2003

Dismantling the master's house : using whose tools? : a critical analysis of the experiences of University Service Advocates at the Service Learning Institute of California State University, Monterey Bay

Judith Flores
California State University, Monterey Bay

Dismantling The Master's House: Using Whose Tools?

A Critical Analysis of the Experiences of University Service Advocates

At the Service Learning Institute of California State University, Monterey Bay

By Judith Flores

Action Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of Master of Arts in Education

California State University, Monterey Bay

May 30, 2003

Dismantling The Master's House: Using Whose Tools?

A Critical Analysis of the Experiences of University Service Advocates

At the Service Learning Institute of California State University, Monterey Bay

By

Judith Flores

APPROVED BY THE DEAN OF THE COLLEGE OF PROFESSIONAL STUDIES

Dr. DOROTHY M. LLOYD — **DATE** 5/27/03

APPROVED BY THE GRADUATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Dr. CHRISTINE SLEETER — **DATE** 6-1-03

TANIA D. MITCHELL, MSEd — **DATE** 06/01/03

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements

First of all, I would like to appreciate my family, the chosen and the biological one, La Familia Flores Carmona and La Familia Nasatir for their unconditional love, confidence, guidance and support. Muchas gracias, Mama Josefina and Mama Dee for helping create the woman I have become. No tengo palabras para agradecer el amor incondicional de mi madre y de mi mentor que es como otra madre en mi vida. Las dos son mis mejores amigas y mis pilares de fortaleza. Mike (my father figure) and Matthew (mi hermano el güerito), gracias for your willingness to be vulnerable and for being allies to women in so many capacities, especially to Flaca and I. You are my male role models, I admire and love you very much. Mis hermanos, Jose G., Carmelo, Pelon, and Junior, gracias por balancear mi vida y por no questionar mis abilidades como mujer. Los quiero mucho aunque no lo demuestre siempre. Rosi, Flaca, and Edith las quiero mucho por ser unas mujeres y mujersita tan fuertes y bellas por dentro y por fuera. Ninfa, no solo eres mi hermana pero una amiga. Eres mi shero, por tu coraje con que luchas en la vida. Thanks for the great advice you always give to me. You are wise and beautiful.

Tia Natalia, Tio Magdaleno, Glace (Horacio) and Chili Dog (Willie) son una familia envidiable. Hay mucho amor y ganas de sobresalir en sus vidas. Los aprecio mucho por siempre dar amor a consejos. Yo se que Horacio y Willie van a ser hombres de bien. Tia Amanda y Tio Arcadio gracias por la deliciosa comida y por el destapacaños. Angie, Hugo, y Merita, son mis mejores primas y primo. Los quiero mucho. Tambien a Johnnie.

Mama Carmen, le agradezco su apoyo y la tradicion de contar historias sobre nuestra cultura. Al resto de la Familia Carmona les digo que nuestra descendencia continua y ahora va hacer historia en instituciones universitarias. Hay mucha sabiduria que aun no se ha contado que existe en nuestra vida cotidiana.

Travis, thank you for being my partner, friend, my ear and shoulder to cry on. Our late night talks, your help in defining terms, and listening to me vent from my stressful times this semester, will forever be appreciated. You kept me going and pushing me despite your own struggles. I love you Mr. T.

I would like to thank my readers and expert informants. Dr. Christine Sleeter gracias, you are one of the few allies marginalized students have on this campus. Thank you for the numerous emails with feedback and for your optimism. Most of all, thank you for admitting me into the MAE program and for allowing my voice to be heard and my story to be told. Gracias, Tania D. Mitchell, soon to be Dr. Mitchell for her indispensable feedback and mentoring. You are a wise woman who taught me so much every time we engaged in deep dialogues.

Thank you my friends and mentors Kathleen, Michelle, Bethtina, Terry, and Ellen. You have provided me with tools that are often times unattainable through higher education, such as compassion and authentic relationships. You are all my teachers, guides, and inspiration through this very hard work. You are role models, for what walking the talk looks like. Thank you for pushing my self-reflection deeper and for working through our difficult discussions.

Vania, Madrina, you are a beautiful friend to have. Your loyalty, support, sense of humor, nuestras noches de chismes, vino, chips and salsa warm my heart. You are the best friend anyone can have. Espero que nuestra amistad perdure por muchos años y que el cariño que nos tenemos sobrepase muchas fronteras.

Deb, Rina, and Pam, when I become a professor, I want to be like you. I admire your perseverance, wholeness, and groundedness despite the messy system. You are role models for how to work within the master's house.

Cecilia, que le puedo decir, sin usted no hubiera venido a este mar donde me tope con todo tipo de criaturas marinas, buenas y malas, bellas y feas, malignas o benignas. Esta ha sido toda una aventura. Le debo tanto por ser mi mentor, amiga, y una mujer a la cual admiro interminablemente. Muchas gracias por su sinceridad, cariño, y humildad.

Dear colleagues (Mike, Lucy, Maribel, Manny, Mireya, and Alfredo), USAs, late night conference room team members, gracias for making me laugh, feeding me, reading parts of this project and giving me feedback. You are allies in this hard work. To all the USAs, I wish you the best on this journey toward social change. It all begins with ourselves, remember that. You are the heart and soul of the SLI, keep up the tremendous work and take care of yourselves to prevent burnouts. Eat well and get some rest when your body tells you so. Take Kleenex to any event you have, as there will be something or someone who will bring you tears of joy, laughter, or sadness.

Lastly, Olivia, Maricela, Sandra, Rhonda, Laura, Jennifer, Yolanda, Miguel Angel, Alberto, Bruce, and Hector I cannot thank you enough for being the heart of this participatory study. You are the soul, el alma, of this piece of work. My sincere thanks to the entire Service Learning Institute team for helping me grow as a leader. Gracias a todos/as.

Sinceramente,

Judith

c/s

Abstract

This participatory action thesis critically analyzes the experiences of the University Service Advocates at the Service Learning Institute of California State University, Monterey Bay. Data were gathered from two focus groups, one formed by seven women and the other composed of four men. The data were analyzed using grounded theory methodology and applied to two theoretical frameworks: Critical Race Theory and Cultural Citizenship. The findings demonstrated an urgent need to rethink the pedagogical approaches in the social justice curriculum co-taught by marginalized instructors or peer facilitators. A module was created as a teaching tool to incorporate reciprocal learning through storytelling, where students and the instructor can gain respect and maintain their dignity in the classroom.

This thesis has served me as a reflective tool to enhance my skills as an instructor teaching issues of power, privilege, and oppression within a higher education institution. Writing this thesis has allowed many emotions and feelings of resentment to be released and has helped me in channeling my anger and use it in my empowerment as a leader and marginalized instructor within the master's house.

Chapter One: Entering the Master's House

Introduction

I was born in Veracruz, Mexico on September 15, 1978. I am the oldest daughter of eight children and the first one to finish high school and to earn a Bachelor of Arts degree. I will also be the first one in my family to receive a doctoral degree some day. I migrated to this country when I was ten years old. Before you assume, I will let you know that my grandmother, siblings and I crossed the border without any legal documentation that permitted our entrance. Once we arrived to South Central, Los Angeles and after getting over the shocking reality that no white people lived in South Central, my mother found out one of my sisters and I had to be bussed to a school in Santa Monica. Though that school was a bit diverse, the principal was Japanese American and students of color were still a small percentage of the student body, I distinctly remember feeling alienated, isolated because I didn't speak English. I knew deep in my heart that I was treated differently because of the way I looked. I didn't wear the Nike shoes or other brand name clothes. I looked different and made no connections with my classmates. In junior high school I attended a school located in Pacific Palisades and the diversity lessened there. While I was dropped off by the big yellow bus other students got out of BMWs and other luxury cars.

Transferring to a local school in South Central was refreshing because I saw myself reflected in the student population and for the first time also in the teachers and curriculum. I had my first instructors of color and that made a big difference in my life. High school was a bit of a struggle since my school was ranked second to last in the Los Angeles Unified School District high school test scores. I knew, because we were told as soon as we entered school, that only one-third of 1500 students would graduate. I was one of the 500 who made it, but because I was

not documented, attending a four-year university was not an option for me. My mentor and ally, a white woman from West Los Angeles, had known of my situation for a few years and had tried many ways to find a solution to my unjust situation. Adoption, a student visa, private colleges were just a few of the solutions we considered. I met Dee, my mentor, and Michael, her husband, through a mentoring program called the Fulfillment Fund in Los Angeles, an organization which provides support and guidance plus a $1000 scholarship to students from "underprivileged, disadvantaged" backgrounds who finished the program. My mentor and her husband, my second family, were able to pay for five years of out-of-state tuition, room and board. Reflecting back I realize that I owe them much more than money, but respect and gratitude for being my allies and for believing in me and not judging me like others did. This demonstration of love sent me to a world I never dreamed of, higher education, and a world that introduced me to the institution which would show me the hard work toward social justice. The following are a couple of examples I experienced in the institution while working toward becoming a social change agent.

I am in a classroom and a guest speaker walks in and begins talking about an innovative, intensive service learning student leadership program. She is talking about being trained to become co-teachers in the classroom and getting paid for work toward social justice. Years later, in the back of my mind I am thinking about how I couldn't get paid for working in the U.S. because I am (was) not a "legal" resident in this country. Was that social justice? Despite my struggles, I go ahead and apply. I end up working one year as a co-teacher in an introductory Service Learning course, one year as a community-based student leader placing students to do their service in the community and one year as an upper division co-teacher within my major. Not one year did I get paid for my exhausting, draining work. Is this work towards or for social justice? How was I using the master's tools to dismantle his house? Was I used in this "social

justice" program and why did I choose to stay there and continue working? Furthermore, how did I continue doing social justice work despite the unjust working situation?[1]

I am a co-teacher in an introductory Service Learning course at California State University, Monterey Bay (CSUMB). It is a Wednesday around 3:45pm. After having had our first race caucuses and dialogues, a white woman walking alongside me toward the door yells at me, "you are so ignorant if you think you can teach me anything!" I am speechless, I meet with my teaching partner and I explain to her what happened to me. We both wonder why those words came out of her mouth. How could such racist comments have impacted me that much? The exploration of my social identities furthers and I conclude that being a Mexican woman, first generation high school and college student, and 20 years old (at the time) have a lot to do with how I was not seen as a teacher.

At CSUMB, students are introduced to the exploration of their socially constructed identities, as well as dynamics of power, privilege and oppression, how to enter the communities with respect and sensitivity, and how a student can be an agent of change in his or her own community. The introduction to this intensive work begins with an undergraduate course entitled Service Learning 200: Introduction to Service in Multicultural Communities. After students take SL 200, usually in the second year (sophomores), they have the opportunity to become student leaders, University Service Advocates (USAs) (after completing an intensive training), co-teaching SL 200 with a faculty member or taking on other student leadership positions with the Service Learning Institute or with a community agency. Since the conception of the USA program in 1996 there have been sixty-five women and twenty-one males. There have been twenty student leaders who identified as white/Caucasian and the remaining as

[1] The italicized sections of this study are the words and lived experiences, the personal stories of Judith Flores, the author of this thesis.

belonging to various ethnic/racial backgrounds, biracial or multiracial. In 1998, I was selected to become a USA and I have been working for the Service Learning Institute ever since.

I co-led, co-developed and co-facilitated the 2001 Summer of Service Leadership Academy (SoSLA) training, a requirement for students wanting to be USAs. I was in charge of working with the previous curriculum developed for this training and reframing it so that it served the needs of the nine students who underwent this four-week long experience. During the 2002 SoSLA training I worked collaboratively with the current Coordinator of Service Learning Leadership, Tania D. Mitchell, who brought depth, creativity and a different perspective from which to train the ten diverse participants. As the current Graduate Fellow, I teach a section of SL 200 and provide support to the USA program as needed. With the five-year history of working for the Service Learning Institute I have had the privilege to experience various roles, as a student, co-teacher, community liaison, facilitator, and Service Learning instructor.

As a person of color involved in social justice and diversity education (through service learning and through my experiences in education), I have noticed that the way the curriculum is structured for diversity and social justice is geared towards educating and informing people in positions of power (i.e., white students) about the perspectives and experiences of people in subordinate positions (i.e., people of color). The pedagogy still centers the dominant perspective thus leaving the marginalized experiences invalidated or having to educate students about racism at the expense of sharing painful lived experiences with racism. The USAs in these experiences often spend much of their time teaching from their experience to inform audiences about their lives, especially if some students have not encountered similar discrimination or do not "see" it. This work does not afford the time needed for those student leaders to deal effectively and completely with their own internalized experiences of dominance and oppression. And since the

student leaders (USAs) are placed formally in the position of educating all students as they prepare to enter community service experiences with predominantly communities of color, I question the impact of doing this work as a person of color, biracial, or multiracial student and how it prevents one from or supports one in dealing with those perspectives of internalized dominance and oppression. Furthermore, are the USAs able to be effective advocates and activists for social justice if they themselves are experiencing social inequalities in their roles as student leaders? How can white USAs be effective allies in the work toward social justice, particularly around issues of racial injustice and inequality and challenge their dominant, privileged identities? Do their roles as educators support or inhibit their growth and ability to be agents of change and advocates for social justice?

Statement of Purpose

This action thesis is intended to be read by the Service Learning Institute students, staff, faculty and administrators. The recommendations that will result from this participatory research will hopefully be implemented in the Summer of Service Leadership Academy (SoSLA), the four-week long training required prior to becoming USAs, student leaders. The changes I envision stem out of the dialogues that have taken place with the USAs. The recommendations will also be adapted from the work that is taking place at other campuses around this issue and are directly connected to the training model we currently use. My hopes are that some of the training focused on helping the student leaders facilitate race/racism/white supremacy discussions will be de-centered from the dominant perspective to be helpful in the growth of co-teachers and the diverse students in Service Learning 200 courses.

In order for diverse USAs to feel comfortable, to enhance their personal growth as leaders and teachers in the classroom when teaching about race/racism/white supremacy despite

the demographics of the classroom, the recommendations from the student leaders are crucial to identify where the limitations of the training lay. Overall, I would like to answer the following questions: What are the experiences of the USAs as social justice leaders? And, how do the intersections of the USAs' social identities impact how they internalize the facilitation training and how they implement it in the classroom as co-teachers?

What is Service Learning?

Service Learning at CSUMB is different from other forms of community involvement in that we strive to balance the learning taking place in the classroom by addressing a specific community's needs and being of service to a community that is directly linked to that particular course's objectives. Service Learning combines coursework with community service experiences. CSUMB's Service Learning program is the only program of its kind in the CSU system and the only campus with a renown service learning student leadership program that prepares students to become leaders in classrooms or communities helping co-teach courses that "address community-identified needs while helping students meet academic, social and civic learning goals[2]."

California State University, Monterey Bay (CSUMB) is also unique in having Service Learning as a graduation requirement. Service Learning enables CSUMB students to develop the social, moral and multicultural civic skills necessary to build more just and equitable communities. With an outcomes-based academic program, the USAs co-teaching Service Learning courses face great challenges since students have to demonstrate understanding and comprehension of a curriculum that may cause, for some, resistance while for others growth and empowerment. Experiential learning and self-reflection through journals are big components of

[2] Taken from the Service Learning Institute web-page http://service.csumb.edu

how the students demonstrate their competency in deep issues such as identity and diversity work.

The USAs together with staff, faculty and community partners make the Service Learning Institute's Mission Statement a goal to achieve. The mission of the Service Learning Institute is "to foster and promote social justice by cultivating reciprocal service and learning partnerships among CSUMB students, faculty, staff and the surrounding tri-county community."[3] The question then is how does the mission become a reality in the Service Learning classroom if not all the stakeholders (students and co-teachers or community partners) possess the same awareness and level of training to "foster and promote social justice by cultivating reciprocal service and learning"?

Though this study is centered at the CSUMB campus, the issues addressed in this research reflect broader perspectives taking place in other universities, as well as in scholarly works. Anyone interested in reading about issues of power, privilege, systems of oppression, student leaders co-teaching in higher education and experiencing simultaneous marginalization can benefit from this participatory case study.

[3] Taken from the Service Learning Institute web-page http://service.csumb.edu

Chapter Two: Finding the Tools in the Academy

In this chapter I provide you with an overview of different theoretical frameworks and their themes that will help explicate the importance of storytelling and different ways of knowing in diverse communities. I will discuss critical race theory and a sister framework, cultural citizenship. The works of Audre Lorde will help us see a larger picture of the intersections of race, class, and gender as well as uses of anger among women.

In this chapter, I review books, scholarly articles and journals on multicultural education and the critical race theory framework, as well as scholarly web sites and published articles discussing service learning. The work of expert informants, such as Dr. Rina Benmayor, is essential to find the connections between critical race theory and cultural citizenship. This chapter has been organized into five different sections: Critical Race Theory which lays a foundation for how these works interconnect and how they relate to the overall study focusing on race issues; Critical Race Theory and Cultural Citizenship which discusses how becoming aware of our social identities empowers us to claim space and rights in higher education especially when teaching controversial courses; Impact of Identity When Teaching About Race describes scenarios focusing on the "simultaneous marginalization" of non-traditional instructors; Race, Class, Gender and Uses of Anger which takes a look at the intersections of race, class and gender and how channeling anger toward social justice can be effective; and finally What are other campuses doing? Rethinking the Curriculum, which gives specific examples from around the country that show what other higher education institutions are doing around this issue.

Critical Race Theory

Critical Race Theory came about in the mid-1970s and it centers race at the forefront of critical analysis. According to Ladson-Billings (1999), critical race theory is the product of

earlier work done by "Derrick Bell (an African American) and Alan Freeman (a White)," (p. 11) which is essential to recognize because the voice of a person of color was included in this process that otherwise would perpetuate the "centering" of the dominant perspective. Critical race theory was created from a legal perspective that questioned the subordination of people of color in the legal system; thus, placing race at the forefront places a clear emphasis on race discrimination. Critical race theory also often takes a look at the intersectionalities of gender and class. According to Solorzano and Villalpando (1998) "Critical race theory examines how legal doctrine is used to subordinate racial groups...it draws from and extends the broad literature base of critical theory." That is why it can help when critically analyzing the *testimonios* of the diverse perspectives of the student leaders. Solorzano and Villalpando expand by stating that,

> Critical race theory has at least five elements that form its basic insights, perspectives, research methods, and pedagogy. They are: (1) the centrality and intersectionality of race and racism, (2) the challenge to dominant ideology, (3) the commitment to social justice, (4) the importance of experiential knowledge, and (5) the use of an interdisciplinary perspective. (p. 213)

Solorzano and Villalpando (1998) pose examples of how students who historically have not had access to higher education are joining the institutions and find themselves experiencing multiple marginalities because they bring such diverse backgrounds and needs that are not met. Solorzano and Villalpando quote the words of Patricia Hill Collins who refers to the oppression of people of color based on race, gender and class as the "simultaneity of oppression or simultaneous marginality" (p. 213-214). This statement means that people with diverse backgrounds suffer from an intersection of oppressions; they experience "simultaneous" marginalization. What Solorzano and Villalpando explain in their article are clear examples of

critical race theory and the need to implement support systems to retain "simultaneously marginalized" students in higher education. Critical race theory also helps analyze the experiences of the students of color, biracial, and multiracial student leaders, women and students from a low socioeconomic status. It works toward the development of curriculum and pedagogy to dismantle race and racism in the United States, specifically in higher education, and work toward social change and the elimination of racism and the subordination of marginalized groups in higher education. Additionally, Solorzano and Villalpando (1998) state the following, "a critical theory that examines the intersections of race, gender and class can be an important tool for generating issues, questions, histories, art forms, and stories that tell us more about the people and the places at the society's margins." (p. 214)

Solorzano and Villalpando (1998) also introduced the words of Gloria Anzaldua who talks about "*mestizaje*" and its connection to experiencing simultaneous marginalities because of the very diverse perspectives *mestizas/os* bring to higher education. *Mestiza* consciousness provides a venue that can help us perceive multiple realities at once. Solorzano and Villalpando quote Anzaldua who explains that being able to "examine individuals, institutions, culture and society" can help see multiple realities and view the "center" from multiple perspectives which empowers the students because they are able to see all their strengths and assets instead of once again centering the dominant perspective as the "only" reality. Therefore, Solorzano and Villalpando assert that: "Centering on the experiences of historically marginalized groups can reveal much about how the members of these groups engage in individual and collective acts of resistance to challenge race, gender and class oppression" (p. 215). Solorzano and Villalpando emphasize the need to "de-center" dominant perspectives and take a look into the ways in which

marginalized groups practice acts of resistance that often times are not recognized as ways of challenging domination.

According to Bell (1987) children create productive learning environments when they see themselves reflected in front of the classroom. Bell affirms that when students see a clear connection between community and school they are able to transition, move from community to school and vice versa. Racism in educational institutions is pervasive and so deeply embedded in our society that instructors who do not represent a particular student population (i.e., a white instructor in a predominantly community or classroom of color), from a particular community, do not meet those students' needs. Thus, critical race theory is important because it allows us to consider the possibilities of the importance of analyzing race and how it plays out in education. Bell (1987) states the following:

> Schools will only become comfortable and productive environments for learning when the cultural and historical presence of black families and communities are infused in the daily interactions and educational processes of children. When children see a piece of themselves and their experience in the adults that teach them and feel a sense of constancy between home and school, then they are likely to make a much smoother transition from one to the other. (p. 263)

Bell clearly shows the importance of examining how the identities of the instructor and the students deeply impact how productive the learning environment can or cannot be. If the students are experiencing different forms of oppression but the instructor is not aware of these, it becomes questionable if the instructor can actually support the students fully. When all the students share their stories, it is then easier to see the areas where they need support. The instructor then has the

responsibility of making sure the students don't become the sole educators and prevents teaching at their expense because the risks of this could be detrimental to the growth of the students.

Ladson-Billings (1999) gives us a clear definition and examples of critical race theory (CRT) and discusses the importance of this theoretical framework to help us hear and analyze the oppressions and to view them clearly from a different standpoint. She affirms that storytelling is a part of critical race theory, which enhances the awareness of teachers to find out what marginalization their students face in a classroom that does not critically analyze issues of race. She also emphasizes the importance of recognizing narrative as a way of knowing without disregarding the fact that not everyone's stories "are received as legitimate," or in support of the "advancement of this discipline (education)" (Ladson-Billings, 1999, p. 14). Ladson-Billings quotes Barnes stating that: "critical race theorists...integrate their experiential knowledge...drawn from a shared history as 'other' with their ongoing struggles to transform a world deteriorating under the albatross of racial hegemony" (p. 12). This last quote affirms the need to interpret narratives and analyze where the stories reflect or mirror the structural disadvantages to prevent the internalization of oppression.

Ladson-Billings (1999) states that, "A second reason for the 'naming one's own reality' theme of CRT is the psychic preservation of marginalized groups...members of minority groups internalize the stereotypic images that certain elements of society have constructed in order to maintain their power" (p. 16). This is showing us how "naming one's reality" can be empowering. It is then when one can begin naming the oppressions and can show resistance to the oppressor by challenging domination and embracing all identities. When narrative as a way of knowing is acknowledged, the historically oppressed are able to voice their experiences and are able to join dialogues, which can help to better educate students of color in educational

institutions. If narrative as a way of knowing is practiced in the classroom as a reciprocal way of learning, all students will then have the potential of learning from one another. Once higher education institutions are able to identify the needs of historically underrepresented students then those needs ought to be addressed and domination can be challenged. Lastly, CRT shifts a deficit-based model, where storytelling is not embraced as situated knowledge, to an assets-based framework where marginalized students can begin sharing their stories and taking ownership as well as responsibility and claiming their education that challenges traditional curriculum and questions if one can dismantle the master's house using his tools.

Critical Race Theory and Cultural Citizenship

Critical race theory (CRT) helps to demonstrate how race impacts students in higher education. Race, among other social identities, is structurally embedded within the institution, resulting in some students "simultaneous marginalization". Being that people can gain power through the sharing of their stories, storytelling, grants "simultaneously marginalized", students and/or instructors respect and the ability to maintain their dignity in the classroom. "Simultaneously marginalized" groups of people are using their ways of knowing and their experiences in their stories to make others aware that voices are being silenced. There is strength in the sharing of stories. Both CRT and Cultural Citizenship (CC) embrace this way of knowing that can open some people's eyes that have been insistent on being closed.

What is the connection between critical race theory and cultural citizenship? CRT centers and analyzes the intersections of race and racism; challenges dominant ideas, values lived experiences through storytelling or personal narratives, and works toward social justice through interdisciplinary ideology. While citizenship is supposed to protect citizens of a particular country equally under the law, in the United States, people born in this country do not

automatically receive equal treatment solely based on their U.S. nationality. Oftentimes, the intersections of multiple social identities impact the way one is treated as a first or second-class citizen. Cultural citizenship, however, focuses on claiming or affirming first-class citizenship (first-class citizenship means having equal access to benefits that come from being a citizen of a particular country) without losing one's cultural identity/ies. While CC encourages the use of one's cultural practices to claim identities, space and rights, CRT helps us to critically analyze why salient identities have inhibited certain groups from being first-class citizens and having equal access and treatment. Both CRT and CC incorporate storytelling, listening, and the interpreting of vernacular expressions of identity and rights.

According to Flores and Benmayor (1997) the concept of cultural citizenship was first introduced by anthropologist Renato Rosaldo. Blanca G. Silvestrini, in Flores and Benmayor (1997), states the following in connection to CC, "Cultural citizenship refers to the ways people organize their values, their beliefs about their rights, and their practices based on their sense of cultural belonging rather than on their formal status as citizens of a nation" (p. 44). Becoming aware of our social identities empowers various people to "use" their identities to claim space and rights by exercising cultural practices.

Rosaldo asserts the following:

> Too often social thought anchors its research in the vantage point of the dominant social group and thus reproduces dominant ideology by studying subordinate groups as a "problem" rather than as people with agency—with goals, perceptions, and purposes of their own. (as cited in Flores and Benmayor, 1997, p. 37)

Rosaldo affirms the importance of critically analyzing the inequalities and social positions in studies of cultural citizenship. It is important that the cultural practices of marginalized groups be

validated (i.e., in academia) in order for those practices to empower such groups. The "subordinate groups" must not be seen as a "problem" but rather as groups who possess assets and knowledge to be learned from, as people with agency. When Rosaldo talks about social position, he is referring to the different experiences one can live in terms of being in the world as marginalized or privileged. He also adds:

> Cultural citizenship refers to the right to be different (in terms of race, ethnicity, or native language) with respect to the norms of the dominant national community, without compromising one's right to belong, in the sense of participating in the nation-state's democratic processes. (as cited in Flores and Benmayor, 1997, p. 57)

Thus, one can conclude that both CRT and CC help not only "marginalized" people to name their realities though storytelling but with CC one can embrace cultural practices that enhance our ways of knowing to be able to resist oppression and challenge dominant ideology. With the implementation of these two frameworks in classroom teaching, it may also be possible to prevent the perpetuation of learning at the expense of the people at the margins through reciprocal storytelling.

Ladson-Billings (1999) discusses the importance of critically understanding how the United States was founded and built upon through explaining what she refers to as the "property issue." She discusses the fact that in earlier history white males were the only ones who had the right to "ownership as a prerequisite to citizenship" (p. 17). From its foundation, this country has established legislation that values whiteness and organizes full citizenship rights around the needs of whites. Thus people of color who do not have the right to "own" do not have equal access to rights. Ladson-Billings offers an example that clearly illustrates this phenomenon

when describing what happened in the classroom of an African American instructor after discussing an article on white privilege:

> One white woman shared a personal experience of going into a neighborhood supermarket, having her items rung up by the cashier and discovering she did not have her checkbook. The cashier told her she could take her groceries and bring the check later…she related this story to an African American male friend, he told her that was an example of the privilege she enjoyed because she was white…Determined to show his friend that their life experiences were qualitatively different, the young man went shopping a few days later…the same cashier…told the African American man that he could push the grocery items to the side while he went home to get his checkbook. (p. 18-19)

The white woman in this example obviously grew up unconscious of her privileges as a white person in this country and the rights and treatment of first-class citizen she receives based on her race. How could CRT and CC have helped these two friends in deciphering this experience? The white woman and her African American friend could have engaged in a dialogue where both shared their experiences with racism. Once they heard each other and identified and validated the fact that race issues in this country remain deeply embedded institutionally; the claiming of space and rights would have been acknowledged by first being fully conscious of their social identities. The white woman also attended schools where the traditional curriculum reinforced and perpetuated the systems that privilege her experience and ways of knowing as assets. She could have analyzed her experiences versus her African American male friend's who perhaps faced acts of discrimination concurrently.

Thus, CRT and CC can provide people of color and white people with storytelling as a tool to begin unveiling and perhaps dismantling racism in this country. If the goal of both, the white woman and the African American male, was to challenge the cashier in that grocery store and they were both fighting to gain equal treatment as customers, then both began to see the embedded institutional injustices through their lived experiences in the same situation.

The Impact of Social Identities When Teaching About Race

The fall of 2002 was the first time I was offered a part time teaching position at California State University, Monterey Bay instructing a section of Service Learning 200: Introduction to Service in Multicultural Communities. The first day of class, I walked into the classroom and sat down as if I was one of the students and waited until more students showed up to begin. As I waited, I began to hear comments like, "when is the teacher going to get here?" and "I wonder what the teacher will be like," among other comments. It was very interesting to hear the preconceptions of who the teacher would be and the fact that I was not considered to be their instructor. Thereafter, I experienced disrespect and was questioned around my awareness of the subject matter due to my age, race, gender, and other social identities.

This experience raised many questions about teaching and social identities: what are the impacts of identity when teaching about race? And, how do the intersections of social identities impact the teaching as well?

"Gender and Race in the Classroom: Teaching Way Out of Line," by Lana F. Rakow (1991), begins by first affirming that students and teachers "have experienced and participated in relationships of domination, submission, oppression, and privilege" (p. 10), experiences which help them have a perspective of who they are and how they see the world around them. It is inevitable to bring a view of the world, as a teacher, that students do not bring and vice versa.

Rakow then explores the specific experiences of the marginalized as teachers in higher education. She states that:

> Those of us who step into the classrooms as professors and as students do not shed our identities at the door with our coats. We enter those rooms as humans situated as subjects and as objects of discourses that give us the identities we claim for ourselves and that are assigned by others. (Rakow, 1991, p. 10)

Rakow is discussing the importance of instructors doing their own identity work prior to entering the classroom. She also reiterates the importance of critically analyzing the intersections of our social identities as instructors. In the example at the beginning of this section, it is clear that the instructor (I) knew who she (I) was and that because of her identities she would not automatically be perceived as the "holder of knowledge." Rakow (1991) explains that:

> The traditional academic definition of a good teacher and of a successful classroom could be described as this: a generic professor, with sufficient knowledge of and enthusiasm for his subject matter, using appropriate pedagogical techniques...This generic professor is, as the language indicates, presumed to be a white male, and the students who successfully master his content will most likely be like him. (p. 10)

As a twenty-four year old, woman of color, five feet tall, with English as my second language, I do not fit the identities of the generic professor; therefore, I was not seen as a teacher.

Rakow (1991) also talks about the intersectionalities between gender, race, and class as main factors and foundational structure of the academy. When the 'generic professor" is not teaching but instead a person of color or a woman (or even a person of color AND a woman) is teaching, the "other" than the "norm" feels threatened and hostile because the "other" may bring a perspective that the students are not used to hearing; respecting and/or seeing as authority. It is

a perspective that challenges the norm and instead "centers" the lived experiences of historically marginalized peoples. What happens when the non-generic instructor eradicates the traditional curriculum that centers dominant perspectives?

In my first semester teaching a Service Learning course, I experienced what Rakow (1991) describes when writing:

> A number of feminist teachers...have reported aggressive and disruptive attempts on the part of white male students to bring the classroom back to the dominant sexist, racist, and homophobic discourse...of course, not all students resist the material and the instructor, and some students respond with enthusiasm, particularly those typically marginalized in the classroom. (p. 12)

According to Gary R. Howard (1999), a white male who may be considered a "generic professor," white men must do their own work prior to entering a multicultural classroom. His book We Can't Teach What We Don't Know (1999), reflects the value that this white male places on learning multiculturalism and teaching in multicultural environments by first exploring his own background and positionality in society. When Howard takes ownership of the need to do his own work in critically analyzing his white male privilege he is challenging the perpetuation of oppression by teaching "way out of line," outside the norm, as a generic professor. Thus, his students will be more open to learning about and challenging their own privileges. Marginalized students will feel validated.

Rakow (1991) argues that "When women and men of color and white women enter the classroom, 'there is trouble'" (p. 10), because they will most likely focus their curriculum on the areas of empowering through embracing their marginalized identities or an emancipatory education as a way of knowing. An emancipatory curriculum empowers groups of people that

historically have been at the margins, people who resist oppression through education as a tool to claim rights. If students have gone through twelve years of education where they have not seen themselves reflected in the curriculum and they have not been taught to challenge the systems of power, privilege and oppression then those students will most likely not be ready to transition and be receptive to learning this emancipatory curriculum. Thus, the students have also not been taught to explore issues of race and racism and/or to challenge systems of oppression.

Nevertheless, other acts of resistance by students of color in higher education are redefined by Solorzano and Villalpando (1998) when describing, what they refer to as, "critical resistant navigational skills" as a coping mechanism of students of color to "succeed in higher education" (p. 216). These "critical resistant navigational skills" are defined as follows:

> Many of these skills do not stem from students' conformist or adaptive strategies, but emerge from their resistance to domination and oppression in a system that devalues their ethno- and sociocultural experiences. Moreover, some Students of Color might voluntarily choose to situate themselves on "the margins" as a site of resistance...one reason to choose the margins may be that they have reconceptualized the meaning of marginalization...By distinguishing between a dominated marginal status imposed by an oppressive system versus a self-defined marginal site, Students of Color can incorporate the concept of human agency...(Solorzano and Villalpando, 1998, p. 216)

The last quote clearly illustrates a shifting of paradigms that empower students of color through an assets-based outlook on labels imposed by dominant mainstream society. The students who traditionally have not had a positive empowering experience in higher education because they are automatically labeled as marginalized (equated with deficient), are challenging that term and

redefining and embracing it. Solorzano and Villalpando (1998) continue by describing what students of color are doing to shift the label of being marginalized:

> Some students assume leadership roles in academic, social, and ethnic student organizations, some do volunteer work as academic tutors, while others work in community-based organizations. Each of these roles would tend to challenge the myth that, in comparison with majority students, these students are academically or socially unprepared for college. Therefore, Students of Color can redefine their marginal location as a place where they can draw strength. They are then able to identify strategies to succeed in a place they perceive to be oppressive. (p. 217)

This quote connects directly to the student motivations for becoming USAs. They assume leadership positions to subvert the marginalized roles they step into when they enter higher education institutions. They are enhancing their growth by getting involved and using their talents. There are however questions that arise; How are privileged students "shifting the label" since they are not marginalized? How are they being allies for "shifting the labels"? And, what happens to non-traditional instructors, whether they are student leaders co-teaching or professors of color in higher education educating diverse groups of students?

Keith Osajima (1991) explains, "In the face of campus tensions and demographic shifts that promise increases in minority student populations, colleges across the country are recognizing the need to educate students on racism" (p. 151). Osajima's (1991) words explicate the need to have student leaders learning about the systems of oppression and becoming co-teachers in the classroom as well as the need to be exposed to a multicultural education. By having students as co-teachers they would be practicing a "shifting of labels" in terms of subverting the professorial authority and growing as student leaders. Additionally, when a

multicultural education is exemplified in the school, white students may take longer to engage or relate to the subject matter because they feel attacked or detached from this work. For that reason, students who reflect the student population are needed as co-teachers. It is also equally important to educate students about the root causes of marginalization and long history of oppression to maintain the systems of power in place. Howard (1999) argues that multiculturalism can be learned if the "oppressor" learns to be an ally by challenging and/or using their privileges. Nevertheless teaching about race and racism is not an easy task nor is teaching about other forms of oppression, especially if the educator is a person of color or represents other marginalized identities. Osajima (1991) explains:

> I find "Race Education" extremely challenging to teach...As in any teaching situation involving diverse student bodies, the differences in experience, knowledge, and perspective that students bring to class raise difficult questions regarding appropriate content of the curriculum...Because most of my students are white and come to class with limited knowledge of racism in the United States. (p. 145-151)

As explained in previous paragraphs, the awareness or lack thereof of the historical issues around race that many students bring to courses that focus on teaching issues of power, privilege and oppression, makes the work harder for non-traditional instructors who constantly face resistance.

Ladson-Billings (1999) illustrates how two instructors who are not considered "progressive," Marva Collins, a Chicago elementary teacher and Jaime Escalante, a high school teacher, continue their hard work toward educating students to survive in mainstream society. She says the following about them:

> Both remind students that mainstream society expects them to be failures, and prod them to succeed as a form of counterinsurgency. Their insistence on helping students achieve

in the "traditional" curriculum represents a twist on Audre Lorde's notion that one cannot dismantle the master's house with the master's tools. Instead, they believe one can only dismantle the master's house with the master's tools. (Ladson-Billings, 1999, p. 23)

Despite the marginalized identities of the two "non-generic" instructors they continue to instill hope in their students to succeed and challenge the status quo. The challenging of the traditional curriculum, by the "non-generic" professors, had a positive impact on students when they were taught, through modeling, to embrace their social identities and use them to "dismantle the master's house." These instructors, perhaps, also learned the "critical resistant navigational skills" while being labeled as deficient and marginalized in higher education.

Race, Class, Gender and Uses of Anger

Audre Lorde (1984) in Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches explores the intersections of age, race, class, and sexuality to critically analyze the experiences of women educators, authors, and oppressed people as educators for the oppressor. She also encourages us to redefine difference in American society. Audre Lorde stated the following:

> Traditionally in american society, it is the members of oppressed, objectified groups who are expected to stretch out and bridge the gap between the actualities of our lives and the consciousness of our oppressor. For in order to survive, those of us for whom oppression is as american as apple pie have always had to be the watchers, to become familiar with the language and manners of the oppressor, even sometimes adopting them for some illusion of protection...In other words, it is the responsibility of the oppressed to teach the oppressors their mistakes. (p. 114)

Lorde (1984) reaffirms that difference has been rejected at the institutional level. As human beings, she says, that we have been programmed to respond to difference in one of three ways:

> Ignore it...copy it if we think it is dominant, or destroy it if we think it is subordinate. But we have no patterns for relating across our differences as equals...there is what I call a *mythical norm*, which each one of us within our hearts knows "that is not me." In america, this norm is usually defined as white, thin, male, young, heterosexual, christian, and financially secure. (p. 115-116, emphasis in original)

What then happens when a young woman of color, first generation college student, and non-practicing catholic, without a doctorate degree, or a baccalaureate degree, tries to teach the "mythical norm" about differences and the need to explore those from a non-dominant worldview? The instructors who do not meet the requisites to fit into the "mythical norm" end up facing resistance and anger from privileged students and internalizing the anger that discrimination, marginalization, and oppression have brought into the life of this "different" instructor. Audre Lorde (1984) expands, "The oppressors maintain their position and evade responsibility for their own actions. There is a constant drain of energy, which might be better used in redefining ourselves and devising realistic scenarios for altering the present and constructing the future" (p. 115). She suggests that the anger one faces as a "non-generic" instructor can be channeled to "redefine ourselves" instead of internalizing anger and doing more harm unto ourselves and not being constructive agents of change.

Ann Berlak and Sekani Moyenda (2001) take us through the crude reality of racism in the United States and the reality that there is much work to do across our multiple differences. These two authors being a white woman and African American woman presents a picture of the complexities that exist to relate interculturally, interracially, and despite the anger and sense of hopelessness. Berlak and Moyenda state the following:

> I (we) wanted the students to see how they (as well as diverse others) are seen by an ever expanding circle of others, including those whose positions in hierarchies of power are different from their own. This, of course, included wanting students who by accident of birth were able to exercise white privilege to learn to see themselves from the perspectives of those whose views are often discounted and marginalized by the dominant culture. My (our) assumption was that as the students developed their abilities to see from the perspective of others, they would be in a better position to identify racism in themselves and others and to grasp it deeply enough to be moved to interrupt it (p. 157).

It would be ideal if white students were able to work with their white privilege to interrupt racism or work toward a more equitable society. What is happening though is that they often don't see themselves as part of the "dominant culture;" therefore, the automatic response is defensiveness or anger. White students want to hear the subjective stories of people of color, to learn from them, not to learn about themselves and their part in enacting racism. When it comes to students of color learning about hierarchies of power, some of them may really grasp that while others who have not been directly exposed to blatant acts of injustice will also get defensive.

Audre Lorde (1984) claims that anger is an okay emotion to have especially when one has experienced harmful, painful acts of racism or other forms of oppression. In "The Uses of Anger: Women Responding to Racism" Lorde stated the following:

> Every woman has a well-stocked arsenal of anger potentially useful against those oppressions, personal and institutional, which brought that anger into being. Focused with precision it can become a powerful source of energy serving progress and change...I

> do not mean a simple switch of positions or temporary lessening of tensions, nor the ability to smile or feel good. I am speaking of a basic and radical alteration in those assumptions underlying our lives. (p. 127)

Instructors, in general, have not had specific "training" or learned to channel that anger to be "useful" against the oppressions they are trying to dismantle which prevents them from bringing about sustainable change in the community or in their lives or work with people different from them. It is ultimately preventing their growth and work toward social justice. Lorde (1984) emphasizes the fact that discussions around and about racism must include the recognition of anger. Simultaneously marginalized educators, especially, must talk about it to learn to channel their anger toward their own empowerment and growth and to prevent internalization of oppression. To not address anger is like not being angry at racism and what it has done to people of color and white people, this has separated us and has kept us from bringing about real change in our lives. It is important then that student leaders as co-teachers, being non-generic instructors, learn to express and channel their anger toward self-empowerment where they can shift the internalization of this oppression and fight it with "critical resistant navigational skills" (Solorzano and Villalpando, 1998).

What Are Other Campuses Doing?: Rethinking the Curriculum

From June 2001 to the time of this writing, I have being going through an intensive self-reflection and questioning of the work that I have been doing for CSU Monterey Bay's Service Learning Institute since 1998, when I first started as a student leader. I have questioned how an institution, where the "isms" are blatantly visible and exercised, can still work toward social justice and change. Through attending conferences and engaging in dialogues with allies and mentors in this area of work, I have come to understand that I must find out what other campuses

are doing to help me rethink the curriculum that I have began to lose trust in, and to help me revive my hope for social change. For the reasons stated above, this section was created.

bell hooks (1994) writes about "education as the practice of freedom." This concept of liberation, of transgression, is intended to liberate students from racial, sexual, and social class restrictions to achieve freedom from the traditional curriculum and pedagogy. She encourages, the "mythical norm," the "generic professor," the "simultaneously marginalized" student and instructor to channel anger in a constructive way of teaching and learning that forces us to deal with racist and sexist issues in the classroom. hooks (1994) states the following, "Any classroom that employs a holistic model of learning will also be a place where teachers grow, and are empowered by the process" (pg. 21). How does "education as the practice of freedom" relate to diversity trainings for white instructors?

Geneva Gay and Tyrone C. Howard (1999) agree that there is a need for diversity trainings or professional development for white instructors due to the increasing number of diverse students in educational institutions. Jeannette M. Ludwig and John A. Meacham (1997) present a study assessing the impact of the instructors' race and gender when teaching controversial issues to diverse classrooms. The study showed that the students' evaluations of the instructor (white) were more positive because they had their expectations met. The instructors of color's evaluations were more negative in terms of the low level of expectations the students had at the beginning of the course and how their perspectives changed toward the end of the semester because they were being challenged and actually learning more than they expected. Unfortunately, according to articles created by students in Dr. Gissier's course at Columbia University (2001) even if the facilitator has earned the credentials to teach on this subject, the experiences are still painful. Facing racism in the classroom is a very painful experience. These

credentials mean nothing if the person is still going to be judged based on the color of their skin or gender.

Audre Lorde's (1984) Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches " The Master's Tools Will Never Dismantle the Master's House," poses a poignant question: "What does it mean when the tools of a racist patriarchy are used to examine the fruits of that same patriarchy?" She then answers that question adding "It means that only the most narrow perimeters of change are possible and allowable" (p. 110-111). Lorde asks us to work through our differences, in a non-dominant way and explore how being different can help different peoples to come together and work to end inequity, since our social identities and oppressions are interconnected:

> Difference is that raw and powerful connection from which our personal power if forged...Survival is not an academic skill...it is learning how to take our differences and make them strengths. For the master's tools will never dismantle the master's house. They may allow us temporarily to beat him at his own game, but they will never enable us to bring about genuine change. (Lorde, 1984, p. 112)

The way that I understand this essay is very relevant to how I understand what happens to "simultaneously marginalized" instructors. There needs to be a clearer focus and we need to be vigilant in working with our differences to challenge dominant perspectives. In the classroom there is no mutual learning of our differences and how to work together to "dismantle" the structures of power that are in place. Therefore, there is no "genuine change" only more work for students and "non-generic" professors. There is no work around the exploration of the "simultaneous marginalization" and the impact we have upon a classroom where students don't see themselves reflected in the teachers. There is no transition from learning exclusively from a

dominant perspective to transgressing, from de-centering the dominant way of viewing the world to practicing "critical resistant navigational skills".

Conclusion

The literature reviewed indicates that the training instructors and co-instructors receive needs to be intensive to be able to facilitate these discussions, so that actual empowerment and growth occurs in the classroom, for the instructor and the students. A model to consider is No Boundaries: A Manual For Unlearning Oppression and Building Multicultural Alliances by Hugh Vasquez and Isoke Femi (1993). This model begins by defining "liberation" as a means to prevent the internalization of oppression, first and foremost. In Chapter Two "Liberation—Healing—Safety" Vasquez and Femi (1993) define liberation as follows:

> It is the elimination of systems, or aspects of systems, that perpetuate the mistreatment of a particular group due to their cultural background, and it is the "undoing" of the effects on individuals of living in an oppressive society...Multicultural work involves the dismantling of oppressive structures, the creation of equitable policies and fair treatment for everyone...It means that one would be able to look at the institutions which comprise our social and economic systems and see equity from top to bottom...it is action oriented with people coming together to use their collective power to bring about institutional change.... In our search for a simple solution, we often overlook the essential elements for building "multicultural" and other alliances. The key concepts are safety and healing as the predecessors to the establishment of liberation and justice. (p. 12-13)

I wonder how "safety and healing" are defined here. What is the process to be safe and to heal? This model seems to be offered as part of the solution or for further recommendations. The model suggests that instead of trying to abolish oppressions simultaneously, one must work

through the dismantling of aspects of the system to prevent the internalization of anger that could prevent one from moving forward in the work toward social change. Furthermore, "The healing stage in liberation work requires the courage to look squarely at the depth of our anguish and despair; to make the space for each to come forward with her/his truth without fear of reprisal" (Vasquez and Femi, 1993, p. 13). This is necessary, they argue, to commit to the hard work of social change.

In conclusion, as agents of social change it is imperative that one critically reflects upon how much work can be done from inside the institution. Through storytelling, multiple realities and truths, that have not been included in the traditional curriculum, must be heard and taken under consideration to change the status quo. It is through collaborative understanding of the simultaneous marginalization and through listening to our anger toward social injustice that we can begin dismantling the master's house. It is not through using the master's tools but perhaps by at least remodeling room per room in his house that we can begin to heal, liberate and transgress.

Chapter Three: USAs Herstories and Histories

This participatory action research thesis used focus group interviews of University Service Advocates (USAs) at California State University, Monterey Bay (CSUMB) to examine the narrative testimonios of the student leaders and also to learn if and how the Service Learning Institute has supported their growth as social justice leaders. The thesis also examined how the social identities of the student leaders impacted how they co-taught race in the classroom or in diverse communities. The purpose of using interactive focus groups as a method to gather data was to be an inclusive researcher and have the participants involved in the data gathering process.

As the moderator, I held an authority position that allowed me to look into the lives of the eleven participants in this study. It is necessary that you, the reader, know the connections and relationships I have formed with several of the participants. At the time of this study, I was the Student Leadership Graduate Fellow. This position served the USAs in multiple ways, but especially as a mentor. In the organizational chart, I held a higher position than they did, as a staff member of the Service Learning Institute. I also worked closely with one of the USAs, Laura, co-teaching an SL 200 course. Several of the USAs are also close friends of mine outside of our professional roles with Service Learning.

Initial discussions and expressions of interest to participate on this project took place in the 2002 fall semester. However, the first focus group, the women, met over dinner (cooked by the moderator) on February 21, 2003. The women signed informed consent forms (see Appendix C) and enjoyed a relaxed, informal discussion that lasted a couple of hours. The room set up was arranged so that the participants were able to see each other. It was critical to establish discussion guidelines to allow room for all voices to be heard. For example, as a group we

agreed to listen to one another fully and to maintain confidentiality. The dialogue was tape-recorded and notes were taken simultaneously to keep track of all the voices and opinions. Though I initially had a set of questions in front of me (described later in this chapter and as Appendix B), and asked a few, I allowed the participants to engage in respectful dialogue and only asked for clarification or follow up when needed. The women had a genuine discussion that touched on various issues they had not previously had the opportunity to voice to one another.

The second focus group, the men's focus group, joined me for dinner on March 27, 2003. Since the moderator was not able to cook dinner, take out was ordered and enjoyed by the five of us. It was important to host the participants for dinner at my house to establish a sense of community and to somehow break the ice as a way to begin the dialogue. Though at first I did not feel at ease with being a female moderator, the males proved to me that there are multiple ways to communicate across our gender differences. They were also open to sharing their emotions and being vulnerable with one another. Again, the environment was arranged so that we all could see each other around the dining table.

Setting and Background

CSUMB has a unique Vision Statement that commits its students, staff, and faculty to engage in reciprocal service with the communities that surround the campus. Part of the Vision Statement reads as follows:

> California State University, Monterey Bay (CSUMB) is envisioned as a comprehensive state university which values service through high quality education. The campus will be distinctive in serving the diverse people of California, especially the working class and historically undereducated and low-income populations...The identity of the university will be framed by substantive

> commitment to multilingual, multicultural, gender-equitable learning...The curriculum of CSUMB will be student and society centered and of sufficient breadth and depth to meet statewide and regional needs, specifically those involving both inner-city and isolated rural populations, and needs relevant to communities in the immediate Tri-County region (Monterey, Santa Cruz, and San Benito). –*September 27, 1994*

Out of the twenty-three CSU campuses, CSUMB is the only campus that requires Service Learning as an integral part of their undergraduate curriculum prior to graduating.

The setting of this study was the University Service Advocate (USA) Program at the Service Learning Institute at CSUMB. The USA Program is the only student leadership program of its kind, and what makes it unique is the fact that students are trained to become co-teachers in the service learning classrooms. Service learning classes at CSUMB deliver rigorous curriculum where students learn about their social identities, power, privilege and oppression, how to enter communities, how they can be agents of change, and the impact they can have in serving in communities different from their own. Thus, the student leaders are instrumental in modeling what they are co-teaching in the classroom.

The University Service Advocates (USAs) must undergo a four-week long leadership training called the Summer of Service Leadership Academy (SoSLA). During the training, students are exposed to becoming aware of who they are as leaders and facilitators of social justice pedagogy. They begin by exploring their social identities and through experiential learning they immerse themselves in a curriculum that further explores different ways of being agents of change. The student leaders cannot become USAs until they themselves have experienced a service learning course in the duration of their education at CSUMB and prior to

their last year at the campus. It is a requirement that USAs serve in their respective positions as student leaders for at least a year.

Participants

The seven women and the four men were diverse in terms of social identities and experiences in the USA Program. They were selected based on their social identities as well as their lived experiences as participants in the USA Program. The various experiences brought depth and breath of information about how the diverse social identities of the participants influenced how they were treated as student leaders in the classroom or in the community.

Instead of imposing labels, titles or categories, I asked both the men and the women to self identify, verbally, according to what they felt comfortable sharing about themselves. The first minutes of the dialogue began with self-introductions. These are their own words, however pseudonyms have been used for confidentiality purposes:

Laura: Multiracial woman, Puerto Rican, Swedish, Italian, French.

Maricela: Chicana, young, strictly committed.

Yolanda: Mexican mutt, 23 years old, graduating senior, middle class, single.

Jennifer: 26 years old, White woman, Hungarian, Welch, German, Swedish, Bisexual, Gypsy.

Sandra: Chicana, bicultural, first generation, low income, border crossing mujer, activist.

Olivia: 20 years old, Biracial, Filipino and white, woman.

Rhonda: Portuguese Immigrant, 25 years old, ally.

The four men were also asked to self-identify themselves prior to starting our dialogue. These are their answers:

Miguel Angel: I'm nineteen years old. I was born in Mexico. I am heterosexual. My religion is Roman Catholic. I'm a senior. Liberal Studies major.

Bruce: I'm a junior. My major is technology. I am biracial, white and part Mexican and some other stuff too. I'm Roman Catholic. My social class is lower middle. My nationality is American. I am heterosexual. I'm twenty years old.

Hector: I am Mexican American. 25-year old male, heterosexual, able bodied. My class would be lower upper middle class. I've been raised in predominantly white communities. I am not bilingual. I speak some basic Spanish and American Sign Language. Raised as Catholic. English speaking, educated.

Alberto: I was born here in the United States but my mother is from Mexico. I'm bilingual, Spanish and English, I am lower class. I'm over twenty. I grew up with only my mother so that really shaped how I grew up.

Data Collection

The data gathering began with guidance from expert informants: former and current staff members from the Service Learning Institute. The topic of interest derived from my experience as lead facilitator of the SoSLA 2001 training and my realization that the USAs were not receiving a training I felt was adequate and deep enough to enhance their growth as student leaders teaching about issues of race in the classroom. An interview with the Coordinator of Introduction to Service Learning Instruction at CSUMB took place in the spring of 2002. The purpose of this interview was to hear her perspective about the work the USAs had done working with her as co-teachers. At that time several USAs were also interviewed via electronic mail to help me narrow down my topic. This was background information that is not included in this thesis, but helped to shape it. The purpose of the pre-interviews was not only to narrow down my topic but also to leave something behind, a product, for the future USAs.

The initial informational meeting with the USAs took place in September 2002. From that initial meeting twelve students showed interest in participating in this project. However, from those twelve only eleven ended up being participants in this project. The twelfth participant simply did not show up to the dinner for unknown reasons. The men and women were informed about the project beforehand and informed consent forms were sent to them electronically to review and sign prior to scheduling the focus group.

As described at the beginning of this chapter, the focus groups began with the participants and the moderator eating and informal dialogue around the fact that this was the first time several of us were in the same room discussing these issues. The participants talked about how happy they were to engage in dialogue with USAs whom they had not connected with prior to this focus group.

The focus groups' dialogues began with informal self-identified introductions and laying out how the information gathered would serve this project. Because I was the moderator, my voice was not as involved in the conversation since I really wanted the participants to converse with one another and engage in deep talks around the questions I posed to them. These are some of the guiding questions used (full focus group protocol available as Appendix B):

- Please state your name and any other social identities you want to identify yourself with.
- Let's begin by reflecting back to your experiences in the USA program. What positions have you held and whom have you worked with, in terms of faculty, community agencies, etc?
- How has the partnership worked or not, between you and the instructor or faculty member/s you have worked with?

- Do you feel that the SoSLA training provided you with all the necessary tools to become a facilitator, a student leader in the classroom and/or in the community?
- What skills did you gain from the training? What would you keep as it is? What would you change about the training?
- What do you think about the curriculum you help co-facilitate, deliver in SL 200 courses, upper division classes, or as community-based USA?

As a woman and also as moderator, I went into the women's group very comfortable and felt prepared leading the dialogue. The women's focus group was successful in engaging in conversations with one another and whenever I felt they got stuck around a question or topic, I would intercede and introduce my thoughts and/or further questions to guide them. The women's group was larger and since this was the first time a lot of us were in the same room, after the discussion we went out to deepen our bonding. The women's group engaged in deep and personal dialogue from start to finish.

The men's focus group was not as successful in continuing the dialogue without the prompting of questions by the moderator. The men waited for one another to finish their thoughts and went around in a circle, each person taking his turn to answer each question. The men's group was smaller, more intimate and open to sharing vulnerable personal experiences. There were three Latinos, from various positionalities, and a multiracial male. For the men's group, however, I felt a bit scared in leading a discussion with all males. However, the men's group proved a lot of my assumptions and fears wrong. At first I thought I was not going to be able to connect across our multiple experiences, and felt awkward leading an all-male group. The men were open to being vulnerable and to fully listening to one another. There were stories shared, I had no idea what would come out. The men took care of one another. After the first

demonstration of vulnerability others also took the risk to share their feelings publicly. This was a great experience that modeled what kind of male USAs the program has recruited and nurtured in a way where they can be allies to women and they don't fear the stigma that comes from being vulnerable with each other and/or around women.

Data Analysis

The dialogue was tape-recorded and side notes were taken. The moderator transcribed, verbatim, the women's focus group recording. The men's group tape, however, was transcribed with the help from one of the women participants due to time constraints. Again, the transcription was verbatim though there were a few areas where a couple of the men's voices were unclear therefore leading the transcriber to summarize the data.

In order to identify consistent themes, the data from each participant had to be cut and pasted in a word-processing program to be able to clearly see the major themes. Also, there were portions of the recorded conversations that were missing or not recorded at all; therefore, follow up via electronic mail with individual participants was used to clarify missing data. To identify the major themes, I had to literally sit away from the computer with a hard copy of the transcription and a pen. I read and wrote notes in the margins to help me see what topics came up from the participants. The grounded theory approach helped me in doing selective coding, a process by which a researcher can identify common themes that come from the participants. By reading the transcription and underlining words or phrases that stood out, I was able to see a pattern in the language the participants were using. I then cut and pasted excerpts under each participants' name and started to see a conversation happening. It was then easier to see where the participants were agreeing with themes and where contradiction emerged.

Chapter Four: Understanding what is Happening Inside the Master's House From Lived Experience

When I first came to this country I felt I didn't have any rights, I was pretty much at the bottom of the barrel and that was why I needed to fit those stereotypes and assumptions that others had about me. Then somebody who didn't look like me said, "you have potential," so I took that and worked with it and went through high school learning more about myself and the concept of thinking outside the box, getting involved in my community and seeing that the community was helping me a lot more than I was helping it...Though I had the experiences, I didn't know what to call them, I didn't have the names for the concepts. Coming to CSUMB, despite the fucking discrimination I went through, I learned to name my experiences and found a voice to call them racism or sexism...After SoSLA I have done a lot of reflection about this...That a social justice program could have done what they did to me...A social justice program that required a social security number, so I hold a lot of anger towards that, I hold anger at myself for having stayed there, for not having asked for a check. I hold anger toward the fact that perhaps my acts of resistance, in continuing my work at the SLI, were not enough toward social change.

Grounded theory is a process through which a researcher can identify the different issues that may arise from the participants of a particular focus group or interview (Emerson, 1995). Through data collection, note taking, coding (for specific themes), memoing (making notes of what else is going on in the environment the focus group or interview is taking place), sorting, and finally writing, one can conclude a common thread/s that connects the participants. This process also helps the researcher see clearly and reflect upon her biases; and the fact that one has

biases invites validity check with the participants and it helps the researcher to triangulate the data (Emerson, 1995).

The data were analyzed using grounded theory. Through using the grounded theory process, several themes emerged from the data from both the women and men's groups. This chapter, however, has broken the data into two different sections by focus groups: Women's and Men's. Each group has been analyzed separately to show you a clearer picture of the different experiences between both groups and to point out the struggles these groups face across the gender differences. The chapter concludes with an examination of the intersecting themes between the two groups.

The Women's Focus Group

This part of the chapter has been organized according to the themes below, in the order that they came up in the focus group. The themes show the thread of the dialogue itself and the connections that the women made as they spoke about different issues. The first four themes--Social Identities: Awareness of Self and Others; Educating White Students at the Expense of Students of Color; Silence, Resistance, and Anger; and Ways of Knowing--are directly connected to Critical Race Theory (CRT) and Cultural Citizenship (CC). The women then shared the importance of taking care of themselves as social justice leaders working toward change, a change that begins with and among them.

- Social Identities: Awareness of Self and Others

This theme emerged from the consciousness around the socially constructed identities the participants chose to embrace and identify with from the beginning of the interview. Their awareness of self and others was demonstrated by quickly identifying with a particular social

group, and being able to aid others in self-discovery and awareness with regards to their various identities and "isms" with respect to power, privilege and oppression.

- Educating White Students at the Expense of Students of Color

This theme addresses in particular, the way in which students of color gain a voice in courses and then have their voices are exploited, especially when the instructor "needs" the perspective of a marginalized student.

- Silence, Resistance, and Anger

These are all emotions or acts that took place in the classroom, as coping mechanisms. The USAs talked about the silence that many students of color use as a tool to resist teaching at their expense. From the anger toward social injustices, many students channel their anger and fight for social change that begins with their own empowerment through that anger.

- Ways of Knowing (i.e., storytelling)

The women USAs shared their personal narratives. Through storytelling, their emotions and details of their own growth as student leaders came through. They also shared that using the "I" in their everyday lives was a way of feeling included in the curriculum and of being heard. They explained the "I" came from being able to share stories about themselves, in the first person, being able to write about their culture, not others' for example.

- Internalized Oppression

This theme stems from the way in which marginalized students have internalized dominant perspectives. To some extent, the stories around issues of socioeconomic class explored this concept. Also, the language the participants chose to communicate some of their stories and emotions, reflected a different level of awareness or internalized oppression.

- Taking Care of Ourselves

The ways in which the USAs nurture their forms of activism to continue the hard work toward social change, was the very last theme that emerged from the data. Their answer affirmed the need to take care of themselves.

The first theme, social identities of self and others, arose as the women began to talk about how they wanted to be identified on tape and in the research paper. Instead of stating their names first they claimed identities such as, Chicana, biracial or multiracial, gypsy, and activist. This awareness of their social identities was also salient as the women began to talk about the faculty members they have worked with and the impact of their social identities as co-instructors. The women's consciousness flowed easily; this common language (i.e., the terminology they used) set a tone of common understanding of their social identities as well as others'. These are Sandra's words about social identities:

> I've co-taught um, Human Communication (HCom) 317, I don't know the name of the course, about three years ago, Women's Issues was last semester, SL 200. This semester is um...Community Research Visual and Public Art (VPA) 317S or something like that...it varies every semester, my first semester I have to say was the hardest, I had. I remember going home crying every time because, because our service learners were at this high school helping the English Department prepare students to become better writers and I was the only person of color in the classroom so I think that...the professor really challenged me to share my experience and then my writing is not the best so she was always using it as an example.

The words of Sandra are also speaking to the power dynamics between her and the co-instructor. In the HCom 317 course, she worked with a white woman with a doctoral degree. Sandra felt used by the co-instructor because she was the only person of color in the classroom and the USA.

In SL 200 she co-taught with a third generation Japanese American woman professor. This was a great experience for Sandra because she truly felt like a co-facilitator and they communicated continuously regarding the course. In the VPA 317S class, Sandra co-taught with an African American female professor. The two women of color faced resistance from the white students and silence "as an act of resistance" (Sandra) from the students of color. Silence as an act of resistance prevents the sharing of their stories to be used as tools, for white students, to learn about racism.

After Sandra's insights, the women began to share testimonios[4] of specific experiences in SL 200 courses, when they were students, first learning about these issues. Maricela shared an incident that involved her disclosing personal feelings toward white people after gaining awareness around her social identities, as privileged and marginalized. Maricela also touched upon another theme, storytelling as a way of knowing (sharing *testimonios*). Maricela talked about growing up including the "I" in her ways of communicating with others, verbally or in written form. She states the following about this theme:

> I don't have a problem so much with that [sharing her story] because I also agree that if my story is actually going to change something then I'm willing to share it, I am going to share it because I know that it's gonna affect one out of thirty students in that class...What I think becomes troubling to me is that within the curriculum for SL200, students of color are encouraged to share stories but once we start to gain a voice in the classroom, we are automatically questioned on everything we say.

---

[4] 1. Autobiographical writing is a very old tradition in women's literature. For Latinas/os, the "testimonio" tradition and legacy of Latin American women activists and writers is more immediate. Life stories are told in many forms. http://classes.csumb.edu/HCOM/HCOM328-01/world/LLSsyl.html#anchor19153 Testimonios are counter stories that serve as tools to relate the lived experiences of people who have historically been marginalized. Testimonios also help in teaching others about the multiple realities of a particular group.

Educating white students at the expense of students of color, and silence, resistance, and anger were other themes that arose. Maricela also spoke on these themes when she said:

> I just felt really upset because I wasn't given that space to say something that I felt as freely as I was when I was sharing a story about coming from a single parent home and from a low income community, and so I think that's when I started to see a lot of, I don't know, a lack of empowerment for students of color 'cause we are constantly being questioned when we finally gain that strength to say something.

Storytelling as a way of knowing was exemplified throughout the focus group duration. Educating white students at the expense of students of color was touched upon, primarily by women of color, but there was also a voice from a woman who benefits from white privilege. Silence, anger and resistance came out as emotions in the stories that were shared. The women shared testimonios rather than answer in a yes or no mode or short answers. This is Maricela's story:

> Once we start to gain that power and strength to open up and to say things that might be hurtful and that are not gonna be as nice or sad to hear than we are gonna constantly be questioned...I recall one situation in my SL200 class, it was towards the end of the semester and I had done a lot of sharing and we were talking about how students of color felt towards white students and it was something that I had felt through the whole semester, since I started at CSUMB and I finally had the courage to say it and I said, "I don't like white people." I do not have a friend that is white, I have never been close friends with anyone that is white and...there was another student in the class who is now a USA with me and I remember her saying, "well I just feel sorry for you 'cause you are missing out on a lot of great people," so that comment to me went both ways.

It was interesting that Maricela realized that her stories were heard and empathized with when she shared about her oppressed identities, but not otherwise. For Maricela, anger also came up by reflecting back upon where that comment came from, specifically around the discrimination and prejudice her family has experienced by white folks. It makes her angry that once she felt empowered to finally voice her thoughts, she was shutdown. Coincidentally, Maricela's words also brought about a lot of reactions from the other participants. Sandra felt similarly when sharing:

> I also feel that when we do finally have that courage to voice it out, I have been used as a token in other classes, especially with Professor Holmes [pseudonym for a female instructor], "I need a woman of color, I need a woman who is in the community, I need this and that..." you boxed me, I shared a story and now you want me to repeat it constantly over and over and over. I might have felt like that at the time but now I have moved on. I am also struggling with that and saying no, no I am not gonna share it just whenever you want me to, that's something that I treasure.

Sandra was referring to an administrator and instructor who often calls upon student leaders to serve particular classroom roles based upon their social identities and how those would enhance and perpetuate the education of white students at the expense of students of color. Though that administrator is a person of color, Sandra didn't feel appreciated for her contributions and felt taken advantage of because she had to share her personal, cherished stories and didn't feel the courage or "power" to say no. The teaching was taking place at the expense of this woman of color.

On the other hand, for Olivia, a biracial (white and Filipino) woman, Maricela's comments made her reflect about her social identities and her positionality and feelings. These are her thoughts:

> I don't know, if I heard that comment, [referring to Maricela's comment about not liking white people] I would feel offended...because I look white so people of color don't like me because I look white and then I try to prove myself as to be biracial because I don't fit in the white category and then they wouldn't hate me. So, I don't know, when I heard that, at the same time like I don't think I could feel for you but I was thinking, "Why does she have the right to say that?"

The question Olivia posed to the group brought up many emotions and various answers that came from the first reactions and of each of the participants. Olivia's positionality as a biracial woman brought up that question. The group moved forward with the dialogue and tried to answer this complicated question. Yolanda questioned Maricela about her comment toward white people and asked if it makes a difference if or when white people talk about people of color in the same manner. Yolanda was clearly questioning the reasoning behind Maricela's words and speaking on behalf of white people because of her relationships with her roommates (who are white) and other white allies. Yolanda's questioning came from her experiences with consciously aware white people whom she sees as allies and friends. Maricela did not have an answer for Yolanda but Rhonda then entered the dialogue:

> In response to Yolanda's question, if I was to hear for example, if I can use Maricela's example, "I hate white people" I think coming from a person of color, in our system, our society that we live in, who in our society don't have the privilege, is not to me personally...I don't take as much offense to that. If it was coming from the opposite side,

a white person saying, "I hate people of color, I hate Latinos," or whatever the comment would be...is coming from a person with privilege and the people in power of this system look just like this and to me that's the difference...It's very clear, this person does not have privilege in our society therefore making a comment like that is very strong and could be hurtful depending on the situation but certainly they have every right to do that...They face racism or prejudice by the way they look and our society flips that on them and that's what makes a difference for me.

Maricela was disappointed in the classroom, in realizing that even if other students of color felt the same way as her about white people, they didn't back her up. The instructor, a woman of color, however did stand up for her. She feels sad that it wasn't "her own people" supporting her. The women in the focus group were clear in identifying that internalized oppression and/or feeling silenced in the classroom played a role in the lack of support Maricela experienced. They drew that conclusion from their own lived experiences interacting with those same students outside of the classroom and hearing their stories. It was also interesting for me to realize that a lot of students of color and white students do come to the classroom with the same level of awareness around their social identities or oppression. They may also come socialized to not have a voice in the classroom.

For example Rhonda, a Portuguese woman, first talked about the privileges she knows she receives because of her white skin. Furthermore, Rhonda also encouraged the group to think about the systemic inequities and positionalities of different people who could have made that same comment. Rhonda stated:

I think that people of color...have to face the shit that comes along with it, with racism, prejudice and that's just something that people have to live with every day. I say they

because I personally don't have to go through that because of my white skin and my blonde hair. So when these white students get in these classes, and all these issues keep going out at them, is all based on the racism that comes down from the system that is governed by white, upper class, you know...and all of a sudden they are uncomfortable, fuck that! Sorry. You are gonna get uncomfortable and get used to it you know.

Rhonda's words were important to ponder because as student leaders, who face resistance from primarily white students, individual and systemic oppression need to constantly be defined. The definition and distinction between individual and systemic oppression needs to be made more frequently. The rest of the group then engaged in a deep dialogue around the definition and distinction.

Jennifer discussed the fact that in our society today, we also need to begin to take a look at the intersection of race and class. Additionally, Jennifer talked about the need for this kind of "honesty" to be implemented in the USA program itself. Jennifer also touched upon the need to have these honest conversations, to take care of ourselves in order to not internalize the conflicts or tension among the group and work better together. These are her words:

It seems that...it was honesty not racism [referring to Maricela's comment on not liking white people]...I think a lot of people can't be honest and say that outright. And I agree with the person that said that to you, that you are missing out on a lot of cool people, but I think that that is coming back to the system. When someone of color says that they don't wanna be friends with people that are white or they hate whites, it is in a sense hating the system of oppressions and making it individual. You know? Now a days I see a lot that really upsets me, it is a system of oppression that is about class and it's about money...Now people know that's not cool to be racist, you're not supposed to be racist,

> but now you can take this money and screw over a community that might have both people of color and white people living in it and people don't even know it. It's looking at the people's income and their race…I wish that there was more of that especially in our USA program because it's all who's gonna step on whose toes and you know there's that division and no one talks about it.

It was important, at that point, for the group to immerse in a discussion around the terminology that was being used so that the group came up together and created a sense of community through language. Equally important to notice is where intersections around race and other identities happened. For example, for some people of color race or ethnicity may automatically come interconnected to immigration status, educational background or social class background. Maricela added:

> I think it comes down to the definition of racism…I am not gonna have the power to walk out of that classroom and state a law that is gonna make every white person suddenly become illegal in this country and not have benefits or access to education, or health care, I think that's the difference. When someone of color says it, they don't have that power to go back and make those changes that's gonna affect the way they feel about white people, whereas, a white person might have that privilege and be able to walk out of that classroom and say you know what "I don't really like what she said, and because of that I am gonna make sure that everyone else that I come across is never gonna have the privilege I have." You know? So I think it is being able to take action upon what your opinions are and not being able to.

Several other issues came up through Maricela's words, among those were systemic inequities and the power to enact legislation that will oppress marginalized communities even more. The

white woman and the women who benefit from white privilege reacted in a positive way by accepting the fact that the system and the individual acts of racism need to be clearly defined before blaming. Maricela agreed with Jennifer by stating:

> I think you are right Jennifer, when I said that statement, I said it with everything built inside of me, against the system, against the people who held my mother back from being an educated single mother in this country, the people didn't allow all my other eight friends to go to college with me and I think you are right, that's what it was and unfortunately the way I said wasn't the best way to express something that deep but I felt liberated...Maybe I didn't use the right words but I feel that it was years of pain and anger you know coming down to those two seconds and it took a lot of courage for me to do that and I don't regret any second of it because it really allowed me to move on and I became friends with the person who told me that so it worked both ways. But, um, it was my space and I wanted to claim that space and I think I had every right to.

Maricela brought up Cultural Citizenship without even knowing she was doing so. She was aware of her social identities, and was claming rights not only for her, but also for other oppressed communities. Maricela's anger and resistance were salient as she spoke eloquently about claiming rights and space. The anger toward social inequities is what fuels her resistance to this oppressive system. She did have every right to voice her anger and to some extent prevent the perpetuation of the learning taking place at her expense, when she shared experiences where she was "simultaneously marginalized." The one area where not all women have experienced "simultaneous marginalization," is in the classroom due to their different social identities.

Sandra shared her experience in co-leading (race) caucus groups in the VPA 317S course. She realized that the biracial, multi-heritage, and the Latina/o groups were receptive and open to sharing their experiences with racism. Those three groups did not blame the white students but simply shared their stories. However, the white students felt challenged, blamed, and attacked for racism in this society. Sandra feels that the curriculum is most definitely designed to educate white students at the expense of students of color. She also talked about the fact that both she and the co-instructor were questioned and challenged by the white students in the purpose of doing this work. Rhonda agreed with Sandra. After taking SL200 with a white professor she realized that the curriculum served white students more than students of color. She understood there were many issues she had not had to deal with as students of color did. She saw how students of color "were put on the spot" to share stories of their experiences with racism to support the fact that racism exists. Rhonda asserts that the curriculum is indeed designed to serve the needs of white students, by stating the following:

> I took SL 200, that was my first experience with Service Learning, with Dr. Love and um…just, it was definitely designed for the white students…I certainly experience white privilege every day so I feel like I was the one learning right along with the white students…I saw the same things you guys are sharing about how the students of color didn't really speak out even though I knew them to be very outspoken in other capacities. I think it really puts people in a very avertable position, people of color, students of color. And I do agree with you that it is designed, or at least some points designed for the learning and the advancing of white students at the expense of students of color because they are the ones who are put on the spot. Educate the white students on what has your experience been or how has racism you have experienced affected you?

The last statement seemed to be an "a-ha" moment for the focus group and made a clear connection as to why students of color are often silent in the classroom. Whereas students of color are vulnerable when sharing their stories and revealing personal information about them, white students become resistant to the curriculum. The resistance from white students may come from hearing stories of racist acts or discrimination toward people of color, therefore feeling blamed or accused, though they themselves were not the perpetrators. Storytelling as a way of knowing is also exemplified in the statement Rhonda shared above in terms of how students of color are able to share their stories, except when they feel forced to do so or if others are not willing to share.

Jennifer, however, posed a different outlook on this matter. Jennifer posed the idea that racism is invisible to white people though racism impacts all people but in different ways. She also discussed the possibility that there might be a lot of dysfunction in white families that is not expressed, talked about, or even admitted. There is a lot of work to be done within the family unit before expecting white students to take ownership of how they enact racism or other forms of oppression. Jennifer further talked about white students not being willing to share if they don't hear the stories of students of color. The question is then: shouldn't all share instead of perpetuating the learning at the expense of a particular group?

Olivia's take on this topic was different than others' because she believed that her SL 200 instructor was an ally to students of color. This is what she said:

> My teacher was Professor Whyte and I thought she was an ally to colored students and in our class most of the people that participated were of color and I think…I can identify with my white side as being more not sharing your feelings so when you don't share your feeling sometimes, you don't really know…how to express your stories or maybe

> understand the feelings of other people but I noticed in that class…I always identified myself as white because I look white before this class…I am learning all this stuff, opening my eyes and I don't, I didn't see it as an expense to other students, I just saw it as from the readings, not sharing it, because we didn't really share our personal stories unless someone wanted to.

Olivia's experiences seem to be different than those of students of color. Olivia was conscious that she benefits from white privilege and that that is why she does not identify as a person of color. However, there are biracial or multiracial students who don't benefit from white privilege and are categorized as people of color. As a biracial woman she sees things through a different lens.

During the focus group, after Olivia used the term "colored people" instead of people of color, some of the women looked at me a bit puzzled perhaps as to where that term came from. Those puzzled stares came from their consciousness of their own social identities and of others. Though it was not talked about during the focus group, a couple of the women kept wondering why she used that term and not people of color. Undoubtedly, we all knew that term was not politically correct and that it had historically been used to segregate and discriminate people of color. Internalized oppression could also be the reason as to why Olivia used different terminology than the other women. I also wondered, but none of us asked Olivia anything. Perhaps the momentum or the belief that we all ought to be at the same level of awareness, let that term slide. I did not further investigate why Olivia used this term because, after the focus group, it was clear to me that this was a painful story to talk about. Also the fact that our personal relationship outside of work is not as deep to engage in this dialogue, made further conversation on this topic difficult.

Laura, a multiracial woman, had yet another experience. Laura benefits from white privilege but her social identities are not all as visible unless she shares them with people. In attempting to be an ally to students of color and the instructor of color, Laura faced resistance and questioning from white classmates. This is her story:

> I had an instructor of color and the USA was also a woman of color and I felt like we spent a lot of time especially, dealing with the white males in that class...with the issues that they had with what we were talking about in that class...I was getting a lot of what the instructor and the USA were trying to teach in that class...maybe the instructor was looking to me because she knew, through journals and conversations outside of class, where I was coming from. I felt like she was looking to me to help get the points across to white students because of how I looked. My experience was different in that the reaction that I got from the white students when I would try to get a point across to the them about racism, classism, or anything...maybe they felt like I didn't really know who I was and they...the white students in the class probably questioned what right I had to say anything of what I was saying as while attempting to be an ally in that class...I was automatically questioned on my identity and basically what I had to say. What right did I have to say what I was saying? As far as, as your question of, "Is it easier to hear it from someone that you identify with?" my experience has been different. My experience was the opposite. It was probably less accepted because they were hearing it from me.

After hearing Laura's story the women realized that a sign of good work in the classroom is when students get upset or get resistant to the subject matter. This exemplified the multiple emotions that arise, anger and resistance, or silence if students are tired of sharing their stories. The women laughed at this irony. Another important point arose as the women began to see a

trend in terms of how they were brought up and the consciousness they have on how they are and why they behave the way they do.

For the group, everyone's sharing of their story was a helpful resource that demonstrated how they all taught one another without singling out anyone to teach at their expense. Olivia shared her painful story about feeling "split up" between her father and mother. She talked about looking like her mom and her brother like her dad and the disparities that stem from that. This was a great example of internalized oppression and/or an absence of depth to her awareness of social identities. These are Olivia's words:

> I'll discuss this kind of stuff [she is talking about the issues USAs address] with her and she'll be like, "what gives colored people," "she's white," "the right to say stuff about white people when we can't say stuff about them and like why is it OK in the classroom." Why do you hate me? Because you hate white people and I look white... I remember this one time when I was little we were driving through my dad's old neighborhood to my grandma's house and it's in kind of the bad side of Oakland, it's kind of nicer now...my grandma would literally not let us go outside and we had to keep the curtains shut because she thought that people would come and takes us or hurt us or something and so I remember driving there. My mom is sitting in the passenger seat and my dad is driving and I am sitting behind my mom and these kids run the yard, colored children playing with rocks like throwing them, and I literally thought they were gonna throw rocks at the car because I looked white in their neighborhood intruding on them. So I was like, "mom we have to duck because they are gonna throw rocks at us because we are white." We were in their neighborhood and we are not supposed to be here and like I don't know where I came up with this. But, I just remember that like so clearly and I was literally

ducking my mom and my dad was like, "this is my neighborhood, I grew up here, there's nothing wrong." I don't know, I just always identified with my mom because I look like my mom and my brother looks like my dad so it's split. He's supposed to identify with my dad because he looks that way and so um…I don't know.

This story answers a question I had regarding Olivia's use of the term "colored people" instead of using people of color. Her close relationship with her mother has influenced much of what Olivia knows. It also answers the puzzled look of the rest of the women. Olivia has been "raised" primarily by her mother since she looks more like her, even though her parents are still together. It also paints a clear picture of the relationship between her and her family and what she goes through based on her biracial identity.

As the women began to wrap up their discussion, Maricela touched upon the tools she gained through the Summer of Service Leadership Academy. As a storyteller, she has been able to use these tools in her USA role. She stated the following:

I think that SoSLA definitely encourages you to share your stories but it helps you channel those stories and how to say them so that they make change but I think I've always been a storyteller and people that know me know that…I think that the training has definitely allowed me to take that "I" and to channel and to put something else behind it. To help it change someone else hopefully, or to allow someone else to see what it is that "I" feel and that "I've" experienced…I try to walk my talk as much as I can but I am not a version of perfection out of the SLI. I am still a human being who has to deal with her own assumptions, stereotypes, and I am constantly trying to break down my own barriers. You know, and make friends with white people, *(giggles)*, so I think it's hard. I

try to walk my talk as much as I can and I think that's better than not being conscious of a walk at all.

In her self-reflection Maricela acknowledged the need to hear stories and to gain tools to use those as practices in the work toward social justice.

On the other hand, Laura wanted to know how to continue this work outside of the institution, where it is not as safe to be addressing these issues. Laura said that:

> SoSLA helped me to facilitate in these classroom situations... I feel like that's where it ends in classroom situations...I think classrooms are set up with guidelines or a general code of conduct kind of, because of the Vision Statement...I'm always asking, "how easy is it to do that outside of the classroom?" I don't feel that I'm prepared to discuss with people outside of the classroom where that learning is structured and planned out for you. Similar issues are coming out in my life everyday and maybe I haven't prepared or allowed myself to discuss that with people as I'm walking down the street or working with other people or whoever.

Rhonda posed the challenge to all of us to try to take this work outside of the institution because that is the "true test." Rhonda currently works within an institution of higher education and she constantly has to practice what she learned through the USA program even though most of her consciousness gets questioned. For Olivia, SoSLA gave her the tool to hear the stories prior to judging someone. This was interesting to hear toward the end of the dialogue because I realized that she had not talked as much as others. Olivia and Laura shared stories but not as much as the rest of the group. Nevertheless, the voices of the women of color were the stronger and louder ones. Olivia also confessed that when she is not in her USA role, she doesn't question or challenge her acquaintances about their oppressive remarks because she feels okay separating her

social and professional life. Could it be that Olivia only sees her position as a job or that the questioning from her mother on why we are addressing these issues has influenced this reaction? The issues tackled in the USA program may be overwhelming even for student leaders who have been exposed to these concepts before. However, in the focus group led by a woman of color, perhaps the biracial/multiracial women did not feel like it was their space to speak up. How could I have created a comfortable space for them even though I do not identify as biracial of multiracial?

For Maricela, this work allows her to constantly reflect upon her every action to take care of herself and others. Toward the end of the dialogue, the women talked about taking care of themselves and each other because of the reality that that is needed. Whether by talking a walk or engaging in discussions of issues they face in their everyday lives, even going out to eat or dance are examples of how they take care of themselves. The women shared stories of feeling burnt out, depressed, feeling drained, and losing their energy.

Yolanda spoke of feeling "at home" at the SLI and learning to become responsible whereas her former job did not require that of her. She adds that working at the SLI helps her challenge and incorporate multiple skills. She did agree, however, that taking care of themselves is essential in this line of work. They also agreed that this job requires a lot of time, leaving very little for self-care. For Jennifer, this is a job that is not paying enough for the hard work and time that it takes to work toward social justice. This comment came from Jennifer's need to be able to work toward social change but get paid for it. Being able to make a living and to live in a better society seemed to be an overall need from the group. If the USAs work is hard to do and is underpaid, is this an example of working toward social justice? On the other hand, being students within an institution does provide them with some privileges. How can the USAs work within

the master's house and still work toward social change? Rhonda concluded by affirming the need to find allies in this path of hard work because they are needed. Indeed, this is how many of the women are able to cope, by coalescing, building alliances.

The group created theory by sharing their own lived experiences as they spoke. The group was conscious of their social identities, systems of power and oppression and though they had different goals for social change, they all created a sense of community through their common language and awareness. Critical Race Theory (CRT) and Cultural Citizenship (CC) also helped to see how the women felt empowered to claim space and rights in higher education especially when teaching controversial courses. The group also made a clear connection to experiences of being "simultaneously marginalized" as non-traditional instructors or when being allies to oppressed groups. The women were also very informed around the intersections of race, class, gender and uses of anger and how channeling anger toward social justice can be effective. The women were very conscious and eloquent when speaking on this topic. They were all in touch with their anger toward injustices and clear on taking action in their lives and for themselves and for others.

The Men's Focus Group

The men's focus group was smaller than the women's, therefore, there is less data to analyze. Two of the four men spoke for longer periods; that is why there is more data presented here from Hector and Bruce. The group shared personal stories when they experienced different oppressions within the Service Learning Institute and outside of the university, in the surrounding communities.

The themes that merged from the men's focus group were:

- Social Identities: Awareness of Self and Others

This theme emerged from the consciousness around the socially constructed identities the participants chose to embrace and identify with from the beginning of the interview. Their awareness of self and others was demonstrated by quickly identifying with a particular social group, and being able to aid others in self-discovery and awareness with regards to their various identities and "isms" with respect to power, privilege and oppression.

- Lack of Authority and Respect

The lack of authority and respect toward USAs was exemplified as the males talked about how despite their roles as student leaders, they held little to no authority and experienced disrespect from service learners. They also connected this "disrespect" to other forms of oppression, such as, ageism.

- Tokenism (exploitation of identity and knowledge)

Several times, the USAs brought up examples of tokenism in classrooms where faculty members knew they were student leaders and thus took advantage of that. The standards that were set for those particular USAs were high and they often felt they were being used to help enhance the curriculum delivery.

- Recommendations for SoSLA and the USA Program (i.e., shared governance)

These recommendations for the SoSLA training and the USA program address particular areas where the USAs feel there needs to be improvement and changes. These changes can begin from the top of the hierarchy, otherwise they feel that there will not be authentic work coming out of the Service Learning Institute.

When speaking of their social identities, at the beginning of the dialogue, the men like the women began by stating the identities with which they wanted to be identified. They all shared identities, such as, gender, age, religion, socioeconomic status, and ethnic backgrounds. The

awareness of the concepts of oppression and privilege were also key in creating a common language for the group to unite and connect through. They also shared the positions they held within the USA program. An example of how empowering the naming of their social identities, for themselves and others, was presented when Hector said the following:

> With regards to me being a person of color...with the first class that I was in which was a IMIE [business] service learning course and...to talk about what it is like to be in the Salinas community and to describe what it's like and thinking that I would have some insights about that because I am Mexican. And constantly having my identity questioned as to how full of a Mexican I am because the way I present myself, the fact that I don't speak Spanish, I'm not the typical "stereotypical" Mexican that a lot of the faculty members have worked or have experienced working with. They would be like, "Oh, so which one of your parents is white?" And I'm looking at them and I'm like, "how can you say that about me?"

Hector's example also poses the power of being able to question others about their own assumptions and stereotypes about certain groups, such as images they hold about Mexican people. He also brought up an interesting point about being asked to speak on behalf of a group because he is a member of it, but then being questioned because he didn't fit into the box they were trying to place him in.

Interconnected to his ethnic background, Hector also talked about experiencing prejudice around the fact that he does not speak Spanish and having a faculty member associate his ethnicity to being an ESL (English as a Second Language) student:

> A faculty member asked if I needed special attention with bilingual education because there was an essay that I did and I didn't proofread it. And she automatically assumed

that English was my second language. Whereas for me it's like, no, you know I grew-up speaking English and Spanish was a second language. Just working at a place where I can deal with that and I was able to share that experience with the faculty at a faculty training and we were able to repair the relationship and for me that was closure to that.

Another person who touched upon this topic was Alberto. In connection being conscious of his social identities and questioning others about their assumptions about him he said; "I guess what I have experienced is more like, you're Mexican, and being asked, just what is it like? I can't talk for the whole race cause you know I'm just me." There was a connection between being able to name their identities and empowering themselves to question individuals who tried to box them into categories that perpetuated generalization and stereotyping.

Connected to this topic, Alberto shared that while he has definitely learned to name his social identities and feel empowered by doing so, he did not feel safe to share some of his "hidden" identities because of the stigma that comes from identifying with certain social groups. The question that arose from that is, why is this happening in a program where we are encouraged to work across our differences, and challenge oppression? Sharing his identity as a gay man was a courageous act, especially since one of the focus group members did not know. Alberto shared that he didn't think the environment in the USA program was safe enough to talk about something he had not yet shared with his mother. These are Alberto's words:

> I'm a gay male and it's like my heart's been racing because one person in this room didn't know and I didn't know if it would be safe to share that and I don't know…I don't know I have haven't thought about the reason why. I guess I don't share and the reason why I usually don't tell people about it is because my family doesn't know. And, the person I love the most is my mother and she basically would not want anything to do

with me anymore if she were to find out or when she finds out. And that's one thing that I guess even though I should feel safe, I do feel safe but I don't want to…I don't want to, I always question myself on why I hide it.

Something else that this brings up is the fact that while the sharing of stories ought to be empowering, according to CC, this has not been the case for Alberto. Though Alberto is claiming space and rights in the USA program by sharing his hidden identities, this has not been achieved therefore it has not been an empowering process for him. The process and fear of having to share are draining for him. This issue, however, places responsibility on the program to make individuals from diverse backgrounds feel welcomed and empowered to further their growth as student leaders. How can this be a social justice program and perpetuate homophobia or other forms of oppression? Alberto also discussed how hard it was to work with people who did not know about his identity and the fears that if he told people they may not want to work with him. He is very conscious of the heterosexism in the USA program. His last comment transitioned us into another theme; how are USAs seen as leaders in classrooms or in the community? The identities of the USAs, both visible and invisible, have an impact upon how the USAs are treated among themselves and by others.

When they were asked about their experiences in working with faculty, community members, and/or other students, Bruce began sharing his story of feeling disrespected and feeling he had no authority as a student leader:

This semester I experienced some ageism when I was talking to one of my service learners…He tried to…he said something like, "well you don't know how busy I could be 'cause you're not that age yet where, you don't know a whole lot about responsibility

'cause you're not as old as I am and you have not gone through what I've gone through." And it really made me feel devalued you know.

Bruce also shared with the group that he felt disrespected and not heard by his supervisors (while working in the community). Bruce talked about feeling like he should have some type of authority because he is a student leader, but feeling unappreciated by older people who hold higher positions and disrespect coming from students who didn't think he had knowledge, or sufficient age, to be their leader.

Another instance when disrespect, interconnected with tokenism, appeared was when Miguel Angel said the following:

> In one of my classrooms that I am right now, my teacher is Professor Simpson, and as soon as I was in the classroom she was happy that I was there. And I knew that every time that she needed an answer for a question she would look at me and ask me for an answer. So, that happened the first day that she asked a question and the rest of the students they didn't want to answer her question, so she automatically looked at me and said, "Miguel Angel, what about you?" So, then I have to answer her question...I kinda feel pressured since she knows me, that I'm a University Service Advocate...She might think that I'm more willing and more open to answer any kind of question and enter any kind of discussion. So I have seen that in this class she expects me to be involved more with the class and to kinda like help her out every time that she seems to be stuck with some part of the discussion. My other classes, I don't think they make a big deal with me being the USA because, maybe they don't know much about the USA program.

In Miguel Angel's experience it is obvious that the faculty member was tokenizing him because he was a USA. The example also showed a level of expectation that faculty have of USAs being

co-teachers in their classrooms, even though they may not be assigned as course-based USAs in their classrooms. Miguel Angel also felt pressured to meet the expectations because the faculty held a position of authority and often times their level of participation or resistance to being tokenized may be reflected in their grade. It is also important to point out that Professor Simpson is white and Miguel Angel is a man of color. How might she be teaching about certain issues at the expense of Miguel Angel? In connection to the women's group, in particular to Sandra's experience, Miguel Angel was also being exploited of his knowledge and his experiences as a person of color by being called upon, as the faculty needed him. In connection to this theme, Hector also had this to say:

> With HCOM [the humanities], which is my minor, which has been a blessing, I had a faculty member who had several USAs in her classroom and she loved having USAs in her classroom. But I didn't make it known that I was a USA, didn't come out until later and I had a conversation with her about how being a USA in her classes scared me because a lot of times people think that being a USA means that you know it all, you've done it all, you're there…I'm still a work in progress. There is no final destination, there is no final stop. There is a hidden judgment where they think that you're gonna be the student to educate the class and that kind of takes that component off of them that "oh, I have a USA in my class so they're going to be responsible for educating the class about power, privilege and oppression."

The expectations of USAs are high and the group agreed that the campus at large needs to be aware of the consequences of this assumption. There is damage being done to the student leaders by exploiting knowledge that is still a work in progress. The faculty ought to be aware of how damaging it can be to utilize the USAs to enhance the delivery of their curriculum, when the

student leaders themselves have not accepted this role as an official placement of the program. It is important to point out that the USAs have been talking, for the most part, about Service Learning instructors but also about faculty in other fields.

Bruce also joined this dialogue by talking about feeling "used" by people who hold positions of power, to whom he doesn't feel comfortable questioning:

> One of the guest speakers we had was one of the people that works with the Service Learning Institute, and she came in and she had all these service learners giving their personal stories, past service learners and showing off what they did as part of their upper division service learning. And so, she was talking about that, and it seemed kinda rushed...the service learners that she chose weren't expecting to go up there but they were also in the class...anyway, she chose these service learners, they were speaking about their experience and how they enjoyed being in the community...And so, I was trying to incorporate what I had learned from the program and from my past experiences like asking them deeper questions like, "well from your experience from what you remember, how are you using it now still if you are and has it changed you like how has it changed you if it has? Do you use it in your everyday life or do you use it only when it's applicable?" And so a lot of them wouldn't really go to deep into it. They had done it a while back just for the grade, they didn't do it for the reasons they should have done if for. And it's like hard to know that cause a lot of the people aren't getting the experience that we're trying to get them to get. She was rushed and then she kept looking at me for answers.

The presenter in Bruce's class depended on Bruce to deepen the discussion, taking that pressure off her shoulders. This injustice of using the USAs to fulfill their personal agendas has got to

stop. These are very serious issues that need to be addressed in order to stop contradicting what the Service Learning Institute is supposed to stand for. While the SLI is supposed to provide service to others, a reciprocal service where all the stakeholders benefit from this act needs to be practiced.

Bruce also shared an experience with Professor Holmes, similar to that which Sandra shared earlier:

> One of our fellow faculty [referring to Professor Holmes] had approached me about doing a presentation for her class. It made me feel awkward 'cause it just seemed like, "I need you right now for this," and after that that's it. It wasn't to get to know me a little bit first, or to see exactly who I was or how I identified...we're doing like a gender dialogue or like a race dialogue..."Right now I need a perspective from a white student, so that they can talk about while male privilege for my class and so I know that you're white and I know that if you're available..." The only reason she wouldn't want me to do it is if I had class during the same time or if I had some kind of prior obligation. It was like a slap on the face...it's really hard 'cause people only want you if you're good at whatever they have to say like whatever they need, then if you're good at it, then they'll ask you. Then after you're done doing it they won't even associate with you anymore.

Professor Holmes had come up a couple of times by now. She is a Service Learning instructor, and therefore should be trained or committed to the social justice principles the institute purports to follow. Why is she causing so much pain to the USAs? The USAs wondered why she is still teaching such a course.

After these confessions, the USAs dived into making recommendations for the Summer of Service Leadership Academy (SoSLA) and for the USA program as well as the Service

Learning Institute as a whole. Miguel Angel shared his feelings about the conflict he has witnessed among the USAs, in terms of not getting along with one another and the contradiction this places on the work they are trying to accomplish. For SoSLA, he would like to see activities where the participants go deep in learning about each other and connecting across their differences. In terms of what Miguel Angel would like to see in the program this is what he suggested:

> I feel like we should have a similar meeting not only within the USAs but a day where the faculty and the USAs meet and deal with the issues. And I know that the only way for us to communicate with the people on top of us, I say on top of us because they're the people who are showing us that sometimes our opinions don't count. And the only way to communicate with these people is by a letter with your signature which I think that that's not as powerful as you telling the person to their face right across the table saying, "look this is what we feel, what we don't agree with, what you're doing and why think this shouldn't be happening and that's the only way that we can improve the program and to see a change. Otherwise, the program continues being like it is right now, that we can only talk to certain people, that we can only make an appointment with that person or if just like suddenly you just see the person walking in the institute because they are just visiting someone else and they are also in positions on top of the USAs...That's the only time that you can cross a word with that person. That's one thing that we need to change.

As student leaders, advocates for change; these words were definitely a way to practice the courage and agency to voice their thoughts. The rest of the group agreed. Another area of improvement is the communication gap among USAs. Bruce talked about there being certain "cliques" and groups of friends that when the time comes to working together, they don't

connect. This could be because they are all connecting around their consciousness of their social identities and of others. Hector talked a bit about the need for "walking the talk" as a whole institute working toward the same goal, social justice. Alberto suggested that the SoSLA training around social identities should go beyond the summer experience to engage the entire group of USAs in this learning throughout the year. Overall, the suggestion from the group was to have a greater sense of shared governance within the SLI, because it is then that we will begin dismantling the master's house. Shared governance is modeled when the voices of all the stakeholders are included in the decision-making process, a sharing of power where everyone holds responsibility and accountability to continue this hard work.

Conclusion

While the women and the men had different themes tackled, they all were consciously aware, at different levels, of their social identities. They all also shared the painful truth of feeling utilized by faculty, by teaching at their expense. They all shared of the lack of respect and validity of their lived experiences. Interestingly, while the women talked in depth about taking care of themselves to continue this hard work, the men talked about making changes within the entire institute. It is important to point out that the men are aware of their privileges as males, something the women do not benefit from. However, the USAs are also conscious that some hidden identities may need to be shared in order for the group to be seriously engaged in their personal growth as well as the USA group. Nonetheless, trust needs to be established first. These were eleven stories from eleven student leaders that are constantly involved on and off campus. There are a lot more of these to hear. Through the sharing of their stories they were all claiming their identities, space and rights.

Chapter Five: Remodeling the Master's House

Overall, through this thesis, I have explored the following questions: What are the experiences of the University Service Advocates (USAs) as social justice leaders? How do the intersections of the USAs' social identities impact how they internalize the facilitation training and how they implement it in the classroom as co-teachers? The USAs' experiences as teachers may resonate with multiple marginalities other teachers face when teaching about race and other forms of oppression. So, there is a larger question embedded within the last one: How do the intersections of the social identities of social justice educators impact on their teaching in the classroom? In this chapter I will present and review examples of those "issues" in teaching oppression and will offer a way of teaching that attempts to address them.

Women and Men's Key Themes from Focus Groups

Through participatory research, data were gathered from a women's group (seven women) and from a men's group (four men). From the women's group, these themes emerged: Social Identities: Awareness of Self and Others; Educating White Students at the Expense of Students of Color; Silence, Resistance and Anger; Ways if Knowing (i.e., storytelling); Internalized Oppression; and Taking Care of Ourselves. The men's group brought up these key themes: Social Identities: Awareness of Self and Others; Lack of Authority and Respect; Tokenism (exploitation of identity and knowledge); and Recommendations for SoSLA (Summer of Service Leadership Academy) and the USA Program (i.e., shared governance). The focus groups' participants engaged in sharing their counter stories, their personal lived experiences as student leaders working toward social justice. As the USAs narrated their stories, a sense of community began to build within the groups. Via storytelling, a common language was created

and a dialogue was constructed around the inequities they all have experienced in classrooms in higher education.

One of the major themes both groups touched upon was the awareness of their social identities and of others. There is importance in this awareness because of the empowerment that occurred when they were able to name the discrimination or oppression they had experienced in the classroom or in the community as leaders working toward social justice. This theme was also imperative for participants to be able to identify the social identities of others and how those played out in working across those differences in various environments. When teaching about race in higher education, both the literature and the focus groups reaffirmed the assertion that the "instructor" must model what he/she wants the students to learn. It is important that the "instructor" is aware of her/his identities and of how those will be perceived in the classroom. Some identities, (i.e., race, class, and gender) can impact how the instructor is perceived as authority, holder of knowledge or not. For example, "simultaneously marginalized" instructors are more prone to experience disrespect than the "generic professor." Thus USAs, as student co-teachers, will definitely experience multiple marginalities, especially if they have to become the spokesperson for entire groups of people, used as tokens to educate white students at the expense of student leaders of color. Exploitation of their social identities happened various times, as shown in the data.

An overall sentiment of feeling "utilized" by faculty members was brought up by the all USAs. Many faculty members do not know how to teach about race without using examples from people who have experienced such oppression therefore the USA becomes the teaching tool for the entire class. A draining of emotions and of their stories becomes overwhelming when they are the sole storytellers, the teachers. There is no reciprocal learning. The themes of taking

care of themselves and recommendations for the USA program helped in thinking about creating a tangible tool that may diminish this utilization of knowledge and lived experience in the classroom. However, before I describe the teaching tool created, two theoretical frameworks will be used in identifying some of the central problems with teaching about oppression.

Deciphering the Critical Race Theory and Cultural Citizenship Frameworks

Critical Race Theory (CRT) and Cultural Citizenship (CC) are two theoretical frameworks that helped in analyzing the data from two focus groups that described the stories of the University Service Advocates (USAs). Both CRT and CC intersect due to the fact that both frameworks validate personal narratives, storytelling as a way of knowing. Storytelling in CC and the use of counter stories in CRT, can help in remodeling the master's house and in reshaping the pedagogies, using ways of knowing from those who have been at the margins and moving those perspectives to the center. After an explication of these frameworks, I will introduce you to a teaching tool adapted and created, from the works of renown scholars in social justice pedagogy, to be implemented possibly in the Summer of Service Leadership Academy (SoSLA) 2003. This module was reframed by using CRT and CC as a foundation, and may have use in a variety of social justice teaching contexts.

The main ideas found in the literature indicated that CRT and CC help in the transformation of traditional pedagogy. "Simultaneously marginalized" instructors as well as peer facilitators, like the USAs, need to learn to cope with the resistance from students who have been programmed to respond to the generic professorial authority. In order to cope, curriculum delivery needs to be restructured so that dominant perspectives are not perpetuated in the classroom. In order to transgress and decenter education from dominant perspective we need to critically analyze the counter stories of people who historically have been at the margins. These

stories are collected through CC and counter stories are written to exemplify the issues, through CRT. It is important to rethink the curriculum so that it serves non-traditional instructors (in the case of the USAs, they serve as co-facilitators) and helps them and their students to grow and transgress.

Both CRT and CC incorporate storytelling, listening, and the interpreting of vernacular expressions of identity and rights. Through the process of sharing their stories, the USAs' personal narratives became a tool to claim recognition and empowerment. Storytelling is a way of knowing with which all were able to identify. Listening to counter stories, the groups created a sense of community through which they communicated and understood one another simultaneously. It was through that understanding that they opposed learning at the expense of one another and claimed rights for their group and a broader community of people who are also marginalized.

Critical Race Theory helps to demonstrate how race impacts students in higher education. Race, among other social identities, is structurally embedded within the institution, resulting in some students' "simultaneous marginalization." Since people can gain power through sharing their stories, storytelling grants "simultaneously marginalized" students and/or instructors to gain respect and maintain their dignity in the classroom. "Simultaneously marginalized" groups of people are using their ways of knowing and their experiences in their stories to make others aware that voices are being silenced. There is strength in the sharing of stories. Cultural citizenship, however, also focuses on claiming or affirming first-class citizenship (first-class citizenship means having equal access to benefits that come from being a citizen of a particular country) without losing one's cultural identity/ies. CC also focuses on affirming basic human rights regardless of legal citizenship status. This is CC, as defined by Dr. Rina Benmayor:

> CC analyzes stories by looking at vernacular expressions of rights, dignity, cultural values; CC stories are oppositional. They are counter stories, told orally and collected in the field. CC is an analytical framework that allows us to deconstruct the embedded meanings in vernacular expressions and stories of personal experience. (Personal communication, Spring 2003)

While CC encourages the use of one's cultural practices to claim identities, space and rights, CRT helps us to critically analyze why salient identities (particularly race or ethnicity) have inhibited certain groups from being first-class citizens and having equal access and treatment. Examples of collected stories of cultural citizenship and constructed dialogues using the embedded theory within CRT came through from the focus groups. This thesis offers such illustrations.

It is important that storytelling be incorporated as an integral part of the training the USAs undergo, to get the issues on the table, from the very beginning. The stories of the USAs will serve as the foundational tool to find out about others' passions, struggles, and rights or space they are claiming within higher education. Through storytelling, the USAs will also gain skills around how to lead this type of discussion in the classrooms or in the community so that their identities and knowledge are not exploited but everyone's voice is heard. The USAs will keep their dignity and gain respect through the reciprocal storytelling. The USAs exemplified storytelling as their way of knowing in the focus groups. For example, a woman of color, Sandra, in particular was very much aware of how her social identities impacted how she was treated in the classroom as a co-teacher, but also in higher education overall. Remember Sandra's story? She was sharing feeling that an instructor in a position of power exploited her story. She talked about finally feeling comfortable speaking her reality and how she felt tokenized by an instructor

of color. She also spoke of feeling powerless and not being able to say no because of her vulnerable position within the institution. These are some of her words:

> I also feel that when we do finally have that courage to voice it out, I have been used as a token in other classes, especially with Professor Holmes "I need a woman of color, I need a woman who is in the community, I need this and that..." You boxed me. I shared a story and now you want me to repeat it constantly over and over and over.

The excerpt above shows that Sandra's identities inhibit her equal treatment or access to fair treatment by the simple fact that her social identities defy the norm. She is also being asked to share and use her pain over and over as a teaching tool. The instructor was exploiting Sandra's knowledge. The salient point from Sandra's story is that the instructor was using her as a tool to better her teaching on race issues. Sandra's act of resistance is through the storytelling, her way of knowing. After she shared her story she was certain she would not let that instructor or others "use" her, instead she will now share her story as a tool of empowerment for other instructors of color to see what is happening in the academy.

The fact that the stories of marginalized groups have been included as tools to enhance the learning of dominant groups, in academia, is an example of the lack of recognition of difference and of appreciation for different ways of knowing. Difference in the United States has not been seen as an asset. Being different, steering away from the norm, is a threat to dominant culture. The *testimonios* of historically marginalized groups, in the United States, have brought depth and new theoretical frameworks to analyze the oppression that many people have experienced in this country. *Testimonios* also include an "I" that represents the community, not only individual stories. CRT and CC invite unheard voices into higher education and enable the voices of people who do not have access to the institution, to have their stories validated. CRT

and CC help us to affirm and validate the stories shared to subvert the dominant ways of knowing.

CRT also helps in constructing the stories that need to be told and included in traditional pedagogy. The USAs sharing of their stories in a way that challenges dominant ideology and claims their lived experiences as a way of knowing, is a form of exploring these issues further. One can conclude that both CRT and CC help not only "marginalized" people to name their realities though storytelling but with CC one can embrace cultural practices that enhance our ways of knowing to be able to resist oppression and challenge dominant ideology. By implementing these two frameworks into teaching practice, it may also be possible to prevent the perpetuation of learning at the expense of the people at the margins through reciprocal storytelling.

The two focus groups, at the center of this study, shared their stories as they sat around a table, listening, caring, and understanding one another in a reciprocal way. Maricela exemplified storytelling as her way of knowing when she shared an experience where she felt she had the courage and power to speak about her feelings toward white people. She talked about the frustration of gaining voice, then being shut down by the dominant group in her classroom and not supported by the students of color. She voiced her honest emotions and she had no support, much less from white students. She understood then that only when she shared painful stories were they all ready to listen. Maricela observed, "Once we start to gain that power and strength to open up and to say things that might be hurtful and that are not gonna be as nice or sad to hear than we are gonna constantly be questioned."

Maricela's story brought up an interesting point, what happens when one stops sharing "painful" stories, or when others do not share? The sharing must be mutual, reciprocal.

Maricela's sharing of her experience and recognition was not validated because it was questioned by the norm, since she was referring to not liking white people. This made her realize that it was empowering for her to finally gain voice. She was also modeling the power of voice and sharing one's story to begin challenging dominant ideology by sharing her reality and not falling into pleasing her audience. She was decentering the dominant perspective and focusing on her empowerment. Alberto, a male USA, also supports this when he says, "I am Mexican, but I can't talk for the whole race, I'm just me." How can pressure to educate dominant groups be placed upon subordinate groups? Gloria Ladson-Billings provides us with a point of view that may answer this question.

As noted in Chapter Two, Ladson-Billings (1999) discusses the importance of critically understanding how the United States was founded and built through explaining what she refers to as the "property issue." She discusses the fact that this country serves the needs of white people, especially those who are able to create laws that revolve around their particular needs. Thus many white people and those who have white skin and can "pass" benefit from white privilege. Among those benefits is having access to rights and fair treatment in this country. As described in Chapter Two, Ladson-Billings offered an example that clearly illustrated this phenomenon when describing what happened in the classroom of an African American instructor after discussing an article on white privilege. A white woman refused to believe that she possessed more privileges in this country due to her skin color. Still, resistant to believe such statement, she doubted. Her disbelief was challenged when going grocery shopping and discovering she did not have her checkbook. Despite that the cashier let her take the groceries and then return with the payment. When the white woman shared this story with her African American friend, it was affirmed by him that she had experienced privilege based on her white skin. Nonetheless,

determined to prove her friend wrong, she had him go through the same instance. However, the African American man was not trusted and was asked to go back home and get his checkbook.

In connection to the story above, here I present you an instance that took place in the Spring 2003 semester at CSU Monterey Bay.

> *It was a Tuesday around 12:45pm. A "simultaneously marginalized" instructor and co-instructor, a USA, were teaching and trying to get their students to engage in a dialogue and participate in a class activity. The USA, a multiracial woman, continuously tried to get the students to listen to her, but she wasn't successful. Finally, she interrupted the disrespect by asking why they couldn't focus. The students got defensive and began to suggest how they wanted the instructors to handle the situation. "Why don't you turn the lights on and off until you get our attention?" was one of the comments. The other instructor, a woman of color, then asked if they would behave the same way if their instructor were a male? A white, middle aged, male? A woman of color answered by saying that she acted that way because she felt a connection with the instructors due to their closeness in age. She then went on to say that she indeed had behaved that way in a professor of color's classroom. He failed her. After realizing that she indeed was treating us in a disrespectful way, she apologized. She also understood that she had power over other students' behavior and by modifying her attitude towards us, the rest of the class would treat us with respect.*

The woman of color realized that she didn't treat "generic professors" in the same way that she responded to us. The woman of color had not been exposed to "non-generic professors" and we were also exposing her to knowledge that challenged dominant ideologies. She had only

seen whites as "authority", "generic professors" as holders of knowledge and in positions of power.

In the classroom, where students have access to gain awareness on these frameworks, CRT and CC could have been used as tools to hear the stories and discover the underlying issues. In the example that took place in our classroom, the African American student met one-on-one with me and we talked about that incident. We both had the time to hear each other's experiences. Though I was the instructor, I took the time to listen to her and vice versa. We shared in a reciprocal way. Thereafter, we related to one another in a respectful way where we all could learn from each other. The woman of color recognized the difference in how we treated her versus "generic professors" in other classrooms. Since I engaged with her in a way of knowing that is familiar to both of us, storytelling, she was able to respond and not get defensive. She realized that it was possible for "non-traditional instructors" to be in positions of power and therefore deserved respect.

She shared of behaving and treating other professors of color in the same manner, however, once gender came into play it was a different story. When I asked about her K-12 educational background, she shared never having an instructor of color and finally finding voice in higher education where she at least saw more people of color thus feeling more comfortable to speak up in the classroom. She admitted to assuming we, the co-instructor and I, would understand her internalization of dominant perspective and her comfort level around her first "non-traditional instructors." I shared my story of also feeling comfortable around instructors of color and of having respect for them for being my role models in challenging dominant ideologies.

Thus, CRT and CC can provide people of color and white people with storytelling as a tool to begin unveiling and perhaps dismantling racism in this country. However, the sharing of stories must be reciprocal and the stakeholders must be conscious of their overall goal for using this tool to connect across their differences. If the goal of both, the white woman and the African American male, was to challenge the cashier in that grocery store and they were both fighting to gain equal treatment as costumers, then both could have challenged the institutional injustices through their lived experiences in the same situation, thus making it easier to begin the process of claiming rights. For the student of color and I, the process of finding a common goal was easy—we both wanted to be heard and respected from our different positionalities. Our goal was attained.

Using Ways of Knowing from Those at the Margins, Moving Their Perspectives to the Center

The focus groups proved what scholars are saying; when instructors from marginalized backgrounds are in front of the classroom, "there's sure to be trouble" (Rakow, 1991). The USAs talked about the resistance they faced from both oppressed and privileged groups. USAs also reaffirmed the notion that oppressed groups ought to be angry at oppression and take action to begin unveiling and demolishing systemic inequities. One area where the focus groups' data and the literature review did not intersect is around the naivety of marginalized people or the lack of awareness of their oppression, even after sharing their stories. A perfect example is Olivia's story, where she talked about she and her mom (a white woman) ducking as her father (a Filipino man) drove through his former neighborhood in Oakland. I have yet to answer a question that arose; do you have to recognize that you experience oppression in order to challenge it?

The Cultural Citizenship Chest (CCC) (see appendix A), is an instrument for use in a curriculum whose goal is to decenter dominant ideology, and/or to prevent teaching at the expense of marginalized students. I adapted this module from the works of Ximena Zúñiga, School of Education, UMASS-Amherst (1997) and from Monroe-Fowler and Motoike, Program on Intergroup Relations and Conflict, University of Michigan (1990). The exercise asks individuals to construct a box, or chest, which symbolically represents who they are on the inside and how they are perceived on the outside. Its purpose is to address the importance of using ways of knowing from marginalized groups to decenter dominant ideology. The CCC is a tool that enhances reciprocal storytelling in the classroom. It prevents the teaching at the expense of students of color and includes all voices in the classroom by setting a tone of respect that allows marginalized groups to keep their dignity. The CCC also helps in challenging stereotypes and assumptions that students and instructors may carry about one another. By using this tool, all the students and the instructor may create a sense of community that will help them in communicating and relating across difference. Exploring how we are perceived on the outside of the box allows for people to hear the painful assumptions and stereotypes that one can internalize. Nonetheless, once one opens up the CCC, it is obvious that there is more to that human being that meets the eye. It is an opportunity to challenge the perspectives others have of you and to challenge those views. This is an empowering process that presents a vivid picture into the lives of others. The metaphor of letting others see what is inside your chest, may reduce the resistance from students who often don't think have stories to share.

This module was practiced in a class I facilitated on April 9, 2003, in a senior seminar on Cultural Citizenship at CSUMB. I began by sharing my own *testimonio* to establish trust within the group. This was important to do since I was the facilitator and I was asking the group to

share their stories with me as well. I spoke about being *Mexicana* born in Mexico and raised in South Central, Los Angeles. My family and I migrated to this country in 1989. I discussed how I felt growing up and attending schools in affluent communities, such as Pacific Palisades, California. I spoke of experiencing racism and having my rights denied because I was undocumented in this country. Sharing my struggles for claiming rights and space helped students in the class consider how they would present their cultural citizenship chests.

Through the Cultural Citizenship Chest I was able to share my story by embracing my cultural practices that got me into the master's house. I shared of my crossing the border and other forms of simultaneous marginalization. But prior to April 9, 2003, I assigned the class with Solorzano and Villalpando's (1998) article, "Critical Race Theory, Marginality, and the Experiences of Students of Color in Higher Education," in which they defined CRT and gave examples of constructed stories addressing issues of discrimination in higher education institutions. I also asked my classmates to come prepared to define the concepts, CRT and CC as they connected to the chest. Through the sharing of stories, we were all able to share about ourselves without having people ask clarifying questions or prying further about the painful moments that are still healing.

For example, the first one to share was a male of color who was born and raised in Compton, CA. He talked about attending a school in the inner city and how he detests the assumptions and stereotypes portrayed about his community. Because he is wanting to fight those prejudices, he will be returning to his community to become a teacher and educate youth about the assets in such a neglected community. He is also returning to prove others wrong about the assumptions and low expectations they had of him. A white woman shared of feeling her rights denied as a woman working in a male dominated environment where she constantly

faces blatant sexist acts. She and I had never engaged in dialogue, but while she shared we looked at each other and I know that she and I both understood one another for the very first time. Her example of claiming space at work where she feels disrespected also helped her in finding a voice and gaining respect and dignity in the classroom. Though my classmates and I were at different levels of consciousness, like the students in the USA program, we knew the names for the concepts and we all understood the need to prevent the painful teaching at the expense of marginalized people, especially students of color. While CRT helped us to critically analyze how we have been discriminated against because of our race and other identities, CC helped us to use our identities, marginalized or privileged, and cultural practices to create solidarity in the classroom. There was no learning that took place at the expense of those at the margins. We created a community that very day with our stories, pain and laughter.

I asked the class to share situations where they felt their rights were being denied, whether due to their social class, gender, race, religion or other social identities. At one point their stories talked about how they fought for a sense of belonging. Some of the students reflected on a few of their socially constructed identities but at times I felt like they were not ready to share those feelings, intersectionalities, and deep-seated pain. Nevertheless, we all built upon our lived experiences and different levels of self-awareness. Though some of us shared more than others, we all connected at some level. We were all engaged and shared of ourselves on our own terms and without hierarchies of power. Through our stories, we created a "learning community" and we began to understand where we had each experienced being the "other" and where we could be each other's ally. Through our stories we all made a claim for social justice and/or for space to be in higher education.

What really worked about this module was demonstrating how CRT helps us to see how race is deeply embedded in our system and that we cannot deny the fact that some of us experience "simultaneous marginalization" in higher education institutions. At the end of the class time, I felt a sense of belonging in the classroom that I hadn't felt because I had not heard others' stories or shared mine. We all gained power through the sharing of our stories and for a moment I felt that even those of us who feel "simultaneously marginalized," felt respected and maintained our dignity without teaching at our expense. There was a reciprocal teaching and learning that took place. Being able to share stories can hopefully help us to gain equal treatment in the classroom or at the very least a space. We also used a very powerful tool, our voice. My ways of knowing are different than those of my classmates but it seems that storytelling has a way of bringing together multiple voices and it is then obvious who has been silenced in the past. That class helped some of my classmates see injustices that perhaps they've never seen or experienced and now they know that there's a lot stored in our individual Cultural Citizenship Chests.

In reflecting back, the Solorzano and Villalpando (1998) article could have been unpacked and discussed further in connection to the activity. I also wish we could have had time to make connections between the stories from the men and women in the focus groups and cultural citizenship in terms of what rights they were claiming and how those connect to what they are experiencing in the classroom.

Implications

This teaching tool can be most beneficial to the future student leaders because this can push them into further reflecting about their assets and talents that they will bring while working as a group. It also provides them with a tool to implement in the classrooms or communities

they will work with. It will be important that the facilitator also be willing to share and be vulnerable, since opening the chest can bring about not only wonderful stories but painful ones as well. The USAs come to the student leadership program with multiple realities, perspectives, positionalities and standpoints, this is why this activity can be a foundational activity to create community and raise consciousness within the USA group.

Other social justice educators may be able to use the CCC as a tool of empowerment for themselves and their students. This instrument can prevent painful perpetuation of hierarchical power and disrespect. By this I mean that if all the stories are shared and validated that there will be no learning at the expense of students of color. The CCC may also give the dominant group an opportunity to share stories of how they became resistant to learning about power, privilege, and oppression. By sharing a story when they felt their rights were being denied, the compassion and space to be allies may be created. For subordinate groups, an empowerment and validation of their struggles through using a way of knowing they are familiar with will take place.

Reflecting back, I feel that the sharing of my story was a way of affirming my own positionality, existence and a way of claiming space in the classroom and on campus. I have been in higher education for six years and it is now that I realize the multiple marginalities I have experienced as a first generation high school and college student, woman of color, twenty-four years old, from low economic social background. I now ask myself, how I have used the master's tools to realize the marginalization I have experienced? I feel, however, that I've subverted the power the master holds over me by naming my own reality through the Cultural Citizenship Chest. I feel as if I had to gain access to a "new" language (concepts) to help me decipher what I now know isn't just and to help claim and gain a space in the academy that is valid and stable.

Conclusion

This participatory action thesis critically analyzes the experiences of the University Service Advocates at the Service Learning Institute of California State University, Monterey Bay. Data were gathered from two focus groups, one formed by seven women and the other composed of four men. The data were analyzed using grounded theory methodology and applied to two theoretical frameworks: Critical Race Theory and Cultural Citizenship. The findings demonstrated an urgent need to rethink the pedagogical approaches in the social justice curriculum co-taught by marginalized instructors or peer facilitators. A module was created as a teaching tool to incorporate reciprocal learning through storytelling, where students and the instructor can gain respect and maintain their dignity in the classroom.

This thesis has served me as a reflective tool to enhance my skills as an instructor teaching issues of power, privilege, and oppression within a higher education institution. Writing this thesis has allowed many emotions and feelings of resentment to be released and has helped me in channeling my anger and use it in my empowerment as a leader and marginalized instructor within the master's house.

Bibliography

Bell, D. A. (1987) And We Are Not Saved: The Elusive Quest for Racial Justice. New York: Basic Books.

Berlak, A. and Moyenda, S. (2001). Taking It Personally: Racism in the Classroom from Kindergarten to College. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Emerson R., Fretz R. and Shaw, L. (1995). Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Flores, W. V. and Benmayor, R. (1997). Latino Cultural Citizenship: Claiming Identity, Space, and Rights. Boston: Beacon Press.

Gay, G. and Howard, T. C. (2001). Multicultural Teacher Education for the 21st Century The Teacher Educator, 36(1), 1-16.

hooks, b. (1994). Teaching to Trangress: Education as the Practice of Freedom New York: Routledge.

Howard, G. R. (1999). We Can't Teach What We Don't Know. New York: Teachers College Press.

Human Communication Department, Web page. Retrieved on April 2003 from: http://classes.csumb.edu./HCOM/HCOM328-01/world/LLSsyl.html#anchor19153

Ladson-Billings, G. (1999). Just What is Critical Race Theory and What's it Doing in a Nice Field Like Education? In L. Parker, D. Deyhle, and S. Villenas (Eds.) Race is Race Isn't: Critical Race Theory and Qualitative Studies in Education. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Lorde, A. (1984). Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches. Trumansburg, NY: Crossing Press.

Ludwig, J. M. and Meacham, J. A. (1997). Teaching Controversial Courses: Student Evaluations of Instructors and Content Educational Research Quarterly. 21 (1) 26-37.

Osajima, K. (1991). Challenges to Teaching About Racism: Breaking the Silence Teacher Education. 4 (1) 145-153.

Rakow, L. F. (1991). Gender and Race in the Classroom: Teaching Way Out of Line Feminist Teacher. 6 (1) 10-13.

Service Learning Institute at CSU Monterey Bay Web-page Retrieved on February 2003 from: http://service.csumb.edu.

Solorzano, D.G. and Villalpando, O. (1998). Critical Race Theory, Marginality, and the Experience of Students of Color in Higher Education In C. Alberto Torres and T. R. Mitchell (Eds). Sociology of Education: Emerging Perspectives Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Vasquez, H. and Femi, I. (1993). No Boundaries: A Manual For Unlearning Oppression and Building Multicultural Alliances. Oakland, CA: TODOS.

Zúñiga, X. (1997). Cultural Chest. Amherst, MA: School of Education, University of Massachusetts.

Appendix A

The Cultural Citizenship Chest Activity

By Judith Flores

Each of you will be creating a "Cultural Citizenship Chest" which will allow you to share personal information with the group about who you are and how you believe others see you, as well as how you have claimed your identities, space, and rights in this society and/or in your specific community/ies. .

Select objects that are significant to you because they describe an aspect of yourself in connection to your membership in any of the following social groups:

- Gender
- Race
- Ethnicity/Tribe
- Sexual Orientation
- Nationality
- Religion
- Socio economic class
- Age
- Physical or mental abilities
- Education History/Background
- Language etc.

1. How have you claimed identities, space and rights exercising your cultural practices?
2. What specific group rights were you claiming?

The artifacts should not only describe an aspect of your identity, but represent a specific situation in which you felt your social, cultural or group rights were denied to you.

These objects might be a photograph, piece of art, book, a piece of cloth, music, or any artifact that describes an aspect of your personal and family herstory/history or social identity that is significant to you.

Place the objects inside a small box (i.e. shoe box)
Decorate the outside of the box with images (pictures, drawings, words, phrases) that describe how you think other people see you.
Come prepared to share what you have placed inside and outside your "cultural citizenship chest" with the group.
NOTE: you will only share what you feel safe and comfortable sharing.

Adapted by Judith Flores from the works of Ximena Zuñiga, (1997), School of Education, UMASS-Amherst and from Monroe-Fowler and Motoike (1990), Program on Intergroup Relations and Conflict, University of Michigan.

Appendix B

Focus Groups' Questions
Self-introductions
Develop group guidelines

- How did these experiences differ for USAs of color involved in service learning experiences with predominantly white students? With predominantly students of color?
- What was the impact of the faculty member's racial identity for the USA?
- How has the training affected their lives, their career goals, their consciousness?
- Have they become agents of change in their own communities?
- How have they shifted their consciousness to be useful in their lives as people of color?
- Where did the SoSLA curriculum come from?
- Who designed this curriculum?
- For what students?
- Was this curriculum designed for students of color?
- Where do these training models come from?
- How are student leaders prepared to facilitate the SL 200 course?
- Are there models on how to facilitate issues of race in the classroom when teaching diverse students?
- What are the biases within this curriculum?
- Is this curriculum appealing to a specific group of students?
- Is this training attracting a specific targeted group of students on campus?
- Who does this training attract?
- How do the facilitator's identities affect how the training is delivered?
- What have USAs learned from this curriculum?
- How did the training impact the learning of the USAs of color?
- How do USAs of color take care of themselves to prevent draining from this work?

Appendix C

California State University, Monterey Bay

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Consent Form

We are asking you to participate in a research study. We want to make sure that you know all about the project, its possible risk and benefits, safety, privacy and confidentiality issues, and your right to withdraw at any time without penalty. Please read this consent form carefully and ask the researcher any questions before you decide whether to give us your informed and willing consent. Thank you.

This study will be conducted by **Judith Flores, BA** from the **Center for Education and Collaborative Studies—Master of Arts in Education Program** at California State University, Monterey Bay. The results of this of this project will contribute to master action thesis. You were selected as a possible participant in this study because you are a University Service Advocate (USA) in the Service Learning Institute at CSU Monterey Bay and your contributions will serve as primary sources of this research.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Dismantling the Master's House: Using Whose Tools?
A Critical Analysis of the Experiences of University Service Advocates
At the Service Learning Institute of California State University Monterey Bay

- To develop recommendations for the student development training to provide or create tools for making the training more inclusive and open environment for students of color.
- To inform instructors/coordinators of the need to create an inclusive more open environment to facilitate discussions of race for them and their students.
- To bring students of color together to discuss their lived experiences and their work toward social justice is tremendously needed in terms of having a space to develop a support group to take care of ourselves and each other.
- To help us coalesce across marginalized groups and to expand our awareness and growth toward our work in social justice.
- The focus groups and findings will hopefully inspire critical reflection and a network to further our own work on internalized dominant perspectives.

PROCEDURES

What I propose to do is select ten to fifteen participants of color to be part of two focus groups from the University Service Advocates program. They will be selected to get a diverse group, in terms of race, gender, and their different experiences with the SoSLA training and USA program.

The participants will be informed, with detail, about what the project entails and what the process will be for the duration of the project. The participants will have the option of using pseudonyms to protect their identity. The participants will sign informative consent forms and they will receive a set of questions to review prior to having the first focus group meet in a "safe" space. We will develop working/discussion agreements to allow space for all stakeholders to speak freely and for confidentiality purposes.

The focus groups will meet in small cohorts in order to establish trust. The focus groups' dialogues will be tape recorded and transcribed carefully. All original tapes and transcriptions will be shared with participants for inter-accuracy. This work will begin October 2002 and will terminate in May 2002.

POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS

The risks to the participants will be lessen by informing the participants with detail about what the project entails and what the process will be for the duration of the project. The participants will have the option of using pseudonyms to protect their identity. The participants will sign informative consent forms and they will receive a set of questions to review prior to having the first focus group meet in a "safe" space. We will develop working/discussion agreements to allow space for all stakeholders to speak freely and for confidentiality purposes.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO SUBJECTS AND/OR TO SOCIETY

The benefits for bringing the students of color together to discuss their lived experiences and their work toward social justice is tremendously needed in terms of having a space to develop a support group to take care of ourselves and each other. These focus groups will help us to coalesce across marginalized groups and to expand our awareness and growth toward our work in social justice.

DISCLOSURE OF APPROPRIATE ALTERNATIVE PROCECURES

NA

NATURE OF RECORD KEEPING

Records will be kept confidential. All original recordings and written materials will be kept safely in Building 3, in Dr. Christine Sleeter's office.

PAYMENT FOR PARTICIPATION

No payment will be received by participant.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission or as required by law. All tape recorded materials are to be reviewed and approved by participants.

PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

You can choose whether to be in this study or not. If you volunteer to be in this study, you may withdraw at any time without consequences of any kind. You may also refuse to answer any questions you do not want to answer and still remain in the study. The investigator may withdraw you from this research if circumstances arise which warrant doing so.

IDENTIFICATION OF INVESTIGATORS

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel free to contact:

Judith Flores
100 Campus Center, Bldg. 8/116
Seaside, CA 93955
831-582-5064
Judith_flores@csumb.edu

RIGHTS OF RESEARCH SUBJECTS

You may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation without penalty. You are not waiving any legal claims, rights or remedies because of your participation in this research study. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research subject, contact the Chair of the Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects, Henry Villanueva at California State University, Monterey Bay, 100 Campus Center, Bldg 1, Seaside, CA 93966; 831-582-5012.

SIGNATURE OF RESEARCH SUBJECT OR LEGAL REPRESENTATIVE

I understand the procedures described above and that I am over 18 (eighteen) years old. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I freely agree to participate in this study. I have been given a copy of this form.

_____
Name of Subject

_____
Signature of Subject

_____
Name of Legal Representative (if applicable)

_____ _____
Signature of Subject or Legal Representative Date

OR

I have read the contents of this consent form, asked questions, and received answers. I give permission for my child to participate in this study. I have received (or will receive) a copy of this form for my records and future reference.

_____
Parent/Guardian (if applicable)

_____ _____
Signature of Parent/Guardian Date

SIGNATURE OF INVESTIGATOR

In my judgment the subject is voluntarily and knowingly giving informed consent and possesses the legal capacity to give informed consent to participate in this research study.

_____ _____

Signature of Investigator Date