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Teaching Emotionally Charged Cultural Diversity Topics in Family Science: 
The Pivotal Role of Instructor’s Emotions

“I have come to a frightening conclusion. I am the decisive element in the classroom. It is my personal approach that creates the climate. It is my daily mood that makes the weather (...)”. (Ginott, 1976).

“Isn’t the educator’s discomfort an equally important part of the call to action, the potential transformation? If I were to rewrite the chapter, I would emphasize in more detail how and when an educator’s own discomforts inhibit educational exchange with students, prevent the educator from taking risks, and eclipses the educator’s very capacity to see, for example, his or her own attachments to particular outcomes” (Boler, cited in Leibowitz, 2011).

In recent years colleges and universities have made diversity education an important, often required, component of their undergraduate curriculum (Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2007). The goal of such policies is to help students develop intercultural skills and become culturally sensitive, mature, and competent citizens. Many students, however, do not appear to prioritize cultural diversity competence as highly as do faculty and administrators. Despite rampant evidence of continued racial and gender inequalities, today’s students, especially White students, no longer see racial and gender inequalities as an important issue (Twenge, 2013). Therefore, they are especially unwilling to engage in topics related to race (Williams & McDermott, 2014). We both teach at a large public university in the southwestern U.S. We have had students ask in the classroom and in their anonymous evaluations why we (as teachers) continue to focus on something that is no longer an issue. However, privately and anonymously, marginalized students (minority race and sexually identified minority) have thanked us and shared that they appreciated information provided in class and the discussion that followed. Unfortunately, as evidenced in our own classrooms as well as in incidents shown on the nightly news, it is today’s students, particularly those in the dominant majority, who would benefit most from engaging in difficult dialogues about race, gender, and other forms of diversity (Pieterse & Collins, 2007).

It is well documented that teaching cultural diversity courses in family studies and related disciplines frequently results in difficult, emotionally charged dialogues in the classroom (e.g., Cutri & Whiting, 2015; Niehuis, 2005; Niehuis, 2006; Roberts & Smith, 2002; Weinstein & Obear, 1992; Zembylas, 2008). These tensions appear to increase when the instructor’s emphasis shifts from descriptive information on different ethnic groups in the U.S. (e.g., Irish Americans, Polish Americans, Puerto Ricans) to attempting to help students develop multicultural competence (i.e., awareness of personal biases, discrimination, privilege, racism, systemic oppression, etc.) and impart values of social justice. The second author of this article reflects on how she tackled this issue:

When I was a graduate student, I was assigned to teach a multicultural class. The course supervisor recommended that I first cover descriptive and historical
information and teach about privilege and power only after having developed rapport with the students. I disagreed with that model on many levels. I felt it was important to lay the groundwork of power and privilege so that when we covered each immigrant group, we could apply the privilege, the power, and the isms that racial/ethnic/immigrant groups experienced historically and still today. This allowed the students to see these issues as not only something having occurred in the past but still deeply relevant as well. When I taught the course this way, students seemed excited to talk about privilege and it helped them ultimately to understand how they were privileged in their daily lives.

Additional topics in family studies beyond racial/ethnic diversity may also spur controversy and strong feelings (Ramos & Blinn-Pike, 1999). These topics include but are not limited to diverse gender and sexual identities and orientations, corporal punishment, abortion, divorce, and child abuse. Here, we primarily focus on teaching about racial/ethnic diversity.

There is already literature on (a) providing practical advice for instructors who teach challenging classes, and (b) examining students’ emotional reactions to subject matter. The present paper’s thesis is that instructors’ emotions, which set the tone for students’ emotions, have been relatively neglected and are worthy of further conceptual and empirical analysis. Furthermore, whereas there are many recommendations for handling challenging situations in the classroom, there are also many questions for which we appear to lack answers. We review recommendations and unanswered questions through the lens of classroom emotional dynamics, suggest additional issues that may help resolve outstanding questions, and share our experiences and the knowledge we gained.

Developmental Models of Intercultural Sensitivity and Maturity

Ethnocentrism refers to a worldview that one’s own culture is good, right, normal, and central to everybody else’s reality. In contrast, ethnorelativism is a perspective that one’s culture is not better than another; different cultures can only be understood relative to one another; behaviors must be interpreted within a given culture’s context; all cultures are worthy of respect, including one’s own; individuals should strive to increase their self-awareness; and that “power, privilege, and oppression affect the construction of knowledge, images of self, and interactions with others” (Perez, Shim, King, & Baxter Magolda, 2015, p. 761). Several models of intercultural sensitivity and maturity, such as the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (Bennett, 1986) and the Developmental Model of Intercultural Maturity (King & Baxter Magolda, 2005; Perez et al., 2015) emphasize the idea that undergraduate students need to move from a perspective of ethnocentrism to one of ethnorelativism if they want to become interculturally sensitive and mature, and ultimately develop better intercultural communication skills.

For example, Bennett (1993) argues that a person who has attained an ethnorelative stance has achieved three milestones. The first is acceptance, defined as respect for behavioral
and value differences in various cultures, holding neither negative nor positive evaluations of various cultures, merely an appreciation for differences. The second milestone is adaptation, defined as being able to imagine or comprehend another person’s perspective and having two or more internalized cultural frames of reference (derived from the experience within a complete cultural frame). The third is integration, namely being able to “analyze and evaluate situations from one or more chosen cultural perspectives … The outcome of this action is a judgment of relative goodness that is specific to some identified context” (Bennett, 1993, p. 61).

In their revision of King and Baxter Magolda’s Intercultural Maturity Model, Perez and colleagues (2015) similarly argue that intercultural maturity requires (at the cognitive level) that a person can view the world from various perspectives and has knowledge of multiple cultural lenses. At the intrapersonal level, maturity means that a person is willing and able to challenge his or her own views in a larger context while accepting multiple social identities in self and others (Perez et al., 2015, p. 768). Finally, at the interpersonal level, an interculturally mature person values and engages in relationships with others different from herself culturally and is willing to fight for social justice and the rights of those who are denied these.

The Centrality of Students’ Emotions in Learning

The two developmental models discussed above emphasize that to move from ethnocentrism to ethnorelativism requires that students are faced with uncomfortable and at times identity-threatening information. Indeed, Boler (1999) strongly advocates for a pedagogy of discomfort if instructors wish their students to accept the notion of social inequalities and institutional oppression and, most importantly, their own complicity in these systems. Not surprisingly, many minority and majority students experience feelings of insecurity, uncertainty, anxiety/fear, guilt, shame, and anger as the result of having been confronted with topics such as racism, prejudice, White (and other forms of) privilege, and inequality (e.g., Brown, Stewart, & Paz Goldfarb, 2006; Ramos & Blinn-Pike, 1999; Sue, Lin, Torino, Capodilupo, & Rivera, 2009). Ramos and Blinn-Pike (1999) note that some of these emotions (e.g., fear of sparking a “heated incident” [p. 226] or of being seen as racist; or perceiving oneself to lack cultural awareness due to growing up in a sheltered, culturally homogeneous environment) tend to be more common than others. However, even if a given emotion is experienced by relatively few students, those who experience it may do so with great intensity. Feelings and emotions such as these are at once a goldmine for those instructors who know how to handle them, but the stuff of nightmares for those who do not (Warren, 2000). These feelings and emotions are, however, a vital part of the path to cultural diversity competence and maturity and therefore should not be squelched. Many instructors, of course, fear them for a variety of reasons; consequently, much has been written about how instructors can or should deal with their students’ emotions in the cultural diversity classroom.

There seems to be general consensus that students’ emotions need to be addressed and acknowledged rather than avoided or ignored (Ramos & Blinn-Pike, 1999), and that instructors have a teaching obligation not only to instigate discomfort, as Boler (1999) argued, but also the
moral obligation to manage and help reconcile such discomfort in their students (Cutri & Whiting, 2015). Thus, to encourage effective learning, instructors need to find a delicate balance between instigating potentially uncomfortable emotions and preventing them from getting out of hand. Given that the focus of the present paper is on instructors’ emotions rather than students’, we simply summarize effective teaching strategies for managing students’ emotions in Table 1.

The Centrality of Instructors’ Emotions in Teaching

At the outset of this paper, we quoted Ginott (1976), who, after years of teaching concluded that instructors’ emotions greatly affect their students’ emotions and ability to learn. Moore (1989), addressing family-life education via the ideas of Carl Rogers, argued that teachers needed to possess these three emotional qualities: “a genuineness and transparency, in which they are their real feelings;” “a warm acceptance of and prizing of the other person as a separate individual;” and “a sensitive ability to see the world of the other person” (p. 153). In recent years, educational researchers have provided strong empirical evidence that instructors’ emotions do indeed affect students’ emotions (e.g., Becker, Goetz, Morger, & Ranellucci, 2014) and that students’ emotions, in turn, play a vital role in their learning (e.g., Goetz, Zirngibl, Pekrun, & Hall, 2003) and academic achievement (Pekrun, Goetz, Titz, & Perry, 2002; Valiente, Swanson, & Eisenberg, 2012).

In this context then, it is particularly disheartening to acknowledge that many instructors teaching cultural diversity courses experience a tremendous amount of negative emotions and cognitions before, during, and after teaching. These include but are not limited to “fears of losing classroom control, inability to understand or recognize the causes or dynamics of difficult dialogues, and lack of knowledge and skills to properly intervene” (Sue, Torino et al., p. 1090). In addition, many instructors experience a wide variety of concerns when facing controversial topics, such as self-doubt and feelings of incompetence, fear of how others may perceive them, and embarrassment. The second author of the present paper shares this reflection:

*I remember the first time I lectured on racism, specifically racism toward African Americans. I was nervous and anxious about covering the topic. Not so much concerning the facts. There was plenty of historic and contemporary information available to draw upon, from slavery to segregation, all the way up to current events, such as news reports of how the KKK had grown in membership in one state or the existence of segregated proms in Alabama. What was much harder was to share how I felt, the emotional side of the story. After the lecture, some African American students came to me and thanked me for helping others understand. Because class lecture and discussion did not get heated or out of hand and nobody complained, I started feeling more confident. I also realized, however, that I needed to be braver for those students that did not feel they had a voice. Even though I had given a watered down lecture, two students felt I had said enough for them to feel included and cared about. I realized then how important it was for me to become more comfortable with my own feelings about*
the material so that I could do a better job for any students who feel marginalized, who feel as though they do not have a voice.

Other emotions experienced include guilt, shame, disappointment in themselves, culture shock, confusion, worry, avoidance, sadness, defensiveness, and awareness of ignorance (e.g., Baumgartner & Johnson-Bailey, 2008; Sue, Torino et al., 2009; Weinstein & Obear, 1992; Zembylas, 2008). Both of the present authors reflect on how their personal backgrounds may have influenced their emotions regarding cultural diversity issues:

I grew up in west Texas, raised by parents who either did not see racism as an issue (too entrenched in their own white privilege) or made racist jokes and placed assumptions on others’ behaviors and thoughts based on their own race. Part of it was the time period, part of it was where we lived, part of it was how my parents had been raised, and part of it was simply ignorance. I first had to understand privilege and my role in it. Then I had to experience my own shame and feelings of guilt for things I had laughed at over the years, for my own racist comments made in ignorance, for the assumptions I made about others based on the color of their skin. I experienced many negative emotions, beat myself up emotionally and psychologically, feeling disappointed in myself, sad, and angry for not realizing these things sooner. This instigated a change in identity from who I was then to who I wanted to be and ultimately became. (Author 2)

I grew up in Germany, raised by fairly open-minded, liberal, mostly non-racist parents, who enjoyed traveling to foreign countries. I was privileged that my parents took me on their travels to exotic locations like Morocco and Turkey, dreamy destinations like Greece, Spain, Italy, France, and Hawai‘i, and provided plenty of opportunity for me to immerse myself into different cultures via exchange programs to England and extensive stays in the U.S. Because my parents did not believe in booking hotels ahead of time, we often ended up staying with locals, who thankfully took us in, because all hotels were fully booked. Thus, I have experienced people from many different countries in their home environments and taken part in their daily routines and celebrations. Later, I was fortunate to travel on my own to many different countries, including Canada, Australia, Puerto Rico [a U.S. territory], and the Netherlands. Despite extensive exposure and only positive experiences with many wonderful people all over the world, I still realized when I taught a multicultural course the first time, that I was rather ethnocentric in many ways. Perhaps not as much as my students, but still too much. I also realized that I was biased with regard to African Americans, especially males. I had to think about where those biases came from, what kind of information I had been exposed to growing up and as an adult, both in Germany and the U.S. As I began preparing for my courses and read the textbook and other sources, I became aware of my own privileges and my complicity in perpetuating inequality and social injustice. Some topics were also harder to teach than others, because they were related to a particular sensitive and painful topic in my
nation’s past: Antisemitism. It is a topic of which I carry a great deal of shame, even though neither I nor my parents were ever anti-Semitic (indeed, I am now married to a Jewish man). Yet, when people think of Germany, that is probably one of the first things that comes to their mind. So talking about groups of immigrants who left their country to avoid slaughter is particularly difficult for me. The strongest feeling I had though was that of being a fraud, of not really knowing what I was talking about, given that I did not belong to the different ethnic or cultural groups I taught about. I felt this, even though I painstakingly prepared my lectures and tried my best to not stereotype various ethnic groups. (Author 1)

These fears are not limited to White faculty but are also experienced by racial and/or ethnic minority faculty (e.g., Baumgartner & Johnson-Bailey, 2008; Sue, Torino et al., 2009). Likely exacerbating these difficulties is that many faculty are sent into the cultural diversity classroom with little regard for their prior training in this area and degree of fit between the instructor’s research and the topic of cultural diversity. According to Brown et al. (2006), “Often, scholars of color or those who belong to diverse groups are assigned to teach the ‘diversity’ courses, even if those courses do not coincide with their specialty areas or instead of [a] course in their specialty area…” (p. 11). In other words, the person teaching about a controversial topic may not have much more background in it than the students he, she, or they have been assigned to teach! The present authors reflect on this matter as follows:

When I began my first faculty job, I came straight out of graduate school and had never taken a course on cultural diversity, let alone taught one. One of the first classes I was assigned to teach was cultural diversity. I am female and European, and was a first-year assistant professor at the time. Given my extensive traveling, and having come to graduate school in the U.S. as an international student and, thus, having had to cope in a different cultural environment might have given me a leg up on my future undergraduate students in terms of intercultural experience, but not by much. When I began to teach about inequality and oppression and the students’ complicity in it, I received considerable push-back and even had students (White ones) leave the class crying. I worried how students’ reactions might affect course evaluations and my odds of getting tenure. I received low course evaluations and it took some time for me to adequately adapt my teaching and experience a rise in my evaluations. Because I was on tenure-track, it never occurred to me to ask to be relieved from teaching the course nor to share my experiences and insecurities with my colleagues for fear of their perception of me. I strongly felt, however, that an assistant professor should not be assigned to teach a course like this and that I had been assigned to teach it, because I was a woman with an international background, with no power in the department (the only other international faculty member, a male assistant professor from another country was not asked to teach it, as far as I know). (Author 1)
I remember many years ago, a faculty member in charge of making the teaching schedule told me it was best to have someone who can relate to not having White privilege teach the multicultural class in the department. Thus, international graduate students or faculty were the only ones to teach those courses during that person’s tenure. Yet, the international students complained about being pigeonholed into teaching that class and always receiving negative evaluations, whereas those who wanted the challenge or had a particular interest in the topic were not given the chance. When I was asked to teach the course (as a White, U.S.-born, female, non-tenure-track faculty member), I had mixed feelings. The first time teaching it resulted in some harsh evaluations from students, making me very worried how these course evaluations might affect the chances of getting asked to teach for the department in the future. I took the feedback the students provided and made changes accordingly. Eventually, my course evaluations improved. (Author 2)

Of course, there are recommendations for what instructors can do to deal with their own emotions, before, during, or after class. They include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Becoming educated and comfortable on the topic via extensive reading, attending trainings, and speaking to colleagues (Sue, Torino et al., 2009). For me, [Author 1] has been that colleague, that senior person who had more experience. She shared her own concerns, misgivings, and lessons learned that I was able to incorporate. (Author 2)

- Being honest with oneself and the students about still learning and making mistakes (Sue, Torino et al., 2009; Weinstein & Obear, 1992). This is a recommendation that I have followed and that has served me well. It helps me feel more comfortable because it takes the need for perfection away, and I think it has also helped my students feel that it is okay to open up, even if it turns out that what they say is perhaps biased, racist, etc. This strategy provides opportunities, rather than closes the door to discussion. (Author 1)

- Becoming increasingly aware of one’s own emotions, privileges, biases, emotional boundaries, hot spots, and past action and experiences, and how to manage them (e.g., Cutri & Whiting, 2015; Weinstein & Obear, 1992). I found journaling or writing about my experiences and feelings very useful. I have even shared my writing with others, who took over from me teaching the multicultural course. I always have a little twinge when I share my personal reflections, though, as I wrote down what I remember to be my most awful, hateful moment. I still get sick thinking about it. It was not an action; it was a thought. It was apathy and it was more than apathy. (Author 2)
Over the years, I have come to realize that the emotions I bring into the classroom transfer directly to students. If I am happy, they are happy. If I am angry, they feel uncomfortable. If I feel miserable, so will they. For this reason, I strongly believe in working through my emotions, which typically means experiencing them until they dissipate, before I enter the classroom. Obviously, given the busy life academics experience, that is not always possible, but it is my preferred strategy. Now that I am tenured, I also feel more comfortable discussing experiences with colleagues. I have never been a journal writer, but I do spend time reflecting and making changes accordingly. (Author 1)

- Using self-talk to re-evaluate, re-appraise, re-affirm, and/or re-frame the material or emotions at any time point (Weinstein & Obear, 1992; Zembylas, 2008).

I have spent a lot of time evaluating my own thoughts as well as the lecture. (Author 2)

- Reflecting privately and critically about the topic before and after class discussions (Zembylas, 2008), e.g., via journaling (Baumgartner & Johnson-Bailey, 2008). A mutual colleague of ours uses journaling intensively. She often teaches about gender and sexuality. She is a firm believer in journaling and has been a resource to bounce ideas off regarding difficult topics. (Author 2)

Uneven Distribution of Emotional Labor across Diversity Dimensions

As should be obvious by now, teaching cultural diversity courses requires tremendous emotional work by instructors. According to Hochschild (1979, 1983), emotional labor is the management of emotions that people perform as part of their paid employment. College and university teaching is included on her list of occupations requiring a large degree of emotional labor. This burden, however, is unevenly distributed across gender and racial lines (e.g., Bellas, 1994; Brown et al., 2006), with women and minority faculty having to do significantly greater amounts of emotional labor. Emotional labor can exist in different variations. DiGregorio (2018), reflecting on her experience as a sexual-minority faculty member, refers to her negotiation of personal and cultural differences between herself and segments of the student population as a “strain between standpoints” (p. 92). She reports that “trying to maintain a delicate balance between the desire to practice effective teaching and the need for self-preservation” was “absolutely exhausting” (p. 92). The first author of the present paper likewise experienced an exhausting strain between standpoints, although centered on different dimensions than those addressed by DiGregorio (i.e., religious background and ideology). Minority faculty teaching cultural diversity courses to predominantly White students “experience daily cultural assaults on their identity stemming from historical stereotypes among students and academic demands” (Moore, Acosta, Perry, & Edwards, 2010, p. 191). They frequently experience challenges to their credibility and authority in the classroom (Huston, 2006; Perry, Moore, Acosta, Frey, & Edwards, 2009) and must engage in greater emotional work than nonminority faculty members do, which often leaves them emotionally drained (Harlow, 2003).
Students often come to my office and disclose. I cannot count the number of times a student has been honest with me about their own sexuality and then tell me I was the first person they have told or that they have not told their parents yet. I have had students share about abuse, sexual assault, and suicide plans. That leaves me drained as I continue to worry about that student even after I have taken them to the counseling center or to the Dean of Students. (Author 2)

When I taught the multicultural course, I initially had my credibility and authority challenged, until I showed a map of the world with little pins illustrating which countries I had visited or lived in, photos of myself in various cultural settings, etc. When I disclosed my views on religion, which were diametrically opposite to those of most of my students, I encountered frequent attempts to convert me to another religion. When I discussed gender inequality, the male students and some of the female students felt I was a feminist (accurate, though not in the derogatory sense the students seemed to perceive). My relationship status, at the time, also become an issue for many of my students. Being single meant that I was not competent to teach about families. It was utterly exhausting, and I was on tenure track, needing high course evaluations and supposed to focus most of my energy on publishing and grant pursuit. (Author 1)

Such classroom difficulties may also lower instructors’ course evaluations, thus harming them professionally (Huston, 2006). To compound this, research has shown that required cultural diversity courses are “dumped” disproportionately on women and minorities across all ranks, including graduate teaching assistants, adjunct faculty, and tenure-track positions. Further, lower-ranking instructors are more likely to be assigned to teach cultural diversity courses than are higher-ranking faculty members (e.g., Moore et al., 2010). Moore et al. (2010) concluded there is “evidence of diversity course ‘dumping’ that excludes systematically the nonminority assistant and associate professors from this academic duty” (p. 196). They also describe that there “is the distinctive emotional burden of teaching these courses for men and women of color who express anger and rage toward multiple layers of devaluing their credibility, authority, and scholarly integrity” (pp. 196-197). These distressing experiences almost certainly extend beyond women and racial minorities to encompass sexual, religious, and other minorities. Moreover, as Cutri and Whiting (2015) have pointed out, emotional work, especially in academia, is often “invisible and disincentivized” (p. 1010) and “[emotional] labor … is generally not viewed as involving valuable skills and is consequently poorly rewarded” (Bellas, 1994, p. 97).

Questions, as Well as Answers

As the above sections show, a great deal of pedagogical scholarship has gone into discovering best practices for instructors to handle challenging, emotionally laden classroom situations involving cultural diversity and other controversial topics. For all of the apparent
answers on dealing with such situations, however, there also appear to be many outstanding questions. They include the following:

- How well are instructors trained to teach cultural diversity courses, which clearly require not only knowledge on topical content but also effective management of their own and students’ emotional work? It can be argued that instructors’ level of cultural diversity training is an ethical issue, as poor instructor preparation can lead to exacerbation rather than amelioration of inter-group tensions and misunderstandings. Some family science faculty may have enhanced emotion management skills stemming from their training (e.g., marriage and family therapists, mediators), but most of us do not. (Having said this, cultural diversity courses should not be dumped disproportionately on instructors with such skills, either.)

- Are the above-listed recommendations sufficient to help instructors of such courses to develop intra- and interpersonal skills necessary to achieve their own intercultural sensitivity and maturity?

- Is some minimal breadth of sociocultural experience necessary to give a cultural-diversity instructor sufficient credibility and trust with a diverse range of students? Presumably, having common heritage or experiences with as many different social identity groups as possible will help an instructor relate and build trust with a wide variety of students in a given class. However, even if an instructor traveled extensively to different nations, met frequently with different cultural and heritage organizations, attended the services of many different religions, etc., he or she would never be able to replicate lived experiences of students of all backgrounds.

- What additional support can and should universities offer women, racial minority, and other minority faculty when teaching cultural diversity courses? Similarly, how can lower ranking, women, and minority faculty be more protected from teaching such courses, with their negative consequences on emotional work, emotional health, and professional advancements through the ranks?

A possible starting point in resolving some of these unanswered questions is discussion. Whereas some faculty members may feel comfortable speaking to colleagues, others – particularly those at more junior stages – may not. University staff members outside one’s department may provide a better option for faculty reluctant to talk to departmental colleagues about teaching challenges. Many higher-education institutions, ranging from community colleges to major research universities, have Centers for Teaching and Learning (CTL’s) on campus. Our informal canvassing of roughly 55 CTL websites suggests that well over half offer resources on teaching diversity, ranging from individual consultations for instructors to web links (see Appendix). Colleges of education, such as that at the University of Southern California (USC), offer extensive online resources on teaching diversity (USC Rossier School of Education, not dated), as well.
Another potential option for increasing instructors’ cultural sensitivity and expertise is requiring them to attend workshops geared specifically toward helping them come to terms with their own biases, prejudices, etc. before teaching such courses for the first time. Online courses (many of the free) are available via Internet searches, although these appear to deal more with traditional workplaces rather than academia.

Moore and colleagues (2010) argue that diversity and inequality topics should be taught in the context of any content course so that no instructor would be excluded from paying the emotional “tax” of diversity courses. Indeed, some universities are requiring instructors across their campuses to include a diversity angle in all their courses (DeRuy, 2016). Alternatively, those in power to assign diversity courses (e.g., department chairs) may want to rotate the course so that everyone in the department regardless of rank, race, gender, or specialization teaches it once in a while. However, this advice should be taken with caution. Administrators know their faculty and if certain instructors have particularly strong desires or interest to teach such courses, as well as the necessary skills, they should not be deprived of this teaching opportunity. Conversely, instructors whose cultural sensitivity and expertise have not been cultivated to the maximum perhaps should not be required to teach cultural diversity courses if it would be detrimental to students’ well-being and learning. Regardless of any structural changes that may or may not be put in place, untenured faculty members should be protected (Cutri & Whiting, 2015) either by not being asked to teach such courses at all or by at least providing them with the training and support necessary to help them succeed.

Ultimately, in our view, optimal cultural-diversity instruction at universities requires commitment at multiple levels. Department chairs should assign cultural-diversity courses equitably and with consideration of instructors’ expertise in the area and academic rank (e.g., protecting graduate students, non-tenure track instructors and assistant professors from teaching this highly demanding course, unless they request to teach it). Centers for Teaching and Learning should provide ample workshops on teaching about diversity, and faculty should avail themselves of the opportunity to enhance their teaching in this area. Ironically, the disproportionate assignment of women, minorities, and lower-ranking faculty members and instructors to teach cultural diversity courses (with the possibility of their receiving low evaluations, at least at first, and negatively impacting their emotional well-being and advancement through the ranks) seems to be replicating the kinds of inequalities in the academy that cultural diversity courses are meant to help eradicate in the larger society.
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Table 1

*Effective Teaching Strategies for Assisting Students with Their Own Emotions, and Authors’ Reflections on Strategies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>How to do this</th>
<th>References/Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Create a safe space for students                   | • Include statement about emotional content in syllabus  
• Set ground rules for classroom behavior  
• Assure the student that everyone makes mistakes and is susceptible to biases, including the instructor  
• Being aware of words that can trigger microaggressions | • Baumgartner & Johnson-Bailey (2008)  
• Brown et al., (2006)  
• Sue, Torino et al. (2009) |
| Validate and respect the feelings underlying students’ opinions. | • Do not be dismissive                                                                                                                           | • Ramos & Blinn-Pike (1999)                                                           |
| Be knowledgeable about the culture/gender/sexuality/ etc. | • Intensify knowledge of topic  
• Attend trainings and conferences  
• Talk with other faculty  
• Expand social group  
• Being aware of words that can trigger microaggressions | • Ramos & Blinn-Pike (1999) |
| Providing opportunities for students to share their thoughts and feelings | • Journal (confidential, non-graded)  
• Anonymous writing  
• Small group discussions  
• Small group and then large group discussion | • Baumgartner & Johnson-Bailey (2008)  
• Bertera and Littlefield (2003)  
• Ramos and Blinn-Pike (1999) |
| Emphasize the importance of continued unlearning of bias and prejudice | • Either before or after a class discussion on the topic  
• Admit to own experiences of having to unlearn | • Weinstein & Obear (1992) |
| Take a time-out if a topic gets too hot            | • Take a break, but come back to the topic, either later in class or the next class period. Do not use the break as a way to end an uncomfortable situation. Also, explain the reason behind this deferral | • Sue, Torino et al. (2009)  
• Roberts & Smith (2002)  
• Weinstein & Obear (1992)  
• Indiana University Bloomington, Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning (2019) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model how you, as the instructor, handle your own discomfort</th>
<th>Show students how you deal with your own emotions</th>
<th>Indiana University Bloomington, Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning (2019)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Intergroup Dialogues | Put students from different social identity groups together to allow them to think about commonalities and differences in groups’ experiences and social justice issues. | Nagda & Gurin (2007)  
Narayan (1988) |
### Appendix

University Centers for Teaching and Learning (CTL) with Resources Specifically on Teaching Cultural Diversity and/or Handling Challenging Classroom Situations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>URL for CTL itself (Specific diversity/difficult-topic resource in parentheses)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brandeis</td>
<td><a href="www.brandeis.edu/teaching/DiversityAndInclusion.html">www.brandeis.edu/teaching</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colby</td>
<td><a href="libguides.colby.edu/inclusive_teaching">www.colby.edu/ctl/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td><a href="ctl.columbia.edu/resources-and-technology/resources/inclusive-teaching-guide/">ctl.columbia.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut College</td>
<td><a href="www.conncoll.edu/offices/center-for-teaching--learning/ctl-resources/bibliographies/">www.conncoll.edu/offices/center-for-teaching--learning/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidson</td>
<td><a href="www.davidson.edu/offices-and-services/center-teaching-and-learning/faculty-resources">www.davidson.edu/offices-and-services/center-teaching-and-learning</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duquesne</td>
<td><a href="www.duq.edu/about/centers-and-institutes/center-for-teaching-excellence/teaching-and-learning/teaching-controversial-topics">www.duq.edu/about/centers-and-institutes/center-for-teaching-excellence</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia College</td>
<td><a href="www.gcsu.edu/ctl/diversity-universal-design">www.gcsu.edu/ctl</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampshire College</td>
<td><a href="sites.hampshire.edu/ctl/inclusive-teaching-and-advising/">www.hampshire.edu/ctl</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td><a href="bokcenter.harvard.edu/navigating-difficult-moments">bokcenter.harvard.edu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt State</td>
<td><a href="ctl.humboldt.edu/node/816/#TIR1">ctl.humboldt.edu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana (Bloomington)</td>
<td><a href="citl.indiana.edu/teaching-resources/diversity-inclusion/managing-difficult-classroom-discussions/">citl.indiana.edu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana U.-Purdue U.</td>
<td><a href="ctl.iupui.edu">ctl.iupui.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Website/Link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>(ctl.iupui.edu/Programs/Teaching-Towards-Racial-Equity-Workshop-Series)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennesaw St.</td>
<td>cctl.kennesaw.edu&lt;br&gt;(diversity.kennesaw.edu/resources/diversity_resources.php)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent St.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.kent.edu/ctl">www.kent.edu/ctl</a>&lt;br&gt;(einside.kent.edu/Management%20Update%20Archive/einside/articledisplay66c5.html?newsitem=E4FFFB17-F5C3-9D24-CD2A126F4AEE3EF6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis &amp; Clark</td>
<td><a href="http://www.lcsc.edu/teaching-learning">www.lcsc.edu/teaching-learning</a>&lt;br&gt;(<a href="http://www.lcsc.edu/teaching-learning/ideas-and-inspiration/inclusive-practices/">www.lcsc.edu/teaching-learning/ideas-and-inspiration/inclusive-practices/</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquette</td>
<td><a href="http://www.marquette.edu/ctl">www.marquette.edu/ctl</a>&lt;br&gt;(<a href="http://www.marquette.edu/center-for-teaching-and-learning/inclusive-teaching.php">www.marquette.edu/center-for-teaching-and-learning/inclusive-teaching.php</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otterbein</td>
<td><a href="http://www.otterbein.edu/ctl">www.otterbein.edu/ctl</a>&lt;br&gt;(otterbein.libguides.com/inclusive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed</td>
<td><a href="http://www.reed.edu/ctl/br">www.reed.edu/ctl/br</a>&lt;br&gt;(<a href="http://www.reed.edu/ctl/programs.html">www.reed.edu/ctl/programs.html</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento State</td>
<td><a href="http://www.csus.edu/ctl/br">www.csus.edu/ctl/br</a>&lt;br&gt;(<a href="http://www.csus.edu/ctl/resources/diversity/diversity%20and%20inclusion.html">www.csus.edu/ctl/resources/diversity/diversity%20and%20inclusion.html</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego State</td>
<td>cctl.sdsu.edu/br&lt;br&gt;(ctl.sdsu.edu/teaching-issues/managing-the-classroom/inclusive-pedagogy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John's (NY)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.stjohns.edu/resources/places/center-teaching-and-learning">www.stjohns.edu/resources/places/center-teaching-and-learning</a>&lt;br&gt;(campusguides.stjohns.edu/c.php?g=266287&amp;p=1783401)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Tech</td>
<td><a href="http://www.depts.ttu.edu/tlpdc/br">www.depts.ttu.edu/tlpdc/br</a>&lt;br&gt;(<a href="http://www.depts.ttu.edu/tlpdc/Resources/Teaching_resources/TLPDC_teaching_resources/HowDoINavigateAndCurbConflictInMyClassroom.php">www.depts.ttu.edu/tlpdc/Resources/Teaching_resources/TLPDC_teaching_resources/HowDoINavigateAndCurbConflictInMyClassroom.php</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity (CT)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.trincoll.edu/Academics/centers/teaching/br">www.trincoll.edu/Academics/centers/teaching/br</a>&lt;br&gt;(commons.trincoll.edu/ctl/files/2013/08/Week-11-Understanding-Prejudice.pdf)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Berkeley</td>
<td>teaching.berkeley.edu/br&lt;br&gt;(teaching.berkeley.edu/sensitive-topics-classroom)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. Denver</td>
<td>otl.du.edu/br&lt;br&gt;(otl.du.edu/advance-my-practice/inclusive-teaching-practices/)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. Georgia</td>
<td>ctl.uga.edu/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U. Michigan</td>
<td><a href="http://www.crlt.umich.edu/">www.crlt.umich.edu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(<a href="http://www.crlt.umich.edu/diversity-and-inclusion">www.crlt.umich.edu/diversity-and-inclusion</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. Missouri-St. Louis</td>
<td><a href="http://www.umsl.edu/services/ctl/">www.umsl.edu/services/ctl/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(<a href="http://www.umsl.edu/services/ctl/faculty/resourcesforteaching/index.html">www.umsl.edu/services/ctl/faculty/resourcesforteaching/index.html</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. Penn</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ctl.upenn.edu/">www.ctl.upenn.edu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(<a href="http://www.ctl.upenn.edu/Node/160">www.ctl.upenn.edu/Node/160</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. South Dakota</td>
<td><a href="http://www.usd.edu/ctl/">www.usd.edu/ctl/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(<a href="http://www.usd.edu/ctl/teaching-and-diversity">www.usd.edu/ctl/teaching-and-diversity</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington U.-St. Louis</td>
<td>teachingcenter.wustl.edu/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(teachingcenter.wustl.edu/resources/inclusive-teaching-learning/)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale</td>
<td>poorvucenter.yale.edu/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(poorvucenter.yale.edu/FacultyResources/Diversity-Inclusion)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>