

ious chapters that have provided practical knowledge of the facilitators themselves, readers can training processes have for those undergraduate students.

Chesler, and Nagda describing an and facilitators of intergroup dialogue facilitators perceive whether processes. It outlines five major related to the significance of their facilitators, the authors examine social identities and intergroup with implications for facilitator

er, and Tran, draws upon facilitator and training courses through the relational power of intergroup prose and poetry, how facilitators impact on deepening their understanding about internalized oppression agents in facilitating the learning

mines the longer-term impact of a study of college graduates, all ators. Through their own words, that facilitation experience on al experience. The chapter ends l programs seeking to catalyze

11

IDENTITY MATTERS

Facilitators' Struggles and Empowered Use of Social Identities in Intergroup Dialogue

*Kelly E. Maxwell, Mark Chesler,
and Biren (Ratnesh) A. Nagda*

The core practices of intergroup dialogue (IGD) involve students exploring their own and others' social identities in the context of broader patterns of systemic inequalities. Exploration of these social identities is critical in building meaningful relationships within and across identity groups and in mobilizing individual and collective agency to promote positive intergroup relationships. We use social identities to refer to group memberships based on physical or social characteristics ascribed by self or others that locate people within societal structures that confer advantage/privilege or disadvantage/oppression. The history of racial/ethnic inequality, sexism, and classism in the United States and around the world makes clear the continuing power of institutional oppression and how these cultural and situational forces affect the daily lives of people (Blauner, 1989; Bonilla-Silva & Forman, 2000; Essed, 1991; Feagin & Sikes, 1994). Social identities thus have internal meaning to us as individuals and also have significance to the rest of the world (Cooley, 1922; Tatum, 2003). Since our social identities shape so much of our internal and external experience, their exploration is crucial to advancing our understanding of ourselves, others, and the social world in which we live.

We are concerned with how IGD facilitators react and respond to this cocreated understanding of their social identities and how it impacts their

We thank Gillian Menaker, Koyonne Mims, Joseph Person, and Monita Thompson for their assistance in the development of this chapter. We alone, however, are responsible for the work and interpretations presented here.

own and others' behavior. In this chapter we share the results of a recent inquiry about how a set of undergraduate peer facilitators perceive their social identities affecting their facilitation processes. Maxwell and Chesler are both White faculty members and, respectively, a woman and man; Nagda is a faculty member and an immigrant man of color. As described below, we analyzed interviews conducted with facilitators of color and White facilitators, with men and women. Just as social identity theory emphasizes the importance of knowing oneself in the context of dialogue, it influences what we see as researchers, the interpretive frames we use, and the sense we make out of the data. As in all works of this sort, it is possible, perhaps likely, that other researchers with different identities, roles, or social and intellectual frames might approach this topic and interpret these data differently.

Social Identities in Intergroup Dialogue Facilitation

Social group identity is relevant not only to the conduct of intergroup dialogues but to the training and practice of facilitation. The training and supervision we provide facilitators is experienced and interpreted through the lens of their locations in the society's structures of race, gender, socioeconomic class, sexual orientation, religion, and other social categories. These identities, locations, and associated experiences provide and reinforce sets of values, talents/skills, and expectations facilitators bring to the dialogic encounter and to their leadership role. Moreover, the responses of students in the dialogue, as well as facilitators' expectations or assessments of these responses, also play a role in their approaches and actions. We can expect, then, that IGD facilitators' social group identities play a role in how they think about acting, plan to act, and do act as they relate with participants and their co-facilitators.

Our interest in these issues comes from our experience training, observing, and supervising facilitators of intergroup dialogues. We have seen, for example, that facilitators from target groups (i.e., identity groups disadvantaged or disenfranchised by a system of oppression that does not favor their group) and co-facilitators from agent groups (i.e., identity groups advantaged or privileged by historic and/or contemporary socioeconomic structures) often view their facilitation experiences differently. Further, the expression of their identities is not simply determined by internal definitions of self and one's membership in social groups; it is also responsive to situational demands and opportunities as well as the responses of dialogue participants (Tappan, 2006). Thus, the relative salience of a particular social identity (or even one's status as an agent or a target group member), and therefore its effect on facilitative behavior, depends on the dialogic context, group composition, and purpose.

Methods of Inquiry

We involved two former facilitators, a woman, to conduct and analyze interviews with 49 current facilitators whether and how their dialogue facilitation experiences had gone through the training and supervision about to facilitate an intergroup dialogue.

We explored the ways in which they experienced their identities (as facilitators with participants) they were trained and with their co-facilitators. We conducted interviews and used grounded theory to then applied these themes to the data, confirming and disconfirming our assumptions. As a result, the following themes:

1. Understanding the dialogue
2. Managing the dialogue
3. Establishing and maintaining the dialogue
4. Establishing relationships with participants
5. Working with co-facilitators

Not all themes were experienced primarily or solely by facilitators from subordinate groups. Some themes were experienced by facilitators from subordinate groups in programs in which we had no experience and experiences largely by facilitators from subordinate groups who they would or did facilitate. We explored broadly in the interviews the themes of race and gender. The pseudonyms for their names

share the results of a recent
facilitators perceive their social
Maxwell and Chesler are both
an and man; Nagda is a faculty
described below, we analyzed
and White facilitators, with
emphasizes the importance
it influences what we see as
d the sense we make out of
le, perhaps likely, that other
social and intellectual frames
ata differently.

Facilitation

the conduct of intergroup di-
cilitation. The training and
and interpreted through the
race, gender, socioeconomic
ial categories. These identi-
and reinforce sets of values,
to the dialogic encounter and
of students in the dialogue,
of these responses, also play
spect, then, that IGD facili-
they think about acting, plan
and their co-facilitators.
perience training, observing,
s. We have seen, for example,
y groups disadvantaged or
does not favor their group)
ity groups advantaged or
eonomic structures) often
ther, the expression of their
definitions of self and one's
to situational demands and
participants (Tappan, 2006).
entity (or even one's status
fore its effect on facilitative
composition, and purpose.

Methods of Inquiry

We involved two former facilitators, a White woman and an African American woman, to conduct and tape-record face-to-face individual and small-group interviews with 49 trained facilitators of intergroup dialogues. They asked facilitators whether and how their social identities affected or might affect their dialogue facilitation approaches and behaviors. All of these informants had gone through the training and preparation process, and they either were about to facilitate an intergroup dialogue or already had.

We explored the ways in which facilitators reported they anticipated or experienced their identities playing a role, the issues (either internally or with participants) they wrestled with, and their comfort level in this work and with their co-facilitators. We first read through the transcripts of all the interviews and used open-coding techniques to identify major themes. We then applied these themes systematically to the data set, seeking confirming and disconfirming evidence of their existence and meaning for informants. As a result, this chapter is organized around the five following major themes:

1. Understanding the significance of social identity in the facilitative role
2. Managing the challenges of privilege/dominance and subordination/oppression in facilitating dialogue groups with both dominant and subordinate group members
3. Establishing and maintaining credibility
4. Establishing relationships with and/or educating members of facilitators' own identity groups, even acting as role models
5. Working with a co-facilitator with different social identities

Not all themes were reported by all facilitators, and some were reported primarily or solely by facilitators acting as members of either dominant or subordinate groups. Since the examination and understanding of dominant-subordinate relations are such substantial elements in the intergroup dialogue programs in which we are involved, we reflect on facilitators' perceptions and experiences largely in terms of their status as dominant/privileged group members or subordinate/oppressed group members in the particular dialogue they would or did facilitate. While we posed the question of social identity broadly in the interviews, most facilitators focused their responses on issues of race and gender. Therefore, we limit the discussion in this chapter to these aspects of identity. In the quotes from informants' interviews we use pseudonyms for their actual names.

Results and Discussion

The Significance of Social Identity in the Facilitative Role

Forty-one of the 49 informants indicated their identities did or would play a role in their work while eight said it did not or would not. Some saw their identities as limiting factors, others saw them as sources of strength, and some saw them as both. Two facilitators, one from dominant racial and gender groups (White and male) and the other from subordinate groups (Asian and female), expressed the views of many as they noted their group's influence on their own approaches to the work.

Because of the privilege this identity affords me I facilitate with a certain level of ignorance regarding the target group experience. This is evident in the way I respond to language, answer questions and challenge assumptions, and am often unable to notice and challenge comments or words that might be an obvious topic of discussion to those of a target group. I believe some will question what I really know about the issues of race. (Scott, White man)

Because I am an Asian, passivity and deep listening are reflective of this identity. (Nadia, Asian woman)

The first informant above expressed ignorance and lack of awareness as well as concern about how others will react to his racial group membership. The second informant reported aspects of her group-based style and implied that her cultural attributes of passivity and deep listening influence her behavior. While Nadia suggested that both attributes may impact her facilitative style, it is unclear whether she saw them both as positive contributors or not. Throughout many of these reports we find facilitators expressing both limiting and contributing (negative and positive) influences of their identities on their facilitation and dialogues.

Other members of subordinate racial groups argued that their identity plays out in facilitation, but not in terms of its influence on their own intentions or behaviors as much as in the responses to it from dialogue participants. They noted that this response, or their anticipation of it, might affect their behavior.

I somewhat expect students to feel uncomfortable with my presence simply because I look different. When others see me they may judge me because of my race identity. . . . They may feel I do not belong at the university. In addition, others may be frightened by my race identity and these things will change my facilitating style; I would be more conscious about the things that I say. (Vega—Black woman)

Acknowledgment the beginning of this inquiry and that as a result their facilitative practice. The their own and others' identities.

Managing the Challenge and Subordination/Oppression

Many facilitators, particularly those from subordinate groups, and acknowledged gaps in their own group's background knowledge and awareness (on oneself, on others in the society at large), it would be knowledge development occur in an intergroup dialogue.

Some agent group facilitators of privilege but indicated their own minds or in the past the downsides of their past common experiences of racism.

My worst fear is having a conversation. This is actually quite a privilege of being unaware. (White woman)

An additional concern was unintentionally offending participants by several facilitators who were cautious or defensive about making a mistake or offending someone.

I had a more difficult time with participants, because I was someone of color than I was.

The concern about White facilitators' unintentional might reflect their implicit bias.

Facilitative Role

identities did or would play a
r would not. Some saw their
sources of strength, and some
dominant racial and gender
bordinate groups (Asian and
ed their group's influence on

facilitate with a certain level of
is evident in the way I respond
ions, and am often unable to
an obvious topic of discussion
what I really know about the

are reflective of this identity.

ance and lack of awareness as
is racial group membership.
oup-based style and implied
o listening influence her be-
s may impact her facilitative
as positive contributors or
facilitators expressing both
influences of their identities

s argued that their identity
its influence on their own
ponses to it from dialogue
eir anticipation of it, might

my presence simply because
ne because of my race iden-
ity. In addition, others may
change my facilitating style;
(Vega—Black woman)

Acknowledgment that identity may affect facilitation style is only the beginning of this inquiry. Most facilitators recognized that identity matters, and that as a result there are both challenges and opportunities in their facilitative practice. The overarching challenge is to learn how to work with their own and others' identities in positive ways.

Managing the Challenges of Privilege/Dominance and Subordination/Oppression

Many facilitators, particularly members of agent identity groups, encountered and acknowledged gaps in their own self-awareness and their knowledge of their own group's backgrounds and realities, as well as that of others'. Without knowledge and awareness of the meaning and impact of one's social identity (on oneself, on others in the dialogue, and in the structure and culture of society at large), it would be very difficult to facilitate the consciousness-raising, knowledge development, and relationship-building activities that typically occur in an intergroup dialogue.

Some agent group facilitators acknowledged coming from backgrounds of privilege but indicated they knew little about how it might play out in their own minds or in the participants'. Others recognized clearly that one of the downsides of their privilege was a lack of knowledge about the culture or common experiences of members of oppressed or disadvantaged groups.

My worst fear is having a conflict arise about something I know nothing about. This is actually quite a likely situation in my case as being White has given me the privilege of being unaware of many struggles that occur in everyday life. (Hannah, White woman)

An additional cost of ignorance is the risk that one's behavior might unintentionally offend members of other groups. This concern was expressed by several facilitators with dominant group identities who noted they were cautious or defensive about their privileged status and concerned they might make a mistake or offend members of target groups.

I had a more difficult time "pushing" participants of color than I had white participants, because I was somewhat more intimidated and worried about offending someone of color than a White person. (Sarah, White woman)

The concern about unintentionally giving racial offense also arises from White facilitators' understanding that some of their attitudes and actions might reflect their implicit or unconscious racism (Bobo, Kluegel, & Smith,

1997; Bonilla-Silva & Forman, 2000; Essed, 1991; Kinder & Sears, 1981; McConahay, 1983; McKinney, 2005). Their internalized privilege and lack of clarity about how to act in ways that reflect a coherent understanding of the implications of such privilege affect both their own behavior and that of target groups. In particular, White students' pervasive ignorance about the reality of lives of people of color, and of their reactions and interactions across racial lines, is typical. Although students of color also often come from segregated backgrounds, they have had to learn about White people and culture in order to succeed and be safe in a White- and male-dominated society. Dominant group members' fear of giving offense is part of the internalization of agent group privilege and reflects the current culture of politeness that characterizes racial conversations and diminishes the possibility of authentic behavior. Target group members rarely mentioned gaps in their knowledge of agent group members' experiences, although several African American facilitators of upper-middle-class origin expressed parallel concern, especially about the degree to which their experience mirrored that of participants of color from less economically advantaged backgrounds.

As some members of dominant groups struggled with the blinders of privilege, some facilitators who were members of socially disadvantaged or oppressed groups struggled with acknowledging and countering internalization of the stereotypes associated with their target group identities. They felt these perceptions could threaten their ability to be authentic and effective in their dialogue leadership roles.

I hold many characteristics that are consistent with a female stereotype—being kind and caring, sympathetic, sometimes soft-spoken. They may affect how participants in my group view me. I definitely feel that I have been totally socialized to “be a girl,” and it is very hard for me to think about many gender issues and speak about them. I feel there will be many blind spots for me in this area. (Trisha—White woman)

I don't want to fall into the passive female role stereotype. However, I also don't want to be taken as that domineering and angry Black woman that is forever being played out in the media. (Jackie, Black woman)

Many facilitators with subordinate group identities noted that they knew of and needed to deal with the negative stereotypes associated with their group. Some expressed concern about the degree to which they accepted or might conform to such stereotypes (for a discussion of these struggles with the acceptance or rejection of negative stereotypes see Fletcher, 1999; Freire, 1970; Hardiman & Jackson, 1997; Tappan, 2006).

While all comments about offensiveness were expressed, comments about potential stereotypes came from women—the expected nature of gender

Establishing and Maintaining

A somewhat unique aspect of the program is the patterns of dominance and facilitators have immense roles in their dialogue group, acting as facilitators. Their role in the program is to transfer upon them leadership in both content and process, not traditional leadership, but especially for undergraduate students.

Several facilitators admitted they handled it, also confirmed they could use their background to work. For instance, some used group identities to increase

Since I am of a minority race,
at things from an objective
pects my facilitation style
tive on things, especially on
woman)

Some members of the core of their credibility stressed the power and

As a male in a patriarchal society
will be listened to and followed
(White man)

While some women have membership in disadvantaged groups in the dialogue, most are not

sed, 1991; Kinder & Sears, 1981; r internalized privilege and lack of t a coherent understanding of the eir own behavior and that of target asive ignorance about the reality tions and interactions across racial r also often come from segregated White people and culture in order ale-dominated society. Dominant art of the internalization of agent ure of politeness that characterizes ossibility of authentic behavior. gaps in their knowledge of agent eral African American facilitators lled concern, especially about the hat of participants of color from

s struggled with the blinders of bers of socially disadvantaged or ging and countering internaliza- target group identities. They felt y to be authentic and effective in

th a female stereotype—being kind They may affect how participants een totally socialized to “be a girl,” ender issues and speak about them. is area. (Trisha—White woman)

stereotype. However, I also don't Black woman that is forever being

o identities noted that they knew ereotypes associated with their egree to which they accepted or scussion of these struggles with ypes see Fletcher, 1999; Freire, 006).

While all comments relating to themes of unclarity and caution about offensiveness were expressed by agent group members (Whites or men), all comments about potential internalization of and coping with negative stereotypes came from women—White women or women of color. Indeed, this is the expected nature of group domination and oppression.

Establishing and Maintaining Credibility

A somewhat unique aspect of the effort to deal with socially constructed patterns of dominance and subordination involves facilitator credibility. Facilitators have immense responsibility in the dialogue, including organizing their dialogue group, setting the agenda, and leading activities and exercises. Their role in the program, and their responsibility for the above tasks, confer upon them leadership status and an aura of credibility and authority on both content and process matters. Such credibility is essential for all instructional leadership, but especially so for peers providing leadership to other undergraduate students.

Several facilitators acknowledged that their group identity status, and how they handled it, also conferred certain credibility and power. They felt they could use their background and knowledge to positively affect their dialogue work. For instance, some facilitators felt they could use their disadvantaged group identities to increase their credibility in the dialogue.

Since I am of a minority race I can help keep things in balance and I can look at things from an objective point of view. I think my identity as a woman impacts my facilitation style in that I make it a point to dig out the male perspective on things, especially on things that are known as woman topics. (Lian, Asian woman)

Some members of dominant groups indicated their Whiteness was the core of their credibility, especially with other White people, while others stressed the power and privilege associated with their male gender.

As a male in a patriarchal society I am going to be given the benefit of the doubt. I will be listened to and I will be thought competent until proven otherwise. (Kevin, White man)

While some women and facilitators of color indicated that their membership in disadvantaged groups could or did increase their credibility in the dialogue, most also reported that their status was challenging to their

facilitation. In fact, most target group facilitators worried that negative stereotypes might diminish the credibility they had or wished to have in their groups.

An example of how my Black identity affects how participants may perceive me can be found in discussions of certain topics. I think people have a tendency to disregard to some extent my statements in favor of affirmative action because of my racial identity. (Jada, Black woman)

Stereotypes of the "typical Asian" who is quiet, timid and not opinionated will definitely prompt others to look at me as a facilitator and think poorly of me. This stereotype of Asians will hurt me in the way that people might not expect a lot of me, which might then lead me to lower my own standards for myself. (Hoshi, Asian woman)

Here Hoshi reflects our earlier discussion of the internalization of negative stereotypes, as she suggests that potential challenges to her credibility might lead her to "lower my own standards for myself."

Another facilitator expressed the complexity that often comes with a target identity. Both positive and negative reactions to her facilitator credibility were articulated.

I am very passionate about issues pertain[ing] to race and that has been a blessing and a curse. A blessing because it enables me to introduce a different perspective to the students in my dialogues; a curse because I have to constantly check myself. (Pamela, Black woman)

While it is clear facilitators from both agent and target identity groups thought about issues of credibility, they did so in different ways. Agent group members generally recognized and tried to act on the power associated with their group's status, although sometimes they expressed concern about inappropriately utilizing or expressing their power or privilege. Target group members, on the other hand, tended to have more nuanced and complex issues to deal with in establishing or negotiating their credibility. Some found in their target group membership unique aspects of knowledge that gave them power, while others acknowledged the general lack of entitlement or influence normally associated with their disadvantaged group status. This might affect their own inclinations and confidence and could lead them to over anticipate cautious or negative reactions from dialogue participants and also, as we see later, credibility within their own group.

Establishing Relationships with Members of Facilitator Groups

Critical to effective dialogue is the ability to establish relationships with members of both facilitator groups. Facilitators from both dominant and target identity groups expressed concern of using their identity as a tool to establish good working relationships with members of their own identity group. These connections led to questions of their own identity group's credibility.

I feel I will be able to relate more to mine. (Camille, Black woman)

I feel that being a female I would be more comfortable to speak out. (Jada, Black woman)

Especially for some White facilitators, a sense of power and authority was associated with their identity. Such authority often was related to the legitimacy of their role and was useful in relating and discussing issues.

Being White affects my facilitator credibility. I realize that race is their own identity. I have difficulty talking about race. This causes me to push the conversation away. (Phil, White man)

My White identity provides me with a sense of power and authority. I can relate to the questions. For example, I can relate to the question of affirmative action because I can relate to the question of affirmative action. (Phil, White man)

Several facilitators—both White and Black—extended this dynamic by being a good role model for their own group.

I believe it is extremely important to be a good role model for students in my group. This is because I am a Black woman and my whiteness and background are a part of my identity. (Jada, Black woman)

itators worried that negative
they had or wished to have in

participants may perceive me can
ple have a tendency to disregard
ive action because of my racial

imid and not opinionated will
or and think poorly of me. This
people might not expect a lot of
standards for myself. (Hoshi, Asian

the internalization of negative
enges to her credibility might
f."

y that often comes with a target
her facilitator credibility were

ce and that has been a blessing
roduce a different perspective
ave to constantly check myself.

nt and target identity groups
n different ways. Agent group
on the power associated with
expressed concern about in-
er or privilege. Target group
more nuanced and complex
their credibility. Some found
of knowledge that gave them
ck of entitlement or influence
oup status. This might affect
d lead them to over anticipate
rticipants and also, as we see

Establishing Relationships With and/or Educating Members of Facilitators' Own Identity Groups

Critical to effective dialogue facilitation is the ability to communicate and establish relationships within and across group differences and identities. Facilitators from both dominant and subordinate groups expressed the importance of using their identity as a tool for relating closely with and educating others of their own identity group. For some, especially for members of subordinate identity groups, like-identity was a pathway to establishing legitimacy and good working relationships with their like-identity participants. Sometimes, these connections led to special opportunities to educate and support students of their own identity group in the dialogue.

I feel I will be able to relate to some people of color who have had experiences similar to mine. (Camille, Black woman)

I feel that being a female I would use that authority to allow women to feel more comfortable to speak out. (Vega, Black woman)

Especially for some White facilitators, their privileged identity conveyed a sense of power and authority to act assertively with other White students. Such authority often was reflected in their own and others' assumptions of the legitimacy of their roles and the ways they thought they could be especially useful in relating and effectively working with other White people.

Being White affects my facilitating in the sense that I want White participants to realize that race is their issue. It is easier for me to understand when White participants have difficulty talking about being an oppressor because I have been there myself. This causes me to push them outside their comfort zones. (Kerry, White woman)

My White identity provides me with an "excuse" to trigger participants with loaded questions. For example, I can more easily play devil's advocate with Affirmative Action because I can echo the belief that it does not help me as a White person. (Phil, White man)

Several facilitators—members of both dominant groups and subordinate groups—extended this dynamic as they expressed their desire to educate others by being a good role model of their own identity category.

I believe it is extremely important for me to be a good role model for the other white students in my group. This includes sharing my personal experiences in relation to my whiteness and background and showing that I am open to hearing other people's

experiences. It also means allowing myself to make mistakes so that students can see that this is OK and can be used as a learning experience. (Trisha, White woman)

I always try to present myself as verbally intelligent. I make conscious efforts to speak correct English and to use words properly. I do this because one of the stereotypes of Black people is that we don't know how to speak English correctly. I am aware of that stereotype and I take every opportunity I can to debunk that belief. (Jada, Black woman)

While the White facilitator's comments spoke to being a role model as a way to show or urge other White students that it was okay to explore openly the content of privilege and oppression, the comments by the facilitator of color suggested that her responsibility was connected, in part, to undoing perceived stereotypes of her group. Because there are few women and people of color in positions of academic or public authority, these students felt a particular responsibility that extended beyond that of a typical facilitator. Even among the women in this sample it was primarily African American women who expressed this link between their dialogue facilitation and the desire to counter oppression. Although some White facilitators wanted to demonstrate that not all Whites are prejudiced, and that they could be strong allies, this additional investment in challenging stereotypes was relatively unique to facilitators with subordinate group identities.

Working With a Co-facilitator With Different Social Identities

As noted previously, every dialogue is co-facilitated by two students, one from each of the identity groups that constitute the primary focus of the intergroup dialogue. Since one of these co-facilitators is from an agent identity group and the other is from a target identity group, issues of their relative credibility and power affect them and must be negotiated both in their collaborative working relationship and in their relationships with dialogue participants.

In some instances, facilitators expressed concern about how they would act to achieve and maintain real "co-ness" with their colleague. Indeed, some of these comments from facilitators of target group identities echoed the prior discussion of the struggle with negative target identity stereotypes.

I think that my identification as a female puts me in a position of less power and control. When my co-facilitator speaks I can't help but feel a bit intimidated by him because I want my opinion to count (too). (Malina, Latina woman)

It (my femaleness) could make my co-facilitator feel like he/she has to take the lead because I'm incapable of doing so. (Hannah, White woman)

In at least one instance, a facilitator acknowledged how he had acted in ways that reinforced privilege and dominance.

Because my co-facilitator is a female, I sometimes play down my own gender roles; my co-facilitator did not. (Roger, White man)

Other facilitators expressed concern about how they represented themselves and their "co" but also about how they represented their own and their co's relative credibility.

My identity as a male affords me more credibility. I expect me to be more in control of the dialogue. (Asian man)

These facilitators' recognition of their own credibility and power in the dialogue and of the feedback and conversation as a way to be an effective team of facilitators deal with participants' different target and agent identities.

Implications for Facilitators

Our inquiry about the significance of social identity for facilitators clearly shows that facilitators' experiences in systems of inequalities and on the co-facilitator's own realities and on the co-facilitator's influence and power they had in the dialogue might be constrained or enhanced. In the relatively high level of personal experience of oppression evident in this group, we edged the degree to which stereotypes about their gender and race, we see how these constraints from target groups and from power

the mistakes so that students can see
experience. (Trisha, White woman)

I make conscious efforts to speak
this because one of the stereotypes
speak English correctly. I am aware
to debunk that belief. (Jada,

speak to being a role model as a
it was okay to explore openly
comments by the facilitator of
connected, in part, to undoing
there are few women and people
authority, these students felt a
and that of a typical facilitator.
is primarily African American
r dialogue facilitation and the
White facilitators wanted to
and that they could be strong
ing stereotypes was relatively
identities.

Identifying Social Identities

led by two students, one from
primary focus of the intergroup
in an agent identity group and
of their relative credibility and
in their collaborative working
group participants.

concern about how they would
their colleague. Indeed, some
up identities echoed the prior
identity stereotypes.

a position of less power and
feel a bit intimidated by him
(Latina woman)

like he/she has to take the lead
(woman)

In at least one instance, a facilitator with an agent group identity acknowledged how he had acted in ways that reflected the internalization of privilege and dominance.

Because my co-facilitator is a female there have been times where I have accepted gender roles; my co-facilitator did the "busy work" while I asked the questions. (Roger, White man)

Other facilitators expressed concern not about the relationship between themselves and their "co" but about how dialogue participants would read their own and their co's relative credibility and power.

My identity as a male affords me privilege. Subsequently, normally my participants expect me to be more in control of the class than my female co-facilitator. (Wem, Asian man)

These facilitators' recognition of the potential pressures on and challenges to their own credibility and power, or to that of their co, is an essential part of the feedback and conversation they must invest with one another in order to be an effective team of instructional leaders. It also highlights some of the intricacies of power and privilege in the intergroup dialogue itself, as facilitators deal with participants' socially constructed images of facilitators of different target and agent identities.

Implications for Facilitator Training and Development

Our inquiry about the significance of social identities for intergroup dialogue facilitators clearly shows that the facilitators struggled with their embeddedness in systems of inequalities and the consequent personal impact on their own realities and on the co-facilitation relationship. Facilitators discussed the influence and power they had as facilitators, exploring the way their influence might be constrained or enhanced by whether they and their participants felt they had credibility as sources of knowledge and leadership. Finally, despite the relatively high level of personal insight and knowledge about prejudice and oppression evident in this group of undergraduate students, several acknowledged the degree to which they accepted or struggled with the imposition of stereotypes about their gender and/or racial groups. Throughout all the reports, we see how these concerns and opportunities are different for facilitators from target groups and from privileged groups.

We turn now to the implications of this inquiry for training and supporting facilitators as intergroup and social justice educators/activists. We propose some avenues for strengthening training and support in the areas of social identity development and facilitation.

Critical Self-Reflective Practice

This inquiry emphasizes the importance of facilitators' continual self-reflective practice that extends their personal understanding of identities to working with others on exploring identities. The reports from facilitators indicate the importance of understanding and undoing both internalized oppression and internalized dominance. To the extent students can recognize the deeply rooted nature of racism, sexism, and other forms of oppression, they may be better able to understand and challenge their own behaviors without the immobilizing feelings of anger, guilt, and despair that lead to evasion of conflict and real connection.

For members of target identity groups, especially facilitators of color and women facilitators, it is important to name and explore internalized oppression, the meaning of negative stereotypes regarding their group memberships, and the degree to which they have incorporated these stereotypes into their own sense of self and their facilitative behaviors. For members of agent identity groups, especially White students, identity development means greater self-awareness of the meaning and implications of their own group memberships and those of target groups, including incorporation of a sense of entitlement and privilege. It also means providing an arena where these facilitators can take the risks of expressing their authentic selves, perhaps even giving offense to others in the expression of internalized dominance so that they may gain awareness of their own behaviors and others' potential responses.

In addition to examining and working with internalized dominance and oppression, the facilitators can explore the complexity of their multiple identities and intersecting positionalities. While some identities may be more salient than others, exploring multiple identities can provide facilitators a way to continue their own learning as well as find a constructive avenue for feelings toward self or others that impede effective facilitation and well-being.

Translating Reflection to Relational Work

The critically self-reflective work that supports and deepens facilitators' own learning has direct implications for the relational work they do with their

co-facilitators. Working on the ability to operate with multiple identity processes and styles of identity deliberations can be a key and other facilitators and co-facilitative facilitation. Co-facilitators' reflections of internalized identities. Such discussions focused reflection of the identity on structural inequality as well as on identity development. how the co-facilitation is shaping the agenda, who takes on co-facilitators work with participants across identity groups and how facilitative work is balanced with co-facilitators tends to do more of one or the other deepens the co-facilitators' ability also strengthen their co-facilitative participants.

Integrating Reflections and

Intergroup dialogues are about content and process issues. Thus, facilitators' identities in their roles to facilitate may bring their reflective work to the facilitation relationship. The co-facilitative participants. The more the facilitators' multiple and intersecting positionalities and oppression, the more effective members in their group and social identity. Facilitators' co-facilitative points of connections with participants and learning processes of identity.

The facilitators' own reflection on the facilitation process can help them to address the challenges that arise in dialogue. The co-facilitative

inquiry for training and support-educators/activists. We propose support in the areas of social

ilitators' continual self-reflective ending of identities to working ports from facilitators indicate g both internalized oppression dents can recognize the deeply forms of oppression, they may their own behaviors without the despair that lead to evasion of

especially facilitators of color name and explore internalized es regarding their group mem- incorporated these stereotypes ve behaviors. For members of s, identity development means plications of their own group dding incorporation of a sense roviding an arena where these heir authentic selves, perhaps of internalized dominance so behaviors and others' potential

h internalized dominance and plexity of their multiple iden- some identities may be more s can provide facilitators a way onstructive avenue for feelings itation and well-being.

and deepens facilitators' own onal work they do with their

co-facilitators. Working on these identity issues can strengthen facilitators' ability to operate with more knowledge of their own and others' identity processes and styles of communication and interaction. The in-depth identity deliberations can be introduced in facilitator supervision with co- and other facilitators and can serve to build trusting relationships for effective facilitation. Co-facilitator conversations may focus on sharing self-reflections of internalized dominance, internalized oppression, and multiple identities. Such discussions become even more fruitful when there is focused reflection of the identity implications of interpersonal work styles on structural inequality as well as the implications of structural inequality on identity development. The following issues may potentially arise: how the co-facilitation is structured (e.g., who takes the lead in presenting the agenda, who takes notes, who is more time conscious); how the co-facilitators work with participants within their own identity group and across identity groups; and how the focus on personal and interpersonal affective work is balanced with structural analyses, including which co-facilitator tends to do more of one or the other tasks. Unpacking these issues not only deepens the co-facilitators' self-knowledge and shared understanding, it can also strengthen their co-facilitator relationship and their work with dialogue participants.

Integrating Reflections and Relationships Into Action

Intergroup dialogues are constructed to simultaneously focus on both content and process issues. Thus, facilitators have the opportunity to utilize their identities in their roles to further the learning of participants. Just as facilitators may bring their reflective work on identities and positionalities into the co-facilitation relationship, they also can bring it into their work with dialogue participants. The more the facilitators have worked on understanding multiple and intersecting positionalities and consequent internalized dominance and oppression, the more effective they can be in supporting the learning of all members in their group and not just those with whom they share a particular social identity. Facilitators can draw on their multiple social identities to find points of connections with students, to empathize with the identity development and learning process rather than to impose a prescriptive understanding of identity.

The facilitators' own reflections along with the explorations of the co-facilitation process can help elucidate the personal and group dynamics that arise in dialogue. The collaborative work—in planning the dialogue,

debriefing co-facilitation dynamics, and engaging in in-the-moment interventions—can help increase facilitators' awareness of covert intergroup dynamics that underlie the overt conversation. Being aware of and strategizing ways to effectively surface these dynamics can deepen the dialogues. By naming and revealing dynamics, facilitators can show how macrostructural inequality plays out in the dialogue setting. By engaging participants in "dialogues about the dialogue," facilitators can model how to unpack the dialogue process constructively and encourage participants to reflect on other areas of their campus or community lives.

These reports from intergroup dialogue facilitators highlight some of the important roles social identities play in intergroup conversation, exploration, and interaction—both for themselves and for the dialogue participants whose educational efforts they lead. As evidenced in their words, facilitators continue to remain cognizant of how these identities interact within the context of unequal societal power relationships. Their continuing engagement with social identities provides educators and trainers a foundation for deepening the learning about particular social identities as well as expanding this understanding to other identities, interactions with others, and leadership roles.

References

- Blauner, R. (1989). *Black lives, White lives: Three decades of race relations in America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bobo, L., Kluegel, J., & Smith, R. (1997). Laissez-faire racism: The crystallization of a kinder, gentler, anti-Black ideology. In S. Tuch & J. Martin (Eds.), *Racial attitudes in the 1990s* (pp. 14–42). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Bonilla-Silva, E., & Forman, T. (2000). "I am not a racist but . . ." Mapping white college students' racial ideologies in the USA. *Discourse & Society*, 11, 50–85.
- Cooley, C. (1922). *Human nature and the social order*. New York: Scribner.
- Essed, P. (1991). *Understanding everyday racism*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Feagin, J., & Sikes, W. (1994). *Living with racism*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Fletcher, B. (1999). Internalized oppression: The enemy within. In *Reading book for human relations training* (8th ed., pp. 97–102). Arlington, VA: NTL Institute.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Seabury.
- Hardiman, R., & Jackson, B. (1997). Conceptual foundations for social justice courses. In M. Adams, L. Bell, & P. Griffin (Eds.), *Teaching for diversity and social justice* (pp. 16–29). New York: Routledge.
- Kinder, D., & Sears, D. (1981). Prejudice and politics: Symbolic racism versus racial threats to the good life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 40, 414–431.
- McConahay, J. (1983). *Modern racism*. New York: Academic Press.
- J. Dovidio & S. Gaertner (Eds.). (1986). *Racism and prejudice: A cognitive perspective*. New York: Academic Press.
- McKinney, K. (2005). *Being white: Identity, culture, and politics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Tappan, M. (2006). Reframing intergroup dialogue: From psychological to the sociocultural. *Journal of Intergroup Dialogue*, 10, 1–15.
- Tatum, B. (2003). *Why are all the black kids sitting together in the lunchroom? conversations about race*. New York: Basic Books.

ng in in-the-moment interven-
of covert intergroup dynamics
are of and strategizing ways to
the dialogues. By naming and
macrostructural inequality plays
ipants in "dialogues about the
the dialogue process construc-
other areas of their campus or

facilitators highlight some of
tergroup conversation, explo-
d for the dialogue participants
nced in their words, facilita-
ese identities interact within
nships. Their continuing en-
ors and trainers a foundation
social identities as well as ex-
interactions with others, and

race relations in America. Berkeley:

ism: The crystallization of a kinder,
Eds.), *Racial attitudes in the 1990s*

t but ... " Mapping white college
ty, 11, 50-85.

York: Scribner.

ark, CA: Sage.

Beacon Press.

ithin. In *Reading book for human*

NTL Institute.

ry.

ions for social justice courses. In
ersity and social justice (pp. 16-29).

olitic racism versus racial threats to
40, 414-431.

McConahay, J. (1983). Modern racism, ambivalence and the modern racism scale. In
J. Dovidio & S. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination and racism* (pp. 91-126).
New York: Academic Press.

McKinney, K. (2005). *Being white: Stories of race and racism*. New York: Routledge.

Tappan, M. (2006). Reframing internalized oppression and internalized domination: From the
psychological to the sociocultural. *Teachers College Record*, 108(10), 2115-2144.

Tatum, B. (2003). *"Why are all the Black kids sitting together in the cafeteria?" And other
conversations about race*. New York: Basic Books.