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ABSTRACT
This article focuses on teachers’ deliberation on communicative potentials in classrooms when students express racism. More precisely, we are interested in what aspects are of importance when teachers reflect, deliberate on, and decide how to act. To elaborate on these aspects we turn to John Dewey’s work on intra- and interpersonal deliberation, and to interviews with 27 Swedish high school teachers. In the results, we present three aspects of importance in teachers’ reflections: (1) individual students’ potential for growth, (2) classroom climate and violations, and (3) teachers’ knowledge and experiences. Based on the results, we argue that if teachers’ experiences of these aspects are positive, they are more open to a deliberative communicative approach. From our perspective, the limits of deliberation in classrooms need more attention, since they expose crucial tensions in teachers’ work and dealings with issues related to power, politics, and morality in schools.
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Deliberation has its beginning in troubled activity and its conclusion in choice of a course of action which straightens it out. John Dewey (1922/1988)

Introduction
Questions related to racism are high on the political agenda in the ‘new Europe’. The polarized political discussion about questions such as nationalism, multiculturalism, migration, segregation, and discrimination has raised the temperature of the debate. Sweden is no exception to this general trend. Over the past decade, the nationalist party, the Sweden Democrats, has been gaining support (Martinsson & Andersson, 2018). There are also reports suggesting that quite a large group of students have intolerant attitudes towards ethnic and religious minorities (Living History Forum, 2014), and the polarized political situation is also reflected in schools.

At the same time, Sweden is a nation which, since the Second World War, has often positioned itself as a ‘land of tolerance’ (Jämte, 2013). In line with that, teachers in the country’s schools have been clearly tasked by the educational authorities with challenging racism in education (SFS 2008:567, 2008, p. 567). As a central part of that responsibility, teachers are expected to use ‘active discussions’ if students express racist views (Lgy11,
This professional obligation relates to the idea that school should be a democratic place where different views can be brought to the table, discussed, and challenged. In particular, there are high expectations regarding their abilities to bring about a respectful discussion among their students. One critical question, therefore, is how teachers relate to the communicative task in classrooms when students express racism?

To elaborate on these matters, we turn to John Dewey’s work (1908/1978, 1916/1985, 1922/1988) on how different forms of deliberation can be used in situations of the kind referred to above. Our study is thus mainly a theoretical contribution inspired by Dewey and others working with deliberation, although we also use recently conducted interviews with 27 high school teachers in Sweden exploring their responses to racism in education. The most central and crucial link between the idea of deliberation and the communicative ideas of Dewey is that mutual communication is placed in the foreground: education as communication as deliberation. This means that the communicative interpretation of Dewey’s work is stressed and that communication is advocated as a central activity to be used at appropriate opportunities. Through communicative participation, the ability to engage in intelligent deliberation and make nuanced judgments is developed. To summarize, we use quite a broad palette of approaches to deliberation from Dewey, but it is primarily his use and elaboration of the concept in his Human Nature and Conduct that is central to our analysis. However, while social psychology is dominant in Dewey (1922/1988), it is worth mentioning that he develops the need for deliberation both on moral issues, as in Ethics (Dewey, 1908/1978), and in broader contexts of democracy, as in Democracy and Education (Dewey, 1916/1985), and politics, as in The Public and its Problems (Dewey, 1927/1988).

Following Dewey (1922/1988), to deliberate can mean to communicate with yourself (intra-), or with a concrete other or others (inter-), about how to act. In this article, we present and discuss two perspectives on deliberation: an intrapersonal perspective, when teachers reflect with themselves on how to act in response to racism (cf. Arneback, 2014), and an interpersonal perspective, when the students and the teacher deliberate in the classroom (cf. Englund, 2006, 2016). The deliberative classroom can be seen as an ideal, but is deliberation ‘enough’ to deal with and overcome racist speech?

In our abductive analysis of texts and interviews, we have focused on the following research question: What aspects are of importance when teachers reflect on the possibility and impossibility of deliberating in the classroom when students express racism?

From our analysis, three important aspects emerge:

- Teachers’ reflection on students’ potential for growth
- Teachers’ reflection on classroom climate and violations
- Teachers’ reflection on their own knowledge and experiences

Taken together, these aspects highlight the complexity that teachers need to deal with when reflecting on and deciding how to act.

**Expressions of racism among students**

Racism is a contested concept with a broad range of interpretations (cf. Gillborn, 2008; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995). In this text we understand racism as a practice that occurs on different levels, based on different factors, as described below.
Historically, different factors have been used to legitimize oppression of groups of people. Racism has been done, and is still being done, on the basis of racial-biological, cultural and religious categories (cf. Jämte, 2013, Arneback & Quennerstedt, 2016). Sometimes these factors are combined and in other cases they are separated, depending on the practice they are supposed to serve.

Racism occurs at several levels that are related to each other (Berman & Paradies, 2008; see also Arneback & Quennerstedt, 2016). First, racism occurs at a structural level in the organization concerned and relates to norms in society. In education this is visible, for example, in the existence of discrimination, school segregation, and monocultural teaching. Secondly, racism occurs at an individual level, in actions between people. For example, in exclusion, hate speech, and violence in education. Finally, racism occurs at an internalized level, meaning that individuals who are exposed to racism develop negative understandings about their own belongings, positions, and possibilities.

In this article we use the term ‘expressions of racism’ to refer to racism at an individual level expressed by students in schools, based on racial-biological, cultural, and/or religious differences. However, in the situations discussed in this text, other levels of racism (structural and internalized) may also be involved in teachers’ reflection on their actions.

**Earlier research on intra- and interpersonal deliberation in education**

This part of the text presents research on two important aspects of deliberation in critical situations in education: the need for and limits of both intra- and interpersonal deliberation.

**Intrapersonal deliberation – teachers’ reflection on experiences and actions**

From an intrapersonal perspective on deliberation in education, research has addressed the need for teachers’ reflection on how to act. This kind of research often highlights moral and political aspects of what it means to be a teacher. Barbara Applebaum (2003) for example, argue that ‘words that wound’ should have no place in classrooms, since they lead to oppression. Deliberation in classrooms is only possible if no one is suffering from the specific expression of racism, and teachers need to promote and live up to this obligation.

Another line of argumentation is offered by those who argue the need for moral space to consider the (im)possibilities of communication. Jim Garrison (2004) emphasizes the need for an ethical approach that makes room for vulnerability and risk and thereby makes growth possible. In connection to this, Emma Arneback (2014) has proposed that teachers responding to hate speech in education need to use moral imagination and take contextual elements into consideration. Intrapersonal deliberation thus becomes even more important in deciding whether, how, and when deliberative communication is possible as a response to hateful speech in education.

Research has also made clear that teachers’ own experiences of racism are of importance for how they relate to their work. Earlier research here shows that both black and white teachers need to reflect upon their background in relation to what it means to be an anti-racist teacher. Robin DiAngelo (2012), for example, highlights the need for white teachers to reflect upon their privileged position, and for critical studies on whiteness in
education. In the same way, it is important to reflect on the constructions of what it means to be black, as a teacher or a student. However, in doing this, care must be taken to avoid simplifications since, as Corliss Charonne Brown (2013) shows, there needs to be room for different stories of what it means to be a black teacher.

**Interpersonal deliberation – deliberative communication and democracy**

From an interpersonal perspective on deliberation, approaches analyzing the communicative potential of classrooms have a long tradition. One strand of educational research has studied the moral dimension of teaching and the ethical nature of teachers’ professional responsibility (cf. Englund, 2016; Hansen, 2001; Socklett, 1993).

In recent research, deliberation has been addressed as an important aspect of democracy in both society (Bohman & Rehg, 1997; Habermas, 1996) and education (Englund, 2016). However, research has also touched upon the challenges of deliberation, which include the consequences of hateful speech (Boler, 2004) and power relationships in deliberative communication (Sanders, 1997; Young, 2000).

One model of deliberative communication for schools, inspired by Dewey (1916/1985), Habermas (1996) and Benhabib (1996), and further developed by Tomas Englund (2006), begins when a conflict or different views emerge on a controversial issue among students. This what we can call the discursive situation of understanding a problem – is clarified by the teacher stressing the different views that exist, as the first criterion of deliberation. From that starting point, procedural criteria of listening to and respecting the concrete other while presenting one’s own arguments are applied with the aim of creating consensus, or at least reaching agreement on what the conflict is about. Deliberative communication is also based on permission to challenge traditions and authorities, including the teacher, and a goal of respectful deliberation is that it will continue outside the classroom.

What is important in this model is that the democratic values and virtues which it seeks to achieve are related to democratic dialogues in line with the communicative principles developed by Dewey, i.e. open communication within and between groups (Dewey, 1916/1985), as well as with Habermas’s criteria ‘that nobody who could make a relevant contribution may be excluded; ii) that all participants are granted an equal opportunity to make contributions; iii) that the participants must mean what they say, the ‘yes’ or ‘no’ stances that participants adopt on criticizable validity claims are motivated solely by the rational force of the better reasons’ (Englund, 2010; Habermas, 1998, p. 44).

**Methodology and empirical data in brief**

In this text we aim to discuss teachers’ deliberation and the communicative potential in classrooms in controversially charged situations, with the following research question in mind: What aspects are of importance when teachers reflect on the possibility and impossibility of deliberating in the classroom when students express racism?

Inspired by pragmatism, an abductive approach was chosen to include a variety of data in the investigation of our research question (Peirce, 1931; Fann, 1970). From this it follows that we have moved in our analysis between theoretical arguments and empirical data. To
be more specific, we have shifted between readings of texts by John Dewey on different aspects of deliberation (inside and outside of education), and by other researchers in the field of deliberation in education, and qualitative interviews with 27 high school teachers in Sweden on how they counteract racism in education. In our readings, we have been searching for different aspects that are crucial for deliberation – on both the intra- and the interpersonal level – when teachers reflect on and respond to racist expression among students. The interviews help us to illustrate how teachers reflect, but also guide us in locating aspects of importance in Dewey’s writing, while Dewey’s texts have in turn helped us to abstract patterns from the empirical data.

This study is part of an ongoing research project on teacher anti-racist action in Sweden. In the selection process, we have sought to ensure a geographical spread, which means that both urban and rural settings, and areas from south to north in the country, are represented. The informants were selected on the basis of three categories: (1) The first group of teachers was selected on the basis of their anti-racist commitment, as expressed in the media and through their work in various organizations. (2) The second group was selected based on publicity about problems of racism in their schools. Finally, (3) the third group of teachers was selected on the basis of their not belonging to the other two categories (no teachers with a clear anti-racist profile and no obvious problems of racism).

In this text, we use data from six of the teachers, chosen on the basis of their reflection on deliberation in education when students express racism.

**Table 1.** Brief information about the selected teachers

| Background information                        | School context                          |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| Linda Woman, white, Swedish background        | High school in the country side         |
| Georgios Man, white, family background in Southern Europe | High school in a large town |
| Martin Man, white, Swedish background         | High school in a medium-sized town       |
| Oscar Man, white, Swedish background          | High school in a large town             |
| Fredrik Man, white, Swedish background        | High school in a medium-sized town       |
| Fatima Woman, black, family background in central Africa | High school in a small town |
Results: three important aspects of teachers’ reflection

Teachers’ reflection on students’ potential for growth

One aspect that is of importance, when teachers reflect on the space for interpersonal communication when a student expresses racism, is how they look upon students’ potential for growth. Teachers who focus on this aspect ask themselves whether or not deliberative communication with students who express racism will make any difference.

Concerning explicit racism among students, Dewey (1916/1985), in *Democracy and Education*, writes that education has an important potential to break down social isolation and fear between different groups in society, based on class, race, and nationality. Therefore, there is a need for a democratic education where students from different backgrounds meet and learn from each other. But what about situations where teachers are unsure whether there is any potential for growth in a specific situation for a specific student who expresses racism? In cases like that, the educational process has an end beyond itself and is really ‘one of continual reorganizing, reconstructing, transforming’ (Dewey, 1916/1985, p. 54).

The question of students’ growth is a central aspect of teachers’ work of reflection and deliberation, but it is also challenging. In this section we present examples from two teachers, who reflect in different ways on students’ potential to grow in relation to racist speech among students. Let us start with Linda, a white teacher who works in a high school where expressions of racism are quite common. In her interview she describes a critical situation: ‘It was Holocaust Memorial Day on Friday and a student said: “It’s nice to have a few gas murders.” Should I answer this or not?’ (Linda). In her reflection on how to act, she distinguishes between provocations from students and speech among students that opens up a discussion. ‘You learn to know when they are just saying it to provoke and when they are saying it because they really can’t reason in any other way. Provocations you need to learn to ignore.’ From a Deweyan perspective, one could say that the question Linda seems to be asking herself is whether or not the student has any potential to grow in the specific situation. She describes how she ignores provocative action, but if there is the possibility of an educative moment she takes time to deliberate with the student, even if she feels that the expression is racist – because she believes that deliberation can make a difference.

As the example involving Linda shows, one question in relation to a student’s growth is whether the teacher believes that the student is receptive to grow in the specific situation. Another perspective that could be applied in relation to students’ growth is where communication can take place (cf. Applebaum, 2003). Should hateful expressions be discussed inside or outside the classroom? Here, we want to use an example from another teacher, Georgios, a teacher with ethnic roots in southern Europe who works at an urban high school. He describes a situation in an introductory language class, where two students express negative feelings about each other’s cultures (the students come from Somalia and Syria). ‘I felt a tension in the room based on what they said to each other. So I told them: ‘You two have to stay after class.’ They stayed and I asked them to share their views’ (Georgios). When Georgios describes why he chooses to deliberate with the students after the lesson, he emphasizes that this provided a greater opportunity for a good dialogue. He describes how, in this particular situation, he was not
sure that deliberative communication in the classroom would benefit the students involved. Instead, he tried to find a way for them to evolve in their thinking outside the classroom.

In line with Dewey’s ideas, this section highlights how teachers reflect on the space for interpersonal deliberation with the specific student in mind. The examples from the interviews with Linda and Georgios show us that teachers’ reflection on growth raises questions about both the students’ receptivity and the place for communication.

**Teachers’ reflection on classroom climate and possible violations in classrooms**

In this section we address how, when a student expresses racism, teachers reflect on communicative possibilities in relation to issues concerning the specific composition of the class and possible violations in the classroom. Teachers who engage in this kind of intrapersonal reflection ask themselves questions about what a school class can handle.

In *Democracy and Education*, Dewey (1916/1985) articulates how ‘the school must itself be a community life in all which that implies of open communication within and between groups. Social perceptions and interests can be developed only in a genuinely social medium – one where there is give and take in the building up of a common experience’ (p. 368). He concludes ‘that all education, which develops power to share effectively in social life, is moral’ (p. 370).

From Dewey-inspired educational research we have learned about the need to create a shared morality in the classroom (Hansen, 1992). But we have also learned about the difficulties involved in creating that moral platform and understanding the limits of communication when the historically created conditions for deliberation are problematic in many different ways (Boler, 2004), and when conflicts are silenced, which implies that ‘a commitment to certain groups comes at a cost in being able to serve the interests of others at the same time’ (Burbules, 2004, p. xiv). What should be done is always up to the teacher, who must reflect and act contextually. This requires a judgment on the quality of relationships that exist in the classroom, as well as on what is possible and appropriate (Arneback, 2014; Burbules, 2004).

We will again use a few examples from the interviews to illustrate this aspect of reflection among teachers. The first is from an interview with Martin, a white teacher, who works at a high school in a medium-sized town. He says that he has few experiences of expressions of racism among his students, and that most of them have other political views. One question he raised in his interview was how other students may act if a classmate expresses racism. Martin states that he avoids being confrontational in such situations and instead tries to say: ‘We need to have this discussion, and I can have it with you, but on another occasion. I don’t want to create an all-against-one situation in the classroom’ (Martin). Once again, we have a teacher who argues that deliberative communication needs to be carried out outside the classroom, but in this case he fears that other students will act in a way that could adversely affect the student’s possibility of changing his/her view. The reason for his action is partly different.

Another aspect that is often mentioned by teachers in our interviews is the risk that an expression of racism by one student violates another student (Applebaum, 2003). Oscar, a white teacher working at a high school in a large town, describes how his way of thinking is in line with the curriculum and the law (Lgy 11, 2011; SFS 2008:567, 2008,
If a student expresses racism in a way that violates other students, he would stop further communication: ‘I say, that’s not okay, you’re not allowed to express yourself like that, you’re not allowed to act like that’ (Oscar). He also cites his old primary school teacher in describing communicative limits in the classroom: ‘she said, it’s not funny if it makes someone sad’. For Oscar, the main question in his reflection on the communicative potential in the classroom seems to be the consequences for other students.

In line with Dewey, this section highlights how teachers reflect on the space for interpersonal deliberation with the specific group in mind (cf. Hansen, 2001). The examples involving Martin and Oscar illustrate more specifically how teachers’ reflection on classroom climate and violations towards students becomes crucial in this kind of situation.

**Teachers’ reflection on their own knowledge and experiences**

With the third aspect we want to highlight how teachers’ reflection on their own knowledge and experiences is of importance in deciding the interpersonal communicative potential when students express racism. Teachers who focus on this aspect ask themselves whether or not they can bear this kind of communication.

In his works, Dewey (1908/1978, 1922/1988) stresses the need to and importance of critically reflecting on and using one’s experiences in difficult situations and dilemmas about how to act: ‘We give way, in our mind, to some impulse; we try, in our mind, some plan. Following its career through various steps, we find ourselves in imagination in the presence of the consequences that would follow; and as we then like and approve, or dislike and disapprove, these consequences, we find the original impulse or plan good or bad’ (Dewey, 1908/1978, p. 293). The consequences mentioned in the quotation could be related to different aspects, for example, a specific student or group of students (as shown in the previous sections) or society in general. One aspect that has been elaborated to a lesser extent so far is the consequences for the specific teacher.

Using two examples from the interviews, we want to illustrate here how this kind of reflection can take place in practice. Fredrik is a white teacher working at a high school in a medium-sized town. He describes how he grew up in a village where everyone was white. In his teens he became politically active in left-wing organizations, giving him access to a ‘practice of anti-racism and of addressing such groups, from neo-Nazis to Sweden Democrats’ (Fredrik). When it comes to his teaching, he tells us that his way of treating racist speech among students has changed over time: ‘It was harder at first, because I felt like I was burning inside when I heard that kind of speech. I still do, but now I think I’m able to consider the situation’ (Fredrik). One way of understanding this process of change is in terms of a need for his experiences as a left-wing activist to be translated into his new situation as a teacher with responsibility for all students (including those who express racism). But Fredrik still feels that this is a challenging situation to handle as a teacher, and fears a situation where he might ‘stand there with nothing to say’. According to Fredrik, he needs to reflect on and consider what kind of communication is possible when a student expresses racism, and in this reflection he also includes himself and his past experiences.

All our informants reflect on their own experiences and how they influence their anti-racist actions, but they do so in very different ways. Fatima works at a high school in
a small town, with students who have recently arrived in Sweden as refugees. Fatima’s concrete appearance as a Black Muslim woman creates another kind of knowledge and experience. During the interview, Fatima talks about how she ‘had a very safe upbringing’, but how racism had occurred in different forms during her life. The first experience of racism that she remembers, at the age of eight, was when the mother of a friend said that ‘people like you, black people, are not welcome here’. Today, her primary fear is ‘what it (racism) does to the children, children who are exposed to such things’, especially her own.

When it comes to her professional life, Fatima describes how she tries to create an open communicative climate in her classroom, even if, for some of her students, she represents ‘otherness’ and a person ‘other’ than what many of the students expected. And, as Fatima analyses the situation, this is positive, but it also creates confusion: ‘I think that many of the students look at me as a model, me being a teacher, and that they become inspired and at the same time have to reflect on their own prejudices and conceptions of what it means to be Swedish and what it might mean to be a teacher’. Fatima also describes situations where racism is expressed by students, and she is clear that she always tries to stand up for herself and others when this occurs.

In line with Dewey, this section highlights how teachers reflect on the space for interpersonal deliberation with themselves in mind. The narratives of Fredrik and Fatima show us how teachers’ reflection on their own experiences and knowledge is crucial when they are deciding how to communicate and act in these kinds of situations.

**Concluding discussion**

Even if we agree with Dewey that ‘deliberation has its beginning in troubled activity’, there is at the same time a need to critically discuss racist challenges to teachers’ work, since we want to address the moral and political dimensions of this work in relation to one of the major challenges of today. Our contribution highlights the importance of teachers’ reflection on different aspects when they are deciding how to act. More specifically, through our argumentation and selected narratives from teachers, we want to visualize aspects present in teachers’ reflection on how to communicate in classrooms when students express racism: (1) the individual student’s potential for growth, (2) classroom climate and violations, and (3) teachers’ knowledge and experience, affecting their ability to handle the situation. This means, on a general level, that if teachers’ experiences of these aspects are positive they are more open to a deliberative communicative approach when students express racism, than if some of these aspects are perceived as being problematic.

What we want to underline with Dewey, and through our analysis of the teachers’ reflection on their experiences of responding to hate speech, is the need for mutual communication in the situations described. Through continual reflective and deliberative conversations, in which different perspectives and elaborated solutions are explored and appraised, the teachers involved become more and more discerning and more able to make good judgments on how to handle these situations.

On the one hand, it is possible to argue that communicative deliberation is an opportunity for change, if handled in a fruitful way (Englund, 2006). It can lead to situations where hateful speech can be challenged and questioned in various ways. On the other hand, it can
also lead to continued oppression if the balance of power is confirmed rather than challenged, and thus end up wounding students (cf. Applebaum, 2003). In the final two sections, we will discuss aspects of intrapersonal and interpersonal deliberation that are of importance.

**On intrapersonal deliberation**

On an intrapersonal level, we have shown how teachers’ deliberation is a complex process. Even if most of a teacher’s activities during a day are done without deep reflection, there are situations where deciding how to act can be hard (cf. Boler, 2004; Arneback, 2014). However, the differences in contexts, experiences, and individuals involved lead to different understandings and communicative solutions when students express racism in schools. Through intrapersonal deliberation, teachers try, based on their experiences, to do their best in the specific situation. One central point in our paper is that deliberation by teachers on how to communicate in classrooms when students express racism brings together aspects that focus on both possibilities and limits, in relation both to others (students) and to oneself in a specific situation.

In the teachers’ narratives we can also see how their own experiences of racism influence their intrapersonal deliberation in different ways (cf. Brown, 2013; DiAngelo, 2012). For a teacher with Fatima’s experience, racism is something that operates on an everyday basis in her life. They are something that is always there. For a teacher such as Fredrik, his political engagement is partly challenging since he needs to relate it to his work as teacher. This raises questions about the political and moral experiences that teachers bring to their professional lives, and how those experiences influence their work as teachers (cf. Hayes, 2007), questions that we will continue to explore in the future. This also means, in line with the work of DiAngelo (2012), that those in privileged positions need to develop self-awareness if they are to be able to develop a readiness to act against racism and for social justice in education.

**On interpersonal deliberation**

The interpersonal level of deliberation, created primarily in situations of disagreement between students, is dependent on the teacher’s ability to formulate a common ground, a discursive situation, for continuous deliberation (Englund, 2006; Hansen, 1992). In the case of racist vocabulary, the most important, and often the most difficult, aspect is to try to build mutual respect between the individuals involved in the deliberation and to put the problem in a perspective that exposes the underlying, often historically shaped, assumptions of different views.

So, is a deliberative approach in the classroom a good way to work when students express racism? In situations where teachers know that they have students in their school class who represent and are able to argue for anti-democratic and racist attitudes and values, deliberation may not always be the answer in the short run (cf. Englund, 2016). In some situations, the teacher may seem forced to accept the impossibility of making use of and developing deliberation. Instead, in future, the teacher may try to make use of other, face-to-face situations with the student in question and try to bring about deliberative communication in that context (Applebaum, 2003). Encountering situations of racism has
to be seen in a long-term perspective, combining deliberation with moral imagination and other measures (Dewey, 1908/1978, 1922/1988).

However, judging from the teacher interviews, what seems to be missing is deliberation among teachers about crucial moments in teaching involving expressions of racism among students. In our interviews, discussions among teachers in schools are hardly mentioned. Turning to Dewey, and interpreters of his works, we argue that there is a need for more interpersonal deliberation among school staff. This kind of deliberation could contribute to a communicative teacher community that would avoid teachers being left on their own, giving every teacher the opportunity to get help and support from colleagues when reflecting on how to act in different situations in his/her specific context (Dewey, 1908/1978, 1922/1988; Hansen, 2001).

Making use of a kind of collegial deliberation in areas such as counteracting racism and racist expression may – in addition – be a way to develop a more collective effort to handle the challenges of racist speech and actions. Developing collegial deliberation in this area may also imply that ‘white’ teachers, who usually react with ‘listening silence’ (Applebaum, 2016), will be affected and become more involved in this troubled activity. Hopefully, this will lead to contextually based moral judgments on how to act.
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