Interrupting Microaggressions, Bias, and Injustice in Social Studies Pre-Service Teachers' Field Experiences

Emma S. Thacker
James Madison University

Ashley Taylor Jaffee
Princeton University

Aaron T. Bodle
James Madison University

Mira C. Williams
James Madison University

Kara M. Kavanagh
James Madison University

Abstract

This manuscript shares how one teacher education program is working to interrupt racist, xenophobic, homophobic, antisemitic, ableist, and sexist microaggressions and other forms of discrimination that occur in P-12 field experiences. In this article, we share our context, actions, and examples (i.e., critical cases) of microaggressions from pre-service social studies teachers' field experiences. Drawing upon microaggressions theory, we frame our work with equity literacy to analyze pre-service teachers' field experiences and connect to microinterventions. We argue that teacher education programs must prepare teachers to respond to and interrupt microaggressions, and move toward curricular interventions in the social studies in an effort to transform schools to be more equitable in the curriculum and institutionally. We hope practitioners will engage with the ideas and practices presented and reflect on connections and applications to their schools, communities, and contexts.

Keywords: microaggressions; microinterventions; field experiences

Field experiences are an important part of social studies teacher education. Observing teaching practices, building relationships with students, and enacting newly learned methods provides pre-service teachers (PSTs) with the space to critically engage with theories and practices learned in the university classroom. What happens, however, when PSTs are

confronted with microaggressions in their field placements, preventing them from engaging fully in the experience? Or when PSTs witness and experience teaching that upholds racist, xenophobic, sexist, ableist, antisemitic, or heteronormative ideas, attitudes, behaviors, histories, and/or policies? This article explores these questions by sharing how faculty members in one College of Education (CoE) in Virginia are interrupting microaggressions, bias, and injustices in field experiences, in hopes of creating more equitable and responsive classrooms and school communities.

Microaggressions are subtle, everyday, discriminatory actions, insults, and/or comments directed toward historically marginalized or underrepresented people that may be racist, sexist, ableist, linguicist, xenophobic, heterosexist, and transphobic, among other forms of oppression (Fleurizard, 2018; Nadal et al., 2011; Pierce et al., 1977; Sue et al., 2019). We explore microaggression theory in this paper and share how microaggressions manifested in PSTs' field experiences across school divisions in our region. We discuss how to interrupt microaggressions in a Teacher Education Program (TEP) by using a framework for equity literacy and responding with microintervention strategies (Sue et al., 2019).

Due to a history of systemic injustices in public schools coupled with the current national rhetoric involving the experiences of marginalized communities, P-12 students and their families, PSTs, and teachers/administrators/staff are experiencing an uptick in bullying, implicit/explicit bias, and aggressive behaviors. These behaviors are rooted in racism, linguicism, sexism, ableism, and other forms of discrimination, inequity, and oppression (Barshay, 2018; Lombardo, 2019). Social studies is committed to "an interdisciplinary exploration of the social sciences and humanities…in order to develop responsible, informed and engaged citizens and to foster civic, economic, global, and historical literacy" (NCSS, 2010,

n.p.). Thus, when confronted with increased microaggressions in schools, we were concerned with P-12 students' and PSTs' abilities to develop the knowledge and skills for "responsible, informed, and engaged citizens" (NCSS, 2010, n.p.). For us, these characteristics of "citizen" are rooted in empathy, anti-bias (Derman-Sparks & Olsen Edwards, 2010), justice-orientated (Freire, 1968; Kumashiro, 2009), and antiracist pedagogies (Love, 2019). We were no longer willing to wait for someone else to challenge and interrupt these issues facing PSTs and their current and future P-12 youth and families, and developed a plan to address these pervasive and traumatizing experiences.

Contextualizing Our Work

In Summer 2018, we formed a committee in our CoE to explore and act on equity, diversity, and justice issues in our PSTs' field placements. As a committee, we have: created an online survey to collect information about students' experiences with field-based microaggressions; removed students from harmful field placements; conducted workshops for students and faculty in the CoE as well as other partners on campus; conducted workshops for in-service teachers; shared our work at conferences; and met with stakeholders (e.g., superintendents, school administrators, CoE leadership) to discuss issues of equity and social justice. This paper shares our context, actions, and examples (what we call critical cases) of microaggressions from pre-service social studies teachers' field experiences. We hope the frameworks, experiences, and critical cases offer readers an opportunity to consider transferring these ideas for taking action to address microaggressions to their own school communities, classrooms, and TEPs. While we consider social studies PSTs' context and experiences specifically in this paper, we have also conducted qualitative research that responded to broader analyses of PSTs' field experiences and reflected as teacher educators on ways to take action to

interrupt microaggressions in field experiences and TEPs (Jaffee et al., 2020) and described in detail the workshop we have developed and provided for stakeholders at various levels including PSTs, CTs, and university faculty (Kavanagh et al., 2021).

We come to this work as teacher educators committed to social justice in education. We acknowledge that we cannot and should not claim to separate our own perspectives from this work, as our positionality inherently influences every aspect of our teaching, research, and service (Noblit et al., 2004). We recognize that everyone enters dialogue around microaggressions from different places. Some people reading this article might experience the weight of microaggressions daily, while others enter the conversation and literature with distance, having not experienced microaggressions, nor their compounded trauma.

We ask ourselves how we can develop a TEP to prepare our social studies PSTs for the realities of the current social, political, and economic contexts of school and schooling, while also challenging their ways of thinking and being in society. We seek to transform PSTs' understanding of the purpose and goals of teaching social studies. It is imperative that we interrupt Whiteness in social studies curriculum and policy, such as disrupting traditional ways Black history is taught in the classroom (Busey & Walker, 2017; King, 2020; King & Brown, 2014) and broadening definitions of civic engagement (Duncan, 2020; Sabzalian, 2019; Woodson & Love, 2019). Challenging systemic issues related to discrimination, inequity, and oppression is truly a democratic imperative and the health of our democracy depends on how we respond. Bias incidents, intimidation, and hateful acts in schools are disruptive to learning and create unsafe learning environments for children (Teaching Tolerance, 2017); it is our responsibility to respond as critical, justice-oriented teacher educators.

Conceptual Framework: Equity Literacy, Microaggressions, &

Microintervention Strategies

To consider how to take action in social studies teacher education by enacting micro- and macrointerventions, or what Sue et al. (2019) described as "the process of disarming, disrupting, and dismantling the constant onslaught of micro- and macroaggressions" (p. 132), we outline the equity literacy framework (Gorski & Swalwell, 2015), define microaggression theory, and introduce how to respond to microaggressions by using microintervention strategies.

Equity Literacy

Gorski and Swalwell (2015) argued that the fundamental issue facing critical multicultural education is moving education programs and organizations from celebrating diversity to equity initiatives. For example, teachers, through an equity literacy lens, should have more of an understanding of "equity and inequity and justice and injustice" rather than "this or that culture" (p. 36). Curriculum and teacher preparation, therefore, should focus on understanding the systemic nature and roots of inequity and injustice, fostering a depth of understanding how institutions were developed on notions of racism, sexism, and classism. These critical discussions are the core of social justice education and support the action-taking work we are striving for in challenging injustices in schools.

Equity literacy cultivates four key abilities for educators and students (Gorski & Swalwell, 2015):

- *Recognize* even subtle forms of bias, discrimination, and inequity.

- *Respond* to bias, discrimination, and inequity.

- *Redress* bias, discrimination, and inequity not only by responding to interpersonal bias, but also by studying structural inequities.

- *Cultivate and sustain* bias-free and discrimination-free communities, which requires an understanding that doing so is a basic responsibility for everyone.

It is within this equity literacy framework that we situate the objectives and ongoing goals of the microaggressions workshop discussed in this paper and our roles in social justice-oriented social studies teacher education writ large.

Microaggression Theory

Sue and colleagues (2007) described microaggressions in three forms: microassaults, microinsults, and microinvalidations (pp. 274-275):

- *Microassaults* are explicit, verbal or nonverbal attacks meant to hurt someone. They are a conscious or an explicit bias. For example, using a racial, xenophobic, homophobic, or sexist slur is a microassault.

- *Microinsults* are verbal or nonverbal subtle snubs and insults that carry hidden meaning. They are unconscious or an implicit bias. For example, a store owner following a Black customer around the store is a microinsult.

- *Microinvalidations* are verbal communications that invalidate the experiences of a person of color. They are also unconscious or an implicit bias. For example, when an Asian American (born and raised in the U.S.) is complimented for speaking English well, it is a microinvalidation.

Importantly, the prefix *micro* does not refer to the size or impact of the microaggression, but it instead refers to the microsystem of Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Systems Theory (1994) where microaggressions occur interpersonally (e.g., school, neighborhood, peers, places of worship). We use microaggression theory to help us critically examine the incidents that took place in our social studies PSTs' field experiences by identifying the type, intent versus impact, and

responses to disrupt them. We center the impact and harm in our analyses and discussions;

however, we have found that analyzing possible intent can provide nuances to illuminate the type

of microaggression, form of bias, and responses. By identifying stakeholders and possible harms,

educators can recognize who is harmed directly or indirectly and how, while providing agency

for mitigating that harm.

Microintervention Strategies

Microinterventions are defined as:

everyday words or deeds, whether intentional or unintentional, that communicates to

targets of microaggressions (a) validation of their experiential reality, (b) value as a

person, (c) affirmation of their racial or group identity, (d) support and encouragement,

and (e) reassurance that they are not alone…They are interpersonal tools that are intended

to counteract, change or stop microaggressions by subtly or overtly confronting and

educating the perpetrator. (Sue et al., 2019, p. 134)

Sue and colleagues offered practical examples for PSTs to interrupt microaggressions taking

place in field placements. For example, strategies include: making the invisible visible (e.g.,

asking "What did you mean by that?"); disarming the microaggression (e.g., saying, "I disagree

with that sexist stereotype."); educating the offender (e.g.; saying, "While you might have

intended to make a joke, you actually harmed students of that faith."); and seeking external

support (e.g., seeking guidance from a faculty member or mentor).

We use the conceptual framework of equity literacy, microaggressions theory, and

microinterventions as a lens to *recognize*, *respond, redress,* and *cultivate and sustain* bias-free

and discrimination-free communities when addressing the myriad of deeply problematic

situations taking place in schools and TEPs. This framework provides an organizational structure

for TEPs to use with their social studies PSTs as they analyze cases of microaggressions reported here, or as PSTs encounter them in the field. By embracing equity literacy, we foster an interdisciplinary space for the development of the key abilities, while working alongside our partners to critically transform classrooms that center on anti-bias, antiracist, asset-based, and inclusive spaces for marginalized and underserved youth and families.

Critical Cases

The scenarios below are real situations that occurred in the field. We used the survey software *QuestionPro* to offer an open space for PSTs to respond to a series of questions. The survey was given to all practicum and student teaching instructors/supervisors in the CoE to share with PSTs during 2018 – 2019 and 2019 – 2020 academic years. The questions are open-ended[2], responses are anonymous (unless PSTs choose to share their name and/or seek the support of CoE faculty), and the link remains open. PSTs shared experiences that caused them to become deeply emotional, question their decision to become a teacher, and inquire about ways to interrupt what they experienced in the field.

In previous work (Jaffee et al., 2020), we have reported on our related qualitative research; here, we use sample critical cases from our social studies PSTs in order to model how PSTs and teacher educators can apply equity literacy, microaggression theory, and microinterventions in classroom-based scenarios. In this section, we share several critical cases

---

[2] The following questions are asked in the survey:

- o Have you witnessed or experienced an uncomfortable situation or ethical dilemma in your practicum and/or student teaching placement (e.g., issues related to race, language, religion, (dis)ability, gender, and/or sexuality involving you or student/families? If so, describe the dilemma you witnessed or experienced.
- o Does this situation or dilemma reflect an isolated incident or a persistent issue? Please explain.
- o Do you want to meet with a faculty member to discuss the ethical dilemma you faced and to receive support while navigating this situation? If so, please include your name, program area, and e-mail address.
- o Is there anything else you would like to share or discuss about your practicum and/or student teaching placement related to challenging ethical situations?

that were experienced by social studies PSTs and present each case using questions guided by the conceptual framework of equity literacy, microaggression theory, and microinterventions. We discuss strategies for enacting microinterventions that interrupt persistent microaggressions taking place in P-12 classrooms.

Case 1

During a high school student teaching experience, a cooperating teacher told her students that Judaism was not a religion. The student teacher in the class, a Jewish woman, expressed to her CT that she practices Judaism and would like to talk to the students about her religion. The CT ignored her and did not do anything to alter her statement or address her student teacher's experience with the students.

Case Analysis: Recognizing the Bias

1. *Who are the stakeholders?*

The stakeholders include the student teacher, the CT, and all of the students in the class.

2. *What is the microaggression? Is it a microassault, microinsult, or microinvalidation?*

The microaggressions in this case could be easily argued as all three types. For example, some may argue that this is a microassault because it is an explicit bias the teacher holds and the antisemitic statement is meant to harm. When the CT is given an opportunity to change course after the student teacher interjected and disrupted the microaggression, she doubled down on her bias by ignoring the student teacher and refusing to correct her false claim. This action gives more credence to the argument that this is a microassault. Some, however, may see this as a microinvalidation because she is invalidating the identities, experiences, beliefs, and religion of roughly 14 million people who identify as culturally and/or religiously Jewish. Still others may

consider this a microinsult, a snub or hidden meaning, to center Christianity as the only religion present in this teacher's perspective.

3. *What is the intent of the person(s) in this case?*

Depending on the type of microaggression analyzed above, one might argue that the intent is to cause harm as a microassault, invalidate or dismiss Jewish people and the Jewish religion as a microinvalidation, or center Christianity as a microinsult.

4. *What is the impact? Who is harmed and how?*

There are several impacts, regardless of the identified type of microaggression, harm was caused and that is the most important thing to recognize, respond, and redress. First, the student teacher is harmed because the power and words of the teacher have invalidated her identity as a Jewish woman. As a result, their working relationship will be harmed and trust broken which has major consequences for teaching and learning. Finally, the students are harmed because they have been taught a damaging, incorrect piece of information that has curricular consequences on state assessments and life consequences as they exist in a multicultural world with an antisemitic belief about Judaism. Additionally, if students or their families identify as Jewish, they will experience harm against their religious identity and relationship with their teacher.

Microinterventions: Responding to the Bias

5. *What could you do next? Who could you reach out to for support?*

First, the PST attempted to disrupt the microaggression by expressing disagreement, which is known as "disarming the microaggression" (Sue et al., 2019, p. 135). When that did not work, she could then contact a professor or university supervisor to discuss the incident. A university professor/supervisor could share this incident with the program coordinator or department head who, alongside the professor/supervisor and student teacher, could develop a

process and protocol for reaching out to school administrators or directly to the teacher to take

additional action to interrupt further microaggressions committed by the teacher. Action to

interrupt this (and other) microaggressions in the classroom might include professional

development experiences, such as reading, reflecting, listening, and learning about

microaggressions and bias that take place in everyday life, schools, and workplace environments.

The actions discussed here represent microintervention strategies that "seek external

interventions" by challenging the perpetrator of the microaggression and directing the action

toward institutional macroaggressions.

In this situation, teacher educators should reach out to other faculty, supervisors, family,

and/or friends for support. Trying to navigate microaggressions alone might become

overwhelming, potentially falling into the trap of "explaining them away" or saying, "maybe it

really wasn't that big of a deal." Gaining support, reflection, and encouragement allows a person

to process what is taking place and figure out how to move forward with ideas for intervention

and action to prevent microaggressions in the future. These opportunities reflect

microintervention strategies that seek external intervention(s) including: therapy/counseling,

support through community, and attending a support group (Sue et al., 2019).

Case 2

A student teacher was in a social studies classroom when discussions about the migrant

caravan came up. The majority of the students said to "build the wall", while one White female

student, Karen, went even further to say that if she were the President, she would "bomb the

caravan." Another White student used the N word, and then chose Trump's campaign to focus on

for a project and said his platform was to build the wall to keep the Mexicans out and to keep the

Mexicans from stealing our jobs.

Case Analysis: Recognizing the Bias

1. *Who are the stakeholders?*

 The stakeholders include the PST, the CT, and students in the class who said or heard the

statements.

2. *What is the microaggression? Is it a microassault, microinsult, or microinvalidation?*

 There are several microassaults in this case because they are conscious, explicit biases

that use racial slurs and xenophobic stereotypes against immigrants from Latin or South

America. The microassaults were derogatory, verbal assaults, and name calling that went beyond

dehumanization to threatening or wishing violence and death upon a group of people because of

their ethnicity.

3. *What is the intent of the person(s) in this case?*

 The intent of the offenders is to cause harm, dehumanize, and explicitly draw an "us

versus them comparison" (Sue et al., 2007) while holding a hierarchical (White supremacy) and

pathologizing description of Latinx culture and people.

4. *What is the impact? Who is harmed and how?*

 While we do not specifically know the ethnic or racial makeup of this setting to know

whether any students of color in the classroom were specifically targeted, we know that hateful

rhetoric or inaccurate thoughts rooted in White supremacy, racism, and xenophobia can have a

ripple effect that impact those inside and outside the classroom from peers, colleagues, and

neighbors to family members. These beliefs, if gone unchecked, promulgate explicit bias,

dehumanization, stereotyping, and discrimination in schooling and social settings. We have seen

first-hand the results of this combination with mass shootings, hate crimes, and domestic white

supremacist terrorism towards BIPOC, LGBTQ+, Asian American, Jewish, and Muslim folx

throughout the U.S. and internationally. Each perpetrator of violence was a student in many

classrooms prior to their violent act.

Microinterventions: Responding to the Bias

5. *What could you do next? Who could you reach out to for support?*

It can be a startling experience to hear overwhelming support for xenophobic, racist, and

derogatory tropes in a setting where these microassaults are not interrupted and are supported by

others. The PST might feel unsure of where to start or how to intervene because it appears to be

the climate of the classroom, and possibly school, to commit racist, linguist, or xenophobic

microaggressions. The PST might consider dismissing the comments for fear of being the only

one to push back, but instead could try several microintervention strategies (Sue et al., 2019). For

example, they could disarm the microaggressions by "educating the offender" about the realities

and facts of immigration and migrant work or point out the xenophobic stereotypes.

Additionally, the PST could "point out the commonality" of parents trying to provide better for

their kids by moving to find a better school, job, or be close to family members whether they are

American or Mexican (Sue et al., 2019, p. 135). In field-based settings where school climates

reflect similar instances to this case, it can be challenging to push back because the vocal

majority disagrees. The PST might consider reaching out for support from a professor or

supervisor who could help them navigate the specific school context and find someone in that

school who could work alongside them to disrupt the macro- and microaggressions.

Case 3

A Black female student teacher reported that she had a White middle school student make offensive comments to her referring to "the 'hood." He changed his voice to a dialect that was not his and said "yeah because that's how they do it in the 'hood." She paid him no attention and then later he blurted out "what do you have against the 'hood?!" directly looking at her. The student teacher reported that she ignored the offending student, but informed her cooperating teacher. While the student teacher said this was an isolated incident, she mentioned the word "colored" was used in class by teachers and students when referring to BIPOC members of the school community, indicating an anti-Black and racist classroom culture.

Case Analysis: Recognizing the Bias

1. *Who are the stakeholders?*

The stakeholders in this case include the Black PST, the CT, the White student saying the microaggression and the other students in the class.

2. *What is the microaggression? Is it a microassault, microinsult, or microinvalidation?*

The offensive comments made by the White student about "the 'hood" and the use of the word "colored" are microassaults. The White student made these explicit comments consciously and directly at the Black student teacher, making it clear that he has an explicit bias against Black people and a stereotype of a "hood" that he deems to be negative as he changes his voice and mocks the student teacher.

3. *What is the intent of the person(s) in this case?*

Most likely this student thought he was being "funny" and wanted to create an atmosphere where others felt like laughing or chiming in to this racialized joke (microassault) to draw attention to race and make BIPOC feel marginalized within the classroom. The comments

directed toward the student teacher and the use of the word "colored" create a divisive classroom environment filled with intimidation.

4. *What is the impact? Who is harmed and how?*

The student teacher is harmed because the White student is not interrupted and the student teacher does not feel as though she can speak up during the attack due to the power dynamics and lack of allies and support in the classroom. As Sue et al. (2019) reminded us, her experience of and with these microaggressions can create feelings of threat, isolation, and painful emotions. The White student is able to shift control from the student teacher by creating an environment that feels hostile, uncomfortable, and filled with White supremacy and power.

We do not know if there were other students of color in this classroom, but we assume that any student that overheard this was impacted by the racialized joke and uninterrupted verbal assaults. If students of color were present, they would be directly harmed, and most likely impacted daily by this White student and others that join in on the racial jokes and evocation of White power. When microaggressions are not disrupted, they can impact the emotional well-being of those harmed and lead to negative feelings and internalized racism.

Microinterventions: Responding to the Bias

5. *What could you do next? Who could you reach out to for support?*

The PST most likely experienced immediate feelings of pain and isolation as the CT didn't address the student at that moment. She reached out to the CT, but nothing was addressed and the overall climate of allowing references to "colored" people is oppressive and difficult to manage. This is exacerbated by the power dynamic that exists between a student teacher and their CT. Perhaps the CT did not speak up because she felt that behavior management is something the PST needs to learn as the student teacher. However, it is important to recognize

the problematic framing of this thought, as research shows that we must not "ask people of color to educate or confront perpetrators when the sting of prejudice and discrimination pains them" (Sue et al., 2019, p. 131). In this case, it is necessary to disarm the microaggression by letting the White student know this is unacceptable behavior and then set limits and state the values of the school. The PST should not be responsible for this, but could reach out to an advisor or program coordinator to help facilitate a conversation with the principal, CT, and student.

Discussion

Redressing bias, discrimination, and inequity in social studies classrooms can occur in multiple ways. This section discusses three specific ways to redress bias in social studies classrooms to interrupt and challenge microaggressions, specifically in the critical cases above. One, responding to interpersonal bias, is a key factor, but should be further buttressed by teaching a curriculum that provides a more complete understanding of groups and individuals who have been historically marginalized. For example, one way to redress the antisemitism described in case one is to develop curriculum that involves teaching multiple perspectives and experiences of being Jewish, including power, oppression, and resistance, but contextualized with a more complete history of Judaism and Jewish people, including literature and other media written by Jewish people, and that feature Jewish characters situated within stories that do not center oppression or violence. Of course, Jewish history is replete with examples of political violence which should not be ignored, but to center these events alone, flattens the complexity of Jewish identity and leads to further dehumanization.

Two, microinterventions can redress bias and discrimination in social studies classrooms. For example, they might include the ways PSTs and teacher educators can center marginalized perspectives, histories, and communities to enact a more inclusive and representative social

studies curriculum. We argue that teachers and teacher educators must be intentional and thoughtful in their inclusion of historically marginalized voices and experiences (An, 2020; Vickery & Duncan, 2020), as well as in their interrupting and correcting of inaccurate historical representations and fake news (Journell, 2021). Only "including," however, may lead to more harm and additional microaggressions if not done well, such as including Black history only in the period of enslavement and a White-washed version of the Civil Rights Movement (Busey & Walker, 2017). We advocate instead for considering a framework that centers and sustains voices, experiences, and stories of underrepresented and marginalized groups in social studies. For example, the Teaching Hard History framework (Learning for Justice, 2021) and King's (2020) Black historical consciousness framework offer themes, objectives, questions, materials, teaching resources, and activities to comprehensively teach Black histories in the social studies curriculum.

When teaching about religion, Subedi (2006) cautioned that "the lack of candid conversation about religions, particularly concerning multiple beliefs and practices, produces stereotypes" (p. 227). Therefore, a singular focus on the political history of religion in social studies limits opportunities for important interpersonal dialogue. Tanenbaum, an organization committed to combating religious prejudice, provides curriculum that support interpersonal dialogue about religion and religious identity, as well as religious conflict resolution. Elementary and middle school students may benefit from engaging in Tanenbaum's Religions in My Neighborhood (2021) curriculum, focused on developing dialogue about religious diversity within a community.

Critical citizenship education necessitates meaningful inclusion of LGBTQ+ voices, histories, experiences, and stories; however, only seven states have included references to

LGBTQ+ people and groups in their social studies standards (Camicia & Zhu, 2019). Maguth and Taylor (2014) argued that meaningful social studies instruction related to LGBTQ+ individuals, events, perspectives, and contributions requires simply sharing, "the truth about the people we already talk about in social studies" (p. 25). As a start, Maguth and Taylor suggested incorporating an exploration of the "worldviews, lifestyles, and advocacy of individuals like Jane Adams [sic], Alexander the Great, Susan B. Anthony, Harvey Milk, James Baldwin, J. Edgar Hoover, Langston Hughes, Walt Whitman, and Eleanor Roosevelt" (p. 25).

Three, the curricular and societal issues mentioned above necessitate systemic change, a key factor in redressing bias, discrimination, and inequity in schools. For example, one possibility is challenging traditional, normative notions of social studies education dominated by White voices and experiences, what Chandler and Branscombe (2015) called "white social studies," toward a more critical democratic citizenship education (Kinchloe, 2001; Swalwell & Payne, 2019; Wheeler-Bell, 2014). We argue that building to macrointerventions, or systemic transformations that impact groups or classes of people (Sue et al., 2019), versus individual teachers enacting interpersonal or everyday changes in their lessons, will lead to greater curricular transformation. Increasing the number of teachers and districts that use counternarratives that center the experiences of historically marginalized populations will lead to a more complete and complex social studies curriculum. We must prepare social studies PSTs to create and implement transformative social studies curriculum while interrupting microaggressions and macroaggressions in their classrooms and schools.

Conclusion

Our goal is to interrupt the implicit and explicit bias and trauma taking place in schools by cultivating and sustaining bias-free and discrimination-free communities (Gorski & Swalwell,

2015). This requires an understanding that when sustaining a bias- and discrimination-free community, it is the basic responsibility for everyone in society to recognize, respond, and redress bias. We must work together to ensure a school community exists where *all* are welcome and the curriculum is working to challenge structures that uphold White supremacy.

We operate under the hope of Dr. Maya Angelou's wise words, "Do the best you can until you know better. Then when you know better, do better;" therefore, this article works to share critical cases from the field in ways that help teachers, PSTs, and teacher educators to do better. Our goal is not to attack teachers, but rather, to support teachers in the challenging work they do everyday and pause to consider how their words and actions impact the PSTs and youth in their classrooms. We recognize that with knowledge comes the power to transform young people's lives, and with this, we take great responsibility as teacher educators.

This article seeks to transform ways of doing school, constructing curriculum, and enacting pedagogy to reflect the experiences and knowledge of historically marginalized students, families, and communities. We hope this practitioner piece, and a manuscript that details our Microaggressions Workshop (Kavanagh et al., 2021), will inspire other TEPs who are engaged in this work to collaborate on professional development for all stakeholders that is focused on implicit/explicit bias and microaggressions in P-16 settings (Fleurizard, 2018; Schwartz, 2019; Souza, 2018). This collaborative work contributes to informing effective and sustainable processes that address inequity, diversity, and biases when sending PSTs into schools.

References

An, S. (2020). AsianCrit as a theoretical lens to trouble and transform white supremacy. In A. M. Hawkman & S. B. Shear (Eds.), *Marking the "invisible": Articulating whiteness in social studies education* (pp. 3-27). Information Age.

Barshay, J. (2018). "Early evidence of a 'Trump effect' on bullying in schools." *The Hechinger Report*. https://hechingerreport.org/early-evidence-of-a-trump-effect-on-bullying-in-schools/

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1994). Ecological models of human development. *Readings on the Development of Children, 2*(1), 37-43.

Busey, C. L., & Walker, I. (2017). A dream and a bus: Black critical patriotism in elementary social studies standards. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 45*(4), 456-488. https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2017.1320251

Camicia, S., & Zhu, J. (2019). LGBTQ inclusion and exclusion in state social studies standards. *Curriculum and Teaching Dialogue, 21*(1-2), 7-20.

Chandler, P. T., & Branscombe, A. (2015). White Social Studies: Protecting the White racial code. In P. T. Chandler (Ed.), *Doing race in social studies: Critical perspectives* (pp. 61-87). Information Age.

Derman-Sparks, L., & Olsen Edwards, J. (2010). *Anti-bias education for young children and ourselves.* NAEYC.

Duncan, K. (2020). "What better tool do I have?": A critical race approach to teaching civics. *The High School Journal, 103*(3), 176-189. https://doi.org/10.1353/hsj.2020.0011

Fleurizard, T. (2018). "3 approaches for confronting microaggressions." *Inside Higher Ed.* https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2018/07/20/how-deal-microaggressions-class-opinion

Freire, P. (1999). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed.* (Ramos, B. Trans.) Continuum. (Original work Published in 1968).

Gorski, P. C. (2013). Building a pedagogy of engagement for students in poverty. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *95*(1), 48-52.

Gorski, P. C., & Swalwell, K. (2015). Equity literacy for all. *Educational Leadership, 72*(6), 34-40.

Jaffee, A. T., Kavanagh, K., Thacker, E. S., & Williams, M. C. (2020). *"I heard a teacher say…": Interrupting and responding to microaggressions, bias, and injustice in P-12*

settings. [Paper presentation]. American Educational Research Association Conference, San Francisco, CA (Conference canceled).

Jones, S. P. (2020). Ending curriculum violence. *Teaching Tolerance, 64*. https://www.tolerance.org/magazine/spring-2020/ending-curriculum-violence

Journell, W. (2021). Taking a reasoned stance on misinformation. *Phi Delta Kappan, 102*(5), 12-17. https://doi.org/10.1177/0031721721992559

Kavanagh, K. M., Thacker, E. S., Williams, M. C., Merritt, J. D., Bodle, A., & Jaffee, A. T. (2021). Disrupting microaggressions in P-16 classrooms: A facilitated workshop approach using critical case analysis. *Multicultural Perspectives, 23*(4), 232-240. https://doi.org/10.1080/15210960.2021.1979403

King, L. J. (2020). Black history is not American history: Toward a framework of Black Historical consciousness. *Social Education, 84*(6), 335-341.

King, L. J., & Brown, K. (2014). Once a year to be Black: Fighting against typical Black History Month pedagogies. *The Negro Educational Review, 65*(1-4), 23-43.

Kumashiro, K. (2009). *Against common sense: Teaching and learning toward social justice.* Routledge.

Kinchloe, J. (2001). *Getting beyond the facts: Teaching social studies/social sciences in the Twenty-first Century.* Peter Lang.

Learning for Justice. (2021). *Teaching hard history.* https://www.learningforjustice.org/frameworks/teaching-hard-history/american-slavery

Lombardo, C. (2019). "Virginia study finds increased school bullying in areas that voted for Trump." *NPR.* https://www.npr.org/2019/01/09/683177489/virginia-study-finds-increased-school-bullying-in-areas-that-voted-for-trump

Love, B. L. (2019). *We want to do more than survive: Abolitionist teaching and the pursuit of educational freedom.* Beacon.

Maguth, B., & Taylor, N. (2014). Bringing LGBTQ topics into the social studies classroom. *The Social Studies, 105*(1), 23-28. https://doi.org/10.1080/00377996.2013.788471

Nadal, K., Issa, M.-A., Leon, J., Meterko, V., Wideman, M., & Wong, Y. (2011). Sexual orientation microaggressions: "Death by a thousand cuts" for lesbian, gay, and bisexual youth. *Journal of LGBT Youth, 8*(3), 234-259. https://doi.org/10.1080/19361653.2011.584204

National Council for the Social Studies (2010). "A state led effort to develop standards for social studies." *NCSS*. https://www.socialstudies.org/statecreatedstandards

Noblit, G. W., Flores, S. Y., & Murillo, Jr., E. G. (Eds.) (2004). *Postcritical ethnography: Reinscribing critique.* Hampton Press.

Pierce, C., Carew, J. V., Pierce-Gonzalez, D., & Wills, D. (1977). An experiment in racism: TV commercials. *Education and Urban Society, 10*(1), 61-87.

Sabzalian, L. (2019). The tensions between Indigenous sovereignty and multicultural citizenship education: Toward an anticolonial approach to civic education. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, *47*(3), 311–346. https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2019.1639572

Souza, T. (2018). Responding to microaggressions in the classroom: Taking ACTION. *Faculty focus: Higher ed teaching strategies*. Magna Publications.

Subedi, B. (2006). Preservice Teachers' Beliefs and Practices: Religion and Religious Diversity. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 39*(3), 227-238.

Sue, D. W., Capodilupo, C. M., Torino, G. C., Bucceri, J. M., Holder, A. M., Nadal, K. L., & Esquilin, M. (2007). Racial microaggressions in everyday life: Implications for clinical practice. *American Psychologist, 62*(4), 271-286. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.62.4.271

Sue, D. W., Alsaidi, S., Awad, M. N., Glaeser, E., Calle, C. Z., & Mendez, N. (2019). Disarming racial microaggressions: Microintervention strategies for targets, White allies, and bystanders. *American Psychologist, 74*(1), 128 –142. https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000296

Swalwell, K., & Payne, K. (2019). Critical civic education for young children. *Multicultural perspectives, 21*(2), 127-132. https://doi.org/10.1080/15210960.2019.1606641

Tanenbaum. (2021). "Coexist: A skills based curriculum for understanding conflict resolution." Tanenbaum. https://tanenbaum.org/about-us/what-we-do/education/curricula-for-educators/

Teaching Tolerance. (2017). "Responding to hate and bias at school." https://www.tolerance.org/sites/default/files/2017-07/Responding%20to%20Hate%20at%20School%202017.pdf

Vickery, A. E., & Duncan, K. S. (2020). Lifting the veil: On decentering whiteness in social studies curriculum, teaching, and research. In A. M. Hawkman & S. B. Shear (Eds.), *Marking the "invisible": Articulating whiteness in social studies education* (pp. xiii-xxiii). Information Age Publishing.

Wheeler-Bell, Q. (2014). Educating the spirit of activism: A "Critical" civic education. *Educational policy, 28*(3), 463-486.

Woodson, A. N., & Love, B. L. (2019). Outstanding: Centering Black kids' enoughness in civic education research. *Multicultural Perspectives, 21*(2), 91-96. https://doi.org/10.1080/15210960.2019.1606631