in small group and larger discussions—something that appeared to irritate and frustrate others in class. Most problematic to the spirit of the class was Darla's tone which seemed to take the position of "I'm-more-advanced-in-my-thinking-on-these-issues-than-you-are." Throughout the semester, Darla missed several classes (unlike the vast majority of students who never missed a single time); during these sessions, students seemed to be feel more comfortable and open to dialogue.*

At the end of the semester, Darla was part of a student group which selected the topic of polyamory for their final group facilitation. Darla, who identifies as polygamous, took the lead and dominated the group facilitation—which largely took the form of a presentation, leaving little time for dialogue to emerge among class participants (which ultimately was the goal of the assignment). The synergy of the group seemed lacking, and when they received the assignment grade, Darla and another group member came to my office to discuss the situation. While the other group member sat silently, Darla complained about the third group member who—according to them—had made very little contributions to the assignment and negatively impacted the final group product. I attempted to mediate the situation, offering to meet with the third group member, but Darla reiterated that that was not necessary. I asked both students what else that they would like for me to do regarding the situation, but neither had any additional requests. The meeting ended, but I didn't get the feel that Darla was satisfied with the interaction. They both left my office, but Darla returned a couple of minutes later with a clear message: "During the meeting, you referred to me with feminine pronouns. That's fine in public, like class, but privately I prefer gender neutral pronouns." I apologized to Darla but their defensive tone didn't change. In

the end, I strongly believe that Darla never felt an integrated part of the class community, something that had a negative impact on everyone's experience. Several years later, I still critically reflect on the series of events in attempts to understand what I might have done differently.

***

Self-reflectivity is a crucial aspect of critical communication pedagogy (Fassett & Warren, 2007) and the previous autoethnographical account reflects the pivotal role it plays in one's teaching. My vision of a "perfect" classroom aligns with that of Ayers and Ayers (2014) who described it as a place "where teachers get to be human beings, and where students get to see teachers make errors, be sad … without surprise or shock or embarrassment" (p. 56). I have found that acknowledging "my own ineptitude, fear, and doubt about teaching became a powerful tool for me," in that admitting not having "to have all of the answers was far more useful than pretending that I did" (p. 57). Yet,

> Despite all of my intentions to do good in the classroom, there was a great possibility for doing harm, and that possibility increased when I made assumptions about who students were, and the ways they should act toward me. (Ayers & Ayers, 2014, p. 57)

Embracing critical communication pedagogy offers no magical spells to ward off moments of frustration and hurt (Fassett & Warren, 2007, p. 127). Instead, it demands a deep and ongoing commitment to understanding more thoroughly and embracing others for who they are. It also requires deep personal reflection as engaging such issues are complicated given the educators own identity politics. In short, "It means as well to be willing to learn more, to read more, to see more; it requires us to challenge our own settled ideas and upend our conclusions again and again. Surely it is not for the faint of heart" (Ayers & Ayers, p. 124).

***

I stopped teaching Interracial Communication*, and started teaching* Taboo Topics*, in part because of student resistance to engaging race and racism in substantial ways. My thinking was that by expanding the array of taboo topics beyond race students would be more likely to transfer lessons learned from moderately taboo topics to dialogic moments on racism and other forms of oppression. This has been the case, in some instances; yet race and racism continue to be difficult topics for students—especially White students.*

During the very first generation of Taboo Topics *students, the issue of race temporarily stalls our attempts to build community. Mid-way through the semester, one group facilitates a session on race and discusses the taboo around the word, nigger. Two female students, Tammy (European American*

woman from Detroit suburb who is part of the facilitation team) and Kia (African American woman from Detroit), engage in a virtual verbal stand-off that becomes so intense that Kia begins to pack up her belongings indicating that she is leaving the class. I quickly intercede and tell Kia that leaving isn't an option. "We need to work through this," I genuinely suggest. She reluctantly stays but it is clear that everyone in the room is uncomfortable to the point that a few students are visibly afraid of what might occur next. Yet, to their credit, both women continue the exchange—as I sit back in my role as participant—and commit to understanding one another's perspective. Other students join the interaction, and a dialogic moment emerges from the conflict—one that transforms existing understandings of race, language, power, and privilege. I sit in awe thinking to myself, "Why wasn't I ever able to get a class to this point after so many years teaching my Interracial Communication *class?!?!?"*

Not all classes are able to work toward interracial dialogue. Most recently, there were times that the class physically and psychologically divided along racial lines. During one discussion of an article on racial microaggressions (7th generation), one White female student shared that she "doesn't see color, but instead, sees people from the inside out." When I responded that "by definition, that is a racial microaggresion," students of color appreciated the description but white students perceived my comment as evaluative. After the class ended a few weeks later, an African American woman in the class made it a point to tell me that "all of the white students think that you favored the students of color…they think that you value our opinions more than theirs."

***

CONCLUSION

This chapter draws from existing critical pedagogy scholarship to offer what I conceptualize as a pedagogy of the taboo. Through praxis-oriented autoethnographic reflections, I present a "collage of moments" (Fassett & Warren, 2007, p. 89) that illustrates how successes and/or failures in the classroom are central to critical communication pedagogy. Writing this piece has been instrumental for me—especially as I continue to reflect on, understand, and engage my role in fostering dialogic moments in all of my communication classes. This sentiment echoes the underlying tenets of Fassett and Warren who assert "Writing is a process of meaning making, not just for the reader, but also for the writer" (p. 105).

The final section of this chapter should offer a conclusion to my efforts to theorize a pedagogy of the taboo. Yet, in very real ways, attempting to craft

a conclusion is much too a grandiose endeavor in that anything that I might pen is hardly conclusive in the true sense of the word. There is so much more work to be done in this area. Embracing a pedagogy of the taboo, both in terms of reflection and action, is a life-long commitment: dynamic, ongoing, unsteady, filled with successes and/or failures. Fassett and Warren (2007) conclude that "Building critical communication pedagogy is like building a carefully crafted house of cards" (p. 152). Accordingly, any successes are tentative at best, and constantly in flux as existing structures and new extensions continue to shape the existence of educational freedom. As a critical communication pedagogue, I remain a work-in-progress as does the *Communicating About Taboo Topics* course offering. So, the best that I can offer as concluding thoughts for this piece come from Ayers and Ayers (2014) who remind us that a pedagogy of the taboo:

> is rooted in the idea that each of us is a work-in-progress—in motion, unruly, growing, stretching, developing, changing, learning, alive and making meaning and acting in the swirl of a vibrant and dynamic history. This means that we are not living at some imagined point of arrival…It means that this moment is as much a historic moment as any other, as any that's come before, and that we are—individually and collectively—the creators of history, the bearers of culture, and the pilgrims toward another world. What we do, or fail to do, has significance and consequences. Another world is not only possible; another world is inevitable. History is unfinished, democracy is largely untried, life is uncertain and unfolding, and so we search for something more; we seek out the rest of our humanity. (p. 136)

REFERENCES

Anderson, M., Kunkel, A., & Dennis, M. R. (2011). "Let's (not) talk about that:" Bridging the past sexual experiences taboo to build healthy relationships. *Journal of Sex Research,* 48(4), 381–391.

Arao, B., & Clemens, K. (2013). From safe spaces to brave spaces: A new way to frame dialogue around diversity and social justice. In L. M. Landreman (Ed.), *The art of effective facilitation: Reflections from social justice educators* (pp. 135–150). London, UK: Stylus Publishing.

Ayers, R., & Ayers, W. (2014). *Teaching the taboo: Courage and imagination in the classroom.* New York: Columbia University.

Bate, B., & Bowker, J. (1997). *Communication and the sexes*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Baxter, L. A., & Wilmot, W. W. (1985). Taboo topics in close relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships,* 2, 253–269.

Boylorn, R. M., & Orbe, M. (Eds.) (2014). *Critical autoethnography: Intersecting cultural identities in everyday life.* Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Evans, R. W., Avery, P. G., & Pederson, P. V. (2000). Taboo topics: cultural restraint on teaching social issues. *The Clearing House,* 73(5), 295–303.

Fassett, D. L., & Warren, J. T. (2007). *Critical communication pedagogy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Freire, P. (1990). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Goodman, D. (1995). Difficult dialogues: Enhancing discussions about diversity. *College Teaching,* 43(2), 47–52.

Hedley, M., & Markowitz, L. (2001). Avoiding moral dichotomies: Teaching controversial topics to resistant students. *Teaching Sociology,* 29, 195–208.

Hooks, B. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York: Routledge.

Keating, A. (2007). *Teaching transformation: Transcultural classroom dialogues.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Nash, R. J., Bradley, D. L., & Chickering, A. W. (2008). *How to talk about hot topics on campus: From polarization to moral conversation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Orbe, M. (2007). Critical reflections from a resistant boiled frog: Striving toward a critical communication pedagogy as articulated by Deanna Fassett and John Warren. *The Review of Communication,* 7(3), 298–302.

Rawlins, W. K. (2000). Teaching as a mode of friendship. *Communication Theory,* 10(1), 5–26.

Roloff, M. E., & Johnson, D. I. (2001). Reintroducing taboo topics: Antecedents and consequences of putting topics back on the table. *Communication Studies,* 52(1), 37–50.

Toyosaki, S. (2007). Communication sensei's storytelling: Projecting identity into critical pedagogy. *Cultural Studies Critical Methodologies,* 7(1), 48–73.

Toyosaki, S. (2012). Praxis-orientated autoethnography: Performing critical selfhood. In N. Bardan & M. Orbe (Eds.), *Identity research and communication: Intercultural reflections and future directions* (pp. 239–251). Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Section III

UNDERSTANDING THROUGH CRITICAL INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION PEDAGOGY

Chapter 8

Obstructing the Process of Becoming

Basal Whiteness and the Challenge to Critical Intercultural Communication Pedagogy

Gust A. Yep and Ryan M. Lescure

Reflecting on the field of intercultural communication, Moon (2013) observes, "One of the most intriguing and timely developments spawned from the critical turn in intercultural communication has been the inclusion of whiteness in the intercultural curriculum" (p. 43). Similarly, noting the development and expansion of intercultural communication pedagogy in the discipline, Nakayama and Martin (2007) call our attention to whiteness when they state, "We . . . call for pedagogies that speak to whiteness, that deconstruct the rhetorical strategies that maintain intercultural communication as about the nonwhite other" (p. 129). By refusing to conceive of culture as solely and exclusively the domain of the "other" and by insisting on the centrality of power, history, and geopolitics as key analytics in the study of culture, critical intercultural communication is uniquely positioned to examine the complex dynamics of whiteness in society, more generally, and in classroom relations, more specifically. To actualize this promise, we maintain that one of the key goals of critical intercultural communication pedagogy is to create spaces—symbolically, affectively, and materially—for members of a learning community (e.g., a classroom) to work toward "becoming"—both individually and collectively. We are using "becoming" in two senses. In the first, becoming refers to the development, expansion, and potential change and transformation of individual and collective worldviews toward greater inclusivity and socially just relations (e.g., Muslim students understanding that certain forms of differential treatment they receive are both individual and systemic; European American students seeing how their whiteness privileges elevates them in certain social interactions) (Yep, 2016). In the second, becoming involves learning more about each other's histories, defying the impulse to create and compare hierarchies of oppression, unlearning cultural stereotypes, and cultivating ways of knowing that allow people to listen and

know each other much more deeply (Alexander, 2002). Unfortunately, and perhaps not surprisingly, these processes of becoming are often obstructed by whiteness in multiple ways—visibly and invisibly, subtly and overtly, and quietly and violently (Yep, 2007). Using our experience of team teaching a critical intercultural communication course and employing a queer methodology to capture its slippery, elusive, contradictory, and messy expressions, we examine, in this chapter, a particular form of whiteness—what we call "basal whiteness"—in the critical intercultural communication classroom. To do so, we first provide a brief overview of whiteness research relevant to our project. Next, we introduce queer methodology, our approach to the study. Third, we engage in an embodied exploration of basal whiteness in the critical intercultural communication classroom. We conclude by exploring the implications of basal whiteness and the process of becoming in intercultural communication pedagogy.

THE ELUSIVENESS OF WHITENESS

Whiteness has been extensively researched in the communication discipline for more than two decades (Nakayama, 2017; Nakayama & Krizek, 1995; Nakayama & Martin, 1999). Similarly, research on whiteness in the classroom has proliferated in communication (Carrillo Rowe & Malhotra, 2007; Cooks & Simpson, 2007; Warren, 2001) and related disciplines (Bebout, 2014; Kincheloe, 1999; Lewis, 2004). Together, this body of research concludes that whiteness is elusive, slippery, and evasive. Because of this, whiteness can be defined and analyzed in multiple ways. For example, Rasmussen, Klinenberg, Nexica, and Wray (2001) note that whiteness can be understood as invisible and unmarked, as an "empty" category, as structural privilege, as violence and terror, as institutionalized European colonialism, and can be deconstructed and criticized as an anti-racist practice—as is exemplified by the field of critical whiteness studies (Yep, 2007).

In an attempt to shed more light into the elusiveness of whiteness, we, in this section, focus on (inter)disciplinary research on whiteness with a particular focus on its content (i.e., how it appears in social relations and what it entails; identifiable contextual practices), process (i.e., how it moves and circulates in the social domain; discursive mechanisms that maintain White supremacy in U.S. culture), and consequences (i.e., how it affects social relations and produces racial hierarchies in U.S. society).

Nakayama and Krizek's (1995) groundbreaking analysis of whiteness as a "strategic rhetoric" significantly informs our conceptualization of basal whiteness. In their analysis, Nakayama and Krizek unpack the material, ideological, and rhetorical dimensions of "white" as a racial category,

arguing that, despite the fact that U.S. society is characterized and organized by White supremacy, the terms "white" and "whiteness" are actually quite difficult to explain. Although whiteness is everywhere, it actively resists particularization. The simultaneous ubiquity and obscurity of whiteness seems contradictory, but actually constitutes a *strategic* elusiveness that reflects and reinforces the hegemonic status of whiteness in U.S. society. By referring to whiteness as a "strategic rhetoric," Nakayama and Krizek emphasize the fact that whiteness purposefully employs a number of discursive mechanisms that allow it to "[reposition] itself to remain in a dominant position" (Nakayama, 2017, p. 69). These mechanisms are difficult to identify and often change form when they are identified. Because identifying and describing the strategically elusive mechanisms that maintain the dominance of whiteness in U.S. society is difficult by design, critiquing and undoing these mechanisms—and, by extension, White supremacy—becomes nearly impossible.

In order to challenge White supremacy, Nakayama and Krizek call for critics to unmask whiteness without essentializing it. They argue, "Whatever 'whiteness' really means is constituted only through the rhetoric of whiteness. There is no 'true essence' to 'whiteness'; there are only historically contingent constructions of that social location" (p. 293). In accordance with Nakayama and Krizek's logic, we avoid the trap of conceptualizing basal whiteness as having a "true essence." Instead, we conceptualize it as a historically contingent and contextual form of whiteness, which is itself historically contingent and contextual. Before we explore basal whiteness more fully, we provide a foundation for understanding whiteness more generally. The available scholarship supports our conclusion that whiteness has both *content* features (e.g., contextual practices that can be identified) and *process* features (e.g., discursive mechanisms that consequently maintain White supremacy in U.S. society). Paying special attention to the ways in which the content and process of whiteness relate to pedagogy, we further unpack whiteness as a social construct, describe some of its content features, explain the forms it can take, and consider its consequences.

In the context of U.S. society, whiteness is a hegemonic social construction. The meanings associated with whiteness and the mechanisms that it uses to maintain its dominance are dynamic as well as culturally, historically, and contextually specific (Cooks, 2003; Guess, 2006; Kincheloe, 1999; Nakayama, 2017; Yep, 2007). As a result of its hegemonic status, whiteness occupies a position at the "center" of U.S. society (Nakayama & Krizek, 1995). Because of its centrality, whiteness is unmarked and invisible, which both reflects and reinforces its power. From its centralized position, whiteness subordinates and oppresses other racial identities, marginalizing them in the process. Subsequently, unlike whiteness, marginalized racial identities are marked and highly visible. Elaborating on this idea, Dyer (1988) states:

> In the realm of categories, black is always marked as a colour (as the term coloured egregiously acknowledges), and is always particularizing; whereas White is not anything really, not an identity, not a particularizing quality, because it is everything—White is no colour because it is all colours. (p. 45)

Illustrating one way in which the centrality of whiteness manifests in the classroom, Lewis (2004) describes a situation in her Race and Ethnic Relations class involving a White college junior named Sally who expressed gratitude that the class offered her the opportunity to learn more about "minority groups." When Lewis pressed Sally to explain what she had learned about her own group, Sally responded, "What group?" (p. 623) This brief but meaningful example demonstrates the invisibility that results from the centrality of whiteness. Because "white" is the dominant and normative racial category, it has the power not to be perceived as a racial category—*especially* by those who stand to benefit the most from its dividends. The centrality of whiteness strategically obscures its ability to be unmasked, and thus obscures the identification of its content and of its process.

Although the content features of whiteness are strategically obscure, whiteness is enacted through a variety of observable material social practices. These practices are often covert, as they are in the case of what Sleeter (1994) calls "White racial bonding." Sleeter argues that "White racial bonding" refers to a set of brief and subtle communication practices such as jokes, strategic moments of eye contact, and conversational asides that White people use to "demarcate racial lines and communicate solidarity" (p. 8). Finding inspiration in Sleeter's research on "White racial bonding," Nakayama and Krizek (1995) further identify six material communicative strategies that White people tend to use that reflect and reinforce the hegemonic position of whiteness. First, White people tend to crudely tie whiteness to power without exploring the complexities of that connection. Second, White people tend to define whiteness by negation. Third, White people tend to conflate race and nationality by perceiving "White" and "American" as synonyms. Fourth, White people tend to consider "White" to be a "natural" scientific category, which constructs it as apolitical. Fifth, White people tend to understand whiteness in relation to European ancestry. Finally, White people—especially White men—tend to refuse being labeled. Building upon Nakayama and Krizek's research and applying more directly to a classroom context, Warren (2001) identifies three general trends in the way that his students perform whiteness. First, students tend to promote a colorblind ideology as a way to avoid confronting racism. Warren describes colorblindness as an ideology in which White people strategically evoke individualism and push discourses of "sameness" in order to ignore the reality of racism in U.S. society. Second, students tend to describe racism as a property of individuals,

purposefully avoiding thinking of racism's structural dimensions. Finally, students tend to depend on stereotypes when discussing race.

Subsequent analyses of the material social practice of whiteness in pedagogical contexts tend to affirm the findings of the foundational scholarship that we have cited so far. Bebout (2014), for example, describes a moment in the classroom that can be understood as a permutation of Sleeter's (1994) "White racial bonding" concept. In his article, Bebout, a self-identified White heterosexual male, describes proctoring a final examination on behalf of a colleague, Sujey Vega, who was attending to a death in her family. Notably, Bebout identifies Dr. Vega as a Chicana Latina/o Studies scholar and as his wife. At the beginning of the final session, a White student named Corey sat by Bebout and asked him if he knew Dr. Vega. Bebout told Corey that he and Vega are colleagues, to which Corey responded, "Man, she doesn't know what she's talking about" (p. 346). In that moment, Bebout understood Corey as attempting to establish a sense of White racial solidarity with him and assuming that because they "share a similar melanin impoverishment, [they] must share the same politics" (p. 346). Bebout refers to this practice as "White racial communion."

Among students, another common material social practice of whiteness involves evoking the ideology of colorblindness (Lewis, 2004; Miller & Harris, 2005). Like Warren (2001), Miller and Harris (2005) find that their White students tend to advance discourses of "sameness" that ultimately erase the material reality of racism in U.S. society. Though White students are not the only ones who evoke colorblindness, Miller and Harris find that their White students are significantly more likely to do so than their Black students. Additionally, Miller and Harris find that many of their White students express feeling invalidated when discussing race, which often leads them to do two things. First, White students tend to perform meaningfully "loud" silences in discussions about race. These silences are rich with meaning and serve multiple functions. For example, Ford (2011) describes silence as a passive-aggressive technique that White students use to challenge the presence of women of color faculty in the classroom. Ellwanger (2017) argues that silence often results from White students' reluctance to participate in critical discussions of race and this silence "is evidence of their awareness of their whiteness, its subjectivity, and its discursive risks" (p. 42). It is important to note that the language that Ellwanger uses seems to suggest that White students position themselves as *victims* of racism when race is discussed in the classroom. Indeed, as Miller and Harris (2005) find, the second thing that White students tend to do when they feel invalidated in discussions of race is to very strategically adopt a sense of victimhood and martyrdom. As one of their White male students put it, "You know that you're on the losing team. Every day you come to class and fight the battle all over again and you're not ever going to be on the winning team" (p. 236). Similarly, Cabrera (2014)

finds that it is quite common for White students to feel that their opinions on race are invalid as a result of their whiteness. These feelings often led White students to claim victimhood. According to David, a student in Cabrera's study, "[White people] feel that [multiculturalism is] infringing on them. Their rights and their, you know, the fairness to them" (p. 46).

As is evidenced from the changing material social practices of whiteness that scholarship has documented, the content of whiteness often changes form and its process is regularly altered, which allows whiteness to maintain its hegemonic status. As Omi and Winant (1986) argue, in U.S. society, the meanings associated with race and racial categories are always in the process of being transformed in relation to social, political, and economic forces. Scholarship by Warren (2001), Bonilla-Silva, Forman, Lewis, and Embrick (2003), Lewis (2004), and Miller and Harris (2005) suggests that the ideology of colorblindness is a crucial component of the strategic rhetoric of whiteness. Interestingly, Ellwanger (2017) argues that whiteness seems to have ceased relying so strongly on colorblindness and invisibility as crucial components of its strategic rhetoric. Ellwanger claims that, as a construct, whiteness is becoming increasingly visible. He attributes the increased visibility of whiteness to its increased coverage in popular culture and to increased efforts by whiteness scholars to unmask it. He argues that White students "experience their whiteness as visible and exposed" (p. 42), which, to him, suggests that White privilege has been revealed. Cabrera (2014), on the other hand, notes that while White students indeed tend to be aware of their whiteness, they tend to use it to claim victimhood, which is a very strategic use of whiteness that reflects and reinforces its hegemonic status. It seems that, for such students, whiteness is unlikely to have been critically and deeply revealed.

Because whiteness is a strategic, dynamic, and contextual social construct, its content and process are always elusive, changing form in relation to larger sociocultural and discursive forces. Despite the fact that its forms tend to change, the underlying consequences of whiteness remain. These consequences include the maintenance of its own dominance and centrality, as well as the subsequent marginalization, subordination, and oppression of all other racial identities. As whiteness takes on new forms in response to discourses that successfully identify and challenge its content and its process dimensions, critics must continue unmasking and challenging its emergent manifestations. Basal whiteness is one such emergent manifestation.

QUEER METHODOLOGY

To capture the elusive, slippery, ever-shifting, contradictory, and messy manifestations of whiteness, we use what Halberstam calls a "queer methodology" (1998, p. 10), which consists of a combination of methods that are

sufficiently supple and responsive to the nuances of the multiple enactments of whiteness in the critical intercultural communication classroom. As a scavenger approach, a queer methodology seeks to capture seemingly elusive phenomena, such as affective charges (e.g., emotional shifts in a classroom space), bodily sensations (e.g., tensions felt before, during, and after a topic discussion), and cognitive shifts (e.g., sudden topic changes that derail deep classroom exchanges), that are felt, considered, contemplated, experienced, and embodied in social spaces. As such, it appears to be uniquely relevant and useful for the analysis and examination of whiteness in social spaces like the classroom.

Queer methodology seems to be particularly useful "when there is a critical engagement of . . . tensions via images, narratives, and representations that work against homogenizing histories [and] violences, and instead center on honoring and building from differences and complexities," such as diverging social locations and distinctive personal and collective experiences with race, racism, and whiteness, of the individuals involved (Zepeda, 2009, p. 622). In communication, queer methodology has been used, for example, to productively examine silences (Yep & Shimanoff, 2013), normativities (Yep & Lescure, 2015), and queer relationalities (Goltz & Zingsheim, 2015), among other communicative phenomena.

To examine the abstractness of whiteness as a system of knowledge, structure of understanding, and a mode of social relations *and* the concreteness of whiteness as a set of social practices, affective embodiments, and identity expressions in the critical intercultural communication classroom, we used a combination of conversation and expository writing to explore the complexities of whiteness—by attending to its affects, textures, and tones—to unmask and examine the content and process of what we call "basal whiteness." We engage in this exploration as two instructors from different social locations, which we describe below. Gust was the instructor of record and Ryan was a member of the teaching team in a class that consisted of about 60 to 65 percent White students and 35 to 40 percent students of color. Women constituted about two-thirds of the class.

BASAL WHITENESS: CONTENT AND PROCESS

We are using "basal" to denote multiple meanings: basic, fundamental; anything from which a start is made, the bottom layer of something, a thing at the bottom acting as support for a structure; something ignoble, mean, contemptible, indecent, vulgar, or vile. In this section, we engage in conversation about our experiences teaching a critical intercultural communication course by first locating ourselves in this exchange before describing P, a student we

had in this particular class, and who, in many ways, exemplified and embodied basal whiteness. Through our respective social locations, we embark in a conversation about P to explore the content and process of basal whiteness by attending to its affects, textures, tones, and consequences. We end this section by returning to expository writing to synthesize the major features of basal whiteness.

A Conversation about Basal Whiteness

Gust: Let's locate ourselves in this conversation. I am a cisgender, middle-class, queer-identified "Asianlatinoamerican" man (Yep, 2002, p. 60). I teach courses on culture, race, class, gender, sexuality, the body, nation, and communication. When I teach about patriarchy, I have been told that I make the subject "more real" and "credible," particularly for women from various social locations. When I teach about White heteropatriarchy, I am often told that I am "too biased" with a "racial and queer agenda." These types of comments affirm the pervasive power of normativity. A teacher with a "mythical intersectional normativity" (e.g., White, cisgender, middle-aged, male, middle- to upper class, heterosexual, able-bodied, Christian, U.S. American), on the other hand, would, in my experience, be generally considered "objective," "neutral," and "unbiased" (Yep, 2016, p. 238). Marked bodies "have agendas"; White bodies are "objective and unbiased."

Ryan: I agree completely. These dynamics often play out quite clearly when we teach together. I identify as a cisgender, middle-class, heterosexual White man. In many ways, my privileged social location makes it easier for me to be taken seriously in the classroom when I lecture about *anything,* but especially when I lecture about power, privilege, and oppression. Students very rarely seem to perceive me as "biased," despite the obliviousness to issues of power that my social location tends to encourage. Often, the way that students react to me demonstrates that my social location actually *bolsters* my credibility when challenging whiteness, patriarchy, and heterosexism. It seems that, for my students, if a White person is challenging whiteness, then whiteness must be real and must be challenged! This is a precarious path to negotiate, however, as using privilege to critique privilege can subsequently reinforce privilege. Because of the elusiveness of whiteness and because of my privileged social location, I have indeed found myself unconsciously reinforcing whiteness and White privilege while critiquing whiteness in the classroom. When these moments occur, I do my best to reflect on them, engage with them, and consider how to do better in the future. I believe that this is a necessary component of becoming a better teacher and a better advocate for social justice. I do not profess to negotiate these situations without issue, however. These situations must be negotiated delicately and with a great deal

of self-awareness and reflection. There is quite a bit to think about. I found myself thinking about all of this extremely often in our class with P.

Gust: Who is P? To me, P is a signifier. As we talk about our experiences with him, individually and collectively, we create meanings about P. As such, P is not an empty signifier. P is about an individual but, in my view, also represents a larger phenomenon—whiteness in U.S. culture at this historical and political moment. Let me reiterate this point: We are talking about a particular manifestation of whiteness—basal whiteness—through P's actions and interactions with us. In this sense, it is not simply a story about a White student in our class.

How would you describe P?

Ryan: Before I describe P, I want to reiterate your point. P does represent an individual, but his specific performance of identity also represents a larger pattern of whiteness that I see being enacted in the classroom with increasing regularity. P's performance of whiteness in our class was often so egregious that he makes a good case study for exploring the content and process of basal whiteness. With that being said, we do need to describe P. In my estimation, P is seemingly White, male, middle class, and able-bodied. In our class, he explicitly identified himself as heterosexual. He often embodied what I perceived to be a relatively normative expression of White masculinity. He tended to speak with a sense of authority, which he accomplished through speaking loudly, by employing a direct communication style, and by controlling conversational space. P was able to control conversational space by interrupting, by using conspicuously exaggerated vocalizations to signify disagreement or disapproval, and by shifting the discussion to an unrelated topic. He seemed to have a cache of unrelated topics to bring up. When others would engage him more deeply on these topics, he would shift into different ones, which seemed to demonstrate both a dedication to obstructionism and a serious lack of content depth.

Gust: Yes! P brought up many irrelevant topics to center the discussion around himself. I think both of us, as inclusive teachers, felt a pressure to honor his participation, but found it difficult to tie it back to the concepts we were discussing. Each time we got deeper into a discussion of a critical intercultural concept, P would usually shift to another topic. It felt like we were chasing ghosts around the room, but the ghosts kept changing shape.

I also noticed that when we discussed the concept of "intercultural cookbooks" (i.e., lists of prescriptive behaviors for "successful" intercultural encounters; see, Moon, 2013; Yep, 2000/2014) or dimensions of cultural variability (i.e., high-low context; individualism-collectivism, power distance, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity-femininity, short- and long-term orientation; see Hall, 1976; Hofstede, 2001), where culture is conceptualized without attention to power, history, and geopolitics that are characteristic of

critical intercultural communication, P appeared to be particularly engaged. In those instances, he was not disruptive and often stayed on topic. The class sessions that directly addressed race and culture, P was absent.

Ryan: It seemed very strategic, like he wanted to avoid challenging whiteness.

I also thought that P was often physically imposing. He tended to stand uncomfortably close to us when he asked us questions. He also seemed to ask us questions when we were seated and he was standing. It seemed like he wanted to interact with us on his own terms. He tried to schedule meetings with us outside of office hours and regularly declined the times that we proposed. He was really dismissive of his classmates' voices. We had several talented and insightful students in our class, but he often opted not to engage with them and occasionally tried to sabotage them. It seemed that he was more inclined to do this with women than with men.

Gust: I felt my stomach tighten when I saw his name on the class roster. He was in a previous class of mine. In that class, he interrupted and talked down to women, both White and of color. When he was confronted about his behavior, he proclaimed, "This is my nature: to express myself." When a White woman pointed out, "It sounds like you are using essentialism [a concept we discussed extensively in the course] to justify what you are doing," P did not appear to understand and basically dismissed her. Eventually, the class collectively agreed to ignore his interruptions and continue our discussion unless P raised his hand and waited for his turn to speak.

I have a calendar for students to sign up for office hours at any time. To increase my accessibility to them, they manage their own appointments with me. I was flabbergasted when P asked my assistant, a man of color, to sign up for him, and when he refused, P asked me to sign up for him. When I declined, he told me that he would just show up during my office hours and I reminded him that without an appointment, he might have to wait. He never signed up but often needed to talk with me, inevitably outside of my office hours, sometimes in the hallway and, a couple of times, he tried to engage in lengthy discussion in the bathroom. He did that with both of us.

Students would often complain about him. Once, P reportedly told a man of color, an excellent student in my class, "Let me dumb it down for you so that you can understand," which was followed by a huge argument between them. P's history gave me a strong feeling of trepidation about his presence in our class.

Ryan: Before I had ever met him, I had heard about P from you and from other students. His classmates repeatedly complained to me about his behavior in the classroom. Their comments made him sound like he was the walking personification of privilege. I felt a sense of dread when you told me that P was on our roster. He sounded like he would occupy the space of fifteen

unruly students by himself. I was also suspicious of his interest in intercultural communication. Based on his classmates' comments, he sounded completely averse to any sort of self-reflexivity. As you mentioned, I had a feeling that he would love talking about cultural differences, but would actively resist anything that could help him understand and be critical of his own social location. Gust, I remember how much your prior experience with him affected the way we structured the class itself. Before our first session, we made sure to do what we could to maximize the potential for rich discussion and prevent the chaos that we expected P to bring.

Gust: As a teaching team, we stressed the importance of community agreements and made an extra effort to demonstrate the importance of adhering to those agreements. P influenced how we approached setting the class up in the first place. We expected to revisit ground rules early on and to enforce our collective agreements.

P increasingly tried to be more out of control in relationship to the parameters that we set for the class. The comments he made derailed class discussion and went into what I would characterize as a "black hole" in an attempt to take over the classroom space. One of the strategies of derailing was to bring up irrelevant "high" theory with comments such as "This reminds me of . . . ," "I just read about this . . . ," or "Does this have anything to do with . . .?" I quickly found out that when I engaged him on the topic, he displayed very little to no understanding of the theory. But his strategy of derailment worked for a while: It prevented us from a deeper and more nuanced engagement with critical concepts about culture and power.

Ryan: At the beginning of the semester, I did not interpret P's behavior as an attempt to derail class discussion. I initially thought he was an earnest, albeit incompetent student. In retrospect, I was being naïve. As you have already said, it became clear to me that one of P's primary derailment strategies was to "respond" to his classmates' comments by citing a "high" theoretical concept or by namedropping a canonical critical theorist. His references rarely, if ever, had anything to do with the topic at hand. It seemed like P was strategically trying to construct his identity as "elite" or as an "intellectual" by making these unconnected references. It also seemed like he was trying to pull his classmates and the class itself away from rich critical discussion toward discursive oblivion.

Gust: It was interesting that he referred to bell hooks as Gloria (Watkins). How presumptuous! At the same time, I do not remember him referring to male theorists by first name.

We both did our best to connect back to concepts. We started by asking him to explain the connections, but he was unable to do so. We eventually sort of gave up. We also tried to get him to talk more about the concept. He often couldn't talk about the concept because he didn't understand it and

hasn't done the readings, but would evoke another concept. Then the process would repeat.

I felt two things: P was taking up a lot of symbolic and affective space and P was sucking the "oxygen out of the room." I tried to track his ideas and logic when there was nothing to track.

Ryan: Constantly having to do that saps a significant amount of emotional energy. Indeed, there is an affective dimension to this situation that we were unable to explore in the moment, given our position as educators. As we increasingly understood P's comments as strategies to recenter whiteness in the classroom, it seemed that we became more inclined to let his comments drop without any acknowledgment. This made me feel conflicted. On the one hand, it seemed like poor critical pedagogical praxis not to at least *try* to connect his comments to something relevant, even if this required adroit cognitive gymnastics on our part. On the other hand, his comments were not made in good faith. If we allowed P to control the classroom space on his own terms, I would feel like we were helping him steal from the rest of the class. As I pondered this, I also considered the dangerous possibility that P would interpret our disengagement from his comments as an attempt by us to "victimize" him, which reflects the classic strategy of "reverse racism" that whiteness uses to maintain its dominance and centrality. P struck me as someone who might surreptitiously compile anything he could take out of context to subsequently use as "ammunition" against us.

Gust: You are right. P was not making comments in good faith: They derailed the class discussion; changed the emotional tenor in the room; inhibited and silenced the more bashful students; and devalued or dismissed contributions from other classroom participants, particularly women and people of color. But, perhaps most of all, he constantly attempted to recenter his power.

I felt that he was trying to put us in multiple double binds. In addition to the ones you just mentioned, I also felt that he could allege that I am "a professor of color trying to silence a White student."

Ryan: Yes, I agree that he seemed to try to put us in double binds within double binds. I was worried about P making those allegations against you as well. Should he have done that, there is also a very real possibility that larger society would take his allegations seriously, since they would be backed by the power of whiteness. While P was unable to put me in this specific double bind, he did put me in others. For example, I did not want to say or do anything that would even *remotely* accommodate or excuse P's comments and behavior, but I felt like my challenges had to be especially careful and precise. This was tricky because we were making our decisions immediately and in front of the whole class. My social location is important to consider here. Our different social locations undeniably influenced our interactions with P as well as his interactions with us. From my privileged

social location, I felt that I could use my privilege to effectively challenge P and his performance of identity without seeming to him and others as "biased" or "threatening," which, as I have previously mentioned, is feedback that I often hear from students. This is obviously problematic. I felt like I could specifically use my White privilege to challenge his efforts to recenter and maintain the dominance of whiteness in the classroom space. I knew that doing this would carry very few consequences for me. Unfortunately, using whiteness to challenge whiteness reaffirms the dominance and centrality of whiteness. This was perhaps *the* major double bind that I felt. To me, it seemed that P would be receptive to the language of privilege, but invoking such language would only resecure the hegemonic status of whiteness, heterosexuality, masculinity, and so on. Having access to privilege in this instance provided me with more options and fewer consequences than it might for someone else in a similar position. It made it less dangerous for me to push back against power.

Gust: I definitely saw that P was listening to us differently. In spite of being the instructor of record with a long disciplinary history, P often seemed nonverbally disrespectful, contemptuous, and dismissive of my remarks by looking away or not acknowledging my comments.

Ryan: P often did seem dismissive of your remarks. It was one of the ways in which he was continuously trying to undermine the process of becoming. He used so many techniques to undermine this process. Even in the face of our and his classmates' polite and carefully constructed rebuttals, P would return with something unexpected. This process was exhausting. I found it difficult to be around such toxicity while still acting professionally.

Gust: Most students were exasperated and frustrated. But we had some students pushed back consistently. When one of our top students symbolically "slapped" P with her sharp theoretical insights, we could see the class grinning in approval. But we were teaching intercultural communication from a social justice perspective and we needed to model it. This was another catch-22.

I started thinking about making other classroom interventions such as talking to P privately or having the entire class participate in changing its dynamics. All of them seem fraught with problems. I did not have much success in talking to him privately. Inviting other class members to discuss classroom dynamics runs the risk of humiliating P publicly. Although this might feel cathartic to many people in the class, it seems inhumane. I often struggled; some class meetings seemed more successful than others. I wonder how other instructors teaching from a social justice perspective would manage someone like P. Of course, this depends on the social location of the teacher and institutional context and support. But perhaps more broadly, how would such instructors negotiate unrelenting basal whiteness in their classroom?

I found myself becoming more rigid about rules (e.g., ground rules, requirements of the assignment) and invoked them for safety. I felt the need to cover all bases by documenting everything. I started a file about the various incidents in the classroom.

Ryan: Covering all bases felt crucial. Though I was not the instructor of record, I also felt a need to protect myself. I feared that P might take my comments out of context or that I might react to my emotions and hastily say something rude that could later be used against me. P's presence felt very panoptic. I became very careful about my language choices around P. I made sure never to engage in unofficial communication with him. I took notes after our interactions so I could correct the future record should it be necessary. I made sure that there were other people around to witness my interactions with P in case I ever needed to defend myself against false allegations that he might make. While I was not sure if I was being paranoid, I knew it was crucial for me to protect myself as much as possible.

Gust: Based on my past experiences with him, I do not think you were paranoid. But the hyper-vigilance was draining and exhausting. However, I want to avoid characterizing P's behavior as symptomatic of individual personality or perhaps even individual pathology. It seems indicative of whiteness.

Ryan: Right. I think that this is a clear example of the strategic elusiveness of whiteness. Whiteness encourages P's behavior to be understood as individual pathology. Such an interpretation allows whiteness to cover its tracks.

Gust: Perhaps we should shift our conversation to focus on how P's whiteness felt. Although I had multiple feelings, such as anxiety, apprehension, worry, burden, and concern, among others, when P was in class, I felt tension and hyper-vigilance with him, particularly when there was no one else around. P felt like an active volcano, ready to erupt at any moment.

Ryan: Same, but the tension also existed for me in the presence of others. Although I have a passion for critical intercultural communication and I love teaching with you, I dreaded coming to class. The classroom environment felt stifling. I felt relief whenever P was absent. When he was gone, the class seemed to come alive. We all knew that we were safe from the volcano for the time being. Class discussion flowed better. Quiet students spoke up. P's absences felt fantastic, but, like procrastinating or saying yes to another glass of wine, I knew that what felt fantastic in the moment would feel terrible in the future, since P tended to follow each absence with a surprise. I remember rambling emails, unannounced visits, and requests to meet with us outside of office hours.

Gust: I felt safer with you around. It was a comforting presence given our relationship and history of working together. You also served as a witness as well as a reality check. As a potential witness, I felt that your recollection of

events would carry more weight in the cultural domain, that is, the power and privilege of your whiteness.

Ryan: I felt that way too. The role that my whiteness played in relation to this situation was notable in a number of ways. In many ways, it served as an asset that we knew we could call upon if we needed to defend ourselves from unfounded accusations. My whiteness, in addition to my identity in an intersectional sense, also encouraged P to interpret me and interact with me in specific ways. There was one moment, for example, where P tried to establish a sense of "White racial communion" with me. This disgusted me. He confronted me unexpectedly outside of the classroom and tried to claim a sense of "White victimhood" to me in front of very few potential witnesses. He asked, "Is it just me, or are White people destined to fail in this department?" I thought there was something especially strategic and slimy about his choice to confront me without you also being there, Gust. His attempt to be clandestine with me and to indirectly call you into question was terrifying. I shut it down immediately. I told him that if he had concerns, he needed to voice them directly to you. I told him to set up a meeting with you through email, which I knew would provide us with documentation. In his email, he emphasized that he wanted me to attend the meeting. It seemed like he was going to try and invoke me as a "White ally," despite my obviously anti-racist politics.

Gust: Despite setting up these special meetings with us, P never showed up!

P's presence in and out of the classroom along with his unpredictability (e.g., requesting special meetings and not showing up, appearing in the hallways or bathroom and insisting that he needed to talk to us) made it difficult to teach with joy. I still feel the trauma from the experience. There was trauma—not capital "t" trauma but there was trauma—invisible, normalized, and unrecognizable in mainstream U.S. culture. But it was very real to me. In addition, fearing that someone might respond to my trauma with a microaggression (e.g., "It could not be that bad," "you are just being too sensitive," "are you imagining this?"), I found myself cautious about sharing it with others.

Ryan: Absolutely. I really felt that I was unable to express what I was feeling. I knew that I needed to respond to P with a cool and detached rationality. I needed to be calm and collected, but my argumentation needed to be diamond sharp. If this was not the case, I knew that I would lose and whiteness would win. While I had some leeway in my interactions with P as a result of my privileged social location, this was a difficult position to find myself in for several hours every week. I felt emotionally drained and utterly exhausted. Indeed, this was an undoubtedly traumatic experience.

Gust: The trauma seemed small but cumulative like death by a thousand paper cuts.

Ryan: Or like a poison slowly accumulating in the body. Scratch that—I like your analogy better.

Gust: Let's talk about other challenges related to basal whiteness.

Ryan: In my estimation, the biggest challenge of basal whiteness is preventing it from taking over spaces while simultaneously making sure that its hegemony is not reaffirmed in unexpected ways. There are so many mechanisms that recentralize whiteness. Many of them are difficult to identify in the moment. Through his behavior, P often *overtly* attempted to recentralize whiteness. I would challenge his attempts, but my challenges often came perilously close to recentralizing whiteness in ways that were difficult for me to understand in the moment. Additionally, if whiteness dictates the rules of a space and requires us to work from a place of defensiveness, whiteness is still ultimately calling the shots. Even before P found himself physically in our classroom, for example, we had already structured the class with him and his obstructionist whiteness in mind.

Gust: Yes, reaffirming whiteness is a cycle that is difficult to get out of. But it can be used strategically and self reflexively, at least in the short term. In the long run, I think the development of Freire's (1970, 1973) critical consciousness—that is, the development of ways of seeing and understanding oppression and to take action against its many forms—might be more useful.

In retrospect, our critical intercultural communication pedagogy is truly "pedagogy without a map." To be clear, I do not believe that there is a universal "one size fits all" map. Teachers create their own to optimally suit their own social locations and pedagogical styles, content demands of the curriculum, and composition and character of the class. In addition, the reading and implementation of such maps change as teachers adapt to the context and dynamics of the class.

But pedagogy without a map is different. Armed with our theories, histories, years of teaching, and the realities of our lived experiences, we do so with love and good faith to expand horizons and worldviews for ourselves and to encourage our students to engage in their own process of becoming. But we did not learn this in our graduate training, particularly in managing and working against the elusiveness and obstructionism of basal whiteness in the classroom.

Ryan: I like the notion of critical intercultural communication pedagogy as pedagogy without a map. I feel that normative approaches to teaching tend to construct the educator as someone who has a "complete" and "correct" map and is able to lead students down a clearly defined path toward becoming, which is the map's fixed, stable, and defined endpoint. There is a great deal of pressure for educators to define "becoming" in four bullet points or less in order to

assess whether or not it is being met. This is not the reality of communication and is certainly not the reality of critical intercultural communication. In my opinion, moments of awkwardness and uncertainty are crucial in the process of becoming for both educators and students of intercultural communication. Of course, privilege offers some educators—such as myself—more resources to deploy when navigating these uncertain moments. Ultimately, educators who think their map is apolitical, stable, and complete should be concerned.

Since we are so extensively using cartography imagery to describe pedagogy and the process of becoming, I find it notable that Nakayama and Krizek (1995) extensively use similar imagery to describe whiteness. They describe it as "a relatively uncharted territory" that resists "the mapping of its contours" (p. 291). As is true for intercultural communication, critical scholars of whiteness should be suspicious of claims that whiteness has been sufficiently mapped. Throughout this chapter, we have argued that the content and process of whiteness are always transforming. As such, the map will never remain static. To borrow language from Nakayama and Krizek, it is necessary to map the ever-changing contours of whiteness in order to keep it in focus under the critical gaze. In my opinion, continuing to map the contours of whiteness in order to work toward social justice is a key element in the process of becoming.

Toward a Conceptualization of Basal Whiteness

Basal whiteness, based on our exchange, might be characterized as a particular form of whiteness, simultaneously basic, fundamental, low, ignoble, mean, contemptible, toxic, and vile. In particular, basal whiteness is a product of the intersection of White hegemonic masculinity at this historical and political moment with its racist, sexist, classist, homophobic, and nationalist overtones and a potential and proclivity toward violence in various symbolic, affective, and material forms. Basal whiteness is crude but not perceived as such; it is anti-civility without being labeled as uncivilized. It is irrational in the guise of logic, rationality, and mastery; it is fragmentation masquerading as coherence. It is narcissistic and self-referential while appearing neutral, inquisitive, and universal. Affectively, it is a malignancy, a toxic contaminant, and a volcano ready to erupt in a social space. Relationally, it is an obstructionist ghost that constantly changes shape to escape detection and scrutiny and to hinder deep and rich intercultural connection and understanding. Given these complexities, intensities, and contradictions, a queer methodology appears to be particularly useful to capture its embodiment and deployment in the social domain.

IMPLICATIONS OF BASAL WHITENESS AND THE PROCESS OF BECOMING

We have examined, in this chapter, the content and process of basal whiteness in the critical intercultural communication classroom. In order to build a conceptual foundation for basal whiteness, we offered a brief overview of whiteness research relevant to our project. We then introduced queer methodology, which served as our approach to the study. Finally, we engaged in an embodied exploration of basal whiteness in the critical intercultural communication classroom. Throughout this chapter, we have primarily focused on the content and process elements of basal whiteness. We now explore its consequences and its relationship to the process of becoming.

Whiteness is a social dynamic and cultural process that "*we all* negotiate, whether we are white, brown, black, or some combination of the above" (Carrillo Rowe & Malhotra, 2007, p. 272; original italics). As such, it is critical that we understand the ways whiteness functions and circulates in our social world, including our relationships, institutions, and structures. With the hope of working toward becoming through critical intercultural communication pedagogy, this goal might be actualized in the culture and communication classroom.

Becoming is a complex process. It is not a product or an actual final and measurable goal that neoliberal forces in education would like us to produce and assess—it is a *striving*. Becoming is polysemous and we are using it in two complementary ways. Yep (2016) argues that becoming is about expanding our individual and collective worldviews to cultivate a critical consciousness for a more inclusive and just social world. He suggests that transformative communication pedagogy through processes of awareness (i.e., become more conscious), insight (i.e., develop deeper modes of understanding), and action (i.e., engage in behavior and social practices) has the potential to imagine and actualize a radically different and more equal social world. Relatedly and originally described in the context of "becom[ing] women of color," Alexander's (2002) becoming stresses the importance of learning (e.g., each other's histories; each other's social, cultural, psychic, and spiritual biographies), unlearning (e.g., hierarchies of oppression and marginalization; cultural stereotypes), and yearning (e.g., seeing each other deeply; relating to each other lovingly) (p. 91). Taken together, becoming is about breath of perspective *and* depth of knowledge committed to a politics of inclusiveness, diversity, and social justice.

Basal whiteness, in terms of both content and process, is clearly an obstruction to the process of becoming. However, unmasking some of its content (i.e., how it appears in the classroom and what it entails; identifiable practices in classroom discussions) and process (i.e., how it moves, circulates, and attempts to colonize classroom spaces; discursive mechanisms that maintain

White supremacy in U.S. culture by shutting down critical discussions about race, culture, and power) provides moments of opportunity for a learning community (e.g., teachers and students) to see, feel, and experience the dynamics of basal whiteness. Such moments must be ceased so that further awareness, insight, and action could be developed and cultivated through ongoing critical self-reflection. Further, such moments can be used to understand the dynamics and consequences of the violence of basal whiteness on learning community members' bodies, psyches, and souls and to develop and foster community and individual and collective healing.

Teaching about basal whiteness in the critical intercultural communication classroom is not simply about an enhanced mental understanding of its elusiveness, its violence, or its consequences; it is about experiencing, feeling, and healing from its many symbolic, affective, and material manifestations and reverberations. This process suggests that we must, in Carrillo Rowe and Malhotra's (2007) words, "hinge" and "unhinge" whiteness (p. 273). "We use the metaphor of a hinge," they elaborate,

> to signify a connection, an axis that allows a door to swing in different directions even as it keeps it connected to the central force of whiteness. This metaphor evokes the constant negotiation between hinging whiteness to White identities/bodies to hold White people firmly accountable within that articulation; and then unhinging that very conflation [whiteness with White identities/bodies] to empower White people and people of color, to move within and against its nuanced forces of racial domination [and allowing] for the formation of antiracist consciousness. (pp. 273–274)

In other words, teaching about whiteness should connect whiteness with White identities and bodies, as we did with P (hinging whiteness), and examine whiteness as strategic rhetoric in our classroom discourses, as we did in our identification of obstructionist strategies that could be enacted by a number of people, including some students and teachers of color, to uphold U.S. White supremacy (unhinging whiteness).

A pedagogy without a map can be frightening, disturbing, and disorienting. Whiteness shifts and changes to evade analysis and critical scrutiny and to maintain power and cultural dominance. A singular and authoritative map is not always useful or necessarily helpful to chart the ever-changing terrain of whiteness. Navigating this treacherous terrain without a definitive map does not, in our view, suggest or imply that it is a directionless—or hopeless—pedagogical endeavor. By identifying the content and process of basal whiteness in the critical intercultural communication classroom, as embodied by P, we can see useful and hopeful signs, markers, and ways of teaching to hinder

its obstructiveness to the process of becoming. In this sense, a pedagogy without a map does, indeed, have a clear and powerful compass.

NOTES

Gust thanks Nancy McDermid, Wenshu Lee, and Phil Wander for our conversations about whiteness and race, and Yogi Enzo and Pierre Lucas, my two furry bodhisattvas who provide me with constant love, affection, companionship, and inspiration. Gust dedicates this chapter to Olivia Danielson, who inspires me in multiple ways.

Ryan thanks Amelia Diedrich for her love, her editorial guidance, and her keen theoretical insights.

REFERENCES

Alexander, M. J. (2002). Remembering *This Bridge*, remembering ourselves: Yearning, memory, and desire. In G. E. Anzaldúa & A. Keating (Eds.), *This bridge we call home: Radical visions for transformation* (pp. 81–103). New York, NY: Routledge.

Bebout, L. (2014). Skin in the game: Toward a theorization of whiteness in the classroom. *Pedagogy,* 14(2), 343–354.

Bonilla-Silva, E., Forman, T., Lewis, A., & Embrick, D. (2003). It wasn't me: How race and racism will work in 21st-Century America. *Research in Political Sociology,* 12, 111–135.

Cabrera, N. L. (2014). Exposing whiteness in higher education: White male college students minimizing racism, claiming victimization, and recreating White supremacy. *Race Ethnicity and Education,* 17(1), 30–55.

Carrillo Rowe, A., & Malhotra, S. (2007). (Un)hinging whiteness. In L. M. Cooks & J. S. Simpson (Eds.), *Whiteness, pedagogy, performance: Dis/placing race* (pp. 271–298). Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Cooks, L. M., & Simpson, J. S. (Eds.). (2007). *Whiteness, pedagogy, performance: Dis/placing race*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Dyer, R. (1988). White. *Screen,* 29, 44–65.

Ellwanger, A. (2017). No exit: White speech and silence in classroom conversations on race. *Pedagogy,* 17(1), 35–58.

Ford, K. A. (2011). Race, gender and bodily (mis)recognitions: Women of color faculty experiences with White students in the college classroom. *The Journal of Higher Education,* 82(4), 444–478.

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

Freire, P. (1973). *Education for critical consciousness* (M. B. Ramos, Trans.). New York, NY: Continuum.

Goltz, D. B., & Zingsheim, J. (Eds.). (2015). *Queer praxis: Questions for LGBTQ worldmaking*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Guess, T. J. (2006). The social construction of whiteness: Racism by intent, racism by consequence. *Critical Sociology,* 32(4), 649–673.

Halberstam, J. (1998). *Female masculinity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Hall, E. T. (1976). *Beyond culture*. New York, NY: Anchor Books/Doubleday.

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kincheloe, J. L. (1999). The struggle to define and reinvent whiteness: A pedagogical analysis. *College Literature,* 26(3), 162–194.

Lewis, A. E. (2004). "What group?" Studying whites and whiteness in the era of "color-blindness." *Sociological Theory,* 22(4), 623–646.

Martin, J. N., & Davis, O. I. (2001). Conceptual foundations for teaching about whiteness in intercultural communication courses. *Communication Education,* 50(4), 298–313.

Miller, A. N., & Harris, T. M. (2005). Communicating to develop White racial identity in an interracial communication class. *Communication Education,* 54(3), 223–242.

Moon, D. G. (2013). Critical reflections on culture and critical intercultural communication. In T. K. Nakayama & R. T. Halualani (Eds.), *The handbook of critical intercultural communication* (pp. 34–52). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Nakayama, T. K. (2017). What's next for whiteness and the Internet. *Critical Studies in Media Communication,* 34(1), 68–72.

Nakayama, T. K., & Krizek, R. L. (1995). Whiteness: A strategic rhetoric. *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* 81, 291–309.

Nakayama, T. K., & Martin, J. N. (Eds.). (1999). *Whiteness: The communication of social identity*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Nakayama, T. K., & Martin, J. N. (2007). The "White problem" in intercultural communication research and pedagogy. In L. M. Cooks & J. S. Simpson (Eds.), *Whiteness, pedagogy, performance: Dis/placing race* (pp. 111–137). Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Omi, M., & Winant, H. (1986). *Racial formation in the United States*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Rasmussen, B. B., Klinenberg, E., Nexica, I. J., & Wray, M. (2001). Introduction. In B. B. Rasmussen, E. Klinenberg, I. J. Nexica, & M. Wray (Eds.), *The making and unmaking of whiteness* (pp. 1–24). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Sleeter, C. (1994). White racism. *Multicultural Education,* 39, 5–8.

Warren, J. T. (2001). Doing whiteness: On the performative dimensions of race in the classroom. *Communication Education,* 50(2), 91–108.

Yep, G. A. (2000/2014). Encounters with the "other": Personal notes for a reconceptualization of intercultural communication competence. In M. K. Asante, Y. Miike, & J. Yin (Eds.), *The global intercultural communication reader* (2nd ed., pp. 339–356). New York, NY: Routledge.

Yep, G. A. (2002). My three cultures: Navigating the multicultural identity landscape. In J. N. Martin, T. K. Nakayama, & L. A. Flores (Eds.), *Readings in intercultural communication: Experiences and contexts* (2nd ed., pp. 60–66). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.

Yep, G. A. (2007). Pedagogy of the opaque: The subject of whiteness in communication and diversity courses. In L. M. Cooks & J. S. Simpson (Eds.), *Whiteness,*

pedagogy, performance: Dis/placing race (pp. 87–110). Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Yep, G. A. (2016). Demystifying normativities in communication education. *Communication Education,* 65(2), 235–240.

Yep, G. A., & Lescure, R. M. (2015). The practice of normativities in everyday life. In D. B. Goltz & J. Zingsheim (Eds.), *Queer praxis: Questions for LGBTQ world-making* (pp. 93–106). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Yep, G. A., & Shimanoff, S. B. (2013). The US Day of Silence: Sexualities, silences, and the will to unsay in the age of empire. In S. Malhotra & A. Carrillo Rowe (Eds.), *Silence, feminism, power: Reflections at the edges of sound* (pp. 139–156). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Zepeda, S. (2009). Mapping queer of color methodology. *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies,* 15(4), 622–623.

Chapter 9

Performing Otherness as an Instructor in the Interracial Communication Classroom

An Autoethnographic Approach

Tina M. Harris

> It is a peculiar sensation, this double-consciousness, this sense of always looking at one's self through the eyes of others, of measuring one's soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity. One ever feels his twoness,—an American, a Negro; two souls, two thoughts, two unreconciled strivings; two warring ideals in one dark body, whose dogged strength alone keeps it from being torn asunder.
>
> —W. E. B. DuBois (1903)

INTRODUCTION

When I embarked into academe as a master's student, I had no idea of what my journey would entail. For someone who reluctantly contemplated college, I was unaware of the difficult yet rewarding terrain lay ahead of me as a student and subsequent professor. I aggressively and joyfully followed my research and pedagogical interests in the area of interracial communication after recognizing that much of the "mainstream" interpersonal work I read rarely considered the role of race in our interactions and how we study these relational phenomena. Filling this void and studying this area of scholarship is a mission that is very near and dear to my heart. It is at the core of my research and teaching. It did not take long for me to recognize that along with doing research on and teaching about race, I was also performing my intersecting identities of race and gender in the process, and quite possibly class as well. My identity forces me to experience a reality that plays out in both public and private spaces that many of my White colleagues do not have to

face. I am faced with the daunting task of managing this intersectionality in unique and difficult ways (Cooks, 2003; Jackson, 2002).

This aspect of my identity is increasingly pronounced when I am in the classroom. One would think that as a full professor at a predominately White institution (PWI), I would feel empowered when I walk in the classroom. I have been bestowed with the university's highest teaching honor, and continue to excel in the areas of research, teaching, and service; however, I am regularly faced with tensions and pressures when I am teaching race- or culture-centric courses. My otherness becomes magnified, per se. Because I am speaking to issues of systemic oppression that I have experienced firsthand, there is a vulnerability that is present in this teaching context. Much like other marginalized groups (e.g., LGBTQ, international students/scholars), women of color (non-White women) are in a unique and constrained situation. While students usually, seemingly, begin the course with the understanding that we are experts on the course's subject matter, we are simultaneously admired and scrutinized as we attempt to educate them about course content (Gasman et al., 2004). For instructors and professors representing historically marginalized groups, our status as a racial/ cultural outsider becomes magnified and salient in ways that are nearly impossible to quantify (Hendrix, 1998; Johnson & Bhatt, 2003). Our knowledge, classroom management style, commentary, and expectations are oftentimes questioned, challenged even, because we do not fit the "norm" of what a college professor should be (Cruz, 2001), which is also the case for international scholars. This scrutiny is heightened for some students when we teach interracial/intercultural communication classes, with students assuming we occupy a biased or subjective positionality that renders us incapable of teaching such courses. In contrast, our White (and male) colleagues are often believed to be teaching from a fairly unbiased positionality and are the standard by which faculty of color are measured (Stangor, Carr, & Kiang, 1998). Sadly, our competency is questioned when we teach theory-driven courses, with the underlying assumption being that we do not have the intellectual capacity to think and teach in very complex ways. Because the implicit biases of students are informing their opinions of racially different others in most contexts, the classroom becomes a site for critique as well. The same is true of all people; however, such treatment impedes the pedagogical goals of instructors of color on a fairly consistent basis regardless of what course is being taught. Accusations are made that a personal agenda is driving our choice to teach courses related to systemic oppression that are not directed to the other non-raced or non-cultured classes that we teach. Whether it has been overt or covert, I have concluded that my collective experiences with course evaluations, classroom observations, and racial microaggressions are quite similar to those of other female faculty of color, which has led to my conclusion that we are unfairly perceived as biased, anti-White, and very

subjective in our presentation of course material are part of an ongoing intellectual, psychological, and emotional battle that has been ongoing for far too long.

As a woman of color, I am personally compelled do my part in the march toward social justice by actively choosing to use the classroom (and other contexts) to educate others about the realness of racism, prejudice, and discrimination. I stress the mutual benefit that comes from such interactions, especially when the people involve are culturally and racially different. To that end, I personally feel a "conviction" or personal responsibility to teach courses about race and otherness in hopes of providing students with the opportunity to become well-rounded citizens in an increasingly diverse world. I assume that a majority of the students enrolled in my race-related classes are there voluntarily, as it is an elective; however, I also anticipate (sadly) that there will always be a few students who actively resist the experience and question every single fact or narrative that is presented to them that is an unfamiliar truth (Ahlquist, 1992). They are usually the ones responsible for erecting an in/visible wall of resistance in the classroom that many of their classmates and I have to strategically determine how we are going to climb over it. Sadly, some students are oblivious to the very presence of the wall, while others are acutely aware of the negative pall their classmate(s) is creating in the classroom (Harris, Groscurth, & Trego, 2007). This scenario is all too familiar for me and other faculty of color with certain sensibilities when it comes to detecting pedagogical tensions in the air in their classrooms, as they have the potential to become transformative pedagogical moments. Personally, I recognize the resistance and immediately begin to contemplate how to best remedy the situation. Do I "call out" the perpetrator? Do I ignore her/his behavior in hopes that it goes away? Or do I turn the situation into a teachable moment for the students (and myself) about how to deal with difficult moments when people's –isms are being confronted? Whatever the "solution," as a teacher-scholar, I recognize that the responsibility of "properly" handling these stressful situations comes with the territory.

I am also keenly aware that there are costs and rewards that come with resolving pedagogical conflict. While the costs might include increased resistance from the student, a negative classroom climate if the conflict escalates or is not resolved, or me being viewed as "confrontational," the rewards theoretically make the risks worth taking. The perpetrator might see the error of her/his ways, other students will learn the negative consequences of ascribing to oppressive ideologies, and I (hopefully) become more adept at developing effective pedagogical strategies for dealing with volatile course content. Unfortunately, many situations have forced me to spontaneously calculate the cost-rewards ratio of addressing a conflict situation that is critically hampering the learning experience for our classroom community. In addition to

assessing the potential consequences of confronting this behavior, but I must also factor into the equation my otherness. I will invariably be perceived as an "angry Black woman" if I "call out" a student for a racist or culturally insensitive remark, doing so with the full knowledge that my White male colleagues most likely rarely or never face such risks and are direct benefactors of positive stereotyping. For me, I engage in significant internal deliberation as I determine which solution is best, for I know that much is stake. I do so, however, while remaining true to the goals of my interracial communication class and operate with a standard of integrity that may make some uncomfortable. I do not relish these difficult moments, but I recognize them for what they are: teachable moments that ultimately equip teacher-scholars with the requisite skills for navigating difficult conversations in a racially charged environment.

For non-tenured junior faculty and graduate teaching assistants with less power, they do not have the freedom to manage their classrooms in the same way; thus, it is imperative that teacher-scholars who do have power work to identify effective strategies that can either be adapted or used by all instructors that elicit productive discussions about institutional racism and systemic oppression in engaging and provocative ways. I purposely create opportunities in my class for dialogue to occur that ultimately functions to facilitate symbiotic, mutual exchange among my students and myself (Orbe & Harris, 2015). It is through these different dialogues and interactions that transformative pedagogy can potentially be achieved.

As I write this autoethnographic essay, I hope that I offer insightful and powerful ways that others can identify ways to best navigate discussions of race, ethnicity, and culture, which is always a difficult process. It becomes increasingly challenging when such discourses occur in a structured context such as the college classroom and are led or managed by instructors of color. It is in these contexts that I have observed a unique communication dynamic unfold that exponentially increases everyone's level of vulnerability, guardedness, and heightened awareness to the sensitivity of others, all of which impact the classroom experience itself and the larger goal of learning. To better understand this communication phenomenon, I will identify strategies I believe are effective for successfully navigating identity negotiation as a raced and gendered person (Kibria, 2000) at a PWI. These strategies may also be adapted for use in other college and university contexts where there is resistance to race- and culture-based classes.

In this autoethnography, I provide a very brief description of the history of my interracial communication class, which has become a high-demand elective course, that I have been teaching consistently for 14 years despite the emotional labor (Harlow, 2003; Lazányi, 2011) that both my students and I

invariably expend throughout the semester. This background information is an integral part of my narrative, as it lays the foundation for my subsequent conclusion that intellectual deliberation about pedagogy in the interracial/ intercultural classroom is imperative to teaching global citizens who will face a world that is becoming increasingly racially diverse. I use this essay as an opportunity to specifically identify and explain the four categories of classroom-related phenomena I believe typically emerge during the semester, which many others are likely to encounter as well. The categories involve stressors that complicate my teaching, which also highlight the serious and deliberate thought that must go into one's decision to teach such complex teaching material. My classroom experiences have also led me to four responses or solutions to the aforementioned problems that can make the interracial/intercultural classroom a positive, transformative experience. It is my hope that, through this essay, interracial/ intercultural communication teacher-scholars have a resource that is instrumental in how they can best manage their classrooms.

By their very nature, these classes are perceived by administrators, faculty, and students as well as instructors as markedly different from other mainstream or "regular" courses. These misperceptions may quite possibly be espoused by departments and universities as well. The other courses might operate under the assumption that the non-raced (e.g., White) experiences and accounts are the standard by which all others are measured; thus, they are void of discussions of race, ethnicity, and culture. Conversely, classes that are germane to racial/ethnic diversity are oftentimes deemed taboo and potentially volatile, resulting in the teacher-scholar contending with how to make the information accessible without compromising the integrity of such an important class. Personally, I have found myself also masterminding the "performance" I engage in every time I enter the classroom, and because I am sure that many others face the same struggle, I hope to empower others to recognize the difficulty of teaching these courses and manage them head on with confidence. Instead of succumbing to the emotional, spiritual, and psychological toll that teaching such courses can have on us, I challenge myself and others to steel ourselves against the sneak attacks that may come. Rather than being ill-prepared to climb the walls of resistance erected within our classes, we must be equipped with the pedagogical resources and skills necessary for creating opportunities for intellectual and personal transformation regarding how our students conceptualize race and culture. It is my hope that this autoethnography can be used as a critical intercultural communication pedagogy tactic that leads to successful classroom experiences by all who choose to engage.

LAYING THE FOUNDATION FOR THE INTERRACIAL COMMUNICATION COURSE

I began teaching interracial communication (IRC) during my first tenure-track position at Bowling Green State University (BGSU) immediately after graduating with my doctorate from the University of Kentucky in 1995. I had never taken such a course in undergraduate or graduate school, so I was unsure of how to design this upper-level elective special topics course. I was advised by the then-department chair that I had the freedom and fortune to offer courses for our majors that were reflective of my research interests, hence these offerings. I knew that discussions about race were imperative to the class design, and I wanted to be a part of the process. I wanted to include assignments that challenged students to be actively involved in critical thinking about race and ethnicity and how they can best communicate with others who possibly have a different worldview. More importantly, I wanted to stress the long-lasting impact that institutionalized racism and colonialism have had on race relations. Given the limited instructional resources available to me, I had to piecemeal course materials together. Over the course of the next year at BGSU and into the first two years at my current institution, I worked tirelessly to develop a curriculum that was equally grounded in theory and application. This all was cemented when my colleague and dear friend, Mark P. Orbe (Western Michigan University), invited me to co-author what is now the leading IRC textbook. We are in our third edition, and being part of such a valuable contribution to the discipline, and by extension the world, has been one of the most rewarding endeavors of my career. There is very little departmental or institutional level incentive for writing a textbook. Nevertheless, my gratification and satisfaction come from collaborating on an incredibly important project whose greatest value is the rich information transforming the lives of some students and their interpersonal networks. I recognize that not everyone will be inspired by this textbook, or even the class, but I remain committed to teaching a class and doing pedagogy and race research. Despite the considerable number of obstacles that I have been able to successfully overcome in my classroom, I remain frustrated by them. I am taking this opportunity with this publication to encourage and inspire likeminded colleagues to remain steadfast and confident that teaching difficult courses like IRC and intercultural communication (ICC) do have their rewards and are worth the sacrifice. While being inherently difficult, it is far more rewarding to know that lives are being positively impacted through increased awareness of how to effectively navigate and communicate across racial, ethnic, and cultural differences in spite of systemic oppression (Chang, 2002; Cochran-Smith, 1995).

I have now been teaching IRC for roughly 16 years, and it remains a high-demand course. It is so popular that a waitlist is always created in an effort to accommodate our majors. This is despite the course's reputation for being fairly rigorous and challenging. While the assignments are manageable, the students are struck by the significant amount of mental labor that will be expended in this course. They also become keenly aware of the emotional labor that comes along with being a part of this intellectual community. This is most apparent by the fact that students regularly struggle with our definition of racism, which is described as:

> the systematic subordination of certain racial groups by those groups in power. In the United States, European Americans traditionally have maintained societal power and therefore can practice racism. Because of their relative lack of institutional power, people of color can practice racial discrimination but not racism. (Orbe & Harris, 2015, p. 10)

Invariably, White and non-White students alike will resist the definition, reducing racism to racial prejudice, thereby assuming and believing that all people can be racist. This subsequently sets the tone for how receptive or resistant they will be to the very frank and honest conversations we will have throughout the semester, not to mention the information they will (hopefully) learn.

Teaching this difficult content becomes complicated for me because I have membership in two historically marginalized groups: women and African Americans. My intersectionality, my otherness is "marked" when I enter the classroom. I am not "merely" teaching or engaging in a one-way communicative exchange with my students; rather, every fiber of my being is on display. My very essence—mind, body, soul, and spirit—is vulnerable to both the unevolved and culturally aware students enrolled in my class. For some students, the long-held tropes ascribed to women who share the same phenotype as me (i.e., angry Black woman, Jezebel, mammy, matriarch) are subconsciously and/or consciously projected upon me against my will. Some see me as an anomaly, an oddity, while others, typically students of color (SOC) or White students interested in the topic, welcome me and my teaching style, viewing my intersectionality and professional identity as an integral part of their educational journey in the class. They appreciate the new opportunity to learn and grow from someone who has both the intellect and personal experience necessary to inform their learning in the classroom. The difficult task for me, and others like me, is determining how to best manage those students who strongly resist nearly everything about the class. They overtly and covertly oppose, sometimes even deliberately conveying their dislike for and resistance to me, my class, or both. As the authority figure,

I am in a precarious position that requires that I devise a plan that successfully educates the student(s) without compromising the integrity of the historicity surrounding course content. I always purpose to integrate the topic of intersectionality throughout the course, as it is an essential part of understanding and deconstructing systemic oppression by critiquing the institutions producing knowledge that is typically exclusionary. Thus, I stress in this essay how every fact, concept, theory, and anecdote shared in this classroom is potentially held to a higher level of scrutiny, subsequently calling into question the intersectionality that is vital to teaching a course on systemic oppression. Although I might not always know the correct response or remedy to render, it is through scholarship such as this and open dialogue with colleagues that I, and others, can develop a cadre of strategies for successfully and effectively navigating the IRC-ICC classrooms. Exploring intersectionality is critical since I situate an intersectional perspective as pivotal to understanding systemic oppression. Students learn early in the semester that there are multiple standpoints that inform our worldviews, and it is through these lenses that they should gain insight into how marginalized people experience life in ways that are markedly different from those that are privileged.

RESISTANCE IN THE CLASSROOM: INTERSECTIONALITY ON DISPLAY

There is a double or triple consciousness (i.e., race, gender, class) that becomes illuminated when female professors and professors of color enter the college classroom (Hendrix, 1998; Johnson & Bhatt, 2003). Both the very essence of our otherness and our awareness thereof become magnified, particularly when we are teaching race- or culture-related classes. We certainly have to work triply harder than our White colleagues (i.e., heterosexual male) to demonstrate our competency. Many of our students are operating under a different ideological framework as they attempt to reconcile our very existence with the negative ideologies they have been taught and subconsciously learned at home, in society, through the media, and the education system. I can only speak for myself, but on an all too regular basis, I feel that I am performing on a stage before an audience, opening my mind (i.e., intellect), body, soul, and spirit to speculative consumption by an audience that comes to gaze at my entire being while I teach them abstract concepts and theories related to otherness. I stand in the front of the classroom as an expert, a harbinger of truth, with a significant amount of knowledge and information that I competently share with our students. Unfortunately, I am not afforded the same luxury as my White male (and some female) colleagues of avoiding being "taken to task" for the information I present, judged (sub)consciously

by stereotypes associated with the groups I represent, deemed less intelligent and more biased, and accused of having an "agenda" when I unravel and reveal the reality of institutionalized racism through various means (i.e., data, peer-reviewed research, critical essays, personal testimony) (Johnson & Bhatt, 2003). Ultimately, I am forced to develop strategies that not only function to maintain classroom integrity, but protect me from the psychological warfare that ensues to varying degrees in my classrooms. These battlefields of the mind seep into and occur in my personal life as well in my day-to-day tasks, which makes it even more difficult to manage these tensions in a holistic manner.

As the saying goes, "To be forewarned is to be forearmed." While this might sound quite pessimistic, it is befitting of how I sometimes prepare to teach the IRC/ICC class. There are four forms of attack that I often encounter during a typical semester: (1) critiquing Black physicality; (2) racial microaggressions; (3) emotional labor; and (4) resistance/rejection. I explain in greater detail below how each of these assaults on my very being are very likely quite similar to others who are part of a historically marginalized group; as such, the responses I offer might be useful for them as well. I offer that these attacks and responses demonstrate the tensions inherent between public and private selves that intersect, for many, in the classroom. Sadly, our personal experiences, identities, and scholarships are challenged in very subtle yet disturbing ways.

In order to illustrate each of my main points, I will use one encounter with a White male student as evidence that these encounters have the potential to escalate beyond what we might imagine. Thankfully, my expertise, wisdom, and courage empowered me to address the situation in the most professional yet firm manner. I was teaching an introduction to interpersonal communication summer course and dedicated one class period (i.e., three hours) to IRC. I chose to show a snippet of community therapist Lee Mun Wah's documentary *The Color of Fear* rather than sharing a personal experience with racism (Harris, 2001), thus avoiding significant emotional labor (Harlow, 2003; Lazányi, 2011). Throughout the 20-minute viewing, a very large, muscular White male student glared at me with disdain and disgust. He essentially refused to watch the segment, opting to unabashedly stare menacingly at me for the duration. It was unlike anything I had ever experienced. During the post-viewing discussion, he pointedly told me he did not believe my data that racism exists. He point-blank questioned the accuracy of my data—my co-authored textbook—and attempted to argue that "reverse racism" is the "true" problem with a racially diverse society. Speaking from the vantage point of "white backlash," he attempted to dismiss everything I had just taught the class. At least one other White male chimed in with agreement, but I politely rebuffed his accusations, referring him to additional sources he

could consult to become better informed on the topic. He brazenly challenged me under the guise of contesting a grade for a written assignment he should have failed. His explicit requests-turned-demands for a meeting to assess the veracity *my* grading rubric were quite alarming. The verbal and written assault on my intersectionality and professional identity compounded by his own physicality (i.e., *6′ 5″* in height and weight of least 225 lbs.), which was significantly larger than mine, made me feel threatened. I agreed to meet with him, but arranged for my then-department head to be in a nearby office in the event the meeting became volatile. Initially, she was dismissive of my concerns, accusing me of bias because of his whiteness, assuming I would act differently with a Black male student. I typically have a unique rapport with Black students in my courses, given our shared racial identities; however, when there is hostility and contempt, the relational dynamics between any student and myself are certainly bound to shift regardless of our similarities or differences. Despite her lack of support and failure to be empathic, I restricted my concern to the parameters of that specific situation and student.

Thankfully the meeting was "successful," or so I thought; he said nearly nothing as I explained his low grade. The remainder of the semester went "well." It was not until a month after the class was over (and grades submitted) that I was notified of the racial discrimination charge the student filed against me through the University's Equal Opportunity Office (EOO). Although it was anonymous, I immediately knew who it was. I was instructed by the EOO to provide an electronic copy of the course material in question. The lawyer was told that the student disagreed with my definition of racism, which came directly from my co-authored textbook and is a very common explanation across disciplines. Naturally, the charge was dismissed and the student was advised that the only violation that occurred was an ideological difference that is an organic part of the university landscape. No matter how hard we might try, instructors are in an ongoing battle as they negotiate identity politics are a daily basis. Every aspect of our physical, spiritual, and intellectual being is critiqued in ways that many of our colleagues cannot fathom. While we might not be pointedly engage in a discussion of body politics, we automatically are susceptible to these critiques in very complex and nuanced ways.

As this experience demonstrates, identity politics are ever present for women and people of color when we are in the classroom, and elsewhere. I made every valiant effort to present this material just as I did other theories and concepts related to interpersonal communication that were taught in this class. Despite my efforts to remain consistent and to use reputable scholarly sources, the very essence of who (i.e., raced, gendered) and what (i.e., professor) I am was called into question, challenged. I was forced to engage in identity politics that became a barrier for student learning, yet at my expense.

Multiple readings are conferred upon my body. While I position and perform my professional identity as central to the classroom experience (after all I am the instructor), it is the intersectionality of my three identities that students simultaneously reject and critique. Nevertheless, I am the perpetual path of identifying ways that allow me to actively engage in a strategic performance of who I am while maintaining my sanity.

Critiquing Black Physicality

Throughout my career, I have been simultaneously intrigued and repelled by the reality of overt and covert critiques of Black physicality by students who engage in behaviors suggesting that they believe blackness is a negative trait or quality to possess. This also involves a common discourse that negates and devalues raced and gender experiences that are born from these identities (Collins, 1993). I teach in and am a part of southern culture that socializes us to be polite, which is an identity I share with many of my students. Like them, my family and I are originally from the south; however, I am viewed as a cultural outsider who embodies little or nothing of what many of my students believe a professor should possess. It is because of my double-consciousness and intersectionality that I have these encounters on a regular basis. These real and/or imagined critiques force me to filter nearly every student comment, behavior, and response from my culturally marked (i.e., raced and gendered) lens. Thus, in order to manage this nearly schizophrenic existence, it is imperative that we recognize several things. I have learned from personal experience that doing so will foster have balance and facilitate understanding of institutional racism as it manifests itself within and outside of the classroom.

First, we must recognize that our mere presence in the classroom oftentimes evokes negative ideologies about otherness that are beyond our control. While some students will see us as role models that defy familiar misconceptions and affirm students' shared identity as a marginalized group member, others will easily devalue us for the very same reason. I have come to largely attribute this to students being confronted with their long-held prejudices and racist beliefs in a very pointed way, and quite possibly for the first time in their lives. Our otherness represents that which they have been taught to hate, dislike, or avoid; thus, being exposed to us causes an unsettling discomfort (Johnson & Bhatt, 2003). In response, students project their societal beliefs onto us, which can make for contentious professor-student interactions, racially charged course evaluations, and perceptions of professor incompetence (Hendrix, 1998). As a professor, I am constantly subjected to psychological trauma due to years of being challenged, critiqued, and scrutinized in ways most of my colleagues are not, which is an all too familiar reality.

For many of us, this contextually induced stress is compounded by the fear of negative course evaluations, which is critical for faculty of color seeking promotion and/or tenure. The stress still exists for us full professors, as we are reviewed annually and expected to meet or exceed our teaching, research, and service expectations. For those of us of color, the pressure intensifies to outperform our peers while also psychologically preparing for potential student backlash in the classroom.

Second, I have found it helpful to be proactive in identifying student-initiated microaggressions early on and determining which violation is disrupting the teaching and learning process. Microaggressions occur on a daily basis, can be either intentional or unintentional, and are typically insults that are directed toward people of color (Sue et al., 2007). In general, these perpetrators (i.e., students) rarely know they are engaging in such negative interracial/interethnic communication; however, there are exceptions. These passive-aggressive behaviors can be an explicit and purposeful racial derogation (i.e., microassault), a subtly rude, insensitive, and demeaning verbal message (i.e., microinsult), language that excludes or negates the thoughts, feelings, and realities of people of color (i.e., microinvalidation) (Sue et al., 2007). My experiences with racial microaggressions are countless, and having been subjected to each of these on a regular basis, I can attest to the fact that these behaviors implicate everyone involved: the victim (i.e., professor), the perpetrator (i.e., student), and the classroom community. The end consequence is tension, silence, hostility, and/or discomfort, and while the behaviors are patently inappropriate, I always aim to create a teachable moment that educates without humiliating the student.

Emotional Labor

Another byproduct of teaching the IRC-ICC class is the emotional labor that comes with teaching such a potentially volatile class (Hoschild, 1979). I have found that by performing my identity (and students theirs), the labor exerted into the class "draw[s] energy from the performer, and carrying a potential to lead to emotional exhaustion in the long run" (Lazányi, 2011, p. 126). A wide range of emotions and feelings are experienced in this class, and I have found that they have a negative effect on one's overall well-being, possible even taking an emotional and mental toll on both the student and the instructor (Harlow, 2003). Thus, the instructor must put forth an effect to process and contain these emotions so that they do not negatively disrupt the class or diversity efforts of the department and university. Over the years, I have come to anticipate this as an inevitable part of the classroom experience for both myself and my students. We all expend varying amounts of energy, which makes teaching IRC/ICC a very emotionally and psychologically taxing process (Lawrence & Bunche, 1996).

I have witnessed students deal with a wide range of emotions that emerge in both expected and unexpected ways throughout the semester. One consistent pattern has been, for example, that White students and students of color have vastly different responses and accompanying emotions to different events that occur within and outside of the classroom. The emotional labor taxed to all SOC involves reactions to their own and others' experiences with systemic oppression and the lack of awareness of and sensitivity to that by their White classmates. SOC also experience positive emotions of happiness, joy, and/or satisfaction when their marginalized experiences are validated rather than dismissed by their professor and course material. Students seem to respond positively to data, personal narratives, and affirmation with feelings of comfort and confidence. For many, my class is the first time where they feel like a part of the curriculum. Students have shared with me that, in other classes, non-Black or White professors sometimes alienate a small segment of the class either unintentionally or intentionally when they minimize or ignore the influence of race, ethnicity, culture, class, and sexual identities on business communication, psychology, and art, for example. The negative emotions include anger, sadness, and annoyance emerge in response to the insensitive comments made by their classmates reflect a semantics of prejudice, or the unintentional revelation of one's prejudiced ideals and thoughts (Orbe & Harris, 2015). These microaggressions also cause some students to experience frustration, which are compounded by the fact that they are dealing with these in their lives outside of the classroom as well. In order to cope, I have had students come to my office to process their emotions and to identify ways they can best manage them without impeding their learning. Sadly, I have even observed some respond with silence in order to "just get through" to the end of the semester.

Conversely, the overwhelming emotion that White students have reported experienced and I have also observed is White guilt upon having frank discussions about the ugliness of colonialism and slavery in the United States. There are those students who do not take ownership of institutionalized racism; rather, they recognize the inherent danger therein and work to either at least acknowledge its existence and/or to challenge the power imbalance in our society. Conversely, other White students view themselves as culpable because of their whiteness, and despite not being personally responsible, they avoid further engagement, as it will most likely engender anger, shame, frustration, or sadness due to their membership in a group that has worked aggressively to maintain institutionalized oppression at the expense of meritocracy. Thus, they do not know how to process or talk about this newfound awareness, so they choose to remain disengaged. I have also observed those that are overcome by their anger, and turn to apathy, contempt, and/or indifference as a way to outright reject and resist course content and, by proxy, me as their professor of color.

I remain encouraged and inspired by those students that embrace their emotional vulnerability to the negative feelings (i.e., sadness, shame, embarrassment), as it typically leads to them becoming more culturally empathic and aware. This can also lead to confusion regarding the lack of humanity in their race and a healthy curiosity about the many issues that emerge through our class discussions. Eventually, for some of these students, they want further exposure to literature and other resources on IRC and ICC. I appreciate the students on this journey because they have oftentimes chosen to actively include me in their self-discovery. They are not embodying the White savior complex or being insincere; rather, there is a willingness to gain greater insight into the perspectives of their classmates of color and how they experience systemic oppression. I have seen these students use their written assignments and class discussions, for example, to engage in self-reflection, sort through guilt, and identify their own behaviors that actively or passively contribute to systemic oppression. This process organically unfolds at the beginning of the semester when I guide the students through a discussion of Peggy McIntosh's (1990) essay "Unpacking Privilege," for example. The White students are visibly shaken and bothered when they hear specific examples of what systemic oppression looks and feels like in the life of a marginalized person. This first step is critical, I think, as I spend the rest of the semester guiding students in the process of learning effective strategies (through applied assignments and class discussions) for directly confronting intimate (i.e., family friends) and nonintimate (i.e., strangers) others about their conscious or subconscious enactment of racial microaggressions that their classmates of color experience on a regular basis.

Rejection/Resistance

The response of rejection/resistance from IRC/ICC students is one that I have found to be common, despite my efforts to fulfill course goals that facilitate enlightenment, awareness, and personal growth through education. Naturally, there are some students that need my class to graduate, and if they are do not believe the truth of what is being presented in class, then the class becomes an obstruction or inconvenience to their end goal. Although they might not verbalize their discontent, they put forth minimal or no effort to learning, and resist being physically, emotionally, and cognitively present. This is specifically evidenced when they claim openly in class or in my course evaluation that political correctness is being foisted upon them. As a result, they do minimal work, physically and/or verbally express disinterest, and have no commitment to learning, which I have seen have an adverse effect on the classroom dynamic. Eventually, I am put in the precarious position of working aggressively against this pedagogical barrier.

Instead of immediately assuming a defensive posture, I first acknowledge that resistant/rejecting students frequently reflect a racist, post-racial, and/or colorblind ideology that actively works against my course goals. These competing ideologies are usually present and force me to pointedly address the tension between meritocracy and racism. Because of my intersectionality, I believe this resistance is magnified; however, in light of heightened racial tensions in the United States the importance of the transformative potential of this class becomes greater. While the stance of rejection/resistance is frustrating, I work to maintain an ethical or moral standpoint in my IRR/ICC class regarding social justice for all systemically oppressed groups.

STRATEGIC INTERVENTION: RESPONDING TO RESISTANCE AND DISCOMFORT

Over the years, I have witnessed an array of intellectual, ideological, and emotional responses from students that are triggered by the race/culture-centric material and magnified, for some, by my race and gender. Many of these students espouse a nonconforming (i.e., racist) ideology that creates further resistance to their learning, especially since, as the "messenger" of this unsettling information, I am sometimes perceived as "unqualified" to teach the course, biased, intellectually inferior, and incapable of teaching her/him anything of significance. Unfortunately, my long history with pedagogical racial microaggressions has a cumulative effect on my mental and emotional health, which thereby impacts how I choose to perform my identity within and outside of the classroom. This oftentimes becomes increasingly difficult or challenging for me to manage, which is why I use the following strategies to cope with these many stressors associated with teaching in the IRR-ICC class as a person of color. I also recommend other marginalized faculty use these strategies as needed. In no particular order, I choose to have (1) a healthy double-consciousness (i.e., four-step process with three sub-steps); (2) go through a three-step microaggression management process; and (3) use a five-step emotional labor management process to prevent breakdown. I developed these different labels in an effort to make sense of what has resulted in successful strategies and approaches that can diffuse or divert volatile situations with resistant students while also providing coping mechanisms for the mental, physical, and emotional exhaustion that invariably accompanies the IRC/ICC course.

Healthy Double-Consciousness

Given the emotionally and psychologically intense nature of this class, I work painstakingly to manage my identity as professor who is both of color and

female. This double-consciousness (Dubois, 1903) or psychological duality must be something that both I and others embrace as these tensions emerge in our classrooms (Jackson, 2004). Competing institutional pressures for faculty excellence in teaching, research, and service are fixed stressors that are exacerbated for faculty members of color. Because our families and communities socialize us to recognize these systemically induced tensions early in life, we learn how to navigate and live our lives in an inherently biased system/world. We are provided explicit rules or guidelines that are ultimately essential to our overall well-being and functionality.

For me, I choose to aggressively create a balance between who I am as a professor and as a raced and gendered person, both of which are constructed by oppressive systems. This requires that I have an emotional support system (i.e., family, friends, partner, colleagues) that provides respite from difficulties that surface from teaching the IRC/ICC course and managing problematic students. While there is departmental and institutional support, it often times feels to be so on a theoretical rather than an actual or real level. Essentially, there are few actions that offer support of the belief that such diversity is valued and appreciated. Thus, orientational (i.e., close) others offer me new perspective and insight into strategies they use to cope with their own intersectionality in other contexts where they are the only a person of color or one of a few people of color. I have found that our shared identities and relational commitment provide a safe haven for me and provide me with the empowerment I need to manage my classroom with confidence and clarity.

As I am sure it does for others, this socioemotional support provides me the freedom I need to confidently and boldly embrace my otherness despite the negative raced and gendered messages received from mainstream society my entire life, that are reified by my students who not only contest the course but all that I embody. Therefore, I must steel myself against the vulnerability that comes with teaching. Rather than rejecting or denying my raced/gendered body, I should embrace it while recognizing that there is a strong possibility of me being subjected to microaggressions that might not be specific to me or who I am, but the ideologies that a student must now struggle to understand. This is a topic I usually address at the beginning of the semester as a means for addressing intersectionality in a fairly non-threatening way. Hopefully, students are less defensive and more receptive to these discussions despite the negative feelings they will undoubtedly experience. While this is a topic visited several times over the course of the semester, I do so at critical moments when a reminder of its significance in a current discussion of otherness is warranted. The hope and goal is that these disclosures are used as educational moments for my students and a catharsis of sorts for me. Every act of resistance is not openly addressed or discussed in the classroom; however, I do have pointed discussions about how resistance is a common student response

to what they are learning in this class. Instead of shunning these students or singling them out, I stress that these responses are typical but should not be a barrier to learning. I also openly address how I very likely represent beliefs that are antithetical to those espoused by the students and embody a raced and gendered identity with which they are unfamiliar. Thus, I proactively work to deflect and depersonalize these attacks, which helps me create emotional and mental distance from what is possibly a racial microaggression.

The support that I receive from my interpersonal network also provides a much needed reality check from in-group and out-group friends and colleagues that are instrumental in helping me interpret these classroom encounters. I have found that these conversations assist me in determining through which lenses I should interpret the meanings embedded in the situations that arise in my classroom. Toward that end, this involves a (a) *clarification* of what is at the root of the problem (i.e., personal, ideological, societal), (b) *validation* from my friends and family that my racialized experience is real, and (c) *reunification* of my multiple identities or lenses, which enables me to view and understand the experience in its totality through my layers.

Microaggression Management

Seventeen years of teaching the IRR-ICC class has taught me that racial microaggressions in the classroom must be addressed, and can be done so through what I now recognize is a four-step process. The first step, *compartmentalization*, requires that I categorize the student's transgression or incident as a result of who s/he is in totality (i.e., race, gender, religion, sexuality, etc.) outside of the classroom. I am fully aware that my students are more than students. For example, they have relational and political identities that are sometimes overlooked when they are in the classroom. Just as they pigeonhole us as one-dimensional beings, we sometimes limit who they are to their role or identity as a student. Students also haves complex identities that must be considered as they are performed in the classroom. The students have ideologies that were shaped before they came to college and inform how they conceptualize race and racism. As a result, I make a concerted effort to avoid summarily dismissing my students because of their naiveté or closed-mindedness. Instead, I challenge myself and other professors to remember the bigger picture: societal change. The second step, *reference framing*, challenges me to recognize the microaggression as being symptomatic of larger social ills that cannot interfere with my ability to lecture, grade effectively, or commitment to the transformative goals of the course.

The third step requires that I work hard to *manage authenticity*. This means that I purposely use personal narratives in the classroom in response to student resistance or attacks. Instead of sensor it myself, I choose to remain

strategically vulnerable by explicitly articulating my humanness and right to have and own my feelings. I share with my students (past) hurtful or painful racial encounters that will potentially resonate with them, relates to what is being learned in the class, and frames me as being multidimensional. "Keeping it real" allows students to hear firsthand accounts of systemic oppression; however, this must be done in moderation, and should suppress all behaviors that imply that I have a bias against a recognizably resistant student. This does not mean that microaggressions are to be tolerated. Rather, I encourage standing firm and addressing inappropriate behavior, which might involve a direct discussion with the student about the disruptive and disrespectful behavior. By managing authenticity and using examples of difficulties experienced with past classes, my students are better able to see me as person who is authentic and has direct experiences with racism.

Emotional Labor Management

Like my students, I also experience a variety of emotions in my IRC/ICC classes. The tremendous responsibility I have of charting the journey for an emotion-laden course that challenges racial ideologies and how students understand themselves takes a toll on my mind, body, and spirit. The topics are personal and real, unlike a theory course where there is typically a less emotional investment in course content. Granted, many of us might be passionate about a certain theory or methodology; however, that rarely makes us as vulnerable and invested as do courses directly tied to identity in very important ways. For professors of color, we are responding to an array of emotions projected onto us, either intentionally or unintentionally, and those elicited by the content. Coupling that with our personal experiences with systemic oppression and efforts to translate course content to concrete concepts and theories, we are invariably subjected to very intense emotions beyond our control. Thus, to avoid the inevitable, I typically attempt to objectively teach the content and remain devoid of as much emotion as possible; however, the pain and hurt associated with my epistemologies relative to our otherness often rise to the surface. While positive emotions (i.e., joy, excitement, passion) are likely to occur as well, it is the negative emotions that contribute to the taxing nature of teaching an IRC/ICC (Lawrence & Bunche, 1996), hence my strong endorsement and practice of emotional labor management.

We should progress through the following stages in order to maintain our mental and emotional health while teaching these difficult and challenging course: (1) *acknowledge* the emotion—identify the emotion—anger, sadness, fear—and admit its existence (i.e., own your feelings; they are valid); (2) *feel* the emotion—experience the emotion in that moment, as it is a release of baggage that is complicating classroom instruction; (3) *appreciate*

that experience—identify the lesson(s) to be learned (i.e., whose teachable moment); (4) *contextualize* or locate the emotion—recognize that the emotion is valid and temporary; and (5) *release* the emotion—let go of the emotion so that it does not impede one's personal growth as an individual and professional. I experienced this process stage several years ago when a White male student disclosed in written assignments throughout the semester his belief in many stereotypes about and negative attitudes toward African Americans. Unfortunately, this student was resistant to personal change and growth. I was heartbroken.

This experience with a resistant, indifferent, and/or struggling student inspired the creation of a roadmap for strategically managing my emotions experienced with and within the IRC course. The fact that my body is a cultural marker that triggers beliefs about my group membership and me is quite saddening. There is sadness over the reality that students are willing to label an entire group of people (me included), unwilling to alter their reality—a reality that was entirely different from those of their classmates. In the case of the student, he cut himself off from amazing relationships, cultural experiences, and new ways of knowing. Nevertheless, I learned to understand him where he was; he was either woefully uninformed or unwilling to appreciate the meaning and interconnectedness of otherness, whiteness, and White privilege (Cooks, 2003; Giroux, 1997), among other concepts. Throughout the semester, I appreciated him as a person and vowed to be the caring professor that I have always committed myself to being. This required that I *acknowledge* my feelings. I was sad, hurt, and disappointed by his beliefs, but I did not own those feelings for very long, as they could consume me, creating a petri dish of toxic emotions inextricably tied to my teaching experiences. Thus, I gave myself "permission" to *feel*: my emotions were genuine and legitimate, and I had the right to express them. I did so outside of the classroom, talking with colleagues, family, and friends about the incredulity of the experience, which freed my mind and spirit, allowing me to separate my emotions from my role as this young man's professor. I was also able to *appreciate* the opportunity to freely teach the class without projecting the "angry Black woman" archetype the students are always expecting to make an appearance. I *contextualized* the experience as a teachable moment for both the student and me. The student's lesson was literal and figurative; the labor of applying what he was learning to the real world was his responsibility. The class provided him with the necessary tools for understanding IRC, thus making it his responsibility to determine when and how to use them. I *released* all negative emotions in order to preserve my overall well-being. I came to recognize the experience as a very complex microcosm of the larger issue of systemic oppression. I assumed a greater, unwavering role in facilitating social justice (Crenshaw, 1995) through the IRC course.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Through this autoethnographic essay, I aimed to offer important advice for navigating discussions of race, ethnicity, and culture, and intersectionality. As a member of two historically marginalized groups, I experience a unique communication dynamic that invariably unfolds in every IRC course that I teach. Along with my students, I experience an incredibly high level of vulnerability, guardedness, and heightened awareness of self that impacts in very degrees and multiple ways. In order to have the long-lasting impact others and I envision these courses as having, it is imperative that we employ strategies that are effective for successfully navigating identity negotiation (Jackson, 2002) for raced and gendered persons at a PWI.

The strategies proposed within this essay have the primary goal of aiding both students and professors who are either marked (i.e., raced) or unmarked (i.e., untraced) in managing the emotional labor that is inherent in an IRC/ICC class. By extension, this should culminate in the larger goal of adopting a spirit of appreciation for the racial, ethnic, and cultural diversity that exists beyond the insulated walls of a university classroom. Too often, the language used to facilitate discourse about the richness of the ever-evolving cultural mosaic that is shifting the demographic landscape of North America (and the world) argues for an attitude of toleration, which is problematic. The "other" (i.e., non-White) is framed as an anomaly that is to be objectified, put up with, and resisted. This is a dangerous ideology to advance the classroom, as it fails to create a foundation upon which students can build an appreciation for the "otherness" of dissimilar others. Thus, the strategies in this essay aim to inspire students to use their newfound skills and knowledge for the greater good of humanity.

For me, it is of equal importance that I have the ability to navigate the IRC/ICC course in a way that preserves the integrity of the course while creating a balance for my dual socially constructed identities as a professor and a person. We are undoubtedly responding to our identities that are inextricably linked to and constructed by oppressive systems (i.e., race, gender); therefore, I must use strategies in the classroom that recognize and accept that there is no one truth or one reality. These courses recognize that worldviews exist that attempt to erase the reality of marginalized others; however, as the professor, I have a greater responsibility to determine how to best manage classroom situations involving students that resist my IRC/ICC course. In general, we are in a precarious position that requires us to devise a plan to educate our students without compromising the integrity of the historicity surrounding the course content. Rather than ignoring our intersectionality as teacher-scholars, we must embrace our otherness and use it as a pedagogical tool to educate others and ourselves about the reality of systemic oppression.

REFERENCES

Ahlquist, R. (1992). Manifestations of inequality: Overcoming resistance in a multicultural foundations course. In C. Grant (Ed.), *Research and multicultural education: From the margins to the mainstream* (pp. 89–105). London: Falmer.

Chang, M. (2002). The impact of an undergraduate diversity course requirement on students' racial views and attitudes. *The Journal of General Education,* 50, 21–42.

Cochran-Smith, M. (1995). Uncertain allies: Understanding the boundaries of race and teaching. *Harvard Educational Review,* 65(4), 541–570.

Collins, P. H. (1993). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment.* New York: Routledge.

Cooks, L. (2003). Pedagogy, performance, and positionality: Teaching about whiteness in interracial communication. *Communication Education,* 52, 245–257.

Crenshaw, K. W. (1995). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity, politics, and violence against women of color. In K. W. Crenshaw, N. Gotanda, C. Peller, & K. Thomas (Eds.), *Critical race theory: The key writings that formed the movement* (pp. 357–383). New York: The New Press.

Cruz, C. (2001). Toward an epistemology of a brown body. *Qualitative Studies in Education,* 14(5), 357–669.

Du Bois, W. E. B. (1903). *The Souls of Black Folk*. New York: Dover Publications.

Gasman, M., Gerstl-Pepin, C., Anderson-Thompkins, S., Rasheed, L., & Hathaway, K. (2004). Negotiating power, developing trust: Transgressing race and status in the academy. *Teachers College Record,* 2004, 106(4), 689–715.

Giroux, H. A. (1997). Rewriting the discourse of racial identity: Towards a pedagogy and politics of whiteness. *Harvard Educational Review,* 67(2), 285–320.

Harlow, R. (2003). "Race doesn't matter, but. . . .": The effect of race on professors'experiences and emotion management in the undergraduate college classroom. *Social Psychology Quarterly,* 66(4), 348–363.

Harris, T. M. (2001). Student reactions to the visual texts "the color of fear" and "rosewood" in the interracial classroom. *Howard Journal of Communications,* 12(2), 101–117.

Harris, T. M., Groscurth, C., & Trego, A. (2007). Coloring outside the lines: Unmasking performances of white identity through classroom role-play. In Leda M. Cooks and Jennifer S. Simpson (Ed.). *Whiteness, Performance, Pedagogy: Dis/Placing Race* (pp. 169–191). Lexington Books (a division of Rowman & Littlefield.)

Hendrix, K. G. (1998). Student perceptions of verbal and nonverbal cues leading to images of black and white professor credibility. *Howard Journal of Communications,* 8(3), 251–273

Hochschild, A. R. (1979). Emotion work, feeling rules, and social structure. *American Journal of Sociology,* 85(3), 551–575.

Jackson, R. L. (2002). Cultural contracts theory: Toward an understanding of identity negotiation. *Communication Quarterly,* 50(3/4), 359–367.

Johnson, J. R., & Bhatt, A. J. (2003). Gendered and racialized identities and alliances in the classroom: Formations in/ of resistive space. *Communication Education,* 52(3/4), 230–244.

Kibria, N. (2000). Race, ethnic options, and ethnic binds: Identity negotiations of second-generation Chinese and Korean Americans. *Sociological Perspectives,* 43(1), 77–95.

Lawrence, S. M., & Bunche, T. (1996). Feeling and dealing: Teaching white students about racial privilege. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 12(5), 531–542.

Lazányi, K. (2011). Organizational consequences of emotional labour in management. *Applied Studies in Agribusiness and Commerce*, 5, 125–130.

McIntosh, P. (1990). White privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack. *Independent School,* 49(2), 31.

Orbe, M., & Harris, T. M. (2015). *Interracial Communication: Theory to Practice* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Sue, D. W., Capodilupo, C. M., Torino, G. C., Bucceri, J. M., Holder, A. M. B., Nadal, K. L., &Esquilin, M. (2007). *American Psychologist,* 62(4), 271–286.

Chapter 10

Encountering *Karma*

The Transgressive Adventures of a Korean-born TCK Pedagogue in the US South

Jieyoung Kong

THE MOBILE PEDAGOGUE

As I try to ease back into my work routine as a college professor in southern part of the United States after my summer pilgrimage to Korea, I find the process of decoupling myself from one place of the world and plugging into another not getting any easier despite having sojourned in various parts of the world as a *third culture kid* (Pollock & Van Reken, 2009). It was the third time I trekked across the Pacific and back since becoming an educator in higher education in the United States. Of course, I was prepared to step into my work-based identity outfit. Being marked as an "Asian" international, or Korean for the more discerning members of the faculty, has been dis/orienting like the vertigo Sekimoto (2014) experienced from her transnational migration, because I was not accustomed to the terms on which I was being hailed.

I often felt dumbfounded during the early months of my job as an Assistant Professor when various American faculty members approached me for favors of one kind or another. I was thrown off balance because unlike the cool indifference of cultural-blindness and distance with which the majority of my American classmates and faculty regarded me during my graduate student days, I was thrust into the opposite direction where I was smothered by the eagerness of some colleagues who sought me out for what they presumed my "Asian" international background would afford me even before we got to learn about each other's particularities. One faculty member assumed I, a native speaker of Korean, would willingly translate Korean election campaign pamphlets into English for his political science research project. Another faculty, who presumed my Asian-ness gave me instant access to the inner workings of the Confucius Institute on campus, approached me to

ask whether the Institute could help arrange a meeting between the Chinese international students and her church. A third supposed that my self-identification as a Korean meant I would be able to decipher classic Chinese poem embroidered on a silk screen her sister had received from her Taiwanese visitors. I was expected to not only be an expert on Korea, but also an informant on China, Taiwan, and even Japan—that is, "Asia" writ large. I tactfully refrained from asking how they would feel being hailed as a translator of North American English or a Native American language, an informant of the United States, Canada, Mexico, or even the West for that matter. Instead, I obliged and went out of my way to find out answers to some of the queries. I also stepped in as a go-between for domestic students and faculty who wanted to meet internationals on campus, but were too hesitant to take the initiative on their own. After all, such queries from American faculty members and staff stemmed not from personal prejudice or bias, but from Whiteness culture whose ideologically produced orientation to the world truncates ethnic, national, and other civilizational particularities along racialized geographic divisions (Bonnett, 1997).

These incidents were not what made the process of plugging myself back into the southern United States challenging, however. It was rather my *attachment*[1] to various locations around the world born out of my Third Culture Kid experience on the one hand, and the nonchalance toward such a world beyond the United States on the part of the majority of students and faculty I interacted with on the other.

> A Third Culture Kid (TCK) is a person who has spent a significant part of his or her developmental years outside the parents' culture. The TCK builds relationships to all of the cultures, while not having full ownership in any. Although elements from each culture may be assimilated into the TCK's life experience, the sense of belonging is in relationship to others of similar background (Pollock & Van Reken, 2009, p. 13).

I derived immense pleasure from remaining oriented to various parts of the world I had traversed growing up as a daughter of a Korean diplomat to better understand global processes and their impact shaping our contemporary life. This was the reason I decided to specialize in intercultural communication, even though neither human communication nor intercultural communication are established fields of study in higher education institutions of my passport country. What made me feel queasy was the prospect of having to resume my struggle to keep myself slightly off balance and never fully oriented to the gravitational pull of a charming yet sedentary and circumscribed horizon of a small city in the southern United States. Even though my sojourn to the United States as a high-skilled worker is indisputably voluntary this time,

I feel no compulsion or desire to fully acculturate to its culture (Moore & Barker, 2012). My destination is not the United States nor Korea, but understanding our interconnected world and its implications on my role, outlook, and praxis to contribute as a citizen of such a world. This is an autoethnographic account of my adventure as a Korean-born TCK female pedagogue, who took students along an intercultural journey through critical communication pedagogy in the southern United States.

THE TCK PEDAGOGUE AND HER NON-TCK STUDENTS

As a pedagogue who had once been a TCK, one of the biggest challenges teaching intercultural communication to American students has been the formidable discrepancy between my and the majority of my students' knowledge, experience, and understanding of the context in which the subject comes to matter. I specialized in intercultural communication, but for me, it is more than an academic focus. It encapsulates the reality and the challenges I had to confront growing up. My father's career took the family to multiple capitals (e.g. Seoul, Korea; Saigon, Vietnam; Rome, Italy; Parimaribo, Suriname; Tripoli, Libya; Addis Ababa, Ethiopia) and global cities (e.g. Los Angeles, USA.; New York, USA.) in various parts of the world, such as East and North Africa, North and South America, Western Europe, and Southeast and Northeast Asia. The family sojourns and travels provided me with a glimpse into the range and depth of some of the differences in histories, ways of life, and ecological conditions in different regions of the world, as well as similarities in people's passions, aspirations, frustrations, and visions with long-lasting effects. At the same time, they challenged me over time to question many of the "received wisdoms" and assumptions I had imbibed growing up about who I and others were, and about the world from various institutional authorities, which insidiously implied a racial and material hierarchy that privileged the industrialized centers of power and affluence. Indeed, more than anything, it was the set of cards I was dealt in life—born to an aspiring South Korean diplomat of a modern republic and industrialized economy that my grandparents and their generation worked hard and selflessly to build following the devastations from the Japanese colonial rule and the Korean War—than by personal effort that exposed me to a United Nations-like cosmopolitan way of life and worldly horizon early in my life. It provided me with an invaluable language and lens to make sense of *the Age of the Dragon*[2] I had been born into, and the dizzying and often confusing effects peoples and cultures had on my transnational existence (Moore & Barker, 2012).

For the majority of my American students, intercultural communication is a course they must take to fulfill their program of study. As students who

largely come from a part of the United States "unaccustomed to immigration"[3] (The National Academies of Sciences, 2016, p. 11) and not a nexus of global economic activity (Derudder, Hoyler, Talyor, & Witlox, 2012), the course provided an opportunity to formally learn about domestic and global diversity usually for the first time. More than my firsthand experience with and knowledge of transnational mobility, what gives me authority to teach intercultural communication in the eyes and ears of my students is the odd mix of foreignness and familiarity I communicate. Visually, I am an "Asian," the perpetual foreigner in the United States (Dhingra, 2007; Nakayama, 2012). Acoustically, the lack of a heavy foreign accent in my speech, due to an early exposure to "American" accent in elementary school, and my facility with academic English render me sufficiently intelligible and white-like in the ears of my American students who might otherwise openly challenge my competence (Rubin, 2002).

Only the rare few students, who grew up in families where at least one of the parents maintained transnational ties outside of the United States and they themselves embraced the transnational opportunities with gusto would approach me for a conversation after class. They would share with me their personal experience sojourning outside of the United States and would remark how excited they were to learn terms and theories that helped to clarify their experience. Attracted by my global outlook and feeling comfortable with my phenotypic markers, they would seek advice about graduate school programs or express desire to pursue a globe-trotting existence. But they were the exception in a sea of an overwhelming majority whose orientation to the world was essentially sedentary with little to no experience venturing outside of their comfort zones. And there I was, a global nomad (Schaetti & Ramsey, 1999) with little inkling about what it is like to grow up never having left one's "home" country, culture, or the gravitational field of American exceptionalism (Lipset, 1996) that the majority of my students were born into. Not only did my pedagogical site exemplify "the distinctly complex, contradictory, and inequitable conditions in which intercultural communication occurs today" (Sorrells, 2014, p. 145), as an intercultural communication pedagogue sensitive to cultural differences and contexts, I was faced with a new and distinctive challenge of teaching mostly sedentary students to become intercultural communicators!

THE PEDAGOGICAL CHALLENGE

I was riddled with what Steven Pinker (Pinker, 2014) calls the *Curse of Knowledge*, the difficulty one has in imagining what it is like for others to not know something one knows. It was difficult for me to imagine what it is

like for the students to not know of the world's heterogeneity, dynamism, and connectivity. If I had to choose one single representation of the world that I thought best captured my sense of the world as I had come to understand, experience, and identify with, it is the globe. For me, geography and maps are not de-localized, de-contextualized, disembodied, and ahistorical representation of the world. Indeed, the globe does not privilege any particular humanized standpoint except the bird's-eye view of the world, a view from nowhere. It also does not capture the ideological, technological, or historical spaces people inhabit, not to mention *globalization*,

> The complex web of economic, political, and technological forces that have brought people, cultures, cultural products, and markets, as well as beliefs, practices and ideologies into increasingly greater proximity to and con/disjunction with one another within inequitable relations of power. (Sorrells, 2014, p. 144)

However, the globe is the best synoptic device that conveys the sense of a single planetary dimension of human existence, while at the same time reminding us of people's lives and events happening around the world in addition to where one is at. For my students, who rarely travel outside of the country (NAFSA, 2003), such a world and its affairs remain remote and alien from their lives.

For my master's-level graduate seminar on intercultural communication, one of the ways I tried to bring the globe to life was by covering a host of issues, such as language, identity, autism, inequities in intergroup relations, conflict and peacebuilding, global business communication, and ethics in various local, regional, and international cultural contexts (e.g. the United States, India, Australia, the Arab region, Western Europe, and East Asia) in the course readings. At the same time, I also realized the limitations of relying on globe-trotting course readings to convey a subject matter that is at its core a *praxis*, "a (continuous) process of critical, reflective thinking and acting that enables us to navigate the complex, contradictory, and challenging intercultural spaces we inhabit as individuals, community members and global citizens" (Sorrells, 2014, p. 145). The safe distance of books and ideas could not substitute for actual intercultural encounters and situations, such as where one has no choice but to suspend the feeling of disgust when drinking a local beer to quench one's thirst from a glass whose previous uses had not been washed off not only because fresh running water and detergent are unavailable amenities, but because it is the only potable option at the time, or where one contends with fear and curiosity when conversing with a North Korean party official on a week-long Trans-Siberian train ride after concealing one's nationality for fear of being kidnapped. The globe encapsulated such encounters I had "in the wild,"[4] where I had to meet the elements head

on. Alleviating the sense of disorientation and learning to become comfortable with its discomforts in my everyday life meant neither running away nor fighting it off, but being curious about others, broadening one's horizon and understanding about the world, and just as crucially, willing to confront one's own deeply engrained habits, assumptions, and ideologies.

THE PEDAGOGUE'S CRITICAL TURN "IN THE WILD"

I still vividly recall sitting in a chauffeur-driven car over two decades ago in sunny downtown Addis Ababa, the capital of Ethiopia, waiting for the traffic light to turn green. My eyes must have hung on the beautiful jacaranda trees with their cool purple blossoms scattered along the boulevard. I was feeling quite forlorn about not being able to fit in wherever I went (Hoersting & Jenkins, 2011) and feeling envious of other normal families who did not have to globe-trot. As usual, a group of young children in rags had swarmed around the car window begging for *baksheesh*, or small change. Rather than turning my eyes away, I stared into each of the faces of the children jostling around my side of the car. What I saw arrested me. The children were jesting and having fun without a care about the fact they were begging for their next meal. I was astonished by the sight of happiness on the faces of the children. And like a flash of lightening, I realized the irony of the situation. There I was nicely clad and sitting in a luxury car knowing where my next meal was going to come from, yet feeling miserable. The impoverished children were laughing and giggling, rather than crying, even if they may have felt hungry at the time. I thought if anyone was to be happy, it should have been me. Contrary to conventional values I had absorbed growing up, the children in the streets made me realize that one's material conditions or life's circumstances did not necessarily determine one's happiness.

The encounter, however brief, put a crack through my assumptions about poverty, material affluence, and human consciousness. The economic, political, and civilizational determinism that I had inculcated growing up began to unravel. While techno-scientific prowess, industrial society, and material affluence provide the basis for our modernist sensibilities and sense of moral superiority, I slowly began to realize that lacking in such infrastructures, capacities, and affluence did not necessarily mean that the moral worth and vision of such cultures and people were any less. The hegemonic pull of the single-track narrative that greater material consumption leads to happiness so prevalent in Western-led capitalist economies was coming loose. From the Ethiopian highlands and far away from industrialized and industrializing centers of power in the West and the non-West (e.g. Korea), I began to peel away the grand narrative and its translucent gaze that was affecting the way I

saw myself, others, and the world. Features of the lives of people in Ethiopia came into focus and took on new meaning. The distinction between people-like-me and people-not-like-me became blurred, and I was left pondering about my moral circle and what it meant to be a human. Despite material deprivation and poverty, I began to see religiosity in everyday ritual and practices which oriented ordinary Ethiopians' sense of uprightness in life that stretched all the way back to the time of Queen of Sheba and King Solomon. I became enthralled by the practical wisdom I saw in food preparation and personal cleaning practices that did not depend on modern-day amenities. I also learned that the Ethiopian socialist revolution which brutally ended the Solomonic dynasty in 1975 with the death of Emperor Haile Selassie also brought health clinics and schools to villages in ways that the Solomonic empire had not.

I also began recasting the economic story of Korea, which until then had a single story. Its industrialization and economic growth was not simply the result of aping the advanced industrialized economies of the West, but an achievement by people who doggedly labored to leave the ravages and poverty behind and secure national autonomy. However, such an achievement would not have been possible without the 3,000 young Ethiopian soldiers sent by Emperor Haile Selassie to join the United Nations forces alongside the United States, the British Commonwealth, Allied, Turkish, and the Filipino units and fight in the Korean War like their own. The world and its history was more complex than what the dominant (Western) discourse had led me to think about the hemispheres its white gaze perceived as available for its destined imperialist ambitions (Munshi & McKie, 2001).

While Ethiopia has since changed many times over, it marked a moment in my life where I began in earnest to question the prevailing discourse and its ideological underpinnings. I had no idea at the time where my critical adventure would take me, but some two decades later, I find myself knowing clearly that I am no longer interested in occupying spaces carved out by "white men." They are spaces social conventions in capitalist, consumerist societies would deem as "successful." Yet, they are spaces riddled with great material profligacy and blinding privilege acquired often times through greed and coercion. Most importantly, my encounter with the begging children in the streets of Addis Ababa provided a crucial revelation into human consciousness.[5] While we were products of historical and political forces and material conditions that placed us in inequitable relations of power, we were also equals, as sentient beings with full control over our hearts and minds. It was the starting point of a lifelong journey to reclaim my authorial position *at the root*.[6] With the benefit of hindsight, I realized that gaining a foothold at the root to perceive myself, others, and the world with the strength of my own gaze that could keep ethno-centric and ideological biases in check was

critical. Navigating the complex, contradictory, and challenging intercultural spaces, so that the world became meaningful rather than confusing and that I had a stake in it rather than feeling I was living in someone else's story, was not easy. Keeping my authorial foothold at the root required an ongoing cultivation of *mindfulness* (Ting-Toomey, 1999, p. 267), that is, stepping outside my current position, keeping my ego/ethno-centric habit of mind and body in check, and resisting the hegemonic pull of cultural ideologies that cloud my thoughts.

THE CRITICAL PEDAGOGICAL INTERVENTION

How to bring intercultural communication to life without the benefit of an actual journey to a foreign setting was the challenge. Reading about why difference matters (Allen, 2004), how culture impacts global business (Hofstede, 1993; Meyer, 2014), how culture and communication intersect (Hall & Hall, 2003), and how value (Chen, 2014) and language difference can aggravate conflict management (Cohen, 2001) was necessary and invaluable. Such content exposure was helping the students to acquire the requisite terminology and perspectives for understanding intercultural issues. It was necessary for students to become more cognizant of the impact social and cultural differences have on human interactions and practices in a variety of settings. However, the seminar readings risked remaining like a museum exhibition on cultures, where learning about the otherness of others would be limited to absorbing, interpreting, and evaluating them from the comforts of one's cultural biases. Students were all too quick to shrug off and dismiss cultural contrasts and moral universe different from their own as cultural oddities to be tolerated rather than try to comprehend it like members of the culture would do, such as perceiving as legitimate and desirable for people to cooperate and make decisions in order to carry out relationship-specific duties, and place the needs of the group and institutions before that of individuals. My conscience told me that without coming up with a site comparable to my encounters "in the wild," the students would be deprived of an opportunity to develop their intercultural praxis. Students in intercultural communication seminar needed to meet "the elements" head on to (1) practice *inquiry* where they "(become) receptive to having (their) perceptions and (their) taken-for-granted presence in the world be challenged and changed" (Sorrells, 2014, p. 156), and (2) engage in *dialogue* where they will be stretched "to imagine, experience, and engage creatively with points of view, ways of thinking, being and doing, and beliefs different from their own while accepting that they may not fully understand or come to a common agreement or position" (p. 159). Students needed a situation where they would have no choice but to take risks.

A fortuitous event occurred early in the semester. The school closed for nearly two weeks due to unusual winter precipitation, snow. While the seminar continued via the course Blackboard, I noticed how student responses to discussion prompts, especially monolingual native-speakers of North American English, were predictable and formulaic. Discussions on cultural differences were confined within mainstream dichotomous markers—such as men versus women, domestic versus international students, Americans versus Japanese, and Black versus White. Students appealed to liberalism as if it were the only solution for reconciling intercultural issues. In other words, the social issues my graduate students wanted to explore were wide ranging, such as race relations in the United States, Japanese and Korean bicultural identity, intercultural communication competence in the social and community context, social network of Westerners in Asian academic institutions, international student advising at WKU, and the portrayal of extremist religious sects in U.S. mainstream media. However, the way they approached their issues was confined within one and the same moral outlook concerned with individualistic, rule-based, and universalist morality typical of mindsets in Western, educated, industrialized, rich, democratic societies (Henrich, Heine, & Norenzayan, 2010). It was as if the students had turned into automatons, and it was the language rather than their critical thinking that determined how an issue or problem was to be grasped. Student thoughts and their utterances became captives of the hegemonic pull of the ideologically produced discursive encirclements they had grown up in. I itched to jolt them out of mindlessness.

Like a flash of lightening, I realized how the course paper could be transformed into a site comparable to an intercultural journey. Rather have students regurgitate knowledge, I reconceptualized the paper assignment as a process which would invite *transformative learning* (Mezirow, 1997), where students could be jolted out of their familiar world and transform their frame of reference and habituated mode of thinking. The paper was made up of two parts, or two worlds. The first part of the paper focused on the world students were familiar with. The second part had the students tread a less familiar territory, where they would have to exercise their intercultural praxis. In the first part, students had to identify an intercultural problem of choice, show how their problem or issue was "usually" and "normally" discussed in conventional literature, and then identify core assumptions or dichotomies underpinning the way conventional literature discusses their intercultural issue of choice. In the second part of the paper, students had to shed a new light on their problem by introducing a different set of assumptions or dichotomies (of their choice), justify them, and then use their logic or standpoint to reimagine and re-present their problem as their analysis.

While I made sure that the necessary conditions were in place to challenge the students, I also had to make sure that the assignment was engineered

in such a way that each of the students would be faced with an analytical-experiential journey that was equitable to their identity positions, intercultural experience, and level of knowledge. I made sure that the assignment and its parameters did not privilege or tokenize any particular identity locations.[7] At the same time, the writing assignment had to hold each student accountable to see the world in a way that did not reinforce their preconceived ideas. In effect, the assignment was set up to give the students a free license to come up with a new worldview of their choice as long as they did not slide back to the familiar terms and assumptions they had identified as "conventional" in the first half of the paper. As a whole, the paper assignment was comparable to an intercultural journey where students would start with a point of view, values, and assumptions they were familiar with, then shed them off to take on values and assumptions they were less familiar with and try to imagine the world on those terms.

THE PEDAGOGUE'S HOPE

I bit my tongue each time I wanted to point out the crux of the term paper assignment was like painting the sky in any color the students wanted except in blue! I did not divulge, however, because I want to see who would be the first to fill in the blank, connect the dots, and realize that they were essentially given the freedom to come with assumptions and values of their choice. Of course, the real challenge was not *writing about* an issue, but rather *writing from* the new "normal," "usual," and "natural," which would take the students out of their comfort zone. My hope was for students to realize through the assignment that linguistic registers and discourse were not neutral, but rather that the terms and categories we deploy foreground and mark certain features of a phenomenon while muting or marginalizing others. I wanted the students to become aware of that part of culture that human consciousness hides from its cultural members, particularly how discourse as a language system constrains what gets talked about and how it gets talked about, and thereby influencing how people view a given issue or problem.

At the same time, I did not want the journey to end at reflexivity alone, where students understand we are a conduit of our respective culture(s). I wanted the students to grasp that despite the givenness of their (social) world, they could reclaim the terms through which they can perceive and experience themselves, others, and the world—namely, by decentering the terms, categories, and norms of dominant ideologies that dictate and color how one's social world is to be understood. Indeed, the exercise was not going to alter the world in any significant way. It was, after all, a thought adventure. Yet, by nudging the students to reclaim their authorial position at the root and unfetter

their agency to perceive, conceive, and examine the world anew, I was hoping, like Freire (1970), to raise their consciousness.

THE INTERCULTURAL ADVENTURES OF THE NON-TCK STUDENTS

Suffice it to say that the open-endedness of the assignment proved to be challenging for the students. While most of the student did not have difficulty writing the literature review and identifying the assumptions, worldviews, or representational strategies deployed by the authors, many struggled coming up with a new cultural normativity and viewpoint. I showed a YouTube video of a digital artwork titled, *Portrait of Gogh and the Story about Ant (2010) by Lee, Lee Nam* (Koreanartistproject, 2012) as an analogous example of what introducing a "foreign" element can do to unsettle a given representation. In the digital artwork is six minutes long where viewers are presented two canvas frames, one white and empty and the other a still picture of three people on a couch having a conversation underneath a huge self-portrait by van Gogh. From nowhere small black dot-like creatures crawl across the museum wall toward the portrait without the three people ever catching on. Soon the self-portrait gets torn up into small pieces and carried piece by piece to the empty frame, where they are assembled back together. By introducing time and motion via ants, the still painting not only comes to life through a new digital medium, but also becomes available to the world via YouTube. I also shared the story about my own dissertation project, where I started out looking at martial art techniques but ended up analyzing space and fields to capture the transculturation of Aikido technique practice. Many of the students failed to realize they were being encouraged to think outside the box.

Instead, many of the students were at a loss. I had extensive meetings with nearly all of the students, brainstorming with them alternative ways to open up their intercultural issue. I would explain how terms (often dichotomous) and assumptions privilege certain features of our world while overlooking or marginalizing other dimensions. I did my best to assuage the uncertainty students felt, patiently explaining the assignment instructions, and giving them leads. I would explain how they might go about displacing conventional view of their problems and bring into focus a different dimension to their issue. I wanted my students to focus on the process rather than worry about their final product.

One student came to my office hours and began to apologize profusely because she was confused and anxious about what she was supposed to do to unsettle the assumption of "us-them" in the portrayal of Muslims and Islam by Western mainstream media. Another student, who wanted to write about

racism in predominantly white institutions in the United States, came to my office on several occasions. He could not understand how there could be other vantage points to examine his issue. When I suggested that he decenter the overused black-white binary and reexamine his problem by centering a unique quality those on the short end of the stick would have, he said there was none. A third student, who was international, asked me how she could turn bi-/multi-cultural/racial identities into the new normative and in turn problematize the monocultural ethnic/racial identity as "less than" or "inadequate." A fourth student interested in exploring the need of international students in American higher education institutions decided to audit the class once she realized what the assignment requirements for the term paper were. A fifth student wanted to look at gender discrimination in the workplace. She wanted help cracking the male-female gender binary. When I explained that there were many ways she could go about decentering the male-female binary, such as by foregrounding group welfare rather than individual labor productivity, she was puzzled. A few students who were able to work on their own with occasional feedback from me. But the majority of the students remained confused and nervous for the most part.

Giving audience to various student reactions at various points in the stages of the paper assignment turned out to be more taxing than I had anticipated. I could not understand why students failed to grasp the idea that the assignment was an open-ended intercultural adventure. The exercise was encouraging them to develop what Yep (2016) describes as "new ways of seeing, perceiving, understanding, and acting in culture and society" (p. 235). At no point did I see anyone get excited by the creative space the assignment offered for devising their own terms to perceive and understand their issues anew. Rather I encountered strong reactions, which I had not prepared for. The strong reactions came especially from those students whose paper topics related to their identity in one way or another. By merely asking the students to displace overused dichotomous terms with a different set of assumptions or normativity from which to reconfigure their problem, several became anxious. I was baffled why some students had such great difficulty conceiving their issue on terms other than those dichotomies they were familiar with. By denying the use of familiar terms, some of the students believed I was denying the actual existence of the reality of their social problem. At some level, I was. At the same time, the assignment was asking them to come up with a different way of thinking about their problem. Rather than seeing that language and discourse were confining the way they were thinking about the nature of their social problem, some of the looks I got suggested that the students thought I had committed blasphemy.

When it came time for the students to present their intercultural journeys to the class, I witnessed a wide range of thought adventures. For those who

started out with a more abstract issue and a core aspect of their identity was not as invested, their analytical intervention did successfully transform how their (social) problem could be re-framed and its issues re-imagined. Among those who had long discussions with me, the degree of their transformation varied enormously. It was from this group of confused and anxious students that the most astonishing intercultural thought adventures emerged, as well as the grossest resistance stemming from deep-seated ignorance. Like a rocket blasting full force to leave behind earth's gravitational field, the voices of students who successfully broke free from the grip of habituated thinking quivered as they held tight to their new gaze to describe an alternative reality before them. They were standing on the very edge of their comfort zone, yet bravely executed their adventure to reclaim their authorial agency.

CODA

I will never know what long-term impact the assignment had on fostering learner's intercultural praxis. One student did tell me a year later that while she thought the paper project was invaluable, several of her classmates did complain at the time. Admittedly, I wished student reactions and their response to learning would have been only positive. I had chosen to use the course paper as a pedagogical site for stimulating the development of their innate metacognitive capacity of *critical reflexivity* (Cunliffe, 2004), the questioning of the tacit ways we construct our (social) realities for opening up our practices and assumptions to possibilities and become more responsive and ethical in the world. Indeed, there were other ways I could have gone about devising "the elements" to challenge the students and foster their intercultural praxis. I could have taken the traditional path and rely on key intercultural communication texts as my primary instructional material. I could have combined it with an experiential approach, such as arranging for the students to meet and interact members of the university and local community with diverse cultural backgrounds, or having students read contemporary novels and autobiographies (or movies for that matter) that highlight different cultural subjects and contexts (Calloway-Thomas, 2016). Alternatively, I could have turned to critical communication pedagogy (Fassett & Warren, 2007) and used my identity and the identities of my students to unpack culture, language, and power in the context of globalization. I could also have woven in materials to set the stage for students to engage with "difficult dialogues" (Landis, 2008). Each is valuable and offers a host of learning outcomes. Whatever pedagogical choices one makes, however, there is no escaping its consequences, positive or negative. And pedagogical consequences can rarely be contained in neat boxes of clear thinking and rationality alone (Allen, 2010; Johnson, Rich, & Cargile, 2008; Simpson, 2008).

The one thing I had not anticipated was the possibility of bumping against *karma*, the entrenched patterning effect on how we perceive, think, feel, and act in the world from years of enculturation, socialization, and internalization. When I initiated my critical pedagogical journey, my hope was for students to realize through the assignment that linguistic registers and discourse were not neutral, that is, the terms and categories we deploy foreground and mark certain features of a phenomenon while muting and stifling others. I wanted the students to become aware of that part of culture that human consciousness hides from its cultural members, particularly how a given language and its concepts constrain how people view and talk about a given problem. What I learned was the limits of my pedagogical prowess. Regardless of the life experiences and position of individuals in relation to dominant ideologies, demystification and analysis of cultural power and its effects will remain elusive as long as each of us fails to critically examine our part in the internalization of its dominant ideologies in our everyday mundane practices. Chipping away at the durational effects of assumptions and ideologies embedded in discourse and language will not occur without developing the strength of one's own gaze at the root to look at oneself.

It is challenging to teach the art of intercultural communication to students whose upbringing have been sedentary and their social world relatively circumscribed and homogeneous in comparison to my life's journey to various capitals and cities in the world. At the same time, this gap has also been an unparalleled training ground for my growth as an intercultural communication pedagogue. I had to find an axis, a common denominator, to help me translate the way I had come to acquire intercultural expertise on terms my students could relate and use. For one thing, any intercultural praxis I cultivated as a consequence of my family's transnational existence was born out of my need to survive its entropic effects. The majority of my audience do not face such life circumstances, with little likelihood of becoming transnational later in life. So, while my experience, my credentials, and my "international" marker position me as an good candidate for teaching intercultural communication in the eyes of institutional authorities and students in the United States, I realized that teaching intercultural communication and praxis as I had come to experience and understand it was not tenable to an audience whose *framing* and *position* (Sorrells, 2014) in relation to oneself, others, and the world is antithetical to mine. It was crucial that I find something constant my students and I shared in common, like the North Star. Making an appeal to the way we make sense of both the world and ourselves, namely our metacognitive capacities (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 2000) to step back to look the self that is experiencing, believing, and judging on the one hand, and using the

temporality of the human life path from birth, growth, maturity, to old age to contextualize various social challenges posed by cultural differences on the other have been critical. In other words, dialoguing with each other through critical reflexivity has been key for recognizing our cultural differences while transcending them.

NOTES

1. From a Buddhist perspective, being attached, preoccupied, and desirous is considered to be one of the main causes of suffering in a person's life.

2. The phrase "The Age of the Dragon" (translated from the Korean phrase, 용(龍)의 시대(時代)) was used by those learned Koreans educated in premodern knowledge system before Western-styled modernity became dominant to describe an age where people would come to fly freely in the sky.

3. According to the latest report on immigration by the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (2016), many states in the South of the United States still have very low proportion of foreign-born immigrants in its population – ranging only 2–5 percent compared to the national average of 25 percent—despite recording highest growth rates in immigration over the last two decades, 1990-2010 (p. 11).

4. I am using the phrase "in the wild" to make reference to Edwin Hutchin's ethnography, *Cognition in the Wild* (1995). The work examines both Western and Micronesian navigational systems to make the larger argument that studying human cognition in captivity fails to understand how it actually emerges, which is via interactions with the environment as it adapts to the dynamic processes in the wild. In keeping with the spirit of the argument, I am using "in the wild" to suggest how my own metacognition emerged out of interactions I had with people and the environment I encountered in my sojourns.

5. Toyosaki (2007) writes about the futility of his multiple and varied attempts to story himself in capturing the "me," his consciousness (p. 50). I am also referring to that nameless, formless, timeless seat of one's awareness that Toyosaki is pointing at. It is from that center seat that one can reflect critically, step outside one's current position, and grasp the power/limits of language and discourse.

6. The phrase "at the root" connotes two things. The first is to suggest radical reflexivity as in the seventh commitment of critical communication pedagogy (Warren, 2009), which argues for the need to be critical of the power language and discourse has in shaping the condition of human communication interaction. The second is to elicit the image of something lying deep below the surface, beyond language and discourse.

7. There were a total of 11 students in the course, none of who identified as a TCK. Three were international students from Asia. Six identified as White Americans, two of whom had sojourned overseas. Two identified as African Americans. Three students were married, two of who had a family with children.

REFERENCES

Allen, B. (2004). *Difference matters: Communicating social identity*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland.

Allen, B. (2010). Critical communication pedagogy as a framework for teaching difference. In D. Mumby (Ed.), *Organizing difference: Pedagogy, research, and practice* (pp. 103–126). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bonnett, A. (1997). Geography, 'race' and whiteness: Invisible traditions and current challenges. *Area,* 29(3), 193–199.

Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (2000). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Calloway-Thomas, C. (2016). *Internationalizing the communication curriculum for global citizenship: Best practices for experiential approaches, classroom activities, and administrative policies.* Paper presented at the National Communication Association, Philadelphia, PA.

Chen, G.-M. (2014). The two faces of Chinese communication. In M. K. Asante, Y. Miike, & J. Yin (Eds.), *The global intercultural communication reader* (2nd ed., pp. 273–282). New York, NY: Routledge.

Cohen, R. (2001). Language and conflict resolution. *International Studies Review,* 3(1), 25–51.

Cunliffe, A. L. (2004). On becoming a critically reflexive practitioner. *Journal of Management Education,* 28(4), 407–426.

Derudder, B., Hoyler, M., Talyor, P. J., & Witlox, F. (Eds.). (2012). *International handbook of globalization and world cities*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.

Dhingra, P. (2007). *Managing multicultural lives: Asian American professionals and the challenge of multiple identities*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Fassett, D. L., & Warren, J. T. (2007). *Critical communication pedagogy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

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

Hall, E. T., & Hall, M. R. (2003). Key concepts: Underlying structures of culture. In D. C. Thomas (Ed.), *Readings and cases in international management: A cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 151–162). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral and rain Sciences,* 33(2/3), 61–135.

Hoersting, R. C., & Jenkins, S. R. (2011). No place to call home: Cultural homelessness, self-esteem and cross-cultural identities. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations,* 35(1), 17–30.

Hofstede, G. (1993). Cultural constraints in management theories. *Academy of Management Executive,* 7(1), 81–94.

Hutchins, E. (1995). *Cognition in the wild*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Johnson, J. R., Rich, M., & Cargile, A. C. (2008). "Why are you shoving this stuff down our throats?": Preparing intercultural educators to challenge performances of white racism. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication,* 1(2), 113–135.

Koreanartistproject (Producer). (2012, Jan. 10, 2017). Portrait of Gogh & the Story about Ant (2010) by Lee, Lee Nam. [HD video, LED TV, mixed media 2010] Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=c24KnA2NRHc

Landis, K. (Ed.) (2008). *Start talking: A handbook for engaging difficult dialogues in higher education*. Anchorage, AK: The University of Alaska Anchorage and Alaska Pacific University.

Lipset, S. M. (1996). *American exceptionalism: A double-edged sword*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Co.

Meyer, E. (2014). *The culture map: Breaking through the invisible boundaries of global business*. New York, NY: Public Affairs.

Mezirow, J. (1997). Transformative learning: Theory to practice. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education,* 74(Summer), 5–12.

Moore, A. M., & Barker, G. G. (2012). Confused or multicultural: Third culture individuals' cultural identity. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations,* 36, 553–562.

Munshi, D., & McKie, D. (2001). Toward a new cartography of intercultural communication: Mapping bias, business, and diversity. *Business and Professional Communication Quarterly,* 64(3), 9–22.

NAFSA. (2003). *Secruing America's future: Global education for a global age*. Washington, DC: NAFSA: Association of International Educators.

Nakayama, T. (2012). Dis/orienting identities: Asian Americans, history, and intercultural communication. In A. Gonzalez, M. Houston, & V. Chen (Eds.), *Our voices: Essays in culture, ethnicity, and communication* (5th ed., pp. 20–25). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Pinker, S. (2014). *The sense of style: The thinking person's guide to writing in the 21st century*. New York, NY: Penguin.

Pollock, D. C., & Van Reken, R. E. (2009). *Third culture kids: Growing up among worlds*. Boston, MA: Nicholas Brealey Publishing.

Rubin, D. L. (2002). Help! My professor (or doctor or boss) doesn't talk English! In J. Martin, T. Nakayama, & L. Flores (Eds.), *Readings in intercultural communication: Experiences and contexts* (pp. 127–137). Boston, MA: MGraw Hill.

Schaetti, B., & Ramsey, S. (1999). The Global Nomad Experience: Living in Liminality. Retrieved Jan. 8, 2016, from Transition Dynamics https://transitiondynamics.wordpress.com/resources-and-products/articles-and-publications/198–2/

Sekimoto, S. (2014). Transnational Asia: Dis/orienting identity in the globalized world. *Communication Quarterly,* 62(4), 381–398.

Simpson, J. S. (2008). "What do they think of us?": The pedagogical practices of cross-cultural communication, misrecognition, and hope. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication,* 1(3), 181–201.

Sorrells, K. (2014). Intercultural praxis: Transforming intercultural competence for the 21st century. In X. Dai & G.-M. Chen (Eds.), *Intercultural communication competence: Conceptualization and its development in cultural contexts and interactions* (pp. 144–168). Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

The National Academies of Sciences, E., and Medicine. (2016). *The economic and fiscal consequences of immigration*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

Ting-Toomey, S. (1999). *Communicating across cultures*. New York, NY: The Gilford Press.

Toyosaki, S. (2007). Communicating sensei's storytelling: Projecting identity into critical pedagogy. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies,* 7(1), 48–73.

Warren, J. T. (2009). Critical communication pedagogy. In S. W. Littlejohn & K. A. Foss (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of communication theory* (1st ed., Vol. 1, pp. 213–216). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Yep, G. A. (2016). Demystifying normativiteis in communication education. *Communication Education,* 65(2), 235–240.

Section IV

THINKING THROUGH CRITICAL INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION PEDAGOGY

Chapter 11

Mediated Critical Intercultural Communication

Ahmet Atay

I live online. I spend the majority of my waking hours staring at my computer screen, mostly reading and writing. From the moment I get out of bed to start my day, typically while my coffee brews, I glue myself to my laptop. Instead of going out into the world, I invite the world into my living room. After reading newspapers from around the world, I attend to some emails. I have breakfast in front of my laptop while I watch one thing or another. I get ready to go out while listening to music on my computer. When school is in session, I pack my laptop into my messenger bag, and I take off for my office. Upon arrival, I turn on my computer and begin staring at it. In the meantime, I have probably checked my iPhone at least 50 times. I spend most of my day on my computer, my phone, and the technologies present in the classroom. When I return home, I continue in front of my screen either writing, grading, reading, talking with friends and family through Skype, or consuming media. I am not a digital native, who is born into digital technologies, but I am a digital immigrant who lives in online domains and platforms. Jenkins (2008) reminds us how we are living in an era of media convergence where not only media companies are consolidated but also where different media forms converge in digital platforms. My everyday reality truly embodies this trend. As I continue to live online, I often question my own critical media and consumer culture literacy, and I theorize about digital cosmopolitanism, digital border crossing, and digital transnational encounters I often engage in on online platforms. Our mediated realities have increasingly become forms of intercultural/transnational communication. As a result, I become a digital, transnational, diasporic, queer scholar who tries to make sense of digital and mediated experiences and cultural texts.

As Martin, Nakayama, and Flores (2002) postulate, "We live in a world of increasing intercultural and international contacts. Sometimes these interactions are on an interpersonal level; sometimes they occur in organizational

settings or political arenas" (p. 3). To build on their arguments, I contend that due to the digitalization of our everyday realities, including teaching and learning, we often encounter individuals from other cultures in online platforms perhaps more frequently than in our face-to-face interactions. For example, online platforms are now used to create digital classrooms where people with different backgrounds gather domestically and internationally for educational purposes. Similarly, because of the availability of access, students can be exposed to international news or mediated texts, making their communication consumption and learning more multicultural. For example, students can consume the BBC's news or the latest films from Germany or Japan. Furthermore, new media technologies and global online platforms such as Skype and Facebook are also enabling immigrants and international faculty and students to maintain the links to their home cultures, family members, and friends. Consequently, these intercultural and international contacts and connections create a network of experiences and relationships that are partially digitalized or mediated. Yet, we do not often critically examine the nature, impact, or political economy of these technologies.

Intercultural communication scholarship and pedagogy often disregard and, in some cases, dismiss the relevancy of mediated texts as a form of embodiment of cultural practices and as a crucial influence in everyday interactions. Similarly, with but a few exceptions, media studies and new media studies scholarship do not typically engage in intercultural communication discourse. While the representation of diversity and diverse bodies in mediated texts occupies a paramount role in critical media scholarship, the scholars in this sub-field do not often engage in intercultural communication scholarship. Hence, these sub-disciplines often bypass each other, and mediated texts are too often not utilized as pedagogical tools within the discourse of intercultural communication. In this chapter, I suggest that mediated texts such as film and television shows, advertising and other visual materials, as well as cyber texts and social media platforms should be included in the discourse of critical, intercultural communication pedagogy as pedagogical opportunities to experience and, in some cases, to understand different cultural interactions and happenings. In doing so, while I argue that critical intercultural communication pedagogy should be taking a mediated turn, I offer intercultural media literacy or mediated critical intercultural communication pedagogy as ways to blend these two areas.

The goal of this chapter, by outlining and articulating the facets of mediated critical intercultural communication pedagogy (MCICP), is to carve out scholarly and pedagogical spaces to utilize mediated texts, cyber platforms, and social network sites to promote social change and social justice in the context of educational settings. Second, this chapter aims to provide tools and techniques to critically and culturally analyze media texts and new media

platforms in order to make sense of our intercultural encounters in the context of globalization, commercialism, consumer culture, and capitalism. Overall, this chapter calls attention to the need to develop amalgamized intercultural and mediated pedagogies that focus on the relationship between communication, culture, identity, pedagogy, globalization, and social justice.

To define mediated critical intercultural communication pedagogy, I borrow from three approaches: critical intercultural communication pedagogy, critical communication pedagogy, and mediated communication pedagogy. A multifaceted fusion of these three approaches could serve as a form of critical intercultural communication literacy with which to examine mediated and digital texts.

CRITICAL (INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION) PEDAGOGY

As a framework, critical intercultural communication pedagogy draws from various theoretical lenses. First, it is based on critical intercultural communication theories such as postcolonial theory, feminist theory, critical race theory, and queer theory and uses critical/cultural methodologies such as ethnography, interview-based research, narrative, autoethnography, and performative writing. Second, critical intercultural communication pedagogy combines these theories and methodologies with critical communication pedagogy's commitment to seeing culture, cultural identity, self-reflexivity, and dialogue as central to the communication education rooted in critical theory (Calafell, 2010; Carrillo, Rowe, & Malhotra, 2007; Cooks & Simpson, 2007; Nakayama & Halualani, 2013; Nakayama & Martin, 2007; Orbe, 2011; Toyosaki, 2009; Warren, 2003; Yep, 2000, 2002, 2007). Finally, critical intercultural communication pedagogy is committed to activism and social justice issues; hence, its goals aim to create social change.

Critical intercultural communication scholars often question the notion of power structures in cultural settings, how context, socioeconomic relations, and history influence and shape culture and intercultural communication, and how political and institutional forces are masked or invisible to certain groups (Nakayama & Halualani, 2013). Furthermore, critical communication pedagogy and critical intercultural communication scholars consider cultural identity to be fluid and shaped by political, economic, and historical contexts (Hall, 1995, 1996; Sorrells, 2015; Yep, 2000, 2002, 2007).

Similar to critical intercultural communication pedagogy, critical communication pedagogy also focuses on diversity, inclusion, and social justice issues. Critical pedagogy as it is explained by Cooks (2010), Freire (1970), and Lovaas, Baroudi, and Collins (2002) intends to empower and liberate

individuals to realize the hegemonic power structure and to achieve social change in order to transform these structures around them. Building on Freire's ideas, Fassett and Warren (2007) argue that critical communication pedagogy is a commitment to pedagogy as a praxis, with teachers and students working together to observe, understand, and solve pedagogical issues that influence and shape their learning environments and processes. Paulo Freire (1970) defines praxis in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* as a "reflection and action directed at the structures to be transformed" (pp. 119–120). Fassett and Warren (2007) also emphasize that critical communication educators engage in dialogue to create change, thereby demonstrating a commitment to social justice–centered educational models and pedagogies.

NEW MEDIA AND TECHNOLOGY AND MEDIATED PEDAGOGY

As the most influential storytellers, media artists provide a variety of stories about education, pedagogy, and mentoring. Lately, new media technologies have provided multiple ways for people from all over the world to communicate and have called upon numerous pedagogical techniques and approaches to unpack mediated representations and make sense of digitalized and globalized cultural experiences. However, as intercultural communication scholars, we do not often question the nature of these stories, the messages they aim to deliver, or the online platforms where most of our digitalized, global intercultural communication takes place. For example, the media and digital literacy and mediated mentoring that takes the form of critical intercultural communication pedagogy continue to remain under examined areas within our field.

Increasingly, new media technologies, mobile communication, and quick media application, referring to online and mobile media forms, occupy a larger role in our everyday communication. As educators, we are teaching a generation whose members are born into a mediated and digitalized culture and who are considered to be digital natives. Similarly, as educators, we are also using these technologies to submit and receive papers, keep track of class attendance, provide alternative spaces for discussion, connect with students and colleagues who are geographically dispersed, and simply communicate with one another every day. Hence, these technologies occupy a paramount role in and outside of our classrooms. Media and pedagogy scholars such as Fox (2000), Jenkins (2008), and DePietro (2013) claim that new media technologies, mobile communication, social network sites, and other online platforms have both positive and negative dimensions. Without a doubt, these technologies make access to information and communication much easier, regardless of time and space differences between the users. Furthermore,

these technologies and platforms also allow traditionally marginalized or oppressed people, including racial and ethnic minorities, women, LGBTQ individuals, people with physical and/or learning disabilities, immigrants, and diasporic bodies to share their stories and find a voice, even though it may be limited at times. As I previously argued, new media technologies have created a modern cultural discourse because these technologies make communication with different groups of people more accessible, available, and more constant (Atay, 2016).

Along with the Internet and computer technologies, mobile telecommunications and quick media forms have also created new spaces and new opportunities for people who communicate interculturally or who experience marginalization or cultural in-betweenness at a local and/or global level.

Even though new media technologies, social media platforms, mobile communication, and quick media offer various positive opportunities, there are also some drawbacks such as the problem of access and the lack of new media literacy by the participants or consumers. Computer technologies are now economically more accessible than ever before. Still, there are millions of people around the world who can neither afford nor access these technologies due to linguistic or ability barriers. Furthermore, since we, as participants, are often heavily immersed in these technologies, we often fail to examine and recognize their shortcomings, negative influences, or political and cultural implications for us. Hence, media literacy becomes rather important, particularly for students, when critically and interculturally examining the reaches and influences of these technologies in our teaching/learning environments and in our everyday life encounters.

New media technology and social media platforms increasingly influence the ways in which we teach, communicate with, and mentor our students within and outside of the classroom, and this will continue. New technologies, online platforms, and quick media applications such as blogs, webcams, instant messaging, social network sites, and tablet and smartphone technologies that enable media convergence provide new ways of teaching, learning, and communicating. Khaund (2005) argues that "[t]he creation of an innovative classroom for every student is now possible" (p. 114). Likewise, DePietro (2013) postulates that "[w]ith new media, a successful pedagogy is an evolutionary one" (p. 2). Hence, as educators, while we must adapt, change, evolve, and follow the current cultural and technological trends to create educational and pedagogical opportunities and carve out spaces for all students—particularly those who are traditionally oppressed and marginalized or who learn differently or may have different abilities—we also must provide them with critical/cultural media literacy. Additionally, most of these technologies and platforms can be effectively and creatively used to address intercultural communication issues such as power and hegemony in educational settings and

in everyday life realities, identity constructions and performances, whiteness, and representations of human bodies, to name a few.

The interactive nature of these new media technologies, social media platforms, and quick media applications sets these types of media apart from the more traditional media forms. Similarly, the interactive nature of these new technologies allows for communication among multiple people despite the time and location restrictions; therefore, these technologies provide different modes of communication. Besides interactivity, these technologies also allow translation opportunities for multilingual people by using multiple languages and modes of communication, text, images, and sound.

Hence, (critical) media pedagogy aims to provide tools, approaches, and frameworks to critically analyze the content of media as well as its production, consumption, and systems. Overall, this pedagogical approach aims to help students become more knowledgeable about traditional and new media (Berger, Hobbs, McDougall, & Mihailidis, 2015; Morrell, Dueñas, Garcia, & López, 2013).

MEDIATED CRITICAL INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION PEDAGOGY

What, then, does mediated critical intercultural communication pedagogy look like? What does it aim to achieve?

MCICP operates under the notion that mediated experiences are increasingly intercultural and global in nature. Hence, MCICP is committed to bridging the gap among media studies, critical intercultural communication, and critical pedagogy, creating a fusion that studies and analyzes these mediated intercultural experiences from a pedagogical perspective. While operating under this approach, this pedagogy employs critical/cultural theoretical perspectives and methodologies to carry out its agenda. As I outline MCICP, I offer five interrelated facets or pillars: (1) the need to articulate mediated critical intercultural communication literacy; (2) the interactivity and dynamic nature of new media technologies; (3) self-reflexivity in relation to media consumption and mediated intercultural communication texts, performances, and experiences; (4) dialogue as a way of critical intercultural media literacy; and (5) social justice–oriented work in digital mediated domains and through media texts as a pedagogical approach.

Articulating Mediated Critical Intercultural Communication Literacy

Even though media literacy (Baran, 2014; Hoechsmann & Poyntz, 2012; Potter, 2016; Silverblatt, Smith, Miller, Smith, & Brown, 2014; Smith, 2016) occupies a paramount role in media and cultural studies, it has not been

substantially integrated into critical intercultural communication or critical communication pedagogy's discourse. Similarly, although media literacy scholars often employ critical and cultural theoretical frameworks, they have not used critical intercultural communication (CIC) and critical communication pedagogy (CCP) literature. Hence, MCICP calls forth the need to create a media literacy that is infused with intercultural and postcolonial sensibilities as well as global examples and contexts. Mediated critical intercultural communication literacy will function along two distinct paths. Along the first path, the scholars and pedagogues who are interested in mediated texts such as films, TV shows, performances, or visual and artistic texts, would take a critical/cultural stand on how to analyze these texts, how they are produced, who produced them, where they are produced, what is in the texts, and finally, how they are consumed, read, or received by the audience. However, in this analysis, these scholars employ frameworks that are present in CIC, for example, whiteness, both in the representations and stories as well as in the artistic teams behind the creation of the text. In addition, other issues such as cultural identity markers and performances, immigrant and diasporic stories and experiences, representations of other cultures, languages, and cultural practices should be examined from a decolonization perspective so as to highlight the domination of white and Euro-American storytelling. In this way, students can see these mediated stories as an extension of everyday realities and treat them as intercultural encounters that require a careful and systematic intercultural analysis.

The second path would focus on the ways in which new media technologies, social network sites, and quick media platforms are increasing our intercultural communication. Therefore, MCICP's goal is to provide a series of lenses to examine the intercultural communication in these domains. While media literacy scholars have been heavily focused on mediated representations and traditional media, the digitalization of our everyday lives also requires new media literacy. This new approach to media literacy must employ intercultural frameworks and should be situated within a global context. Due to the Internet's globalizing effect and the social network sites' global reach, situating this discussion solely on a Euro-American perspective would be very limiting. For example, as educators, we can discuss how people from different cultural backgrounds use these sites to communicate nationally and globally, build communities, and in some cases, connect with people in their home cultures (Atay, 2015; Gajjala, 2002, 2004, 2006). In these discussions, as educators, we can highlight the fact that these individuals construct, reconstruct, and perform their cultural identities perhaps differently than they do their offline identities since these platforms provide them with opportunities to represent different aspects of themselves. In these discussions, we must also highlight that these platforms have both positive and

negative implications for these individuals. While they provide tremendous possibilities and stages from which to express one's identity, they are, after all, provided by the commercial companies that are driven by profit goals. Furthermore, these platforms use English as their primary language, leading the users to perform linguistic colonialism on bodies who communicate by using different languages. These discussions will hopefully raise some degree of student awareness about how these technologies do not always provide positive opportunities for all people. Hence, addressing these issues as part of MCICP's agenda will also fulfill some of the other facets outlined below.

INTERACTIVITY AND DYNAMIC NATURE OF NEW MEDIA TECHNOLOGIES

Unlike the more traditional media forms such as TV, radio, newspapers, and film, the new media is interactive and dynamic. On the one hand, it allows participants to communicate with each other at a higher speed regardless of time and space differences. On the other hand, the interactive nature of new media allows immediate responses from the content creators. For example, I can email or text a message to one of my students who is studying in Australia or India and quickly hear back from the student. I can also chat with someone who is part of a global company located in Singapore or Dublin to answer my questions or solve some of my problems. These global encounters exemplify how our lives are far more connected than before due to these technologies.

The development of new media technologies and the creation of global digital platforms has also allowed for the emergence of online learning opportunities for people around the world. First, access to information is much easier. For example, as I write these passages sitting at a coffee shop in England, I can access my university's electronic library database to look up relevant reading material. When I cannot find a source, I simply fill out a form, and the source will be electronically delivered to me within days. Similarly, I can submit a letter of recommendation for a former student from Bangladesh when she applies for a job in Dhaka. Second, due to the globalized nature of online platforms and their accessibility, a new type of educational idea has emerged—online education. Students who are non-traditional (older, with a lower-income status, single parents, or those with physical and/or learning disabilities) or students who use English as their second or third language can easily access these learning opportunities. Even though most of these online educational opportunities are profit-driven, they do provide opportunities. Third, the increase in the digitalization of our everyday realities also demands the incorporation of new media technologies, social network sites (to a degree), and quick media application into our curriculum. Nowadays, more

courses are taught from online domains, or they incorporate these technologies or platforms into the course content, thereby creating a hybrid learning experiences. Clearly, these possibilities provide access to those students who have been marginalized or often silenced in traditional educational settings. For example, students who have higher speaking anxieties or varying levels of English competencies can use these platforms to perform differently in class discussions because now they are online, and translators are readily available.

As we incorporate more online assignments and presentations into our classes, or assign projects that require searches on global databases, we are exposing our students to mediated or digitalized intercultural communication and enabling them to communicate outside of the classroom with people around the world via these global platforms. The questions we should be asking now are: How prepared are our students for processing these intercultural or global encounters? How do they make sense of these interactions? How do they decide what is good or bad, what is appropriate or not, what is acceptable or not, and what is dangerous or not on these platforms? Finally, how much do they know about the positive and negative outcomes of this globalized connectivity? Finding answers to these complex questions is not easy. However, I believe that MCICP can provide different approaches and lenses to educate our students about the complexities of these online intercultural encounters. MCICP's main goal is thus to highlight the idea of the new media technologies and online platforms that are global in nature and part of the global corporations. Because of the characteristics of these new media technologies, we will have more abundant and intensified intercultural and globalized experiences that are, on the one hand, more dynamic and more interactive and, on the other hand, culturally more complex due to the participants' differing cultural and linguistic backgrounds. MCICP, therefore, aims to highlight important issues, such as the role of the digital divide or of domination of English, in relation to the new media technologies and our intercultural experiences with them.

SELF-REFLEXIVITY

As outlined by Freire (1970) and Fassett and Warren (2007), self-reflexivity is an essential element of critical pedagogy. Building on their ideas, I argue that MCICP must incorporate self-reflexivity as one of its central pillars. Albeit that we heavily use the Internet, new media technologies, social network sites, and quick media applications, we rarely question how we use them, how often we use them, and what we do with them. As a critical media studies scholar, I often assign my students a project where they have to keep

track of their social media consumption. Their discoveries often surprise them and in some instances, they are also puzzled by their technological dependencies. However, it is very difficult for them to step back and critically reflect on their participation in these media forms and their consumption of online narratives posted on social media. In addition, they rarely think about their intercultural encounters in these domains and the mere fact that they are a member of different online communities.

Mediated critical intercultural communication pedagogy strives to cultivate self-reflexivity among students and faculty members who use these new media technologies and social media platforms for both social and educational purposes. Hence, MCICP sets out to actualize two goals: self- reflexivity within new media consumption, and self-reflexivity within the intercultural dimensions of online communication. The first goal falls within the realm of media literacy. In this arena, MCICP illuminates the fact that new media, social network sites, and quick media applications are created by profit-driven global companies, so we must critically understand our usage of and the type of information we share on these sites. Since the ownership of information posted on these sites belongs to these domains, we have little control of how the information is used or stored. We must also educate our students about the material effects of their web presence on themselves and on the others around them since we often share information or visual material about the others as well.

The second goal of MCICP is found where media literacy and critical intercultural communication overlap and intersect. Through MCICP, we can educate our students about the intercultural dimensions of their new media usage and presence. Since the consumers and participants might use more than one language and may indeed come from different cultural and national backgrounds, our messages and identity performances can be read very differently. When these consumers achieve this level of self-reflexivity, we can begin the second phase of MCICP, which is to explain how much of our communication with others on social media and quick media applications, deliberate or not, might use U.S.-centric ways of communication. We must recognize that due to the lack of interpersonal presence and feedback, we might be colonizing how others communicate and present themselves. The second goal also requires a high level of self-reflexivity from educators as well. Considering that we might be using different forms of new media as part of our classes or teaching our classes on an online platform, we must also aim for self-reflexivity. We must understand and reflect on the ways in which our pedagogical and course content-related choices will expose our students to intercultural and global encounters. This is the only way we can prepare them to be more critical about their own participation in the new media. Furthermore, self-reflexivity should also involve the self-realization of the privileges of access, both technological and linguistic, and the power that is ingrained in these privileges.

DIALOGUE

Like self-reflexivity, dialogue is one of the building blocks of critical (communication) pedagogy outlined by Cooks (2010), Freire (1970), and Fassett and Warren (2007). As they explain, creating safer spaces for dialogue where we can carry out honest and open discussions with our students about course content as well as about the power structures within which we operate are the main goals of critical communication pedagogy. MCICP follows a similar path because it is committed to creating a healthy and progressive dialogue, within and outside of the classroom, about the different facets of the new media forms and their potential influences on our everyday lives. Moreover, MCICP highlights the importance of an intercultural perspective in this dialogue. Hence, it is committed to address issues of whiteness, the intersectionality of different cultural identity markers, constructions and performances, and the potential spaces that new media forms offer for creating alternative venues for people, particularly the marginalized others, to represent themselves. MCICP is also committed to addressing the importance of self-presentation and identity performance on social media from a global standpoint, reminding us of the importance of layered perspectives in understanding one's communication and self-presentation on these platforms. Finally, MCICP tackles the idea of mediation and digitalization to illuminate our presence and participation in social media.

Such an honest and invitational dialogue would lead to more progressive ways of making sense of our intercultural encounters. Moreover, such a dialogue would empower marginalized bodies by allowing them to address how these platforms that are potentially liberating to some can be limiting or oppressive to those who might not enjoy equal technological or linguistic access. Finally, these dialogues would also uncover how much of the language and social structure of these new media technologies are U.S.-centric and culturally dominant over those who might reside in other parts of the world. These types of dialogues can also have a decolonizing effect on students when it comes to intercultural and global issues, particularly on those mainstream students whose lived experiences or exposure might not be interculturally complex.

SOCIAL JUSTICE

The works of Cooks (2010), Fassett and Warren (2007), Frey and Carragee (2007a, 2007b), and Frey and Palmer (2014) highlight the growing body of literature on social justice and activism in communication pedagogy. Situated in this discourse, promoting activism to create social justice is one of

MCICP's main goals. By focusing on the intercultural and global dimensions of critical communication pedagogy, MCICP strives to achieve inclusion of diverse perspectives and voices.

Achieving diversity and an inclusion of difference and valuing their multiplicity and importance require deliberate actions performed by educators and students if they are to carve out the spaces that will allow marginalized bodies to be heard. MCICP's main goal is to provide overlapping perspectives and ideas to students and educators and to articulate the role of media forms and new media technologies in a social justice discourse. To this end, I claim that MCICP offers two interrelated arguments: How can we critically analyze media texts and contexts to illuminate oppressive and/or hegemonic structures? And how can we use different media forms, particularly new media technologies, social networking sites, and quick media to perform deep and long-lasting activism that would lead to social change? As I previously mentioned, MCICP's commitment to offering critical intercultural media literacy intends to answer the first question. Answering the second is more complicated because it requires that students and educators alike be committed to the ideological agendas of social justice work. Once this commitment is achieved, the second goal involves a critical, deep self-reflection about our new media consumption. A critical dialogue about the positive potential and the use of new media technologies must be outlined if we are to engage students in collaborative projects that aim to achieve social change. Of course, social justice work requires collaboration and alliance building. In this type of work, students should also realize that there can be negative outcomes of their new media usage while they aim to create change. There may be oppositional voices and in some cases even legal actions against the activists. This type of knowledge is rather useful in helping students understand that activism and intercultural communication that requires social justice work are messy and often attract negative criticism by hegemonic and oppressive powers or their supporters.

In addition to activism, new media technologies can also be used to create intercultural dialogues among groups of people. The interactive and dynamic nature of these technologies would allow participants to get to know each other despite their time and locational differences. Finally, providing culturally sensitive tools to students to empower the marginalized groups without speaking for them or silencing them would achieve the goals of MCICP. Hence, MCICP aims to equip students and educators to understand the power of media texts. Additionally, it provides educational and practical tools and methods to question, critique, and in some cases challenge and change the mediated forms and texts, and either build new forms or engage in them differently in order to combat societal, intercultural insensitivities, and oppressive systems.

CONCLUSION

Above, I asked two critical questions: What does mediated critical intercultural communication pedagogy look like? And what does it aim to achieve? To conclude this chapter, I return to these questions and offer the following points.

First, as new media technologies are changing the ways in which we teach and communicate with our students, as educators, we reinvent our teaching techniques as we adopt new pedagogical approaches. MCICP aims to focus on how culturally diverse bodies (both students and teachers) carry on their educational experiences both in the classroom and on cyber platforms, thereby focusing on how mediated intercultural experiences impact pedagogical issues and how traditional pedagogies shift to open spaces for the development of mediated critical intercultural communication pedagogies. Mediated critical intercultural communication pedagogy is thus concerned with the mediated natures of intercultural communication and critical communication pedagogy.

Second, mediated critical intercultural communication pedagogy also recognizes that the use of traditional media forms and new media technologies also influences our approaches to teaching. Consequently, MCICP helps us to theorize its own role through the lens of mediation and the digitalization of pedagogy.

Third, mediated critical intercultural communication pedagogy calls attention to the "interactivity" that is presented in cyber platforms and social network sites, especially in the context of intercultural communication. When, as educators, we employ mediated pedagogies, we must understand that interactivity outside of the classroom will become a reality. Furthermore, when we are engaged in intercultural pedagogies that are mediated, especially in the context of cyber platforms, we must recognize that not only our pedagogies but also our intercultural experiences are mediated. Hence, mediated critical intercultural communication pedagogy focuses on these interrelated yet complex issues.

Finally, mediated critical intercultural communication pedagogy recognizes that the media texts we consume are forms of intercultural communication due to the issues that are presented—race, ethnicity, nationality, gender, class, sexuality, disability, and immigration. Hence, we actively partake in the intercultural communication that is mediated. In addition, mediated texts that are global in nature also direct us to a communication that is global in nature because of the high presence of different languages, cultural practices, and human bodies. Therefore, mediated critical intercultural communication pedagogy aims to connect the discourse of media and intercultural communication in the context of critical communication pedagogy by suggesting that

we must be self-reflexive in our mediated intercultural communication, recognize power dimensions, acknowledge the impact of mediated text in identity formation, and finally, recognize its possibilities of offering social justice.

As a result, I argue that we must push the boundaries of intercultural communication, intercultural communication pedagogy, and critical intercultural communication to include, in particular, mediated texts, cyber platforms, and social network sites as domains for intercultural communication and communication education. I therefore call attention to the need to further the discussion on mediated intercultural communication pedagogy and the discourse of globalization, cyberspace, technology, and critical intercultural communication in order to theorize and explain the complex, everyday realities of mediated intercultural communication within and outside of the classroom and within the context of communication pedagogy.

REFERENCES

Atay, A. (2015). *Globalization's impact on cultural identity formation: Queer diasporic males in cyberspace*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Atay, A. (2016). Making connection possible through new media technologies: The usage of social media as a learning tool for students with disabilities. In A. Atay & M. Ashlock (Eds.), *The discourse of disability in communication education: Narrative-based research for social change* (pp. 129–145). New York: Peter Lang. 2016.

Baran, S. (2014). *Introduction to mass communication: Media literacy and culture* (8th ed). New York: McGraw Hill.

Berger, R., Hobbs, R., McDougall, J., & Mihailidis, P. (2015). We're in this together: Building a global community for media education research. *Media Education Research Journal*, 5(2), 5–10.

Calafell, B. M. (2010). When will we all matter?: Exploring race, pedagogy, and sustained hope for the academy. In D. L. Fassett & J. T. Warren (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of communication and instruction* (pp. 343–3359). Los Angeles: Sage.

Carrillo Rowe, A., & Malhotra, S. (2007). (Un)hinging whiteness. In L. M. Cooks & J. S. Simpson (Eds.), *Whiteness, pedagogy, performance: Dis/placing race* (pp. 271–298). Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Cooks, L. M., & Simpson, J. S. (Eds.). (2007). *Whiteness, pedagogy, performance: Dis/placing race*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Cooks, L. (2011). The (critical) pedagogy of communication and the (critical) communication of pedagogy. In D. L. Fassett & J. T. Warren (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of communication and instruction* (pp. 293–314). Los Angeles: Sage.

DePietro, P. (2013). *Transforming with education with new media: Participatory pedagogy, interactive learning and Web 2.0*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Fassett, D. L., & Warren, J. T. (2007). *Critical communication pedagogy.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fox, S. A. (2000). The uses and abuses of computer-mediated communication for people with disabilities. In D. O. Braithwaite & T. L. Thompson (Eds.), *Handbook of communication and people with disabilities: Research and application* (pp. 319–336). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M. B. Ramos, Trans.). New York: Herder and Herder.

Frey, L. R., & Carragee, K. M. (Eds.). (2007a). Communication activism: Vol. 1. Communication for social change. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Frey, L. R., & Carragee, K. M. (Eds.). (2007b). Communication activism: Vol. 2. Media and performance activism. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Frey, L. R., & Palmer, D. L. (Eds.). (2014). Teaching communication activism: Communication education for social justice. New York, NY: Hampton Press.

Gajjala, R. (2002). An interrupted postcolonial/feminist cyberethnography: Complicity and resistance in the "cyberfield." *Feminist Media Studies*, 2(2), 177–193.

Gajjala, R. (2004). Negotiating cyberspace/negotiating RI. In A. Gonzales, M. Houston, & V. Chen (Eds.), *Our voices: Essays in culture, ethnicity, and communication* (pp. 82–91). Los Angeles: Roxbury.

Gajjala, R. (2006). Cyberethnography: Reading South Asian digital diaspora. In K. Landzelius (Ed.), *Native on the net: Indigenous and diasporic peoples in the virtual age* (pp. 272–291). London: Routledge.

Hall, S. (1995). The whites of their eyes: Racist ideologies and the media. In G. Dines & J. M. Humez (Eds.), *Gender, race and class in media* (pp. 18–22). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hall, S. (1996). Introduction: Who needs 'identity'? In S. Hall & P. du Gay (Eds.), *Questions of cultural identity* (pp. 1–17). London: Sage.

Halualani, R. T., & Nakayama, T. K. (2013). Critical intercultural communication studies: At a crossroads. In T. K. Nakayama & R. T. Halualani (Eds.), *The handbook of critical intercultural communication* (pp. 1–16). Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Hoechsmann M., & Poyntz, S. R. (2012). *Media literacies: A critical introduction*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Jenkins, H. (2008). *Convergence culture: Where old and new media collide*. New York: New York University Press.

Khaund, M. (2005). Enhancing student learning: A multimedia case study. In G. Chiazzese, M. Allegra, A. Chifari, & S. Ottaviano (Eds.), *Methods and technologies for learning* (pp. 113–119). Southampton, England: WIT Press.

Lovaas, K. E., Baroudi, L., & Collins, S. (2002). Transcending heteronormativity in the classroom: Using queer and critical pedagogies to alleviate trans-anxieties. *Journal of Lesbian Studies*, 6(3/4), 177. doi: 10.1300/j155v06n03_15

Martin, J. N., Nakayama, T. K., Flores, L. A. (2002). A dialectical approach to intercultural communication. In. J. N. Martin, T. K. Nakayama, & L. A. Flores (Eds.), *Readings in intercultural communication: Experiences and context*s (pp. 3–13). New York: McGraw Hill.

Nakayama, T. K., & Martin, J.N. (2007). The "white problem" in intercultural communication research and pedagogy. In L. M. Cooks & J. S. Simpson (Eds.),

Whiteness, pedagogy, performance: Dis/placing race (pp. 111–137). Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Orbe, M. P. (2011). *Communication realities in a "post-racial" society: What the US public really thinks about Barack Obama*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Potter, W. J. (2016). *Media literacy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Silverblatt, A., Smith, A., Miller, D. C., Smith, J., & Brown, N. (2014). *Media literacy: Keys to interpreting media messages* (4th ed). Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.

Smith, J. (2016). *Master the media: How teaching media literacy can save our plugged-in world*. San Diego, CA: Dave Burgess Consulting.

Sorrells, K. (2015). *Intercultural communication: Globalization and social justice* (2nd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Toyosaki, S. (2009). Politics of social agency in racialized educational discourse. *The International and Intercultural Communication Annual*, 31, 255–278.

Warren, J. T. (2003). *Performing purity: Whiteness, pedagogy, and the reconstitution of power*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Yep, G. A. (2000/2014). Encounters with the "other": Personal notes for a reconceptualization of intercultural communication competence. In M. K. Asante, Y. Miike, & J. Yin (Eds.), *The global intercultural communication reader* (2nd ed., pp. 339–356). New York, NY: Routledge.

Yep, G. A. (2002). My three cultures: Navigating the multicultural identity landscape. In J. N. Martin, T. K. Nakayama, & L. A. Flores (Eds.), *Readings in intercultural communication: Experiences and contexts* (2nd ed., pp. 60–66). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.

Yep, G. A. (2007). Pedagogy of the opaque: The subject of whiteness in communication and diversity courses. In L. M. Cooks & J. S. Simpson (Eds.), *Whiteness, pedagogy, performance: Dis/placing race* (pp. 87–110). Lanham, MD: Lexington.

Chapter 12

Addressing Cultural Intersections

Critical Feminist Communication Pedagogy

Amy Aldridge Sanford and
Jennifer V. Martin Emami

> With awe and wonder you look around, recognizing the preciousness of the earth, the sanctity of every human being on the planet, the ultimate unity and interdependence of all beings—*somos todos un paíś*. Love swells in your chest and shoots out of your heart chakra, linking you to everyone/everything. . . . You share a category of identity wider than any social position or racial label. This *conocimiento* motivates you to work actively to see that no harm comes to people, animals, ocean—to take up spiritual activism and the work of healing.
>
> —Gloria E. Anzaldúa (2015)

Contemporary university classrooms in the United States are spaces in which teachers and learners have the opportunity to recognize what Anzaldúa (2015) referred to as "the ultimate unity and interdependence of all things" (p. 138). The realization of teacher-learner and learner-learner interdependence are a positive consequence of intercultural dialoguing in which there is thoughtful exploration of difference—including differences between cultural understandings and lived experiences. Classroom conversations in which cultures collide can be uncomfortable, and unfortunately, this discomfort causes some students and teachers to avoid the difference conversations altogether—both inside and outside the formal classroom space. The avoidance of tough dialogues has a larger societal impact though, as it can stifle the advancement of a civil, compassionate citizenry where people ask thoughtful questions of each other and disagreements lead to commitments to learn more from each other.

Historically, higher education classrooms in the United States have not been the places of critical thought that they are today. In the past few decades,

professors and instructors influenced by feminist, queer, womanist, and other critical pedagogies, openly encourage dialogues on religion, sexuality, elections, legislation, social movements, critiques of power, and numerous other "taboo" or "controversial" topics. While some taxpayers and conservative politicians complain about liberalism in postsecondary education, many college and university students have come to expect that their learning experiences will involve critical dialogue. In fact, during the fall of 2015, when a communication professor at Kansas University was perceived as unreceptive to the students' ideas about systemic racism, five of the students filed a discrimination complaint with the university's Office of Institutional Opportunity and Access (Shepherd, 2015), and the professor's contract was not renewed.

Throughout this chapter, the path of feminist and other critical pedagogies for the past 100 years in the United States will be considered, including the transition from monist feminist ideologies to intersectionality in the 1980s. We suggest that feminist pedagogy embracing intersectionality combined with critical communication pedagogy (CCP) advanced by communication scholars Fassett and Warren (2007) presents an ideal opportunity for intercultural dialogues in the classroom because it allows the participants to better embrace the wholeness of each other and not just a piece of an identity, which can lead to tokenism and a ranking of a person's oppressions. Additionally, the inclusion of CCP offers the opportunity to move from inaction to action through dialogue. It was Freire (1970) who argued, "Without dialogue there is no communication, and without communication there can be no true education" (pp. 92–93). Strategies will be offered for this dialogic approach that we call Critical Feminist Communication Pedagogy (CFCP), with special attention paid to student-teacher relationships and safe(r) dialogic spaces where all learners can share their thoughts without fear of retribution. With the introduction of CFCP, the authors hope to further expand, problematize, and center both teachers' and learners' cultures *and* each person's cultural intersections.

THE JOURNEY TO FEMINIST PEDAGOGY

Schoolchildren in the early history of the United States were rigidly controlled by teachers and clergy who placed value on elocution and rote learning, which included memorization of "facts," Christian Bible verses, and other prose (Cubberley, 1920). Teachers were the originators of all knowledge and transmitted it to pupils who were compliant and would repeat the material verbatim whenever summoned. At the turn of the twentieth century, John Dewey (1916) challenged the effectiveness of rote learning. Instead of

simply focusing on the students' abilities to memorize and recall information, he said that students should be taught how to reach their full potentials. Charles D. Hardie (1942), an internationally respected philosopher of education, was a critic of Dewey, writing that Dewey's vision of democratic schools was absurd and that "an autocratic school is necessary to establish a democratic world" (p. 63). Hardie and many of his contemporaries believed that education was superior when it was done *to* the child, not *with* the child. Seventy years after Dewey's groundbreaking critiques, Brazilian educator Paulo Freire (1970) argued in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* that educators should not simply deposit information into students.[1] Instead, he suggested that learning should consist of the co-construction of knowledge between teachers and learners through critical dialogue. Like Dewey, Freire believed that education was best learned through experiences that made sense in the lives of the students.

The works of Dewey and Freire, coupled with the women's liberation movement of the 1960s and 1970s, created a pedagogy and ideology that was embraced by feminist scholars of many disciplines (Maher & Tetreault, 2001). Early feminist pedagogy[2] put emphasis on middle-class White women's experiences and perspectives and was grounded in gender-based analyses of power, social structures, and educational contexts. In the spirit of consciousness-raising of that era, women were asked to voice their experiences in instructional settings. Feminist pedagogy required that collectivism be valued over individualism (Fisher, 2001); therefore, the group shared the burden of each woman's experiences. For example, a student who brought up a concern regarding campus safety would not be dismissed or treated like an oddity in a feminist classroom. Other students and the teacher would be expected to empathize and share similar safety concerns. Shrewsbury (1993) referred to feminist pedagogy as a crucial component of the women's liberation movement.

TRANSITION FROM MONIST TO INTERSECTIONAL

While feminist scholars and activists in the 1960s and 1970s acknowledged women's multiple identity categories, they focused their energies on fighting for equality based solely on biological sex, and by default, the main focus was on White women like themselves. During the 1980s and 1990s, Women of Color (WOC) theorists, including Patricia Hill Collins, Kimberlé Crenshaw, Chandra Mohanty, Audre Lorde, and Bell Hooks, critiqued the women's liberation movement and worked to bring attention to the *intersections* of lived experiences, including biological sex, sexuality, race, religion, politics, class, ability, etc. WOC scholars discussed the marginalization associated

with these identities as well as the systems[3] that helped to create and maintain marginalization. They believed that singular identity categories (i.e., gender or biological sex) limit social justice theories and praxis (Cooper, 1892; Combahee River Collective, 2015; Crenshaw, 1991; Hooks, 1981; Lorde, 1984; Mohanty, 1988). Audre Lorde (1983), poet and Civil Rights activist, acknowledged the complexity of personal identity and stated that her personal intersections were "Black, lesbian, feminist, socialist, poet, mother of two, including one boy, and a member of an interracial couple" (p. 9). Lorde drew attention to the way her embodied identities positioned her to experience sexism, heterosexism, and racism simultaneously.

Consequently, scholarship that speaks to the experiences of all women as a singular experience (i.e., the White, middle-class, heteronormative, able-bodied experience) perpetuates a divide between women. WOC scholars have often felt excluded in women's studies and feminist pedagogy scholarship. Zinn, Cannon, Higginbotham, and Dill (1986) argue that,

> Practices that exclude women of color and working-class women from the mainstream of women's studies have important consequences for feminist theory. Ultimately, they prevent a full understanding of gender and society. The failure to explore fully the interplay of race, class, and gender has cost the field the ability to provide a broad and truly complex analysis of women's lives and social organization. (p. 33)

In 2000, Patricia Hill Collins made the argument that WOC continued to be suppressed through scholarship. She pointed out that systems of oppression work to suppress women of color beyond large societal institutions and that many U.S. White feminist scholars resisted having Black women as full colleagues. Collins (2000) believed that the resistance toward WOC stemmed from prioritizing gender/sex oppression and neglecting to acknowledge "how race and class intersect in structuring gender" (p. 8). Mohanty (1988) also articulated the limitation of scholarship that does not consider intersectionality, arguing, "Feminist discourse on the third world which assumes a homogenous category—or group—called 'women' necessarily operates through such a setting up of originary [*sic*] power divisions" (p. 79).

The shift to intersectionality advanced by WOC was controversial and resisted by mainstream feminists when it was initially proposed. Luft (2010), who did not identify as a WOC, argued that singular identity categories (rather than the intersection of identities) have to be the focus in the classroom in order to avoid neutralizing oppressions. In Luft's experiences, she found that her White students often denied racism existed which, she argued, made it important for her to focus specifically on race matters before moving on to other -isms. Unlike Luft (2010), scholars Hull and Smith (1982) argued that

the lack of intersectionality had been less than helpful in the advancement of feminist pedagogy. Furthermore, Hull and Smith noted that when a classroom discussion is about race it usually centers on Black men by default, and when the discussion is about gender or sex, it is most commonly the White female perspective. The scholars believed that intersectionality was necessary in order to not erase the experiences of those who embody multiple oppressed identities and to further consider the systems that maintain those oppressions.

Yuval-Davis, in an interview with Guidroz and Berger (2010), further noted that using a monist approach in the classroom can lead to tokenism, where all people of a particular category are thought of as the same. Yuval-Davis argued that when identities become tokenized, they are viewed as less important and are erased when social justice efforts take place. Some social justice educators seek to hear from "other voices" so much so that the burden of representation is placed on one or few students in the classroom. Tokenism is not useful or productive; it takes away from the appreciation of one's complex personhood that exists in the intersections. In addition to tokenism, Moraga (2015) warned of the dangers of ranking oppressions that can occur when there is a monist approach. Crenshaw, speaking to a TEDTalk crowd in October 2016, warned that a monist approach does not allow a large enough frame for effective social justice: "Without frames that are capacious enough to address all the ways that disadvantages and burdens play out for all members of a particular group, the efforts to mobilize resources to address a social problem will be partial and exclusionary" (qtd. in Vasquez, 2016).

Contemporary feminists have embraced intersectionality, believing that the fight for equality must expand beyond the realm of sex equity. In 2013, De Welde, Foote, Hayford, and Rosenthal (2013), advanced a definition of feminist pedagogy that was inclusive of multiple categories beyond sex and racism: "Feminist pedagogies advance social justice by weakening the foundations of sexist, racist, homophobic, classist, and other oppressive ideologies" (p. 106). Crabtree, Sapp, and Licona (2009) defined feminist pedagogy as "a movement against hegemonic educational practices that tacitly accept or more forcefully reproduce an oppressively gendered, classed, racialized, and androcentric social order" (p. 1). While these scholars recognize multiple identity categories, it is important that pedagogues consider the intersections of the categories and not just simply examine them as singular identity categories. As May (2012) asserted, "Intersectionality offers a vision of future possibilities that can be more fully realized once a shift toward the multiple takes place" (p. 165). Intersectionality moves the intercultural dialogue beyond sex, gender, or even race. It allows for a more complex discussion of sexuality, which was often lost or underappreciated during Women's Liberation movement of the 1960s and 1970s. It acknowledges complex personhood (Gordon, 1997).

CHARACTERISTICS OF CRITICAL COMMUNICATION PEDAGOGY

Critical Communication Pedagogy (CCP), as conceptualized by Deanna Fassett and John Warren (2007), continued the century-long discussion began by Dewey (1916). CCP centralizes the importance of communicative practices in classroom discourse and includes 10 commitments focused on communication, power, reflexivity, and research as praxis. Fassett and Warren (2007) were particularly concerned that teachers and learners deconstruct harmful ideologies: "Dialogue is not a matter of negotiation and not a process of friendship building, though both may occur; it is a process of sensitive and thorough inquiry, inquiry we undertake together to (de)construct ideologies, identities, and cultures" (p. 55).

Mythical norms, as initially advanced by Lorde (1984), are the idealized characteristics (e.g., whiteness, thinness, maleness, youth, heterosexuality, being money rich, etc.) of society that hold power and bring about oppression. In order to critically disrupt and challenge mythical norms, all classroom participants (including the instructor of record) must participate in deconstructing socially constructed ideas of identity that are presented in status quo stories.[4] The act of deconstruction in a critical classroom happens through dialogue and personal reflection, and as Fassett and Warren (2007) as well as Keating (2007) pointed out, is very much influenced by the choice of course materials. Assigning multiple readings from many perspectives help deconstruct pre-established norms among teachers and learners. The challenge for instructors is to avoid assigning only what closely aligns to their particular worldviews—worldviews that could reinforce mythical norms. Readings or other classroom materials can be chosen by students in addition to the instructor of record. When students are able to relate to readings, authors, and/or experiences, they can find personal entry points to offer their own stories, which may very well run counter to status quo stories.

Alcoff (1988) pointed out that (re)constructing new stories has been a limitation within feminist theory. As mythical norms are (de)contructed, new truths have to be offered in order for teachers and learners to create alternative ideologies, identities, and cultures. Fassett and Warren (2007) warned that naming the problem or injustice is not enough to create change. Besides creating alternative ideologies, the scholars wanted to see more responses to problems that are brought up in intercultural dialogues. "Most 'critical' books and articles we've read (and some we've written) disappoint in the end, for they usually offer some final thought that never quite seems to do enough, never seems to respond to the problem they've set out to address" (Fassett & Warren, 2007, p. 164).

INTERCULTURAL DIALOGUES AND CRITICAL FEMINIST COMMUNICATION PEDAGOGY

The thread from Dewey to Freire to CCP is obvious when reading Fassett and Warren (2007). They all have a critical approach to pedagogy in which the curriculum should be mutually owned by teachers and learners and every participant's lived experiences should be valued. What may be less discernible with CCP are the roles of feminist pedagogy and intersectionality of cultures (Crenshaw, 1991). CCP certainly includes information regarding culture. In fact, Commitment #3 of the abovementioned 10 commitments is specifically about the centralized role of culture in the classroom, but there is a lack of conversation regarding the intersections. With Critical Feminist Communication Pedagogy (CFCP), we would like to expand, problematize, and further center a person's cultures *and* their intersections. When the tenets of progressive education, critical pedagogy, feminist pedagogy, intersectionality, and CCP come together, the partnership presents an ideal opportunity for intercultural dialogues in instructional spaces, whether inside of a formal classroom or in less formal gatherings of teachers and learners outside of the classroom.

CFCP is defined as a teaching and learning paradigm in which intersectionality is valued while participants share power, connect curriculum to lived experiences, dialogue about intercultural differences, and seek solutions and understanding through communication. When an understanding of CFCP is cultivated in a critical classroom it enhances intercultural dialogues by (a) disrupting power imbalances and status quo stories, (b) engaging intersectionality and decentering a monist understanding of oppression, and (c) encouraging a focus on commonalities while acknowledging difference.

Disrupting Power Imbalances and Status Quo Stories

Fassett and Warren (2007) encouraged the disruption of power imbalances within their 10 commitments to CCP. In the spirit of CCP and the communicative practices that were central to the delivery of that pedagogical approach, CFCP asks teachers and learners to be deliberate with language choices and expression when practicing (de)construction and (re)construction in the intercultural dialogue. For example, Mohanty (2003) did not like the term "opposition" as a response to power because she saw it as a binary that drew attention to who and what was perceived as "powerful" and who or what was perceived "powerless." As a result, efforts to challenge hierarchy, patriarchy, and other forms of oppressive power often create further distinctions which direct focus on the "powerful" center. Keating (2010) agreed, stating that this dualistic thinking of "us" versus "them" reinforces the status quo where a

person is entirely the same or entirely different from people with whom they[5] disagree.

Together, classroom participants can work to disrupt preexisting ideas of power through dialogue, but helping students identify the ways power imbalances exist is not enough. While challenging privilege and power has been and continues to be a productive tool to ignite change, Fassett and Warren (2007) and Mohanty (2003) argued that it is necessary to explore the possibility of working beyond criticism. Instructors must work with students to challenge the injustices that stem from imbalances, as well as envision the possibility of different outcomes (even within existing hegemonic systems of power). In a CFCP classroom, it is important to demonstrate and facilitate change that students have helped construct because it will allow them to envision change outside of the classroom as well. This is when disrupting status quo stories becomes possible because students are able to normalize different and new stories.

Engaging Intersectionality and Decentering a Monist Understanding of Oppression

Mainstream feminism and feminist pedagogy have been critiqued for narrowly focusing on sex and gender inequality (Berger & Guidroz, 2010; TuSmith, 1989). When one engages in an intersectional approach they decenter any one identity category. There may be times when one form of oppression may be more salient than others, but the focus should not remain solely on one category, one experience, one oppression, one privilege, or one voice. CFCP insists that teachers and learners acknowledge the intersections of oppressions and the fact that lived experiences are complex and often overlapping. As Collins (1993) argued, "Either/or, dichotomous thinking is especially troublesome when applied to theories of oppression because every individual must be classified as being either oppressed or not oppressed. The both/and position of simultaneously being oppressed and oppressor becomes conceptually impossible" (p. 37). This both/and position, which Collins described, is what encourages individuals to grapple with their own oppression as well as others. Moraga (2015) believed that people cultivate compassion for each other's experiences when they seek understanding about their own role in oppression.

Consider Figure 12.1 when visualizing such dialogue. When the spheres are in motion, they rotate in many directions. While one can step back and recognize the continuous movement, there will be moments when certain aspects are more visible. These spheres are all present at the same time, they all move at the same time, they are all visible at the same time.

Figure 12.1 Complex Spheres of Dialogue. This image illustrates the multiple components of classroom dialogue as well as the complex points of each person's experience.

Much like dialogue that engages multiple perspectives, the components of Figure 12.1 work together and separately. People's perspectives of the spheres will be different based on their social and cultural locations. If the topic of class discussion is family communication, the center circle might represent definitions of family, the inner sphere might represent household roles, and the outer sphere might represent cultural influences. The solid circles on each sphere might represent different points of discussion that become salient to a participant. One person might reflect on their experiences as the youngest child in a trilingual home with a mother and father and another student may focus on being raised by a grandmother in an affluent home in the South. No two people share the exact same lived experiences, but through a dialogic exchange, each person's own experience is presented. The model can be read as CFCP because it acknowledges the multiplicity and simultaneous existence of experiences without isolating or essentializing any one identity, person, event, place, or other aspect of life.

Encouraging a Focus on Commonalities While Acknowledging Difference

When commonalities and connections between teachers and learners are embraced, hierarchies of both power and oppression are counteracted. Fassett and Warren (2007) encouraged classroom participants to believe that people's behaviors are "purposeful and logical," even when the logic is not obvious (p. 52). Yuval-Davis (2006) defined identities and argued that "Identities are individual and collective narratives that answer the question 'who am I/are we'?" (p. 197) Her definition encouraged readers to think beyond the ways an individual identified to instead consider the ways identities connect people. As an entry point for dialogue, it can be useful to first think about what ideas, experiences, or identities are shared in common. This does not mean that differences should not or will not be discussed. It is crucial to consider the differences in lived experiences and histories as these components help shape the way individuals know and understand the world. If the dialogue focuses on only one experience, the learning will be flat and lack dimension. Deeper understanding and broader perspective can be developed through embracing differences. One cannot use focusing on commonalties as an excuse to ignore difference. In fact, truly focusing on what connects classroom participants together should simultaneously engage the representation of intersecting, multilayered, and multidimensional unique experiences. As Keating (2010) claimed, "'Commonalities' indicates complex points of connection that both incorporate and move beyond sameness, similarity, and difference; commonalities acknowledge and contain difference" (p. 85). A sense of responsibility comes with learning to focus on the ways beings are connected, understanding that such connections makes it difficult to ignore the experience of others.

TENETS OF CFCP

CFCP implores teachers and learners to embrace the critiques of feminist pedagogy offered by WOC scholars, which will result in the heightened awareness of cultural intersections. Classroom strategies necessary to facilitate a shift to CFCP are offered. In addition to classroom strategies, CFCP encourages that healthy student-teacher relationships and safe(r) spaces be operationalized effectively both inside and outside of the classroom in order to better facilitate intercultural dialogues.

CFCP Classroom Strategies

Seven strategies are offered for encouraging and embracing intercultural dialogues both inside and outside of the classroom.

- All participants must commit to keep the dialogue going, especially when there is difference and disagreement (Arnett & Arneson, 1999). When conversations turn to difficult or taboo topics (e.g., religion, politics, sexuality) or there is a sense of discomfort, many people will want to quit rather than continue the conversation. It is vital during these times to continue the discussion (unless safety is a concern) and to commit to connect and fully understanding each other's point(s) of view. If the conversation must stop for time's sake, commit to continuing the conversation at a later time, either inside or outside of the formal classroom setting.
- Tolerate misperceptions in order to find constructive ways to talk about them (Fisher, 2001). People will use the wrong words, (un)intentionally make racist and sexist comments, and their nonverbals will be off putting. In these times, commit to the larger goals of learning from each other, connecting, (de)constructing, (re)constructing, and affecting change. If fellow learners are constantly called out and corrected in harsh ways, dialogue will shut down and opportunities for personal growth through dialogue will decrease. On the other hand, a person should never feel dehumanized in the classroom either. Harmful language should never be tolerated.
- Be self-reflexive when it comes to presumptions, truths, and lived experiences (Keating, 2007). Democratic dialogue requires analysis and critique on a grand scale and it involves each individual reflecting on their intercultural beliefs and biases at both a local and international levels. A classroom participant may hold a truth (based on a lived experience) that is harmful and needs to be personally and perhaps publicly acknowledged as such.
- Sometimes it is best to simply listen. It is not necessary for everyone to say what is on their minds all of the time. People of privilege are particularly guilty of this misstep. It is important to weigh whether or not the

contribution will add to the intercultural dialogue in a meaningful way (Fisher, 2001). This is particularly important when a person is not a member of the community that is being discussed. For example, people who are most affected by police misconduct should be considered the experts in the room when discussing the Black Lives Matter movement. It is never OK to belittle an affected person's experiences, tell them how to feel, and/or try to speak for them.

- When intercultural dialogue is present, a synergetic experience among teachers and learners is a major goal. Within this synergy, more is achieved together than could have been experienced as an individual outside of the dialogue. In order for synergy to happen though, teachers and learners have to approach classroom dialogues with a willingness to be persuaded. Agreeing to disagree is often the easy way to avoid a paradigmatic shift, but opting out of a tough conversation will not get a person to a place of change and growth (Keating, 2007).
- Both teachers and learners should moderate and shift intercultural dialogues so that learners with the most sophistication, maturity, and/or content knowledge do not dominate the space (Maher & Tetreault, 2001). Everybody should feel that they can contribute to the conversation without being stifled or belittled. Practice will result in better dialogic skills and more communication confidence.
- Power differences of the discussants, which will likely center on intersections of race, sex, class, religion, etc., must be addressed (Fisher, 2001) and can initially be introduced through shared readings and further considered during class discussion(s). The conversations will not be easy, but it is important to be both self-reflexive and acknowledging of privilege and marginalization among classmates. Power and who has it should be an ongoing conversation.

Teachers and learners who embrace these CFCP strategies will model a respect for intersectionality, safer spaces, and healthy student-teacher relationships both inside and outside the walls of a classroom. They will also find themselves in a situation where all people are valued and the course material is relevant to everybody, not just the privileged few who identify with and contribute to status quo stories.

Student-Teacher Relationships in the Classroom

A mutually rewarding student-teacher relationship in a CFCP space requires joint effort. Students are expected to come to class prepared and ready to engage, with the willingness to give the CFCP approach a whole-hearted effort. It is up to the instructor to also adequately prepare for class and to

facilitate an environment that gains the trust and respect of classroom participants. Scholars agreed that effective feminist facilitation requires the practice of good communication skills (Adams, 2007; Maher & Tetreault, 2001); vulnerability and being wholly present (Brown, 2012; Hooks, 1994); treating students as individuals (Crabtree et al., 2009); sharing power (De Welde, Foote, Hayford, & Rosenthal, 2013; Fisher, 2001); and calling out different injustices (Adams, 2007; Ludlow, 2004).

Communication skills

Feminist pedagogy requires good communication skills and the valuing of interpersonal relationships. One way educators can reflect this ideology is in their willingness to reply to emails and requests in a timely and thoughtful manner. Students should do the same when communicating with each other or the instructor of record. Inside and outside of the classroom, professors should model the dialogue they expect from students, providing structure and asking good questions until the other participants ask thoughtful questions of each other (Adams, 2007). As pointed out by Maher and Tetreault (2001), teachers and students shape each other's voices.

Vulnerability

Sociologist Brené Brown (2012) believed that people have to be vulnerable, which involves uncertainty, risk, and emotional exposure, to engage in productive dialogue. Being wholly present, sharing an unpopular opinion, disagreeing with another person, and telling personal narratives often cause communicators to feel vulnerable. This vulnerability and emotional exposure is imperative to the CFCP classroom. It breaks down metaphorical walls, allows for empathy, and enriches the discourse. People who are not willing to be vulnerable have a need for the uncertain to be certain, and that approach does not allow for dialogue to move forward. As Hooks (1994) pointed out, sharing personal narratives (which can make one feel vulnerable) and linking the stories to academic knowledge enhances the capacity to know.

It is particularly challenging for WOC scholars, including international faculty, to allow their already vulnerable bodies to become even more vulnerable in their classrooms. TuSmith (1989), who identified as a Chinese-American academic, believed that there are many pitfalls when giving up the traditional lecture format and therefore relinquishing "professorial authority" (p. 19). She said that the dialogic approach in which the professor becomes vulnerable is viewed by some students and administrators as weak or incompetent, particular when it is practiced by a WOC. However, she recognized that if she wanted to teach about uncomfortable subjects, then she had to help her students confront the topics that cause discomfort. TuSmith managed this

internal struggle of the perception of weakness and the need to help students grapple with discomfort by framing herself as a cultural translator, helping students bridge the gaps between the literature and their lived experiences.

Treating students as individuals

All feminist teachers should model care in a non-hierarchical relationship for their students: treating students as individuals, helping them make connections between the classroom material and personal experiences, and guiding them through the process of personal growth (Crabtree et al., 2009). In other words, students cannot be treated en masse in a CFCP classroom. Each learner should be appreciated for their own lived experiences, truths, and abilities. Every student starts at a unique place at the beginning of the course and will end at their own unique place at the end of the course. The CFCP professor hopes for growth for each student and coaches everyone as individuals, whether that is achieved by comments on reading responses or by offering guidance on how to most effectively participate in class discussions.

Sharing power

The student-teacher relationship in a college classroom centered on CFCP is communal and egalitarian (Maher & Tetreault, 2001). The dynamics between classroom participants should be fluid, where teachers and learners see their roles as non-dichotomous. It should not be a space where teaching only comes from the instructor of record, but rather the role of teacher and learner should always be in flux as everyone learns from and teaches each other. Everybody is a contributor in a learning environment. This sharing of power or fluidity can be witnessed in classroom seating arrangements, in the selection of curriculum, and the flow of classroom discourse.

The professor of record in a CFCP environment should be a person who is approachable inside and outside of the formal learning environment. As Fisher (2001) pointed out, authority has to be reframed because of the teacher's responsibility to students and feminist and other human rights movements. Professors and students benefit by spending time together outside of the classroom in less formal settings (i.e., coffee shops, community events) where the instructor of record does not have immediate authority or expertise. This shaking up of authoritative norms can help facilitate more open classroom discussions. Fisher (2001) believed that many college students are afraid to challenge teachers even when they disagree with them. In a classroom centered on CFCP, students are encouraged to express their opinions and lived experiences, even if they are in contradiction with another person's experience, including the professor's truths. It is through this expression of difference that students practice critical thought and civil discourse.

Calling out injustices

A feminist educator has the responsibility to be a role model in the pursuit of social justice both inside and outside of the classroom, especially since they may be one of the first feminist educators in a college student's life. Feminist professors and students must bring voices to the classroom to address injustices and to demonstrate how overlapping, intersecting identities are impacted in various ways by injustices. These voices can be presented in texts, through videos, guest speakers, and/or class discussions. It is important that classroom participants do not get in a rut of constant amicable agreement with each other, but in order to successfully avoid groupthink, all participants (including visitors) must feel that their comments will be treated with respect and that the facilitator will intervene to keep them safe from verbal or physical attacks (Adams, 2007). Differences should be valued and disagreements acknowledged.

Teachers and learners must also engage outside of the classroom to call out injustices. High-risk activism may involve attending rallies or engaging in protests. Understandably, many professors and instructors, especially those who have not achieved tenure and/or who are in bodies that make them more vulnerable, may fear backlash from university administration should they partake in a protest or rally or other more high-profile event. After all, faculty have lost their jobs over similar choices. The folks who feel that they need to be more cautious may be more comfortable volunteering with local nonprofit agencies and/or giving workshops about topics of interest to people in the community. Nevertheless, professors should invite students to join them in activities that are most appropriate.

Safe(r) Spaces

Ideally, the CFCP classroom is a space where participants can explore issues of social justice while feeling free from verbal intimidation and confident in the group members' honesty and shared values (Ludlow, 2004). Unfortunately, this is not always the reality. Many people (professors and students) fear for their well-being or safety in spaces where power and privilege are discussed.[6] After all, talks about these topics can threaten classmates who benefit from the status quo patriarchal structure (Fisher, 2001). In short, marginalized students and teachers should be safe from persecution or harassment in the college classroom, but things often do not work out that way. There are preexisting oppositional forces (like power and privilege) in every university classroom. Unfortunately, not all learners will feel that they have the same rights to speak or that they are respected. Embodied and historical differences affect how safe a space feels to the learners (Redmond, 2010). As teachers and learners, the best hope is the creation of safer spaces.[7] CFCP can help develop safer spaces by encouraging instructors to foster the types

of relationships outlined in the previous sections. These relationships include mutual respect, vulnerability, and good communication.

If students perceive that a learning environment is threatening, then they will not allow themselves to be wholly present and vulnerable. Additionally, in a high-threat, unsafe environment, teachers and learners will become defensive of their worldviews, rationalizing any challenges (Bell & Griffin, 2007). Many people's automatic response to opinions different from their own is to be cynical. They may put down the ideas verbally or nonverbally and belittle the person expressing the thought. This defensive discourse will impede productive intercultural dialogues. Students will also become silent and lack engagement, thus making it impossible to build the necessary classroom community (Hooks, 1994). Noddings (2003) believed that it was the teacher's responsibility to intercede in high-threat classroom spaces.

> Everything we do, then, as teachers, has moral overtones. Through dialogue, modeling, the provision of practice, and the attribution of best motive, the one-caring as teacher nurtures the ethical idea. She cannot nurture the student intellectually without regard for the ethical ideal unless she is willing to risk producing a monster. (Noddings, 2003, p. 179)

There are many ways to achieve safer classroom spaces. Both teachers and learners must be committed to nonjudgmental listening (Fisher, 2001; Freedman, 2009), where dialogic partners listen to understand rather than listen to form an argument. This ideal of non-judgmental listening should be discussed and operationalized within the first few class meetings. As stated earlier, it is imperative that discussants stay committed to understanding each other's points of view and to find commonalities on which they agree. There will be times when classroom participants will disagree though, and the disagreement may lead to a situation where people may become offended. When this happens, it is important to be self-reflective regarding why they feel offended and share those reasons with the person who said the offending words. Both people need to show compassion in this exchange. Not all participants may be open to sharing their feelings, but openness and reflexivity are goals for dialogue. Thoughtful, deliberate exchanges allow the threat inside the classroom to remain as low as possible while still holding students and teachers accountable for their words and reactions. The same advice holds true for meetings and exchanges between teachers and learners outside of the classroom as well, whether that takes place at a coffee shop, a political rally, or a presentation to a local community group. It is important for dialogic partners to remain self-reflective, compassionate, thoughtful, and committed to understanding the other person's point of view.

In order to encourage safer spaces, students need to be aware of access to resources, including counseling and crisis centers (Gardner, 2009). Information,

including a description of each center and contact information, should be included in syllabi. People who work in these facilities could also be invited as classroom speakers and/or discussants. Topics that are discussed in CFCP classrooms can often be very raw for students, especially if students allow themselves to be wholly present and vulnerable. Emotions are frequently at the surface since these are not topics they tend to have a lot of practice discussing in a group setting. It is imperative that pedagogues in these classrooms are compassionate and understanding should a student or students need to miss a class in order to attend to their mental well-being. Vulnerability can be emotionally draining.

Self-care is encouraged in a CFCP classroom. Students should know that the teacher is concerned for their well-being. One way teachers can express care is by acknowledging that some class discussions may be triggering (or distressing) to the participants. By creating a policy that allows students to remove themselves from such discussions, a precedent for being responsible to one's own self-care will be set. Self-care comes in many forms; however, in college classrooms self-care may not be discussed or demonstrated in a holistic manner. Students should be encouraged to take emotional care, spiritual care, rest, eat well, pursue hobbies, and exercise (Maparyan, 2012). These elements of self-care should be openly discussed and/or be subjects students feel comfortable bringing into classroom dialogue. Self-care practices differ among people. Some self-care practices are cultural such as meals, music, and dance. Other self-care practices may include quiet time alone, reading, or an earlier bedtime. For some, participating in activism is part of their self-care. Self-care should not be defined as a luxury or as unnecessary. WOC scholars (Lorde,1988; Hill Collins, 1990; Maparyan, 2012) have long argued that practicing self-care, especially for women of color, is a radical act of activism because too often they are expected to care for everyone else while neglecting the self. Self-care is healing, growth, and ultimately survival.

The instructor of record should also engage in self-care. Acts of self-care can be particularly difficult to enact in higher education because of the value placed on knowledge production of instructors, particularly faculty in tenure-track lines. They may fear admitting to themselves or to their colleagues that they need some time to recharge. However, it is imperative that they do. CFCP professors, by their nature, feel deeply about the human condition and are susceptible to feeling every hurt and defeat in their environments. Many will try to take on all the burdens of the people around them, but of course, that is not healthy. Teachers should follow the self-care advice given to students, but they also need people with whom they can confidentially discuss their teaching challenges and triumphs, whether that person is a colleague, a counseling professional, or somebody else outside of the academy. Additionally, writing about classroom experiences, whether in private journaling or writing

for an academic outlet or taking on a book project, can also be therapeutic. Reflection will aid in the teaching and learning process. Teachers and students should openly discuss self-care when engaging in CFCP. Self-care is a crucial part of survival for marginalized communities and as such is a part of history, current events, and the sustainable future.

CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

When Dewey initially proposed his "radical" ideas for the classroom 100 years ago, students were quite homogeneous. Teachers and learners shared classrooms with people who looked quite a bit like each other and had very similar family and community experiences. Over the years, classrooms have evolved to become shared spaces where people with multiple experiences and beliefs converge to learn together. In order for the learning to take place, the classroom participants must value each other's contributions to the classroom, and that can only happen through meaningful intercultural dialogues where people are heard, intersectionality is a given, and thoughtful questions are asked. Critical Feminist Communication Pedagogy allows for such experiences, and although it may not be easy, the discomfort is necessary.

NOTES

1. Freire famously referred to this "depositing" as the banking style of education.
2. Not everyone refers to this type of pedagogy as feminist, including many of the authors referenced in this chapter. The theoretical underpinnings that contribute to our argument include, but are not limited to, Black feminist thought, Womanism, critical theory, feminist theory, queer theory, and critical communication theory.
3. Crenshaw, who wrote an oft-cited early work regarding intersectionality, was a law professor who believed that the legal system perpetuated the marginalization of People of Color.
4. Status quo stories are the narratives that reinforce mythical norms. Keating (2007) said that "Status-quo stories limit our imaginations and prevent us from envisioning alternate possibilities—different ways of living and arranging our lives. Status-quo stories train us to believe that the way things are is the way they always have been and the way they must be" (p. 23).
5. The authors have chosen to use "they" or "their" in place of singular pronouns in the hopes of being inclusive of all genders and biological sexes.
6. Fassett and Warren (2007) did not promote the use of safe or safer spaces and believed that students shaped each other for better or for worse. They saw safe spaces as time-out from the real world, which they thought was counterproductive for creating change outside of the classroom.

7. **"**Safe space" is a term often associated with CFCP classrooms. Your authors resist this term because we do not believe that "safe" looks the same to everyone.

REFERENCES

Adams, M. (2007). Pedagogical frameworks for social justice education. In M. Adams, L. A. Bell, & P. Griffin (Eds.), *Teaching for diversity and social justice* (pp. 15–33). New York City, NY: Routledge.

Alcoff, L. (1988). Cultural feminism versus post-structuralism: The identity crisis in feminist theory. *Signs*, 13(3), 405–436. doi: 10.2307/3174166

Anzaldúa, G. E. (2015). Light in the dark/Luz en lo oscuro: Rewriting identity, spirituality, reality. In A. Keating (Ed.). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Arnett, R. C., & Arneson, P. (1999). *Dialogic civility in a cynical age*. New York City, NY: SUNY Press.

Bell, L. A., & Griffin, P. (2007). Designing social justice education courses. In M. Adams, L. A. Bell, & P. Griffin (Eds.), *Teaching for diversity and social justice* (pp. 67–87). New York City, NY: Routledge.

Berger, M. T., & Guidroz, K. (2010). *The intersectional approach: Transforming the academy through race, class, and gender.* Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Brown, B. (2012). *Daring greatly: How the courage to be vulnerable transforms the way we live, love, parent, and lead.* New York, NY: Gotham.

Crabtree, R. D., Sapp, D. A., & Licona, A. C. (2009). Introduction: The passion and the praxis of feminist pedagogy. In R. D. Crabtree, D. A. Sapp, & A. C. Licona (Eds.), *Feminist pedagogy: Looking back to move forward* (pp. 1–20). Baltimore, MD: The John Hopkins University Press.

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6), 1241–1299. doi: 10.2307/1229039

Collins, P. H. (1993). Toward a new vision: Race, class, and gender as categories of analysis and connection. *Race, Sex & Class*, 1(1), 25–45.

Collins, P. H. (2000). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment.* New York: Routledge.

Combahee River Collective. (2015). A Black feminist statement. In C. Moraga & G. Anzaldúa (Eds.), *This bridge called my back* (4th ed., pp. 210–218). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Cooper, A. J. (1892). A voice from the South. New York: Oxford University Press.

Cubberley, E. P. (1920). *The history of education*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

De Welde, K., Foote, N., Hayford, M., & Rosenthal, M. (2013). Team teaching 'gender perspectives': A reflection on feminist pedagogy in the interdisciplinary classroom. *Feminist Teacher*, (2). 105. doi:10.5406/femteacher.23.2.0105.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York City, NY: Macmillan Co.

Fassett, D. L., & Warren, J. T. (2007). *Critical communication pedagogy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Fisher, B. M. (2001). *No angel in the classroom: Teaching through feminist discourse*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Freedman, E. B. (2009). Small group pedagogy: Consciousness-raising in conservative times. In R. D. Crabtree, D. A. Sapp, & A. C. Licona (Eds.), *Feminist Pedagogy: Looking Back to Move Forward* (pp. 117–137). Baltimore, MD: The John Hopkins University Press.

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

Gardner, S. (2009). Teaching about domestic violence: Strategies for empowerment. In R. D. Crabtree, D. A. Sapp, & A. C. Licona (Eds.), *Feminist pedagogy: Looking back to move forward* (pp. 150–158). Baltimore, MD: The John Hopkins University Press.

Gordon, A. (1997). *Ghostly matters: Haunting and the sociological imagination*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Guidroz, K., & Berger, M. T. (2010). A conversation with founding scholars of intersectionality Kimberlé Crenshaw, Nira Yuval-Davis, and Michelle Fine. In M. T. Berger & K. Guidroz (Eds.), *The intersectional approach: Transforming the academy through race, class, and gender* (pp. 61–80). Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Hardie, C. D. (1942). *Truth and fallacy in educational theory*. New York City, NY: Teachers College Press.

Hooks, B. (1981). *Ain't I a woman: Black women and feminism*. Brooklyn, NY: South End Press.

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

Hull, G. T., & Smith, B. (1982). Introduction: The politics of Black women's studies. In G. T. Hull, P. B. Scott, & B. Smith (Eds.), *But some of us are brave: All the women are White, all the Blacks are men* (pp. xvii–xxxii). New York City, NY: Feminist Press.

Keating, A. (2007). *Teaching transformation: Transcultural classroom dialogues*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Keating, A. (2010). Lessons from transformation from 'This bridge called my back': Radical writings from Women of Color. In M. T. Berger & K. Guidroz (Eds.), *The intersectional approach: Transforming the academy through race, class, and gender* (pp. 81–99). Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Lorde, A. (1983). There is no hierarchy of oppression. *Bulletin: Homophobia and Education,* 14(3/4), 9.

Lorde, A. (1984). *Sister outsider: Essays and speeches*. Trumansburg, NY: Crossing Press.

Lorde, A. (1988). *A burst of light, essays*. London; Sheba Feminist Publishers.

Ludlow, J. (2004). From safe space to contested space in the feminist classroom. *Transformations: The Journal of Inclusive Scholarship And Pedagogy*, *15*(1), 40–56. Retrieved from http://www.njcu.edu/transformations/past-issues/

Luft, R. (2010). Intersectionality and the risk of flattening difference gender and race logics, and the strategic use of antiracist singularity. In M. T. Berger & K. Guidroz (Eds.), *The intersectional approach: Transforming the academy through race,*

class, and gender (pp. 100–117). Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Maher, F. A., & Tetreault, M. T. (2001). *The feminist classroom: Dynamics of gender, race, and privilege*. New York City, NY: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Maparyan, L. (2012). *The womanist idea*. New York, NY: Routledge.

May, V. (2012). Intersectionality. In C. M. Orr, A. Braithewaite, & D. Lichtenstein (Eds.), *Rethinking women's and gender studies* (pp. 155–172). New York City, NY: Routledge.

Mohanty, C. T. (1988). Under Western eyes: Feminist scholarship and colonial discourses. *Feminist Review*, 30, 61–88. doi:10.1057/fr.1988.42

Mohanty, C. T. (2003). *Feminism without borders: Decolonizing theory, practicing solidarity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Moraga, C. (2015). La Güera. In C. Moraga & G. Anzaldúa (Eds.), *This bridge called my back* (4th ed., pp. 22–29). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Noddings, N. (2003). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Redmond, M. (2010). Safe space oddity: Revisiting critical pedagogy. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work.* 1–14. doi: 10.1080/08841230903249729

Shepherd, S. (2015, November 20). KU professor who used n-word in class discussion is placed on leave [Electronic version]. *Lawrence Journal-World.*

Shrewsbury, C. M. (1993). What is feminist pedagogy? *Women's Studies Quarterly*, 21(3/4), 8–16. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/40022001

TuSmith, B. (1989). The cultural translator: Toward an ethnic womanist pedagogy. *MELUS,* 16(2), 17–29. doi:1. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org.manowar.tamucc.edu/stable/467208 doi:1

Vasquez, A. (2016, October 27). The urgency of intersectionality: Kimberlé Crenshaw speaks at TEDWomen 2016. In *TEDBlog*.

Yuval-Davis, N. (2006). Intersectionality and feminist politics. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 13(3), 193–209. doi: 10.1177/1350506806065752

Zinn, M. B., Cannon, L. W., Higginbotham, E., & Dill, B. T. (1986). The costs of exclusionary practices in Women's Studies. *Signs*, 11(2), 290–303. doi: 10.2307/3174050Complex

Chapter 13

Dialogue and Intercultural Communication Pedagogy

Alberto González and Linsay Cramer

One of the earliest attempts to map the purview of intercultural communication is Michael Prosser's (1978) book, *The Cultural Dialogue: An Introduction to Intercultural Communication*. Throughout much of the book "dialogue" is synonymous with interaction or conversation. However, early in the book Prosser, drawing from Dean Barnlund and his description of contrasts between Japanese and U.S. cultures, observes that "cultural dialogue between such contrasting cultures results from the ability to get in touch with each other, by learning to know and feel what others know and feel" (p. 15). Continuing, Prosser states that, "people must be willing to search for the truth about themselves in the context of their own cultures" (p. 15). Since this recommendation, dialogue and intercultural communication (IC) have been inextricably and frustratingly linked across nearly four decades.

Dialogue, whether theorized as an ineffable quality of interaction, a rarely achieved goal of interaction, or an indescribable experience from interaction—is frequently invoked by critical IC scholars. If dialogue is both the condition for and the process of IC understanding, what does this imply for pedagogical praxis? As embodied subjects in the classroom, can we facilitate an understanding of dialogue and an orientation toward it without first entering into dialogue with our students? In other words, how do critical IC scholars meet the double task of teaching dialogue and creating it at the same time?

In this chapter, we discuss the presence and significance of dialogue in IC studies, we explore whether dialogue was achieved when Black Lives Matter activists attempted to engage speakers during the U.S. presidential election, and then we consider implications for our teaching.

THEORIZING DIALOGUE

Many discussions of dialogue begin with and are influenced by philosophers and critics such as Mikhail Bakhtin, Martin Buber, Dwight Conquergood, and current interculturalists.

Bakhtin (1981) argued that monologue is a single-voiced discourse that ignores others' voices. We see this in instances when individuals are talked *to* or talked *at* rather than engaged *with*. In contrast to monologue, Bakhtin theorized that *dialogue* requires engaging the voice of the other in some way. It requires a form of interaction. Within this interactive process, he argued, dialogue is characterized by a tension between two or more opposing discourses. His conceptualization focused on dialogue as contradiction-ridden and tension-filled in which meaning is established in the "in-between" of perspectives.

Bakhtin's focus on power offers insight into how dialogue is experienced. Specifically, Bakhtin's explains that "centripetal" or normalized discourses (such as whiteness rhetorics) and "centrifugal" or marginalized discourses (such as the Black Lives Matter movement) compete for power, voice, and influence. The important element of difference appears to be implicit within this struggle.

Moves toward cosmopolitanism, such as the common acceptance of post-racial, color-blind, post-national, and post-feminist ideologies, contradict the conditions necessary for dialogue, as they ignore the experience of the other, or rather, they ignore difference in creating a universal human identity (Glenister Roberts, 2014). In facilitating dialogue, these distinct voices require an acknowledgement and understanding of the other, namely, through a recognition and understanding of difference. This is often difficult in conversation and we believe this is part of what contributes to the rarity of genuine dialogue.

It was Martin Buber (1970) who stated that, "I-You establishes the world of relation" (p. 56). Buber placed emphasis on the infinite possibilities for knowing and understanding from interaction with the other: You. Influenced by both Bakhtin and Buber, Dwight Conquergood (1985) likened dialogue and dialogical performance with "having intimate conversation with other people and cultures" that can produce "honest intercultural understanding" (p. 10). Conquergood held "genuine dialogical engagement" (p. 9) in contrast to the common negative conditions for IC interaction: objectivism, distance, hierarchy, and self-centeredness.

For Willink, et al. (2014), dialogue is a mode of confrontation—where the marginalized *other* may dialogue with colonizing structures. Dialogue becomes a technique of liberation—of decolonization—a method whereby one can "speak back to power" (p. 295).

Kaiban Xu (2013) shifts the focus of dialogue from understanding cultural differences to understanding how cultural groups are discursively positioned relative to one another. He states:

> Intercultural dialogue and relation, rather than the ontological difference between cultures, should be the focus of intercultural communication research. It is not the difference between cultures, but the situated dialogue, relation, and interculturality between them, that makes better understanding of each possible. (p. 385)

In our postmodern era, dialogue in critical IC "is consistent with dialectics, fragmentation, and resistance" (p. 383).

For Sorrells and Nakagawa (2008), *inquiry* generates dialogue. This means that as participants in conversation, "we are receptive to having our perceptions and our taken-for-granted presence in the world challenged and changed" (p. 27). In teaching, this means that we can be transformed by our students and move closer to their perspectives. In doing this, we might then be able to perform meaningful social justice work as a collective.

CRITICAL EXPECTATIONS FOR DIALOGUE

The writing by Kathleen Glenister Roberts (2014) on dialogue in her recent book, *The Limits of Cosmopolis*: *Ethics and Provinciality in the Dialogue of Cultures*, is particularly challenging and provocative as we theorize dialogue in the intercultural communication class. For Glenister Roberts, dialogue "has to do with thinking together. This happens between two people when they challenge their own beliefs and perspectives. Thinking together leads to a deeper shared understanding, a kind of mutual meaning. This is dialogue at its most powerful" (p. 77).

In dialogue, each person presents their "ground"—their commitments, their feelings—without limitation. What is excluded or impermissible by notions of "civility," and "literacy" is gone. Instead, each encounters the other with limitless possibilities—drawing on Emmanuel Levinas, Glenister Roberts (2014) calls this "the infinite" (pp. 115–122).

Glenister Roberts worries that in discussions of globalization and intercultural relations, notions of dialogue have moved toward the identification of common ground and the achievement of consensus. In her critique of cosmopolitanism, she worries that dialogue is little more than polite talk that works to hide difference and in so doing the dominant or normalized values and identities are reinscribed into social relations.

Additionally, Glenister Roberts states that dialogue cannot be planned, it just happens. Therefore, we cannot facilitate or guide dialogue. We cannot

plan for it or create an activity to foster it. This presents a challenge to instructors. Allowing for this "event" to happen in the classroom contradicts much of our training to meet course and learning objectives and to do so by carefully planning each class session.

In summary dialogue is characterized by the following:

- Dialogue is a "human meeting" (p. 78) where a new "emergence" of relations (as opposed to convergence) is possible,
- Difference is maintained,
- There is recognition of interdependence rather than dependence and control,
- There is a free challenging of beliefs and equality of participation,
- There is mutual trust, and
- Dialogue is "a specific and bounded event" (p. 79).

In the next sections we explore cases of possible public dialogue and then direct consideration to the IC classroom.

PUBLIC DIALOGUE: THE CASES OF BERNIE SANDERS AND BILL CLINTON

In this section, we wish to explore a public phenomenon that received widespread attention during the primary campaign for U.S. president during the summers of 2015 and 2016. How do these incidents approach critical notions of dialogue? What do we learn from these cases that might assist us in the IC classroom?

In the aftermath of the police shooting of Michael Brown, a teenager from Ferguson, Missouri, in the summer of 2014 and the subsequent failure by a grand jury to indict the officer who killed Brown, Black Lives Matter (BLM) arose to advocate for basic legal rights for African Americans and to call attention to arguments about inequalities in the treatment of Black Americans in the U.S. legal system. In the face of repeated shooting of Black males (most unarmed) under highly disputed circumstances, BLM advocacy emerged as a leading voice that critiqued local law enforcement and advocated equal treatment by law enforcement for people of color.

BLM activists used campaign rallies to express their positions. On August 8, BLM activists Marissa Johnson and Mara Jacqueline Willaford interrupted a rally just as Sen. Bernie Sanders was beginning to speak. At first, the rally organizers refused to allow the activists access to the microphone. As the activists demand the microphone, one organizer says, "We're trying to be reasonable." Amid a mix of cheers and boos, activists shouted, "Let her speak!" as they negotiated with the rally organizers. After repeatedly telling

the activists that they can speak "after Senator Sanders," the organizer said, "we're shutting it down." Later, after appearing to confer with Sanders, he began to relent and gave them two minutes to speak. Eventually, the activists gained control of the microphone and after several minutes attempted to hold a moment of silence to commemorate the shooting of Brown one year earlier (Basu, 2015). The event is cancelled and Sanders did not address the Seattle audience.

On April 7, 2016, former President Bill Clinton was speaking at a rally for Hillary Rodham Clinton, the nominee of the Democratic Party for U.S. president. Partway through his speech, Clinton was interrupted by BLM activists. Clinton initially responded by saying that, "I love protesters," but then—citing previous rallies—he said that the activists "won't let me respond" and "don't want to hear the truth." As with the Sanders rally, the crowd wavered between supporting the activists and shouting them down with chants of "Hillary!" While the statements by the BLM activists were difficult to hear from video, Clinton responded to their statements and explained policy considerations that led to the 1994 crime bill whose sentencing provisions (which Clinton attributed to Republicans) are widely credited for the mass incarceration of Black Americans. Clinton went on to complete his prepared remarks (Bradner, 2016).

After the incident, NPR called it a "heated exchange" while *Rolling Stone*.com called it a "tussle." Salon.com said that in defending the 1994 crime legislation in the "confrontation" that Clinton had lost his political "superpower."

In thinking about these exchanges as possible instances of public dialogue, what can we observe? These were obviously human meetings although they were not meetings arranged to engage differing perspectives. (This does not preclude the possibility of dialogue since dialogue can be unexpected.) When new voices were heard from the audience, they were unexpected and insistent, as dialogue often is. There was no expectation of consensus but there was the *possibility* of moral action as a result of the exchange. Beliefs were strongly challenged and it was not comfortable to watch or hear, again as dialogue often is. Both sides spoke from their own "moral ground," particularly at the Clinton rally. There was some element of trust; Clinton encouraged the expression of opinion and Sanders initially negotiated time for the speakers before cancelling his rally. There were clear recognitions of differences—for example, interpretations about what the 1994 legislation produced. Finally, we understand this as a specific bounded event; it had a clear beginning and an end.

The exchanges at both rallies have important elements of dialogue and warrant more analysis than we devote here. But for our consideration of dialogue, we ultimately conclude that dialogue was not achieved. Dialogue requires equal participation and equal control of the interaction. In these cases, the rally

managers maintained the power to continue to the end of the event. Clinton remained at the podium essentially moderating the give-and-take. If the rally managers had decided to relinquish their control of the event dialogue might have been possible. We consider these events in relation to IC pedagogy, particularly because we know the IC classroom space as one in which exchanges among students and with instructors often exemplify elements of dialogue. We question, however, if dialogue can be achieved, given the various elements that influence the instructor's ability to facilitate true dialogue.

MOVING TO IC PEDAGOGY

As John Warren (2003, 2013) and other scholars focusing on critical communication pedagogies have pointed out, pedagogies and practices that aim to challenge and dismantle power hierarchies, require a non-traditional approach, an approach that contests dominant voices and allows for marginalized voices to be heard and considered. This pedagogical goal necessitates a classroom environment that allows for dialogue—the ability to truly experience the other—to happen.

However, as instructors, creating conditions in which dialogue can emerge, is essential to critical pedagogies. Fostering a space in which dominant voices of the instructor and/or students are not dominating, but instead, are allowed to be engaged with, can create conditions for dialogue. Creating spaces in which often marginalized voices are allowed and encouraged to speak, to be heard, and to be considered, can create conditions for students to encounter, inquire, relate, and ultimately know and experience others. This can also create a space of vulnerability and risk.

Considering our own experiences and the experiences of other instructors, we will share elements that inhibit creativity, reflexivity, and dialogue and elements that might set the stage for dialogue.

Linsay Cramer graduated with a Ph.D. in May, 2017. In the fall of 2017, she began a tenure track job teaching, among other courses, intercultural communication. Alberto González received a Ph.D. in 1986 and has been teaching courses in rhetoric and intercultural communication since then.

Linsay

As a new faculty member on the tenure track, I have become increasingly aware of the efforts that my institution, as well as others, have and will engage in to measure and assess my teaching effectiveness, both those in person and online, which will then be utilized to determine if I am granted promotion to a tenured position. How high do my students rank my teaching effectiveness?

Did they perceive me as organized? Did I respond quickly enough to students' emails? Did they perceive me as available to ask questions? Did they perceive me as competent? Did they think they learned from my teaching style? Ultimately, my students' perceptions of me as an instructor as well as my teaching approach hang over my head as I put together my syllabi and plan to connect my weekly activities with the overall course objectives. In my efforts to centralize marginalized students within this process, as a woman who identifies as White, will my students who occupy dominant positionalities accuse me of favoring students of color over White students? Women over men? International students over domestic students? (the answer to that is yes, they already have). Will my students accuse me of promoting a specific liberal agenda over a conservative one because I explicitly address issues of racial and gender inequities in class? (again, yes, they already have) When students do not understand or are put off by such teaching methods that encourage them to engage in dialogue with difference, and report their dissatisfaction with my teaching style on my course evaluations, how do I proceed as a non-tenured faculty member? As a critical cultural scholar, I know that I will persist because I have entered into this profession with the exact goal of working toward social justice and equity, but I also know that I do so with one eye looking over my shoulder, curious as to what the repercussions will be for myself as a new and non-tenured faculty member.

Alberto

In their recent book on critical pedagogy, Rudick, Golsan, and Cheesewright, (2018) note that, "How you introduce and conduct discussions about privilege and oppression will have to be reflective of the relationships you have built (or not) with students . . . ." (p. 67). How students relate to me will be different from how they relate to Linsay. I am a full professor, three-time chair of my department, I've worked in the central administration of my university, I am an alumnus of the university, I am active in the community, and I grew up in the next county. How the university views my successes or failures in the classroom will be different from how Linsay's university will view her teaching performance.

But there are some things that apply to both Linsay and me that might be helpful regarding dialogue. First, it is helpful to not think of "the class" as an aggregate. The class is a collection of individual students who don't enter and leave the IC course uniformly. Some students may learn much from the class by gaining a handful of new realizations while other who already have these realizations may push to get to other topics. Differential learning by students is not (or is rarely) assessed or accounted for in teaching evaluations. But still we must come to understand and care about how each student approaches the class.

Related to this, students will be at different points in their educational journey. Some students may be ready to graduate, others might be first- or second-year students. Some students might be returning students with years of career experience and others (depending on the state) might be high school students earning college credits. When learning about cultures and difference, *one class does not have to do everything for everyone*. The class isn't a failure just because everyone doesn't "get woke." Some students may not value the class until years later. We can use our caring about student growth to encourage them to pursue projects or topics that truly excite them. We need to trust their curiosity and the admittedly short time of the semester to allow them to make the connections to social justice implications. If the curriculum is designed smartly, classes will reinforce one another so that learning is cumulative.

Relating is ongoing, relating is becoming. Sometimes students will be distant and sometimes they will show intense interest. We need to have the flexibility to adapt to fluctuations in our relationships. Despite our best efforts to practice genuine caring, not having dialogue in a class does not mean students are not learning. However, if the important elements are in place—decentralized authority, caring and trust, and free participation dialogue is likely.

***

In her book, *Community Engagement and Intercultural Praxis*, Mary Jane Collier (2014) uses the term "itinerary" to "point to movement" (p. 8). Itinerary can refer to the fluidity of cultures but it can also refer to a trajectory or path forward. Now we take up the itinerary of the critical IC pedagogue and describe how dialogue—as phantom ideal or as instructional method—orients our teaching and relating.

In the conclusion to *Performing Purity*: *Whiteness, Pedagogy, and the Reconstitution of Power*, John Warren (2003) advances implications for his own thinking rather than recommendations for classroom instructors who adopt critical pedagogy. He practiced what Mary Jane Collier calls "dialogic reflexivity" (2014, p. 14). This is the continual process of self-interrogation of values and reactions. It is also anticipation, which can take the form of imagined conversations with others in a community or in a class. Here we present some implications for our own path in teaching IC.

Linsay and Alberto

Our quest for dialogue, as an ideal and also as an instructional practice, has required that we engage in reflexive thought considering our respective positionalities and the particular ways in which our bodies as a text, as well as our performances as instructors, are read. Students initially read Linsay as

a fairly young, able-bodied, White woman. They initially read Alberto as a senior faculty member who is Latino. While these categories certainly do not describe us alone, we continuously reflect on how these subject identities, as well as those that we self-disclose to our students (i.e., being a first-generation college student or being a parent), foster or inhibit our strategies, plans, and desires for fruitful interpersonal relationships with students, as well as dialogue both within and outside of the classroom. As Ronald Jackson II (2006) argues, "The body is a social instrument that figuratively holds the projections of others in the confines of its text" (p. 7).

We also are aware of why dialogue is such a value in IC instruction. So often in earlier texts and approaches, communities were defined by detached individuals who prized objectivity and who judged communities through the values of their own dominant positions. Community residents were defined by citizenship, nationality, race or ethnicity. This reductionist approach merely reproduced ethnocentrism and stereotype. Through our own imperfect strategies, we want to acknowledge difference in the world and in the classroom through experience and engagement in our own communities.

Finally, we now consider that what dialogue looks and sounds like can depend on the relationship we have with our students. Yes, it can be loud, "uncivil" and emotional, but it can also be quiet, or online as well as face-to-face. New generations of students will have distinctive expectations and practices to which we will need to adapt. Further, given the nature of class schedules, it is possible that dialogue could extend over time, that is, across several class periods or online posts.

CONCLUSION

Rudick et al. (2018) note that, "Dialogue is an important component of any social justice project" (p. 76). Implied in dialogue is gaining access to the "limitless possibilities" in understanding and relating to others. As Collier (2014) and others have shown, the intercultural communication agenda and the social justice agenda come together when we direct our expertise and energy toward advancing the interests of co-cultures and when we reveal and subvert the practices that work to centralize power.

In this chapter, we have described various formulations of dialogue in the IC context. We have reinforced the need for dialogue but we also have reduced the pressure to create moments of dialogue. Like doing ethnographic work, and like studying culture itself, dialogue can be problematized to the point of inaction. We remain committed to the belief that if relationships are created and maintained in the IC studies, dialogue will follow.

REFERENCES

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination*: *Four essays by M.M. Bakhtin* (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Basu, T. (2015, August 9). Black Lives Matter activists disrupt Bernie Sanders speech. *TIME*. Retrieved from: http://time.com/3989917/black-lives-matter-protest-bernie-sanders-seattle/

Bradner, E. (2016, April 8). Bill Clinton spars with Black Lives Matter protestors. *CNN*. Retrieved from http://www.cnn.com/2016/04/07/politics/bill-clinton-black-lives-matter-protesters/index.html

Buber, M. (1970). *I and thou*. (W. Kaufmann, Trans). New York, NY: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Collier, M. J. (2014). *Community engagement and intercultural praxis*: *Dancing with difference in diverse contexts*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Conquergood, D. (1985). Performing as a moral act: Ethical dimensions of the ethnography of performance. *Literature in Performance*, 5(2), 1–13.

Glenister Roberts, K. (2014). *The limits of cosmopolis*: *Ethics and provinciality in the dialogue of cultures*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Jackson II, R. (2006). *Scripting the black masculine body: Identity, discourse, and racial politics in popular media*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Prosser, M. H. (1978). *The cultural dialogue: An introduction to intercultural communication*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Rudick, C. K., Golsan, K. B., & Cheesewright, K. (2018). *Teaching from the heart: Critical Communication pedagogy in the communication classroom*. San Diego, CA: Cognella

Sorrells, K., & Nakagawa, G. (2008). Intercultural communication *praxis* and the struggle for social responsibility and social justice. In O. Swartz, (Ed.), *Transformative communication studies: Culture, hierarchy and the human condition* (pp. 17–43). Leicester, UK: Troubador Press.

Warren, J. T. (2003). *Performing purity*: *Whiteness, pedagogy, and the reconstitution of power*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Warren, J. (2013). It really isn't about you: Whiteness and the dangers of thinking you got it. In T. K. Nakayama, & R. T. Halualani (Eds.), *The handbook of critical intercultural communication* (pp. 446–460). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Willink, K. G., Gutierrez-Perez, R., Shukri, S., & Stein, L. (2014). Navigating with the stars: Critical qualitative methodological constellations for critical intercultural communication research. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication*, 7(4), 289–316.

Xu, K. (2013). Theorizing difference in intercultural communication: A critical dialogic perspective. *Communication Monographs*, 80(3), 379–397.

Chapter 14

Critical Intercultural Communication Pedagogy from Within

Textualizing Intercultural and Intersectional Self-Reflexivity

Satoshi Toyosaki and Hsun-Yu (Sharon) Chuang

There are many approaches to critical intercultural communication pedagogy. Our approach takes a form of pedagogy that is "from within." By this, we mean three things: First, we need to critique and work from within institutionalized education. Second, we need to critique and work from within our relationships, organizations, and communities. Third, we need to critique and work from within our own selfhoods and intersectional identities. Our selfhoods, relationships, organizations, communities, and institutionalized educations are seamlessly connected to be situated in and render our society. Pedagogy of "from within" focuses on what we do, not what someone else does, and sees our self-reflexivity as a relational and co-constructive praxis of teaching and learning intercultural communication. Critical intercultural communication pedagogy from within understands selfhood as the most accessible focus for which we can make ourselves accountable (Toyosaki, 2012).

In this chapter, we are interested in working with intercultural and intersectional self-reflexivity from within selfhoods, relationships, organizations, communities, and institutionalized education. Reflexivity is widely spoken about but often critiqued for not developing its practices. With this goal and critique in mind, in what follows, we discuss the classroom as a site of critical labor, introduce intercultural and intersectional self-reflexivity, and give communicative texture to it as a pedagogical praxis for which we along with our students can strive in our teaching and learning.

CLASSROOM AS A SITE OF CRITICAL LABOR

Education is a culturally rich site and context to explore societies, historical institutionalizations, cultures, and people simultaneously. It helps us see how culture and power work simultaneously and often seamlessly in complex,

nuanced, and orchestrated manners at the macro-meso-micro levels. These levels all collide in education. Educational communities, such as classrooms, student organizations, committees, departments, etc., are culturally complex as people from many similar and different cultural and social paths with privileges and disadvantages come together under institutionalized education as an organizing force.

In what follows, we paint the complex picture of educational communities, especially classrooms. We start with Mohanty's (2003) words on resistance. "Resistance lies in self-conscious engagement with dominant, normative discourses and representations and in the active creation of oppositional analytic and cultural spaces" (p. 196). The focus on self is important for critical labor because power and dominance are accomplished through our everyday communication and interactions (Anderson, Bentley, Gallegos, Herr, & Saavedra, 1998). Critical selfhood emerges as an embodied cultural critique (Toyosaki, 2012) while being "constructed, maintained, and changed through narrative" (Jones & Calafell, 2012, p. 961). Critical selfhood is an analytical, performative, and narrative existence (Toyosaki, 2012) that "has qualities that reverberate across cultural, social, and political contexts" (Calafell, 2013, p. 9). On this point, Calafell asks important questions about the narrative nature of selfhood: "How does my story speak in relationship to larger stories of cultural Others . . . ? Where do the 'I' and the 'we' become separable? Do they?" (p. 9).

In classrooms, various I's and we's become re/deconstructed simultaneously while rendering various you's, they's, and it's. Critical intercultural communication pedagogy sees classrooms as a series of communicative, performative, and political interactions among people whose narrative existences, consciously or not, emerge from a culmination of various past cultural, social, political, and institutional communities of the macro, meso, and micro levels. Classroom participants' identities are, themselves, complex and often reflecting the social, cultural, economic, and global politics of power, domination, and colonization. Critical intercultural communication pedagogy treats the politics more complexly than "any simple relation of colonizer and colonized, or capitalist and worker" (Mohanty, 2003, p. 56); Such politics has been produced and reproduced through simultaneity of both privilege/disadvantage (LeMaster, 2016) and "multiple intersections of structures of power" (Mohanty, 2003, p. 56), and it is always in the status of forming in classrooms. In addition, we, both teachers and students, come from various cultural, social, political, religious, and institutional communities. This is the very reason why a classroom community can potentially function as a culturally rich site through which we can both transform education from within by transforming ourselves from within our own selfhoods and intersectional identities.

Classrooms are institutionally constructed spaces, historically reflecting dominant epistemology (Mohanty, 2003). "The curriculum tends to reflect the dominant culture (middle class, male, European-American, heterosexual, able bodied, etc.) . . . ; a hierarchical system is reproduced through the student-teacher relationships, evaluation procedures, and so on" (Anderson, Bentley, Gallegos, Herr, & Saavedra, 1998, p. 276). While classrooms consist of people who have their own unique intersectional identities, classroom communities often work in oppressive and colonial manners, reflecting the dominant culture. Historically, education has used the language of cultural compartmentalization that is based on and leads to colonializing and Othering effects (Natividad, 2014). Educational practices that reflect the dominant culture have been institutionalized and universalized simply as "educational," instead of "educational and cultural," which naturally rewards those researchers, teachers, students, and administrative staff whose intersectional identities, either entirely or partially, fit with the dominant culture.

Moreover, education, especially the banking model (Freire, 1970), has institutionalized rituals of passages (McLaren, 1999) that weed cultural differences out of many students and teachers. They experience liminal stages, driven by socially constructed fear of failing (i.e., bad grades, bad student evaluations, damaged self-esteem, etc.) and capitalistically constructed joy of succeeding (i.e., good grades, jobs, promotions, etc.). Thomassen (2015) argues that liminal experiences and passages are formative to our own individual and social identities; however, they are also "the heart of community formation" (p. 40). Our classroom interactions often translate institutionalized education's values through educational practices, passages, rituals, and community-organizing behaviors that reflect the institutionalized educational culture and, hence, the dominant culture.

Classrooms often translate power and dominance seamlessly through our communicative interactions, educational relationships, communal organizing, and knowledge transmissions and productions and simultaneously function as a pedagogical site to critique and work against and from within power and dominance. Our classrooms are messy, and if we want to work from within the messiness, we need to be self-reflexive and messy in understanding the messiness; Jones (2010) encourages us to be self-reflexive and "jump into the messiness" (p. 124). This chapter outlines one way to attempt to do so through self-reflexive teaching and learning. In what follows, we organize one way to jump into the messiness while acknowledging that delivering our chapter in a textually organized manner may reproduce the intellectual hegemony we hope to challenge. We are cautious; however, we hope that this chapter may function as a starting point to prepare us to delve into the messiness of our classrooms and our self-reflexive maneuvering in our teaching and learning.

INTERCULTURAL AND INTERSECTIONAL SELF-REFLEXIVITY

A classroom community is complex. Critical intercultural communication pedagogy works with this complexity through our reflexivity. Reflexivity, in the simplest definition, "means a turning back on oneself, a process of self-reference" (Davies, 1999, p. 4). We stand along with Boylorn and Orbe (2014), Calafell (2013), Chávez and Griffin (2011), Fassett and Warren (2007), Griffin (2012), Jones (2010), LeMaster (2016), Yep (2010), and many others who believe in power of intersectional self-reflexivity. We need to raise our consciousness to gradually understand ways through which our various positionalities concurrently work and influence each other in our everyday lives and various contexts, instead of just "list[ing] them as some sort of disclaimer" (Jones & Calafell, 2012, p. 961). Careful and complex readings of cultural politics (Atay, 2010) play a significant role in envisioning critical intercultural communication pedagogy.

Intersectional analyses and careful readings vulnerably placed upon ourselves function as a mode of intercultural dialogue and a pedagogical mechanism to help us become accountable for our own and each other's intersectional identities that are in a status of always forming in intercultural classrooms. Jones (2010) writes:

> Engaging in intersectional reflexivity requires one to acknowledge one's intersecting identities, both marginalized and privileged, and then employ self-reflexivity, which moves one beyond self-reflection to the often uncomfortable level of self-implication. (p. 122)

Jones continues, "Reflexivity got to hurt. Reflexivity is laborious" (p. 124).

Intercultural and intersectional self-reflexivity is relational and dialogical and requires "a special kind of listening" (Delpit, 1995, p. 46). It "requires not only open eyes and ears, but open hearts and minds. We do not really see through our eyes or hear through our ears, but through our beliefs" (p. 46). Delpit continues:

> It is painful as well, because it means turning yourself inside out, giving up your own sense of who you are, and being willing to see yourself in the unflattering light of another's angry gaze. It is not easy, but it is the only way to learn what it might feel like to be someone else and the only way to start the dialogue. (pp. 46–47)

Thus, intercultural and intersectional self-reflexivity is a relational commitment to one another in intercultural communication classrooms in order to open our hearts and minds and to listen and dialogue.

PEDAGOGICAL TEXTURE OF INTERCULTURAL AND INTERSECTIONAL SELF-REFLEXIVITY

Reflexivity has been discussed in various intellectual circuits; however, we often fall short in theorizing reflexive practices and strategies for teaching and learning. In what follows, we attempt to give pedagogical texture to intercultural and intersectional self-reflexivity. We offer eight aspects of intercultural and intersectional self-reflexivity. They are interrelated and overlap with each other. Also, these aspects are not exhaustive as we continue to work to understand intercultural and intersectional self-reflexivity. We are also cautious of "formulating" intercultural and intersectional self-reflexivity as we conceptualize it to be organic, creative, and contingent, instead of prescribed. However, we hope that these aspects help us engage intercultural and intersectional self-reflexivity as a pedagogical praxis in classrooms. At the end of each section below, we offer pedagogical exploration points. There are many more points we can engage from each section; however, we attempt to offer a few as a starting point.

Historicity of Identity

Historicity of our identity facilitates discussions of cultural membership from a spatial-temporal standpoint. "Historicity of identity pertains to the enactment and formation of identity under the constructs of history, space, and temporality" (Chuang, 2015, p. 4). How we recognize the historical roots and trajectories of our own identity in relation to space and time is significant to the understanding of our cultural and communal memberships. "Past historical events shape our perceptions of who we are" (Chuang, 2015, p. 5). Although historicity implies past events, Cavallaro (2001) asserts, "There is no linear progression from the past through the present to the future…. [F]uture is already buried in the past" (pp. 179–180). The identity historicity of the past, the present, and the future informs where we belong in societies, cultural groups, and communities, and how we become interpellated by and interpellate ourselves and others into discursive strategies and mechanisms we use to render cultural and communal belongings.

From multiple historical viewpoints, we need to unpack complex ways our intersectional identities have been forming contextually. Oftentimes our identities have been compartmentalized (Natividad, 2014) through learning about cultures, such as African American history, women's history, and so on, leaving out nuanced and intersectional knowing. It is important to reconstruct our history/ies both interculturally and intersectionally. No identity develops in isolation. Identities are already always relationally achieved and forming. Such a relationality is not always told as parts of the history, though, as

many historical documents are partial and represent the dominant views. The historical absence is a particular kind of presence that is violently excluded by the hegemonic discourse of representing and excluding (Gordon, 1990). Madison (2012) writes:

> While postcolonial theory examines various circumstances that constitute the present setting—settlement and dislocation, economic and material stratification, strategies of local resistance, as well as representation, identity, belonging, and expressive traditions—in order to more fully comprehend this present, postcolonial theory also examines and reenvisions history. (p. 55)

Thus, we are faced with a critical task in reengaging, rewriting, and/or reenvisioning our identity histories through our intercultural and intersectional self-reflexivity. It helps us "uncover . . . and reclaim . . . subjugated knowledges . . . to . . . claim alternative histories" (Mohanty, 2003, p. 196) about who we are/become in our intercultural classroom and who we are in the world.

Pedagogical Exploration Points

- How have our intersectional identities been forming throughout historical and present events?
- What historical texts are available or unavailable to us through our education and media to understand and explore our intersectional identities?
- How do we as intersectional beings uncover subjugated knowledges and reenvision our histories because of us and for us?
- How may our intersectional identities be compartmentalized/minimized in the context of institutionalized education?

Oppression

Jones and Calafell (2012) observe that, when the focus of critical work is placed on an individual, we oftentimes keep "systemic and institutionalized oppressive practices . . . uncritiqued" (p. 965). Focusing simultaneously on the micro-meso-macro levels of oppression is important. Capturing and critiquing one type of oppression can be misguided since no one oppressive system works by itself in its history of forming and sustaining. For example, whiteness hinges upon other oppressive systems, such as capitalism, to sustain itself (Toyosaki, 2016). The plasticity and mutability of oppression derives from the network of multiple cooperative oppressive systems that simultaneously support each other. We are situated within the network, simultaneously being privileged and disadvantaged, sometimes distinctively and other times indistinctively. Calafell (2013) writes:

> I understand lived experience through what Hill Collins . . . terms the matrix of domination that guides us to consider how we might simultaneously exist in spaces of privilege and disadvantage. These spaces, in their complexity and multiplicity, call us to be accountable to others and to ourselves in marking the workings of power. (p. 7)

Jones (2010) also argues that we need to pay vigilant attention to oppression of many groups simultaneously, instead of "cherry-picking" (p. 122). By engaging intercultural and intersectional self-reflexivity, we need to acknowledge ways in which we are complicit in mutating, guising, and regenerating oppression within the network of intersecting oppressive systems in which we coexist simultaneously as the privileged and disadvantaged. Smith (cited in Mohanty, 2003) points us to interrogate relations of ruling within social contexts of "organized practices, including government, law, business and financial management, professional organization, and educational institutions as well as discourses in texts that interpenetrate the multiple sites of power" (p. 56). Critical intercultural communication pedagogy interrogates the network of intersecting oppressive systems. Education sometimes translates power into educational practices while hinging upon other oppressive systems, such as whiteness, classism, ablism, sexism, and so on. Critical intercultural communication pedagogy is to be reflexive as well in interrogating how it reproduces oppression in an intersectional manner.

Pedagogical Exploration Points

- How are we as intersectional beings implicated in the network of oppression both as the advantaged and the disadvantaged simultaneously?
- Why is it difficult for us to be intersectionally complex and participate in class discussions about oppression with classmates?
- How and why do we compartmentalize and minimize our intersectional identities in such discussions?
- How and why do we cherry pick to fight against oppression in our everyday lives and education?

Institutional Memory

El Sawy, Gomes, and Gonzalez (1986) state, "If each individual can be his or her own historian, then it is possible to view organizations, as collectivities of individuals, as their own historians, and it is at this level that institutional memory is best understood" (p. 118). Organizations and institutions to which we belong can include corporations, educational systems, families, governments, religious groups, and/or regions of residence (El Sawy, Gomes,

and Gonzalez, 1986; Weedon, 2004). When we identify as a member of an organization or institution, we are part of the collectivities that co-create the unique institutional memories through past and present experiences, which in turn, affect future decision making of the organization. Such memories cultivate distinctive group memberships and identifications.

Institutional memories are political; so is our remembering. There is a "right" way to remember, often determined by the generational chains of the powerful members. "Wrong" ways to remember are violently excluded through various microaggressive, aggressive, informal, and formal corrective mechanisms. For example, the powerful leader says, "We have always done it this way," which forecloses conversations about innovating institutional conventions. Those who remember "wrong" about the community to which we belong experience a liminal state while being given "ritualistic passages" to be trained to be reoriented. Such reorientation renders a community or institution homogeneous through members' rememberings, which, in turn, makes it difficult for the community or institution to change when desired and necessary to grow.

Critical intercultural communication pedagogy works from within and against the institutional memory of education. This is so because U.S.-American higher education, for example, was built on a culturally exclusive foundation, and we have continuously been suffering from its legacy and residual effects. That is, we with uniquely intersectional identities remember education differently, so do/did our parents, grandparents, and great grandparents. Even today, education is critiqued for recentering the dominant culture (Anderson, Bentley, Gallegos, Herr, & Saavedra, 1998; Gordon, 1990; Jones & Calafell, 2012; Yep, 2007). Critical intercultural communication pedagogy brings Freire's (1970) vision of "education as the practice of freedom" (p. 81) by marking and challenging the hegemonic mechanisms of "right" remembering and by intentionally laboring toward making safe(r) spaces for intersectional and various rememberings of education for it to transform for the future.

Pedagogical Exploration Points

- How have our intersectional identities and/or compartmentalized identities been forming in relation to our communal and organizational affiliations and their institutional memories both inside and outside education?
- How do we cherry pick our intersectional identities to remember institutionalized education "right" in our classroom interactions?
- What microaggressive and/or aggressive strategies have been used to correct rememberings that we render from our intersectional identities? Have we used such strategies to correct Others' rememberings?

Subjectivity

To be reflexive of our own identities is essentially to study ourselves, which is often termed as "subjectivity." Cavallaro (2001), Polkinghorne (1988), and Day Sclater (2003) all indicate the processual and interactive nature of human subjectivity. According to Chuang (2015), subjectivity is relational, situational, social, and intersubjective. Giddens (1991) further claims that our subjectivity arises from our intersubjectivity. Thus, that we who are fully aware of our own subjectivity understand Others is a false consciousness as one's own subjectivity is always already relational. The relationality renders our subjectivity.

The intersubjectivity is inherently political. We make, consciously or not, some determinations depending on intercultural contexts what parts of us are desirable and not/less desirable (Anzaldúa, 1999; LeMaster, 2016). We contextually privilege some parts of us and contextually subjugate other parts of us relationally, socially, culturally, institutionally, and politically. When such privileging becomes normalized, internalized, and performatively sedimented (Butler, 1990), we reduce our complex, nuanced, and intersectional identities and relegate the importance of the relationality among various aspects of our intersectional identities.

Our intersubjective identity constructions are relational, both through our intercultural interlocutors' presence and absence. The presence and absence can be physical, conceptual, and imagined. Schrag (2003) explains the intersubjective and dialogic nature of our selfhood constructions by characterizing that the "I" and the "you" are "coemergents" (p. 125). He continues, "No 'I' is an island, entire of itself; every subject is a piece of the continent of other subjects" (p. 125). Schrag also explains the dialogical nature of intersubjectivity as thought experiment between "I" and "you." This thought experiment is situational and political. Wander (1999) explains that the "you" emerges through "an invitation which can be heard and responded to" (p. 369), and "what is negated through [the you] forms the silhouette of a Third Persona—the 'it' that . . . is objectified in a way that 'you' and 'I' are not" (p. 369). The third persona is not an interlocutor, but is the spoken about. The Third Persona is conceived as

> groups of people . . . who are to remain silent in public [and] who are not to be part of "our" audience or even be allowed to respond to what "we" say. [T]he Third Persona draws in historical reality . . . of peoples categorized according to race, religion, age, gender, sexual [orientation], and nationality. (p. 376)

In other words, the Third Persona is "the summation of all that you and I are told to avoid becoming" (p. 370).

As a result, we come to exist as subjects while rendering the "we," which is a summation of "I" and "you," and the "they," the objectified absent Others who are not "invited" to actively participate in our relational coemerging as

subjects. The "we" often assumes the consensual agreement in reproducing comfortable dialogical partners for each other. Acknowledging and critiquing the absence and our own objectification helps us interrogate how the social and educational landscapes in which we are situated are limiting in terms of cultural diversity, how we are becoming complicit in conditioning and making such exclusive social and educational landscapes for Others, and what self-(re)centering manners we construct our own subjectivity with comfortable interlocutors in our everyday lives and education.

Pedagogical Exploration Points

- What aspects of our identities do we elect as desirable and undesirable during our classroom interactions?
- When we discuss power, privilege, and oppression, what kind of speaking-listening (first-person plural) subjectivity do we construct while simultaneously constructing the objectified/third-person Others?
- How can we (re)envision an inclusive classroom discussion where we can be intersectionally present for each other?

Codes and Rituals

Our cultural and communal memberships are germane to the use of symbolic codes, such as speech codes, semiotic codes, and language choices (Chuang, 2015). In speech codes theory (Philipsen, Coutu, & Covarrubias, 2005), speech codes stand for the systematic, culturally and socially constructed communicative patterns, rituals, and ways of speaking in a speech community (Philipsen, 1975). According to Leeds-Hurwitz (1993), a semiotic code is a group of patterned signs which systematically carries significant meaning which may be interpreted differently by different groups of users. The meanings of a semiotic code are subject to change in that interpretations of a sign can sometimes vary widely, especially because signs are ambiguous and arbitrary. As a semiotics code, the language(s) we speak is the most common model (Leeds-Hurwitz, 1993). If we are capable of conforming to, recognizing, and performing the significant symbolic codes of a cultural group, such as speaking the same language, then it is likely that we can exchange meanings and messages and acquire cultural memberships. As Chuang (2015) summarizes, "Having the ability to competently conform to and perform symbolic codes in a culture/community renders epistemological exclusivity and intimacy that differentiates inside from outside members" (p. 7).

Here lies the importance of approaching speech codes—symbolic, communicative, and performative—critically in relation to envisioning intercultural and intersectional self-reflexivity in educational contexts. Delpit

(1995) writes, "There are codes or rules for participating in power" and "the rules of the culture of power are a reflection of the rules of the culture of those who have power" (p. 24). Our teaching and learning of such rules of power are often ritualized (McLaren, 1999) within and through our educational practices. "Ritual is not about how we decorate reality; it is about that reality . . . [Rituals forms] mold and shape human beings going through liminal experiences" (Thomassen, 2015, pp. 40–41). For example, Nakayama and Krizek (1995) explain whiteness as strategic rhetoric; "Whatever 'whiteness' really means is constituted only through the rhetoric of whiteness" (p. 293). That is, a dominant ideology becomes dominant within and through its logical and communicative dominance and by dominating, delegitimizing, and subjugating Other sense-making processes and communicative codes. Education often participates in such standardization of the dominant codes through ritualizing teaching and learning. Such communicative dominance forecloses our intercultural and intersectional thinking about our own identities and our relationships with others. We are complicit with the communicative dominance sometimes as educators, researchers, and students and other times as people who seek for more power, safety, security, and recognition in our everyday lives.

We understand that such cherry-picking and working against power are strategies for survival; however, critical intercultural communication pedagogy promotes intercultural and intersectional self-reflexivity that helps us understand the political nature of various codes functioning simultaneously to sustain the institutional education that privileges the mainstream cultural logics and codes. Hooks (1994) explains the critical focus on cultural codes when we transform our education to be "a place for multicultural learning" (p. 41). We need to acknowledge and appreciate different cultural codes. She goes on, "To teach effectively a diverse student body, I have to learn these codes. And so do students. This act alone transforms a classroom" (p. 41). Thus, critical intercultural communication pedagogy should not aim at standardizing communicative codes as a set of educational practices. Our identities are intersectional. What can catch and house our intersectional identities are intersectional modes of communicating, rather than a singular oppressive mode of communicating.

Pedagogical Exploration Points

- On the individual level, how do we acquire and let go of certain cultural and communicative codes in order to obtain more power, dominance, and privilege? What does this mean to our intersectional identities?
- What cultural and communicative codes and rituals do we observe that lead us to success in education?
- What communication styles do we create, invent, and/or employ to house and represent our intersectional identities?

Agency

Critical intercultural communication pedagogy assumes the position where we need to interrogate and critique unjust educational and social practices through our active intercultural and intersectional self-reflexivity. Critical intercultural communication pedagogy encourages us to take a stance and act against and from within to challenge socially unjust practices when we can. Institutionalized education may work, even critical work in which we hope to take part, may reproduce social injustice, normalcy, and power. Richardson and Villenas (2000), for example, argue that we often regenerate Eurocentrism (i.e., a specific version of democracy and ethics) in our everyday work of transforming our educational practices. Spivak (2005) writes about a notion and practice of "agency" and its close connection to "institutional validation" (p. 481), specifically problematizing "reproductive heteromormativity as the broadest global institution" (p. 481). Toyosaki (2008) observes ways in which whiteness becomes regenerated in agency claims and performances of speakers who wish to work against racial injustice in education at one public forum.

Critical intercultural communication pedagogy promotes our critical engagements with social, cultural, and political issues we experience both within and outside education. However, it also asks us to further interrogate how limited manners—both interculturally and intersectionally—we engender our agentic actions in our educational and everyday lives. When we see social injustice as the "it," the objectified phenomenon, we might fail in recognizing our own accountability. Such self-distancing rhetorically creates the separation between the "we" and the "it"/the "they." The "we" are the people who are "dreamed by an advocate and infused with an artificial, rhetorical reality by the agreement of an audience to participate in a collective fantasy" (McGee, 1999, p. 343) and who "justify political philosophies . . . . [The "we" is] an idea of collective force which transcends both individuality and reason" (p. 343). Thus, critical intercultural communication pedagogy asks us to examine the ways through which we construct the "we" in producing our agentic actions and how such actions become legible through "institutional validation" (Spivak, 2005, p. 481).

Some parts of our intersectional identities and some people are not invited to participate in the collective identity to claim agency on behalf of their own intersectional identities, themselves, and Others. Gordon (1990) describes academia as "a world where the unthought is violently expelled" (p. 494). Furthermore, reflecting upon the Foucauldian view of society, Ward (2003) writes, "Society defines itself by what it excludes . . . . Discourses are the systems of exclusion and categorization upon which society depends" (p. 144). Thus, critical intercultural communication pedagogy asks us to continue interrogating our own agency and critical labor that we engender while opening,

transforming, renewing, and/or challenging the exclusive communities to which we belong and diagnosing the communicative dominance within them.

Pedagogical Exploration Points

- How do we compartmentalize and categorize oppression and injustice when they are already always intersectional? What does such compartmentalization accomplish?
- How can we be intersectional selves in working against intersectional oppression and injustice?
- What can we do to make sure that our critical labor does not exclude and/or objectify Others?

Resistance

Szakolczai (2015) explains the etymological root of "critique" and "crisis." They are related. "Crisis denotes a dramatized version of transition" (p. 28). Oftentimes, "critique" has a bad name and is met by communal resistance. This is so specifically because critique threatens the powerful, to whom the rules of communities adhere (Delpit, 1995). Furthermore, "those with power are frequently least aware of—or least willing to acknowledge—its existence. Those with less power are often most aware of its existence" (p. 24). Specifically discussing whiteness, Bonilla-Silva (2003) explains that "the beauty of this new ideology is that it aids in the maintenance of white privilege without fanfare, without naming those who it subjects and those who it rewards" (pp. 3–4). Anderson, Bentley, Gallegos, Herr, and Saavedra (1998) observe probably what many of us do in our everyday critical labor; "Authentic engagement in critical classrooms is difficult to foster because it tends to interrupt the privilege of those who are used to wielding power in social interactions in all arenas, including classrooms" (p. 275). When critique is pressed, the powerful are placed in the liminal, transitional, and uncomfortable state where they experience "the weakening and eventual suspension of the ordinary, taken-for-granted structures of life" (Szakoiczai, 2015, p. 28). Critique relates to crisis.

In this backlash (Anderson, Bentley, Gallegos, Herr, & Saavedra, 1998), we resist resistance. Through our strategically planned or naturally occurring identity performance and colonial compartmentalization of the Others, we orchestrate our backlash against critique. Bush (2004) writes, "*Resistance is stigmatized, marginalized, and racialized*, with the ultimate message that things are the way they are because that's the way they should be and they won't and can't change" (p. 231, *italic in original*). Discussing how whiteness works, Bonilla-Silva (2003) writes, "Shielded by color blindness, whites

can express resentment toward minorities; criticize their morality, values and work ethics; and even claim to be victims of 'reverse racism'" (p. 4).

We stigmatize even more, marginalize even more, and racialize even more violently those who critique us, the powerful, through strategizing and orchestrating the backlash against them. Sometimes we backlash with careful planning; other times, we backlash with intuitive teamwork. We disguise our backlash. Sometimes we observe that "this disguised racism can manifest in the classroom through students who deny the existence of racism, citing as proof that an African American man has been elected president" (Jones & Calafell, 2012, p. 965). Other times, such a disguise can take a form of "a discourse of 'harmony in diversity'" (Mohanty, 2003, p. 193). Mohanty critically asks what kind of difference we acknowledge in education. She writes, "Difference seen as benign variation (diversity), for instance, rather than as conflict, struggle, or the threat of disruption, bypasses power as well as history to suggest a harmonious, empty pluralism" (p. 193). She further explains that "difference defined as asymmetrical and incommensurate cultural spheres situated within hierarchies of domination and resistance cannot be accommodated within a discourse of 'harmony in diversity'" (p. 193). "Harmony" is power-laden and reproductive, like comfort, and can work violently against those who are deemed "different." Whose harmony, and whose comfort? Here we authors are not suggesting to become inharmonic, but we hope to engage and work differently with harmony as a more inclusive, less hierarchical, and continuously reflexive cultural practice.

We experience critique/crisis in complex and various manners since our identities are intersectionally constructed both with privileges and disadvantages. Anderson, Bentley, Gallegos, Herr, and Saavedra (1998) observe, "While mostly those who belong to dominant groups engage in this backlash, increasingly those from non-dominant groups are identifying with the interests of dominant groups" (p. 276). Relating West (1992, cited in Norton, 1997), Norton explains desire and identity formation/performing. The desire for recognition, affiliation, and security and safety helps form our identities, and such desires are often connected with capitalistic and material resources. Thus, backlashing against critique often manifests as cooptation of the marginalized via capitalistic persuasion while the marginalized may not have other choices of survival and may choose, either strategically or not, to affiliate themselves with the dominant and to minimize their intersectional identities. For example, Toyosaki (2008) observes that students increasingly use the socioeconomic-only lens to make sense of their experience with social injustice, instead of a race, race-and-class, or intersectional lens. Such a minimizing effect of our intersectional identities oftentimes assists one oppressive ideology (i.e., whiteness) in hiding behind and upholding another (i.e., capitalism).

Harmony is not a problem; how we conceptualize and practice it as a rationale for excluding difference may be problematic. Our lack of reflexivity is not a problem as we are all incomplete and partial in our own identities. It is our refusal to engage reflexive dialogue with our own continuously changing intersectional selves and intersectional others. Harmony should not be reproductive, restorative, exclusive, and stagnant. Such a conception damages our own growth as social beings. Harmony is to be continuously transformative since those who are in harmony are to be continuously transformative as we explore our intersectional identities and as we encounter Others who explore their intersectional identities.

Pedagogical Exploration Points

- Why do we resist critique, and why do we welcome critique? What critique do we resist and welcome?
- How do we critique or resist changing some hegemonic cultural and educational practices in our classroom? How do we compartmentalize and/or minimize our intersectional identities in critiquing and resisting resistance?
- How do we envision transformative harmony for our class community?

Relating

Warren (2011a) writes, "Reflexivity cannot be done alone" (p. 141; also cited in Calafell, 2013). In the very complex and simplest sense, we are all incomplete and partial in understanding how our intersectional identities have been and will be forming, how our communities have been and will be forming, how domination started and continues to exist, and how we make sense of the world in which we coexist interculturally and intersectionally. "Bakhtin argues that consciousness is impossible without Other. Persons can never see themselves as a whole; Other is necessary to give us—to author—our consciousness" (Baxter & Akkoor, 2008, p. 25). Bakhtin (1990) offers that we are dialogically constructed since we see different things differently and uniquely. I/we lack your/their ways to seeing; you/they lack my/our ways of seeing. "If we wish to overcome this lack, we try to see what is there together" (Holquist, 1990, p. xxvi). So, we need relationships that help us become more aware of the world and less complicit with social injustice which we are situated to live with, elect to live with, and/or make a choice to work against.

Not only seeing ourselves as dialogical constructs, we need to engage in dialogues with Others as "the means as much as the end of honest intercultural understanding" (Conquergood, 1985, p. 10). Through dialoging, we "can question, debate, and challenge one another. It is a kind of performance

that resist conclusion, it is intensely committed to keeping the dialogue between performer and text open and ongoing" (Conquergood, 1985, p. 9). Relating Conquergood's dialogical performance, Calafell (2013) writes,

> I wonder if we might push ourselves toward a new level of vulnerability . . . driven by love, driven by relationality, and an ethic of care. A vulnerability, love, and care that allows us not only to see our reflection in the "I", but also in a "we" that may be based in an Otherness that is not our own. (p. 11)

Being dialogical in our own intersectional learning of our own intersectional identities through dialoguing with Others means that we are always already in a liminal state. We can be liminal "when previous certainties have been at least partially dissolved by a move 'to the limit'" (Szaklcazai, 2015, p. 29). The ambivalence that derives from and conditions our liminal intersectional identity-forming begs us to be creative and innovative in renewing our own intersectional identities and the communities, organizations, and institutions within which we coexist with Others. Jumping in such a messy formative state makes us anxious and nervous. It makes us struggle; we choose to struggle. Refusing to struggle is to stay in stagnation while the world is continuously moving and changing. We struggle in love with Others through our intercultural and intersectional self-reflexivity for ourselves and Others. Szakolczai (2015) writes:

> The formative power of liminality can be well illustrated through the phenomenon of love, which appears not inside one person as a "subject" towards another person as the "object," but exactly in the "in between." To put it as clearly as possible: it is not the "I" that loves the "you"; rather it is the "it," the love itself that emerges in between two human beings, forming and transforming both . . . . (p. 30)

Reflexivity is found in the love that is in the "in between" us.

While aiming to be in love of the "in between," we need to be further cautious since this relationality is not power neutral. Intercultural relationality is always already political (Halualani, Mendoza, & Drzewiecka, 2009). Anderson, Bentley, Gallegos, Herr, and Saavedra (1998) claim that the student-teacher relationships reproduce an educational and cultural hierarchy. Reflexivity practiced in classrooms are more than likely power laden; however, we need to continue to be creative in struggling with, within, and against the institutionalized power bestowed upon our professions and social roles. We are critical intercultural communication pedagogues.

Critical intercultural communication pedagogy asks us to engage, develop, and nurture relationships through our intercultural and intersectional self-reflexivity to renew our communities, organizations, and institutions.

However, we authors feel that critical intercultural communication pedagogy also has to teach us that sometimes it is important to run away and retreat to safety, if possible, which is privilege itself however. When continuing to stay in an inhabitable relationship, community, organization, and/or institution damages our physical and psychological beings, we sometimes need to be brave to run away and find other places and other ways to engage our critical work through our educational and everyday lives.

Pedagogical Exploration Points

- What relational experiences have we had that helped us realize that our identities are, indeed, intersectional and incomplete?
- How do our intersectional and liminal beings assist us to be creative and innovative in teaching and learning about dominance, power, and injustice?
- How can we as intersectional beings achieve open relational dialogues in classroom?
- What does it mean for us as intersectional and incomplete beings to nurture love and care in the "in between"?

CLOSING

In this chapter, we have discussed several ways to give texture to intercultural and intersectional self-reflexivity. Above, we have identified eight particular aspects that we can engage simultaneously in critical intercultural communication pedagogy and on which we can mount our self-reflexive labor in our teaching and learning. They are: historicity of identity, oppression, institutional memory, subjectivity, codes and rituals, agency, resistance, and relating. We reiterate that these aspects and their pedagogical exploration points are not exhaustive as we see intercultural and intersectional self-reflexivity is contextual and contingent. However, we hope these are helpful in giving pedagogical texture to self-reflexivity as concrete communicative acts that help build inclusive, transformative, harmonious, and critical communities in our classrooms.

We share a vision of community (i.e., classroom community) with Warren (2011b) when he writes, "Social justice is about love, about leading with a critically engaged love that seeks not just community, but community with a purpose, a goal, a hope, a vision of equality that trumps hate and division" (p. 30). Intercultural and intersectional self-reflexivity is one of many pedagogical ingredients that help us envision and work toward justice-oriented classroom communities that connect like "rich parches of rhizomes" (Jones, 2010, p. 124) in our institutionalized and neoliberal education. Intercultural and intersectional self-reflexivity helps us catch power in its seamless

maneuvering, slippery texturing, and messy marking by being complex, contextual, contingent, nuanced, interdisciplinary, and rhizomatic in critiquing and working from within our own selfhoods, relationships, classrooms, and education.

When it comes to intercultural and intersectional self-reflexivity and community-making, we often think that success can be a dangerous pedagogical concept. No one can conduct "perfect" and "correct" self-reflexivity to understand ourselves. It is an ongoing process. No one sees the world holistically simply because we cannot encounter everyone in the world. We are meant to fail. We are all partial, and we need each other to make a bit more sense of the world in which we coexist, one conversation at a time, one encounter with another person at a time, one relationship at a time, one community at a time, and one classroom at a time. In our attempt to make sense of the world collaboratively through intercultural and intersectional self-reflexivity and dialogues with Others that do not conclude, we fail to make sense of the world that we share and make sure to be accountable for our collaborative failing. Failing is productive (LeMaster, 2016). We work together to fail differently one conversation at a time, one encounter at a time, one relationship at a time, one community at a time, and one classroom at a time. Intercultural and intersectional self-reflexivity is a relational commitment for making livable spaces for people to gather, fail together differently, and grow for one another. This may be a journey without success and answers, but for this journey we can make livable spaces for us to come together and shape the spaces in which we coexist. We find hope in and because of our incompleteness.

REFERENCES

Anderson, G., Bentley, M., Gallegos, B., Herr, K., & Saavedra, E. (1998). Teaching within/against the backlash. In R. Chávez Chávez & J. O'Donnell (Eds.), *Speaking the unpleasant: The politics of (non)engagement in the multicultural education terrain* (pp. 274–323). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Anzaldúa, G. (1999). *Borderlands* = La Frontera. San Francisco, CA: Aunt Lute Books.

Atay, A. (2010). Touch of pink: Diasporic queer experiences within Islamic communities. In S. Habib (Ed.), *Islam and homosexuality* (pp. 445–462). Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1990). *Art and answerability: Early philosophical essays* (M. Holquist & V. Liapunov, Eds.; V. Liapunov & K. Brostrom, Trans.). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Baxter, L. A., & Akoor, C. (2008). Aesthetic love and romantic love in close relationships. In K. G. Roberts & R. C. Arnett (Eds.), *Communication ethics: Between cosmopolitanism and provinciality* (pp. 23–46). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2003). *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in the United States*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Boylorn, R. M., & Orbe, M. (Eds.). (2014). *Critical autoethnography: Intersecting cultural identities in everyday life*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Bush, M. E. L. (2004). *Breaking the code of good intentions: Everyday forms of whiteness*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Calafell, B. M. (2013). (I)dentities: Considering accountability, reflexivity, and intersectionality in the I and the We. *Liminalities: A Journal of Performance Studies,* 9(2), 6–13.

Cavallaro, D. (2001). *Critical and cultural theory*. London: The Athlone Press.

Chávez, K. R., & Griffin, C. I. (Eds.). (2011). *Standing in the intersection: Feminist voices, feminist practices in communication studies*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Chuang, H.-Y. S. (2015). Complete-member ethnography: Epistemological intimacy, complete-membership, and potentials in critical communication research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods,* 14(4), 1–11.

Chuang, H.-Y. S. (2017a). The discursive pushes and pulls of K-pop and J-pop in Taiwan: Cultural homogenization and identity co-optation. In S. Toyosaki & S. Eguchi (Eds.), *Intercultural communication in Japan: Theorizing homogenizing discourse* (pp. 101–113). New York, NY: Routledge.

Chuang, H.-Y. S. (2017b). *Identity management politics in glocalized English hegemony: Cultural struggles, facework strategies, and intercultural relationships in Taiwanese English education* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Southern Illinois University Carbondale, Carbondale, IL.

Conquergood, D. (1985). Performing as a moral act: Ethical dimensions of the ethnography of performance. *Literature in Performance,* 5, 1–13.

Dauenhauer, B. P. (2002). Schrag and the self. In B. Beck Matustik & W. L. McBride, *Calvin O. Schrag and the task of philosophy after postmodernity* (pp. 152–164). Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Davies, C. A. (1999). *Reflexive ethnography: A guide to researching selves and others*. London, UK: Routledge.

Day Sclater, S. (2003). What is the subject? *Narrative Inquiry,* 13(2), 317–330.

Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York, NY: The New Press.

Diversi, M., & Moreira, C. (2009). *Betweener talk: Decolonizing knowledge production, pedagogy, and praxis*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

El Sawy, O. A., Gomes, G. M., & Gonzalez, M. V. (1986). Preserving institutional memory: The management of history as an organizational resource. *Academy of Management Best Papers Proceedings,* 1986(1), 118–122.

Fassett, D. L., & Warren, J. T. (2007). *Critical communication pedagogy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M. B. Ramos, Trans.). New York, NY: The Seabury Press.

Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and self-identity: Self and society in the late modern age*. Stanford, CT: Stanford University Press.

Gordon, A. (1990). Feminism, writing, and ghosts. *Social Problems,* 37(4), 485–500.

Griffin, R. A. (2012). I AM an angry Black woman: Black feminist autoethnography, voice, and resistance. *Women's Studies in Communication,* 35(2), 138–157.

Halualani, R. T., Mendoza, S. L., & Drzewiecka, J. A. (2009). "Critical" junctures in intercultural communication studies: A review. *The Review of Communication,* 9(1), 17–35.

Holquist, M. (1990). Introduction: The architectonics of answerability. In M. M. Bakhtin, *Art and answerability: Early philosophical essays* (M. Holquist & V. Liapunov, Eds.; V. Liapunov & K. Brostrom, Trans.) (pp. ix–xlvi). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Hooks, B. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Educating as the practice of freedom*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Jones, R. G., Jr. (2010). Putting privilege into practice through "intersectional reflexivity:" Ruminations, interventions, and possibilities. *Reflections: Narratives of Professional Helping,* 16(1), 122–125.

Jones, R. G., Jr., & Calafell, B. M. (2012). Contesting neoliberalism through critical pedagogy, intersectional reflexivity, and personal narrative: Queer tales of academia. *Journal of Homosexuality,* 59(7), 957–981.

Leeds-Hurwitz, W. (1993). *Semiotics and communication: Signs, codes, cultures*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

LeMaster, B. (2016). *Queer intersectionality: Queering the limits of identity studies in critical intercultural communication research* (unpublished doctoral dissertation). Southern Illinois University Carbondale, Carbondale IL.

Madison, D. S. (2012). *Critical ethnography: Methods, ethics, and performance* (2nd ed). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

McLaren, P. (1999). *Schooling as a ritual performance: Toward a political economy of educational symbols and gestures* (3rd ed). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Mohanty, C. T. (2003). *Feminism without borders: Decolonizing theory, practicing solidarity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Natividad, N. D. (2014). The walking of words: Third World feminism and the reimagining of resistance by indigenous communities. ALTER*NATIVE: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples,* 10(3), 232–247.

Nakayama, T. K., & Krizek, R. L. (1995). Whiteness: A strategic rhetoric. *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* 81, 291–309.

Norton, B. (1997, Autumn). Language, identity, and the ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly,* 31(3), 409–429.

Philipsen, G. (1975). Speaking "like a man" in Teamsterville: Culture patterns of role enactment in an urban neighborhood. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 61(1), 13–22.

Philipsen, G., Coutu, L. M., & Covarrubias, P. (2005). Speech codes theory: Restatement, revisions, and response to criticisms. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Theorizing about intercultural communication* (pp. 55–68). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Polkinghorne, D. E. (1988). *Narrative knowing and human sciences*. Albany: The State University of New York Press.

Richardson, T., & Villenas, S. (2000). "Other" encounters: Dances with whiteness in multicultural education. *Education Theory,* 50(2), 255–273.

Schrag, C. O. (1997). *The self after postmodernity*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Schrag, C. O. (2003). *Communicative praxis and the space of subjectivity*. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press.

Smith, C. (2005). Epistemological intimacy: A move to autoethnography. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods,* 4(2), 1–7.

Spivak, G. C. (2005). Scattered speculations on the subaltern and the popular. *Postcolonial Studies,* 8(4), 457–486.

Szakolczai, A. (2015). Liminality and experience: Structuring transitory situations and transformative events. In A Horvath, B. Thomassen, & H. Wydra (Eds.), *Breaking boundaries: Varieties of liminality* (pp. 11–38). New York, NY: Berghahn.

Thomassen, B. (2015). Thinking with liminality: To the boundaries of an anthropological concept. In A. Horvath, B. Thomassen, & H. Wydra (Eds.), *Breaking boundaries: Varieties of liminality* (pp. 39–58). New York, NY: Berghahn.

Toyosaki, S. (2008). The politics of social agency in racialized educational discourse. In M. J. Coullier (Ed.), *The International and Intercultural Communication Annual,* 31, 255–278.

Toyosaki, S. (2012). Praxis-oriented autoethnography: Performing critical selfhood. In N. Bardhan & M. P. Orbe (Eds.), *Identity research and communication: Intercultural reflections and future directions* (pp. 239–251). Lanham, MD: Lexington.

Toyosaki, S. (2016). Praxis-oriented whiteness research. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses,* 11(3), 243–261.

Wander, P. (1999). The third persona: An ideological turn in rhetorical theory. In J. L. Lucaites, C. M. Condit, & S. Caudill (Eds.), *Contemporary rhetorical theory: A reader* (pp. 357–387). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Ward, G. (2003). *Teach yourself: Postmodernism*. Chicago, IL: Contemporary Books.

Warren, J. T. (2011a). Reflexive teaching: Toward critical autoethnographic practices off/in/on pedagogy. *Cultural Studies Critical Methodologies,* 11, 130–144.

Warren, J. T. (2011b). Social justice and critical/performative/communicative pedagogy: A storied account of research, teaching, love, identity, desire, and loss. *International Review of Qualitative Research,* 4, 21–33.

Weedon, C. (2004). *Identity and culture: Narratives of difference and belonging*. New York, NY: Open University Press.

Yep, G. A. (2007). Pedagogy of the opaque: The subject of whiteness in communication and diversity courses. In L. M. Cooks & J. S. Simpson (Eds.), *Dis/placing race: Whiteness, pedagogy, performance* (pp. 87–110). Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Yep, G. A. (2010). Toward the de-subjugation of racially marked knowledges in communication. *Southern Communication Journal,* 75(2), 171–175.

Index

African-Americans:
stereotyping, 66, 104, 144–45, 155
agency, 23, 238–39
aggrieved entitlement, 53–56
Alexander, B. K., 17
Alexander, M. J., 132
anger:
productive/generative power of, 52, 53, 59
Anzaldúa, G., 52, 56
Arnett, R. C., 30, 33
autoethnography, xiii, 97–98
account of interracial communication class, 140–44
Ayers, R., 99
Ayers, W., 99

Bakhtin, M., 218
basal whiteness, xiv, 116;
content and process of, 122–31;
implications of, 132–34;
notion of, 117, 131
becoming, 130–32;
and basal whiteness, 127, 132–34
Black Lives Matter, 220–22
Black physicality, 145, 147–48
Bowling Green State University, 142
Britt, L., 39
Buber, M., 218

Carey, J. W., 32
CCP. *See* critical communication pedagogy
CFCP. *See* critical feminist communication pedagogy
Cheng, H. I., 21
CICP. *See* critical intercultural communication pedagogy
cissexism:
cultural performance of, 87–90, 94;
notion of, 87;
and racism, 89–90
classroom:
and constructivist approach to identity, 18–79;
and critical feminist communication pedagogy, 209–12, 212n6, 213n7;
and critical labor, 227–30;
cultural codes and communication in, 11;
as cultural space, 24;
diversity and differences in, 19, 54–55, 212;
dominant culture in, 229;
ideal/perfect, 104–5, 108;
monist approach in, 199;
participation and silence in, 20, 119;
shift from “safe space” to “brave space”, 103–4;

as space for critical dialogue, 195–96;
as space for social justice activism pedagogy, xii, 27–28
Clinton, B., 221–22
Cohen, C., 60
Collier, M. J., 224
Collins, P. H., 198
colorblindness, 118, 119, 120
communication:
communal aspects of, 32–33;
is contested, 14, 22–24;
is contiguous, 14, 20–22;
is contingent, 13–14, 18–19;
guiding principles of, 12–14;
skills, 207
communication activism pedagogy:
ethics of, 32–35
communication activism research:
first-person accountability, 38;
knowledge/action divide, 37, 38;
communication education, 15
communication ethics, 32–35
communication ethics literacy:
Arnett's model, 33
community service-learning (CSL), 39
compassion, 55
conflict:
costs and rewards, 139–40;
in interracial communication class, 108–9, 145–46;
and performance of whiteness, 123–31;
role in critical love, 49, 60
Conquergood, D., 218
contact, 29
contextual communication ethics, 33
control, 29
Crabtree, R. D., 199
crisis, 239, 240
critical communication pedagogy (CCP), vii, 12, 17–18;
characteristics of, 200;
commitments of, viii, 16;
"critical" in, 98;
definition of, 98, 99;
evolution of, 14–16;
and identity, 18–19, 83, 93;
"pedagogy" in, 99;
as praxis, 106, 181–82;
and process of becoming, 130–31;
and taboo topics, 98–101
critical consciousness, 130
critical feminist communication pedagogy (CFCP), xv, 196;
classroom strategies, 205–6;
and intercultural dialogue, 201–4;
notion of, 201;
and student-teacher relationship, 206–9
critical intercultural communication activism pedagogy:
ethics of, xii, 35–40
critical intercultural communication pedagogy (CICP), ix–xi, 3–4, 12, 181–82;
"critical" in, xii, 4–5, 7–8, 17;
doing, xiii;
from within, xv, 227;
and identity, 19;
locating, xii, 16–18;
notion of, 17;
paradigm shifts in, 29–30;
scholarship/studies on, viii–ix;
theories of, xiv–xv;
understanding through, xiv
critical love:
as intercultural pedagogic approach, 59–61;
notion of,51;
and queerness, 51–53, 55–56, 58–60;
role of conflict in, 49, 60;
in student-teacher relationships, xiii, 50–51
critical reflexivity, 171–73
critique, 239, 240
CSL. *See* community service-learning
cultural identities, 29, 181;
and new media technologies, 185–86
culture:

and classroom communication, 11;
codes and rituals, 236–37;
and communication contiguity, 20–22;
of dissent, x–xi;
notion of, 22–23

Davies, C. A., 230
Davis, O. I., 17
decolonization:
and ethnoautobiography, 72–73
deconstruction:
in classrooms, 228;
and dialogue, 200
democratic communication ethics, 33, 35–36
De Welde, K., 199
Dewey, J., 196–97, 200, 212
dialogic communication ethics, 33–35, 41–42
dialogic reflexivity, 224
dialogue:
characteristics of, 219–20;
and contemporary classrooms, 196–97;
and critical communication pedagogy, viii, 99–101, 200;
and critical feminist communication pedagogy, 201–5;
and intercultural communication, xv, 166, 196, 217, 222–24;
and mediated critical intercultural communication, 189;
notion of, 218–19;
and recognition, 34;
and self-reflexivity, 241–42;
and social justice, 32–33, 35–36;
and taboo topics, 102, 108–9, 140
difference(s):
bridging, 54–57;
in capitalist culture, 90–93;
in classroom, 19;
grounding of ethics in, 30, 34
digitalization:
of everyday lives, 179–80, 185–87
dissemination, 34
dissent:
public culture of, x–xi
Diversi, M., 31
double-consciousness, 151–51

EA. *See* ethnoautobiography
Ellwanger, A., 119, 120
emotional labor:
and interracial communication pedagogy, 145, 148–50, 154–53
ethics:
of communication activism, 32–35;
of critical intercultural communication activism, xii, 35–40;
notion of, 30–31
Ethiopia, 164–63
ethno-accounting, 73
ethnoautobiography (EA), xiii, 65;
as pedagogical approach for multiculturalism, 71–74, 77–78;
in practice, 74–77

faculty of color, 50–51;
challenges and experiences, 53, 66–68, 138–39, 147–48
Fassett, D. L., 15–16, 83, 98, 99, 103, 106, 200, 201, 212n6
feminist pedagogy, 197;
notion of, 199, 212n1
Foote, N., 199
Fraser, N., 34
Freire, P., 24, 98, 99, 130, 182

gender identity, 88–92;
disclosure of, 103–4, 107
Gorski, Paul, 6–7
Griffin, R., 51

Habermas, Jürgen, 33
Halberstam, J., 85, 120
Halualani, R. T., 21
Handbook of Critical Intercultural Communication, 4
Hardie, C. D., 197

harmony, 240–41
Hayford, M., 199
hegemonic ideology, 164–65, 167;
and academia, xi, 19
historical trauma:
and ethnoautobiography, 71–77;
and Mendoza, 68–70;
White students' engagement with, 66–68
history:
intercultural encounters, 67–68, 164–66;
shadow material, 72, 77
Honneth, A., 34
Hooks, B., 50, 57
Hull, G. T., 198–99

identity(ies):
and agency, 23;
of classroom participants, 228;
as communication construct, 18–19, 21,93;
and critical communication pedagogy,83;
cultural identities, 29, 181, 185–86;
formation of, 240;
historicity of, 231–32;
intersectionality of, 143, 144–47, 197–99;
marginalized identities, xiii, 117–20
identity politics, 145–47
interactivity:
and new media technologies, 186–87, 191
intercultural communication, 161–62, 169–71;
critical pedagogical intervention, 166–68;
and dialogue, 166, 196, 217, 222–24;
and media studies, 180;
pedagogical challenges, 162–64;
skills/application focus of, 5–7
intercultural education, 6–7
intercultural encounters, 67–68, 163;
complexity of, 164–66;
and mediated intercultural communication, 187
institutional memory, 233–34
instructional communication, 14–15
insulted narcissism, 53–56
Internet:
positive and negative outcomes of, 185–86
interracial communication, 18, 137,156;
autoethnographic account of, 140–44;
and dialogue, 108–9;
ethnoautobiography pedagogic approach to, 74–77;
misperceptions about, 141;
pedagogic challenges and dilemmas, 27–28, 42, 138–40, 142;
pedagogic strategic interventions, 151–55;
students' resistance to, 41, 108, 139, 145, 150–51;
White students' resistance to, 75–76, 108–9, 118–20, 145–47, 239–40
intersectional and intercultural self-reflexivity, xv, 83, 230, 243–244;
pedagogical aspects, 231–42
intersectionality:
of identity, 60, 143–47;
of oppression, 88–89, 144, 202–4;
of women's identity, 197–99
intersectional reflexivity, 83, 92–93, 230

Jackson-Paton, R., 73

Keating, A., 201–2, 212n4
Kremer, J., 73, 74
Krizek, R. L., 116–18, 127

Leeds-Hurwitz, W., 236
LeMaster, B. H., 23
Lewis, A. E., 118
Licona, A. C., 199
liminality, 229, 242
listening, 205–6, 210
Lorde, A., 52, 90, 198
Luft, R., 198

Martin, J. N., 17
MCICP. *See* critical intercultural communication pedagogy
media convergence, 179
media literacy, 183–84;
and critical intercultural communication, 188
mediated critical intercultural communication pedagogy (MCICP), xv, 180–81, 184–86;
aims of, 187, 191–92
mediated pedagogy, 182–84
mediated texts, 180, 191
Mendoza, S. L., 68–70
microaggressions, 27, 41, 82, 129;
racial, 109, 138, 145, 148, 149, 151, 153–54
Mohanty, C. T., 201, 228
Moon, D. G., 22
Moreira, C., 31
Morton's continuum model, 39
multiculturalism:
ethnoautobiography pedagogic approach, 71–77;
pedagogical challenges, 65;
undergrad teaching, 66–68
Muñoz, J. E., 84
mythical norms, 81–82, 85–86, 200, 212n4

Nakayama, T. K., 116–18, 131, 219
narrative communication ethics, 33
new media technologies:
interactive and dynamic nature of, 186–87, 191;
positive and negative dimensions of, 182–84, 190
non-normative embodiment, 81, 82, 85–86
normative dissociation, 71
normativity, xiii, 81–82, 122;
and queer communication pedagogy, 83;
and queer failure, 85, 94

online education, 186–87
Ono, K. A., 15
oppositional sexism, 89
oppression, 27, 35–36, 55–56, 82, 89, 94, 138, 144;
emotional engagement, 149–50;
monist understanding of, 198–99, 202–4;
and self-reflexivity, 232–33
otherness, xiv;
coping with/embracing, 151–53;156;
and critical love, 50;
magnification of, 67, 68, 138–40, 143;
resistance to, 143–48, 156

performative writing, 49–50
personal narratives, 153–54, 207
Peters, J. D., 32
Philippines:
US colonial rule, 68–69
postcolonialism, 22–23;
agency in, 23
power, 35;
in classroom,229;
sharing, 208
praxis, 24, 106, 163,182;
intercultural praxis, 172
Prosser, M., 217
public dialogue, 220–22

queer communication pedagogy, xiii, 83–84, 92–93
queer failure, xiii, 83–86, 93–94
queer intercultural studies, 85
queer love:
and differences, 55–56;
and mentoring relationship, 57–60
queer methodology, 120–21
queer people of color:
and critical love, 52–53, 55–56, 59–61;
marginalization of, 51–52
queer studies:
efficacy of, 95n1
queer theory, 49

race and racism:
and cissexism, 89–90;
and communication scholarship, 18–19;
taboo topic of, 97, 108, 141;
White students as victims of, 119–20, 126, 145–46.
See also interracial communication
racial microaggressions, 109, 145, 148, 149,151;
management of, 153–54
recognition:
and social justice, 34
redistribution:
and social justice, 34, 35
reflexive failure, 85
relationality, 241–43
resistance, 228;
to interracial communication, 75–76, 108, 118–19, 139, 145–47, 150–51, 239–40;
to otherness, 144–47;
to social justice activism pedagogy, 40–41
reverse racism, 119–20, 126, 145–46, 239–40
Rosenthal, M., 199
rote learning, 196–97

safe(r) spaces, 212n6;
critical feminist communication classrooms as, 209–12, 213n7
Sanders, B., 220–21
Sapp, D. A., 199
scholarly legitimacy, 38
self/selfhood, 228;
indigenous understanding of, 74–77
self-care:
and critical feminist communication pedagogy, 211–12
self-reflectivity, viii, 108, 229;
and critical feminist communication pedagogy, 205, 210;
and mediated critical intercultural communication, 187–88;
notion of, 230
semiotics code, 236
Serano, J., 89
silence:
students' use of, 20, 119
skills-based disciplines, 5–6
Sleeter, C., 118, 119
Smith, B., 198–99
social justice activism pedagogy, xii;
approaches to, 34–35;
and critical feminist communication pedagogy, 209;
dilemmas, 27–28, 41–42;
ethics of, 36–40;
knowledge-action divide, 37, 38;
and mediated critical intercultural communication, 189–90;
students' resistance to, 40–41
Sorrells, K., 219
Sprague, J., 15
status quo stories, 200–5, 212n4
Strobel, L. M., 74
students:
emotional engagement with interracial communication, 149–50;
engagement with multiculturalism, 66–68;
and ethnoautobiography pedagogic approach, 74–77;
performances of whiteness and masculinity, 55–56;
resistance to interracial communication, 41, 75–76, 108, 118–19, 139, 145–47, 150–51, 239–40;
resistance to social justice activism pedagogy, 40–41;
victimhood of, 119–20, 126, 145–46
students of color:
critical love between faculty of color and, xiii, 50–51, 59–61;
emotional engagement with interracial communication, 149–50;

engagement with interracial communication, 108–9, 143
student-teacher relationships, 50–51, 242;
in critical feminist communication classroom, 206–9
subjectivity, 73, 81–83, 235–36

taboo topics pedagogy, xiii, 97, 99, 101–10, 141, 195–96
teacher activists, 37, 42
teachers of color:
challenges faced by, 53, 68, 138–39;
critical love between students of color and, xiii, 50–51, 59–61;
mentoring relationship and queerness, 57–59;
and otherness, xiv, 138, 140, 144–47, 151–53
teaching:
Freire's concept of, 98
third culture kid:
experiences of, xiv, 159–61;
notion of, 160
tolerance, 205
traditional sexism, 89
trans empowerment groups, 86–87, 94
transformative approach:
to intercultural communication, 167;
to social justice, 34–35
trans gazing, 87–92, 94
trans identity and embodiment, 88–92, 103–4
transmisogyny, 89
transnational experiences, xiv, 161, 162, 164–64, 172
trigger warnings, 41–42
TuSmith, B., 207–8

United States:
colonial rule in Philippines, 68–69
universal-humanitarian communication ethics, 33

vulnerability, 50, 53–55, 58, 60–61, 207–8

Warren, J. T., 15–16, 83, 98, 99, 103, 106, 200, 201, 212n6, 224
Watson, M., 56, 57
White guilt,149–50
whiteness, 115,131;
students' resistance to engagement with curricula on, 40–41, 75–76, 108–9, 118–20, 145–47, 239–40;
submerged ethnicities in, 71–73;
teaching about, 27–28;
ubiquity and obscurity of, 116–18;
using whiteness to challenge, 122–23, 126–27, 129;
and violence in classroom space, 55–56;
visibility of, 120.
See also basal whiteness
white privilege, 27–28, 66–68, 75–76, 123–25
white racial bonding, 118, 119
white racial communion, 119, 129
White supremacy, 69, 70, 117;
material communicative strategies of, 118–19
Willink, K. G., 218
women faculty of color, 68, 137–40, 143–45;
critique of Black physicality, 147–48;
and identity politics, 145–47;
socioemotional support, 152
women of color scholars:
advocacy of intersectionality, 197–99

Xu, K., 219

Yep, G. A., 132
Yuval-Davis, N., 199

About the Editors and Contributors

ABOUT THE EDITORS

Ahmet Atay (PhD, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale) is an Associate Professor at The College of Wooster. His research revolves around media and cultural studies, globalization, postcolonial studies, and critical intercultural communication. Particularly, he focuses on diasproic experiences and cultural identity formations of diasporic individuals, political and social complexities of city life, such as immigrant and queer experiences, the usage of new media technologies in different settings, and the notion of home. Currently he is carrying out an ethnographic project on the current state and the future of the soap opera genre in the United States and United Kingdom. He is the author of *Globalization's Impact on Identity Formation: Queer Diasporic Males in Cyberspace* (2015, Lexington Books) and the co-editor of *The Discourse of Disability in Communication Education: Narrative-Based Research for Social Change* (2016, Peter Lang) and he published a number of journal articles and book chapters. He is the editor of two book series, Transnational Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies (Lexington Books) and Critical Communication Pedagogy (co-editor, Deanna Fassett) (Lexington Books).

Satoshi Toyosaki (PhD, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale) is an Associate Professor in the Department of Communication Studies at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale. He teaches and researches international and intercultural communication, critical pedagogy, and qualitative/critical methodologies. His publications are found in the *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication*, *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, *Cultural Studies Critical Methodologies*, *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, and *International Review of Qualitative Research*, among others.

ABOUT THE CONTRIBUTORS

Bernadette Marie Calafell (PhD, University of North Carolina) is Professor of Communication Studies at the University of Denver. She is the author of two books *Latina/o Communication Studies: Theorizing Performance* (Peter Lang, 2007) and *Monstrosity, Performance, and Race in Contemporary Culture* (Peter Lang, 2015) and co-editor (with Michelle Holling) of *Latina/o Discourse in Vernacular Spaces: Somos de Una Voz?* (Lexington, 2011). In 2009 she received the Lilla A. Heston Award for Outstanding Scholarship in Interpretation and Performance from the National Communication Association. Her research and teaching are focused in the areas of queer of color theory, women of color feminisms, performance studies, and vernacular discourse.

Linsay M. Cramer (PhD, Bowling Green State University) is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Communication Studies at Indiana University East. Her research interests include critical whiteness studies, the examination of the new racism including the rhetorics of postracism, intersectionality, and colorblind ideology, and critical pedagogical approaches to teaching communication.

Hsun-Yu (Sharon) Chuang (PhD, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale) is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Communication at Denison University. Her research and teaching interests include (critical) intercultural communication, interpersonal communication, East Asian Studies, Taiwan studies, and topics related to identity, language, pedagogy. Her scholarly works appear in the journals of *The International Journal of Qualitative Methods* and *Kaleidoscope: A Graduate Journal of Qualitative Communication Research* and in the book of *Intercultural Communication in Japan: Theorizing Homogenizing Discourse*.

Leda Cooks (PhD, Ohio University) is Professor in Department of Communication University of Massachusetts, Amherst. She teaches communication and food studies courses from a critical and with a social justice orientation. Her research addresses the ways identity, morality, power, relationships, community, culture and citizenship intersect in spaces and performances of (1). teaching and learning and (2). Producing, preparing, consuming, and communicating about and through food. Her recent work includes essays and research on food waste and identities and a book on food and family over the lifespan.

Alberto González (PhD, Ohio State University) is Distinguished University Professor in the Department of Communication at Bowling Green State University. His research has appeared in various journals including *Quarterly Journal of Speech, Southern Communication Journal, Communication Quarterly, Western Journal of Speech Communication, Intercultural Communication Studies, Women & Language, and Journal of Poverty.* Most recently, he co-edited the sixth edition of *Our Voices*: *Essays in Culture, Ethnicity, and Communication*. He co-edited *Mediating Cultures*: *Parenting in Intercultural Contexts* (2013) and he is co-author of *Intercultural Communication For Everyday Life* (2014). For the National Communication Association, he has served as chair of *La Raza* Caucus, the International and Intercultural Communication Division, and the Affirmative Action and Intercaucus Committee.

Robert Gutierrez-Perez (PhD, University of Denver) is queer of color scholar, activist, and performance artist from San José, CA who currently resides as an Assistant Professor of Culture and Communication at the University of Nevada, Reno. His research and life revolves around the goal of empowering, remembering, and advocating for queer people of color with a particular focus on the LGBTQ Chicanx and Latinx community. Gutierrez-Perez is currently creating and preparing to tour a solo performance based on the oral history narratives of gay, bisexual, trans, queer, and/or questioning Chicanos/Xicanos in the U.S. Southwest as well as working on a co-edited collection on Anzaldúan approaches to communication theory and methods. Other research interests include critical communication/performance pedagogy, critical intercultural communication, performance studies, critical qualitative research methodologies, and queer of color critique. His most recent scholarly work has been published in academic journals, such as the *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication, Liminalities: A Journal of Performance Studies, Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies,* and *QED: A Journal in GLBTQ Worldmaking,* as well in several books on race, gender, pedagogy, performance, queer theory, and critical/cultural studies.

Rona Halualani (PhD, Arizona State University) is a tenured (Full) Professor in the Department of Communication Studies at San Jose State University, where she has taught and researched in the areas of intercultural communication and diversity since 1998. Her teaching and research interests include: critical intercultural communication studies, intercultural cities and cultural spaces in relation to intercultural contact politics, identity formations, diasporic communities and politics, renaming and historical memory, microaggressions, biases, and cultural appropriation. She served as the Editor-in-Chief of the *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication* (JIIC) from 2013 through 2016.

Tina M. Harris (PhD, University of Kentucky) is a Professor in the Department of Communication Studies at the University of Georgia, where she has been on faculty for nearly 19 years. She has expertise in the area of interracial communication, where she explores the ways in which individuals communicate about race. Her research specifically addresses how racial identities play a critical role in how people choose to communicate with others from a different race and the strategies that are used to navigate those difficult conversations. She is the co-author of the textbook *Interracial Communication: Theory into Practice* (2015, Sage Publications) with Mark P. Orbe. Other research interests include diversity and media representations and race and ethnic disparities and religious frameworks in health communication. Her current research explores the impact of racial microaggressions on the mental, physical, and emotional health of students of color at predominantly White institutions. Her commitment to communication scholarship and pedagogy is evidenced in her recognition as the 2017 Engaged Scholar Award (Office of the Vice President for Public Service and Outreach), a Distinguished Josiah T. Meigs Teaching Professors (highest teaching honor), 2009 recipient of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning award (University System of Georgia Board of Regents' (BOR)) for her research on pedagogy and race, and the 2012 recipient of the International Diversity Award Recipient from the UGA Offices of International Education and Institutional Diversity. Her primary interest as a communication scholar is in the area of interracial communication. Harris has published many articles and book chapters on race and communication, served as reviewer for many top tier communication journals, and fulfilled many service roles within the discipline, the National Communication Association, the Southern States Communication Association, and other communication organizations. Her commitment to translating research from theory into practice is evidenced in her continued service to the department, university, discipline, and community through work that facilitates critical engagement with race.

Jieyoung Kong (PhD, Arizona State University) is a "global nomad" who constantly interrogates the meaning and performance of culture, is Assistant Professor in the Department of Communication at Western Kentucky University. Her research focuses on culture and communication, especially transculturation, communities of practice, intercultural dialogue, and critical pedagogy. Her work appears in *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication*, *Global Handbook of Conflict and Peace Communication: Contemporary Contexts* (with Benjamin Broome in Roy (Ed.), forthcoming) and other journals and edited volumes.

Benny LeMaster (PhD, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale) serves as Lecturer of Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies at California State University, Long Beach. Their research can be located at the various points where critical intercultural communication, performance studies, and rhetoric intersect. Their research can be found in *Women's Studies in Communication*, *Qualitative Inquiry*, and *QED: A Journal in LGBTQ Worldmaking.* The author would like to thank the editors of this important collection; your feedback was invaluable and this addition to the discipline is crucial. All correspondences with the author may be sent to Benny.LeMaster@csulb.edu.

Ryan M. Lescure (MA, San Francisco State University) is a Lecturer of Communication Studies at San Francisco State University and an Adjunct Instructor of Communication Studies at Skyline College in San Bruno, California. He teaches courses such as Gender and Communication, Critical Approaches to Culture and Communication, Communication and Masculinities, Argumentation and Debate, and Public Speaking. His courses emphasize the linkages between communication, critical theory, and social justice. His research primarily focuses on the intersections between communication, gender, sexuality, media, culture, memory, and power.

Jennifer V. Martin Emami is a doctoral candidate in women's studies at Texas Woman's University in Denton, Texas. Her areas of research include feminist and womanist pedagogy, intercultural communication, classroom rhetoric, and activism in the classroom. Jennifer obtained a master's degree in communication studies at Northeastern State University in Tahlequah, Oklahoma. She has presented at 12 academic conferences and is active in multiple professional organizations. Jennifer has been an officer on her department's graduate student association, an active committee member for campus wide events, and serves as a reviewer for academic journals.

S. Lily Mendoza (PhD, Arizona State University) is a native of San Fernando, Pampanga in Central Luzon, Philippines and is a fluent speaker of Kapampangan and Tagalog. She is Associate Professor of Culture and Communication at Oakland University in Rochester, Michigan. She is the author of *Between the Homeland and the Diaspora: Theorizing Filipino and Filipino American Identities* (Routledge, 2002; Philippine revised edition by University of Santo Tomas Publishing, 2006) and lead editor of *Back from the Crocodile's Belly: Philippine Babaylan Studies and the Struggle for Indigenous Memory* (Center for Babaylan Studies, 2013; Philippine edition by UST, 2015). She has published widely around questions of identity and belonging, cultural

politics in national, post- and trans-national contexts, race and ethnicity, and, more recently, modernity and industrial civilization and what it means to be a human being in the face of climate change and ecosystems collapse.

Keith Nainby (PhD, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale) is Professor of Communication Studies at California State University, Stanislaus. He earned his PhD in Speech Communication, with emphases in communication pedagogy and philosophy of communication, from Southern Illinois University. His research interests include learning relationships, the philosophical groundwork of critical communication pedagogy, and musical performances. He has previously published in *Communication Education*, the *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication*, *Text and Performance Quarterly* and *Contemporary Theatre Review*, among other journals, and he has contributed book chapters to *Political Rock* and *The SAGE Handbook of Communication*, with a co-authored chapter in the *Handbook of Instructional Communication* forthcoming.

Mark P. Orbe (PhD, Ohio University) is an internationally known educator, author, and consultant/trainer. His teaching and research interests center on the inextricable relationship between culture and communication as played out in a number of contexts (intrapersonal, interpersonal, intergroup, mass media). To date, he has published over 100 books, articles, and book chapters. At present, Dr. Orbe is Professor of Communication & Diversity in the School of Communication at Western Michigan University where he holds a joint appointment in the Gender and Women's Studies Program. He has served as the Secretary-General for the World Communication Association and past Editor of *The Journal of Intergroup Relations* and *The International and Intercultural Communication Annual.*

Amy Aldridge Sanford (PhD, University of Iowa) is a first-generation college graduate, Amy Aldridge Sanford has spent the past 13 years in higher education as a faculty member and administrator. In 2016, she was appointed associate vice president for Academic Affairs at Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi, after completing six years as a department chair in both Texas and in her home state of Oklahoma. She was a founding director of a Women's & Gender Studies program, where she had the privilege of consulting with Cherokee Chief Wilma Mankiller to form a women's book club that counted feminist icon Gloria Steinem among its membership. In just the past five years, Amy has presented on more than 30 academic panels, given nearly 50 invited lectures for both academic and public audiences, and has published in academic journals, professional newsletters, and community newspapers. She is currently writing a book about student activism. Amy is on the board

of directors for YWCA Corpus Christi and is the first vice president for the Central States Communication Association. She has also served as the state president for the Oklahoma Speech Theatre Communication Association, vice president for AAUW Oklahoma, and state chair for the Texas Association of Communication Administrators.

Jennifer Sandoval (PhD, University of New Mexico) is an Associate Professor at the Nicholson School of communication at the University of Central Florida. She has a PhD in Communication and Culture from the University of New Mexico and a Master's of Dispute Resolution from Pepperdine School of Law. Dr. Sandoval brings her experience as a mediator, project manager, trainer, and consultant to the classroom and her research program at UCF. Her research focuses on the communicative elements involved in the intersection of identity, the body, and health policy. Currently, she is continuing to investigate these elements in the context of fertility tourism—specifically international surrogacy in India. Additionally, she examines the rhetoric of choice and Assistive Reproductive Technology for women, as well as looks at reproductive health access for the LGBT community. Dr. Sandoval also continues work with community based-participatory research projects focusing on health intervention in underserved and underrepresented populations.

Gust A. Yep (PhD, University of Southern California) is Professor of Communication Studies, Graduate Faculty of Sexuality Studies, and Faculty in the EdD Program in Educational Leadership at San Francisco State University. His research examines communication at the intersections of culture, race, class, gender, sexuality, and nation, with a focus on sexual, gender, and ethnic minority communities. In addition to three books and a monograph, he has authored more than ninety articles in (inter)disciplinary journals and anthologies. He is recipient of numerous academic and community awards including the 2011 San Francisco State University Distinguished Faculty Award for Professional Achievement (Researcher of the Year) and the 2015 Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (AEJMC) Leroy F. Aarons Award for significant contributions to LGBT media education and research.