

#SocialWorkSoWhite: A Critical Perspective on Settler Colonialism, White Supremacy, and Social Justice in Social Work

Autumn Asher BlackDeer
Maria Gandarilla Ocampo

Abstract: *To date, social work continues to be a predominantly white-dominated profession; this is true across all levels of the profession's current and aspiring membership, including students, practitioners, and faculty members. This racial composition is remnant of our profession's history of upholding white supremacy and legacy of white saviorism. Not surprisingly, foundational teachings of social work center and champion white women (e.g., Jane Addams) while neglecting the important contributions of Black and Brown social workers to the profession. The harm done by continuing and upholding these practices extends to all spheres that social work education touches, directly or indirectly. While the National Association of Social Workers Code of Ethics would lead one to think of social work as a noble profession, the reality demonstrates that we continually fall short of that reputation. Social work education is guilty of exploiting vulnerable and marginalized communities for the benefit of the profession under the guise of promoting social justice. For example, field placement, a cornerstone of social work education, continues to send mainly white students into communities of color for the purposes of learning, often treating the community as guinea pigs in the pursuit of white knowledge through experiential learning. Although in the long run, field placements can have some benefits for communities, we need to be more critical about the practices we engage in and the ways in which they fail to advance social justice and reinforce the status quo. We are at a pivotal moment in our profession as we reckon with the dissonance between our preaching and practice. The purpose of this paper is to highlight the many ways in which social work education haphazardly 1) perpetuates colonialism and upholds white supremacy, 2) harms marginalized communities, and 3) fails to model our code of ethics. We make a call for serious introspection within the field of social work: to evaluate the power dynamics at play, reckon with our past, and plan for a profession that strengthens and lives up to its commitment to social justice. We conclude with recommendations for transformative change within the social work profession.*

Keywords: *Social justice; white supremacy; settler colonialism; antiracism; social work education; social work practice; field education*

Despite the supposed dedication to achieving social justice, the social work profession has continually perpetuated settler colonialism and white supremacy. Several have pointed to the year 2020 as a moment of reckoning due to the global coronavirus pandemic and the national *racial justice awakening* spurred by state-sanctioned violence against Black and Brown lives. Goode and colleagues (2021) posit that living in times of racial and political unrest requires social work activism; however, the social work profession remains largely silent as revolutionary social movements of our time unfold (Jeyapal, 2017). If the social work profession were living up to its true mission of social justice, social activism would

Autumn Asher BlackDeer, PhD, MSW, Assistant Professor, Graduate School of Social Work, University of Denver, Denver, CO. Maria Gandarilla Ocampo, MSW, Doctoral Candidate, Brown School of Social Work, Washington University, St. Louis, MO.

Copyright © 2022 Authors, Vol. 22 No. 2 (Summer 2022), 720-740, DOI: 10.18060/24986



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

be the norm and reactionary statements during times of civil unrest would be unnecessary from the profession. As part of the new generation of social workers, we refuse to remain silent. We add our voices to fellow social work scholars who have called for a reawakening of our profession and a radical confrontation of oppression (Goode et al., 2021). Social movements are a ripe opportunity to challenge the profession's complacency and our notions of professionalism in favor of a more progressive social work that can challenge oppression and promote social justice (Jeyapal, 2017). Throughout this paper we will demonstrate how the social work profession 1) perpetuates colonialism and upholds white supremacy 2) harms marginalized communities, and 3) fails to model our code of ethics. We conclude with recommendations for transformative change within the social work profession.

History of Social Work

Upon first glance the social work profession appears to be based upon specialized knowledge and a commitment to social justice, but the actually relies on authority and power (Gambrill, 2001). Scholars posit that in actuality very little evidence exists to support the social work profession's supposed dedication to radical social change and structural transformation (Brady et al., 2019). Social work claims to originate from powerful social movements throughout time (Reisch, 2013 as cited by Brady et al., 2019); however, scholars have begun to delineate the following pattern regarding the social work profession's actual involvement with social movements: As new social movements emerge, the field of social work begins to reject the social movement, including its leaders, members, and goals (Brady et al., 2019). Soon after, social work begins to lionize the social movement's ideas, embracing its leaders, members, and goals, and attaches itself to its legacy (Brady et al., 2019). Finally social work uses the movements' influential ideas and methods in order to co-opt any victories and subsequent icons for the credit of social work, not the social movement itself (Brady et al., 2019). In other words, the social work profession opposes social movements as they emerge, and often will support them as they become successful as a means to attach the profession to its victories and leaders, without giving full credit to the movement itself.

Social work institutions formulate the backbone of the profession, and historically were not as grounded in social justice as one might think. Social work has an extensive history of complicity, carrying out the government's agenda and enforcing social control, from segregated settlement houses and social services; the removal, relocation, and genocide against Indigenous communities; the incarceration of Japanese Americans; and the ongoing state-sanctioned violence against Black and Brown communities (Brady et al., 2019; National Association of Social Workers [NASW], 2021; Tang Yan et al., 2021). Social work has been historically influenced by Christianity, the doctrinal authority which upholds and justifies white supremacy (Dyson et al., 2020), and deficit-based thinking (Brady et al., 2019). Early social work organizations were segregated, anti-Native, and decidedly Christian, with services primarily delivered through the church (Brady et al., 2019). This heavy patriarchal influence on social work persists today in the paternalistic values and ethics imparted upon the profession.

Early social work saw different individuals as problems to be treated, a line of thinking that persists today through the medical model (Brady et al., 2019). This deficit approach was carried out in the work of Mary Richmond and Jane Addams as they tied social problems to individual deficits and problematized individuals as people in need of treatment, often including institutionalization (Brady et al., 2019). Social work reproduces this line of thinking in treating marginalized communities, predominately those of color, as deficits or problems that need help integrating into white society, as social work promotes white civility as a benchmark of assimilation (Fortier & Hon-Sing Wong, 2019). Social work and whiteness are further seen in Jane Addams' 1910 words as she likened "pity for the poor" as *charitable* but juxtaposed "hatred of injustice" as *radical* (Jeyapal, 2017). Based upon this history, social work is actually founded more in charity than empowerment (Lerner, 2021). This foundation of charity is perpetuated through hidden curriculum in social work education and manifests today as white saviorism.

Social Justice

While social justice appears as an explicit social work value, the actuality continues to reproduce racial and societal hierarchies (Bhuyan et al., 2017). Despite clear calls for social justice from the social work governing bodies such as the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE), NASW, and the American Academy of Social Work and Social Welfare, there is an evident lack of research on how to integrate social justice into the classroom through course content, syllabi, assignments, etcetera (Atteberry-Ash et al., 2021). Previous research has shown that social work students start their programs with a strong social justice commitment and endorse that their education has a positive impact on that commitment overall; however, these students also report very little opportunities to learn or apply social justice theories and skills acquired in their MSW programs (Goode et al., 2021). Research has found that social work students reinforce this dichotomy in viewing social justice as separate from clinical practice, stating social justice classes are too theoretical and fail to offer practical skills (Bhuyan et al., 2017). Schools of social work lack emphasis on social action overall (Apgar, 2021). Results also found an overall lack of social justice integration throughout the curriculum, reporting that a lack of institutional support reinforced whiteness as the dominant social work perspective and an overarching lack of practical social justice skills throughout the program (Bhuyan et al., 2017). Ultimately, social work students report a disconnect in curriculum and skills from the profession's overall mission of social justice (Goode et al., 2021).

Further, while social work purports to value social justice, the profession appears to stall in moving this ideal into motion through social action. Social action, originating from community organizing, is essential to the social work mission of social change (Apgar, 2021). The NASW says social work involves political and social action; however, recent work reports that social workers are largely not involved in efforts for systematic change (Apgar, 2021). In fact, there has been a decline of activism within the field, with social workers spending less than 2% of their time engaging in macro practices such as community organizing or policy development (Apgar, 2021). While there have been critical and influential voices throughout time, the entire social work profession itself falls short (Brady et al., 2019), with some calling out the profession's deep thread of insincerity

(Gambrill, 2001). Mainstreaming is defined as the combination of marginalized critical social work approaches with the institutionalized commitment to social justice (Bhuyan et al., 2017). This reduces the discourse to creating a professional image or branding, rather than offering tangible skills in order to achieve social justice (Bhuyan et al., 2017). Social work as a field likes to “talk the talk,” yet proves time and time again that it lacks commitment to “walk the walk,” revealing this unchanging gap between our so-called dedication to social justice compared to the actual actions of activism (Apgar, 2021). Social work is guilty of mainstreaming social justice, reducing our mission to hashtags and virtue signals instead of an actual commitment to structural change. These conflicting ideas of valuing social justice versus taking social action lead the present authors to ask—is social work really committed to achieving social justice?

Settler Colonialism

Present day discussions of white supremacy are remiss in the exclusion of the lasting impact of settler colonialism; this modern culture of whiteness is rooted in colonization, and must be named and addressed in order to dismantle white supremacy (Lerner, 2021). Coloniality is defined as the long-term patterns of power, seen throughout culture, labor, and knowledge production, that result from colonialism and survive beyond the colonial time period (Almeida et al., 2019). Coloniality is maintained in higher education through the criteria of academic performance of knowledge through which the experiences and values of marginalized populations become invisible (Almeida et al., 2019). Coloniality manifests through three key systems: hierarchies (racial division), knowledge (privileging white ways of knowing as “objective”), and societal systems (reinforcing hierarchy’s ability to regulate and segregate in order to uphold fellow systems; Almeida et al., 2019). Ultimately, controlling history, knowledge, health, and justice is coloniality in action (Almeida et al., 2019).

Colonization is present in the classroom and is not merely something from the past (Lerner, 2021). Despite social work’s commitment to diversity and inclusion, social work continues to teach Eurocentrically, perpetuating the colonization of Indigenous peoples and knowledge and every other non-white population (Dumbrill & Green, 2008) through the continual invalidation and refusal of other ways of knowing (Lerner, 2021). Examples of this can be seen throughout social work curricula, including the teaching of Eurocentric frameworks of research for knowledge building and of clinical models for assessment and treatment. Social work teaches from an internalized colonial mindset, leaving students with little to no skills to decolonize their own education and organizations. Such a mindset leads to the perpetuation of oppressive practice (Lerner, 2021). Further, social work is taught through an individualist lens, which posits that individuals make sense of their realities through reflection of their own social experiences, reinforcing how coloniality centers on individual issues such as identity development when in reality the entire system is causing harm (Almeida et al., 2019). This coloniality is further seen in social work practice through the psychosocial assessment, a problematic and othering approach to an individual seeking help (Almeida et al., 2019). Specifically, the psychosocial assessment and like iterations (e.g., biopsychosocial assessments) do not fully consider how structural and systemic barriers manifest in the form of biopsychosocial problems and as a result, plans developed

from such assessments place the onus of resolving often structural or systemic based issues (e.g., poverty, racism, etc.) on the individuals seeking support. We can decolonize this approach by situating the problem within the matrix of coloniality and considering frameworks like the social determinants of health rather than a “neutral” context (Almeida et al., 2019). For example, using the social determinants of health – economic stability, education access and quality, health care access and quality, neighborhood and built environment, social and community context (Healthy People 2030, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, n.d.) can provide a better understanding of how context, systemic, and structural barriers impact individual health, shifting the focus away from individuals and highlighting the need for social workers to address system issues more broadly.

Beyond the classroom, colonization is perpetuated by the profession through inaction to address systemic and structural harm to marginalized people and communities of color. Recently the NASW published a report in which they outlined the numerous ways in which the social work profession has failed to promote social justice by actively “supporting policies and activities that harm people of color” (NASW, 2021, p. 2). A major manifestation of coloniality in social work is the practice and perpetuation of white supremacy.

White Supremacy

We must name these structures of white supremacy and colonization in order to begin to interrupt them (Almeida et al., 2019; Lerner, 2021). White supremacy is a mechanism of social control and oppression originating from European imperialism (Almeida et al., 2019; Beck, 2019). There has been extensive work (Peweward & Almeida, 2014) on how white supremacy has become law in the formation and cementation of the United States as a nation (Almeida et al., 2019). Within the literature, these formative processes are known as the racial contract, referring to how whiteness has been translated into social capital through the definition of beliefs, values, and behaviors (Almeida et al., 2019). Beliefs around individualism, as opposed to collectivism, as well as ideas and behaviors around professionalism are an example of this in social work.

Hegemony is how colonizers dominate power in society through economic, education, media, and government by forcing Eurocentric worldviews on everyone, presenting white power as beneficial to all (Lerner, 2021). The hegemony of whiteness posits that white is normal, neutral, and objective (Beck, 2019). This has direct implications for conceptualizing research in what counts as objective. If whiteness is the norm, then whiteness is the only true objectivity, thus Black, Indigenous, and communities of color (BIPOC) can never achieve truly objective scholarship. Scholars have described how the academy perpetuates knowledge production based upon white logic (Zuberi & Bonilla-Silva, 2008). Consequently, this inability for BIPOC scholars to achieve “true objectivity” impacts the ways in which their scholarship is evaluated to be deemed worthy for funding, knowledge building, and integration into the profession. Ultimately, these circumstances result in the practice of erasing and devaluing the contributions and presence of BIPOC people, which reinforces hegemonic whiteness (Frey et al., 2021). Through these practices

and others, social work is complicit in maintaining and perpetuating hegemony (Yee, 2016). In a recent report, the NASW detailed how social workers have historically and currently been complicit in shameful practices such as blocking Black enfranchisement, helping lead “Indian Schools”, and contributing to overrepresentation in child welfare systems (NASW, 2021).

Despite social work being a predominately female-dominated profession, the patriarchy inherent within white supremacy reigns supreme (Almeida et al., 2019). Even at the turn of the century, social workers were calling for a reexamination of social work learning and practice for the inclusion of feminist theory into the curriculum (Freeman, 1990). Scholars advocated for a shift from a “women’s issues” approach to a broad integration of feminist content into the curriculum (Freeman, 1990) which has yet to be realized nearly three decades later. Conversations of gender oppression have been diluted and lost into broad sweeping feminist frameworks that center individual empowerment over addressing structural issues that impact women (Almeida et al., 2019). A content analysis of articles on women and social work conducted from 1998 to 2007 found a decrease in both women’s and feminist content in social work journals (Baretti, 2011), with researchers demonstrating that the influence of feminism in social work has been largely constrained to individual projects or initiatives and not across the curriculum or profession as a whole (Phillips & Cree, 2014).

#SocialWorkSoWhite

Social work reproduces whiteness daily (Jeffery, 2005), through centering whiteness in education (e.g., teaching a white-based social work history and failing to provide counter narratives), practice (e.g., client surveillance and gatekeeping of resources), and scholarship (e.g., excluding BIPOC knowledge; Crudup et al., 2021; Frey et al., 2021). White privilege is a product of white supremacy (Beck, 2019), and privilege is the mechanism of oppression remaining invisible in dominant groups (Simon et al., 2021). We bypass addressing white supremacy in social work by talking about white privilege instead of the structures that enable and maintain this supremacy throughout our profession. Jeffery (2005) identified a paradox in social work and whiteness: whiteness is taught as a set of social work practice skills, so when we teach self-reflexivity and are critical of whiteness, we are inherently inviting a critique of social work. If you have to give up whiteness, by current competency standards, how can you be a good social worker? (Jeffery, 2005). Scholars recommend a decreased focus on marginalized groups and identities and more on privilege and resistance to change (Yee, 2016). In doing so, we can avoid traps such as viewing whiteness as a monolith and perhaps even become braver about challenging institutions that reinforce oppression (Yee, 2016). This shift away from a voyeuristic view of communities of color is an invitation to turn the focus inward and evaluate how one comes to the work. However, merely changing views of privileged individuals will not eliminate oppression, just as increasing the number of people of color in higher education does not equate to systemic change (Yee, 2016). Ultimately, introspection without action is not enough. Social work must move from surface level evaluations of privilege to actively dismantling systems and structures of oppression.

Respectability politics are a tool of whiteness utilized to weaponize the denial of power (Haley, 2020). Used as a tool to manipulate and control communities of color, respectability politics define non-normative behavior as deviations from whiteness, focusing on individual behavior instead of structural issues (Haley, 2020). White social workers participate in respectability politics through enforcing whiteness on their peers of color which ultimately silence and further oppress communities of color under the guise of inclusion (Haley, 2020). For example, a study of Black female faculty at a research-intensive school of social work found that these scholars were unable to present themselves authentically and engaged in self-management, code switching, and appearance regulating due to unspoken, white-based arbitrary rules of professionalism (Fields & Cunningham-Williams, 2021). Further, these scholars received messaging that indirectly or directly minimized their qualifications to secure employment by referencing that hiring practices to increase inclusion, instead of their qualifications, would make it much easier for them to secure employment in the academy (Fields & Cunningham-Williams, 2021). Interventions to address manifestations of whiteness, such as respectability politics, fall short in their approach to address white individuals and further harm communities of color. People of color have had to learn to deal with whiteness in order to succeed and sometimes just to survive, and as such do not have the same experiences in unlearning whiteness as their white peers (Gregory, 2020). Further, racial equity focused social work interventions perpetuate racial oppression by leaving whiteness intact through avoiding discomfort, taking a color-evasive approach, and continuing the notion of omnipresent whiteness (Gregory, 2020), just as the majority of diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) workshops consider to center white feelings, comfort, and worldviews.

Social work is and always has been complicit in the social construction of whiteness (Gregory, 2020). Educators and students alike wonder why social work education fails to teach skills to enact structural change against oppressive systems and undo colonialism (Lerner, 2021). Scholars call for the academy to ask ourselves about our own involvement in white supremacy (Beck, 2019). To interrogate whiteness, individuals must view the entire picture of colonialism, white hegemony, logic, and knowledge production (Beck, 2019). The social work profession must be intentional in unmasking the insidious nature of white supremacy and its legacy of harm (Beck, 2019). We have an ethical mandate to confront the white-centered nature of social work education by helping students understand how they perpetuate whiteness, so they do not end up blocking antiracist work for the sake of white fragility (Lerner, 2021). We must take a deliberate, consistent, and holistic approach to uprooting whiteness in the social work profession. The antidote to white supremacy: liberating the mind, body, and brain from oppression (Lerner, 2021).

Manifestation of Whiteness in Social Work

Social Work Education

There are three pillars of social work education: explicit curriculum, implicit curriculum, and field education (Bhuyan et al., 2017). Explicit curriculum includes the core educational competencies set forth by CSWE, which social work teaches through a colonial, color-evasive, Eurocentric approach to maintain present power structures (Tang

Yan et al., 2021). Implicit curriculum refers to how students are socialized into the profession, including mitigating classroom conflicts, and reinforcing professional behavior (Bhuyan et al., 2017). The professionalization of social work is a manifestation of neoliberalism, as the profession shifts to focusing on providing services more than it encourages critical thinking, movement building, or social action (Brady et al., 2019). Further, this implicit curriculum often mirrors hidden curriculum as students are socialized not only into the profession, but into the dominant (white) group overall (Bhuyan et al., 2017). Tang Yan and colleagues (2021) describe this hidden curriculum in social work as neoliberalism in which mainstream narratives of social justice are privileged and market values such as consumerism and managerialism reign supreme. This has shifted the profession from radical social change through collective action into a micro intervention focused field that helps clients adapt to the systemic oppression around them (Tang Yan et al., 2021). Social work is notorious for providing band-aids to our clients rather than advocating for actual structural level change. Finally, field education trains social workers in environments that limit advocacy, penalize disruption, or embody perspectives from marginalized groups – essentially views or beliefs that represent or embody minority communities (Bhuyan et al., 2017). Social work education and practice teach with a curriculum mainstreamed for white students and marginalizing non-western theory and knowledge (Lerner, 2021).

I. Explicit Curriculum: Teaching Diversity and Cultural Competence

Diversity. Social work education sidesteps social justice and focuses on teaching diversity and cultural competence instead. Social work education began to address diversity in 1973 through identity-specific classes, eventually adding group-specific courses over time across sexual orientation, ability, gender, and country of origin (Alvarez-Hernandez, 2021). This model of diversity is inherently representative of white supremacy in social work education, namely through the nature of hegemony herein where white populations are considered the norm, and all other groups are now othered and considered “diversity” (Dumbrill & Green, 2008). This concept of diversity is mainstreamed for individuals to accumulate advantage for the already advantaged, providing students with their MSW badges of honor, instead of truly challenging disadvantage (Bhuyan et al., 2017). Social work is more concerned with tolerating difference through teaching diversity rather than disrupting the status quo of settler colonialism and white supremacy.

Centering diversity instead of social justice is a direct implication of accrediting bodies. CSWE mandates learning of diversity in social work education yet provides no details on implementation (Franco, 2021). Schools of social work have taken varied approaches toward adding diversity into their curricula (Atteberry-Ash et al., 2021). Some take a parking lot approach, covering diversity in one foundational class only, thereby leaving it in the parking lot, while others infuse the content throughout their curriculum or offer a hybrid parking lot/infusion combination (Atteberry-Ash et al., 2021). Newer approaches include offering mini courses or workshops on diversity, similar to CEU style events (Atteberry-Ash et al., 2021). It is unclear which model is best for integrating diversity into social work curriculum, but none truly account for intersectionality

(Atteberry-Ash et al., 2021) or address the elephants in the room – colonialism and white supremacy.

The problem of focusing on diversity as a proxy for social justice or social action is the omission of intersectionality in its entirety (Atteberry-Ash et al., 2021). Diversity classes gloss over how intersecting identities are impacted by the institutional oppression embedded within systems, often failing to ask reflective questions or promote structural change (Franco, 2021). Social work can never be antiracist as long as we stay in diversity management and competency development (Jeffery, 2005). Diversity will never dismantle the master's house.

Cultural competence. Surface-level understandings of peoples' lived experiences are known as cultural competence; academics use cultural competence as a way to avoid examining structural issues of dominance and oppression (Almeida et al., 2019). Current social work teachings on diversity and inclusion center on micro level practice, citing cultural competence as a key skill in order to demonstrate respect and respond to "difference" (Craig et al., 2021). Social work as a field has otherized diversity, collapsing in multiple concepts such as multiculturalism, intolerance, diversity, and cultural competence, humility, and sensitivity – all without an interrogation of colonization and cultural imperialism (Almeida et al., 2019).

Overall, cultural competence lacks a social justice lens (Franco, 2021). Cultural competence remains the dominant social work framework (Franco, 2021) despite critiques of perpetuating an individual focus rather than addressing systemic issues (Craig et al., 2021). Cultural competence has tried to save face with the addition of concepts like cultural humility and intersectionality; however, it continues to focus more on self-awareness rather than content that directly addresses oppression (Craig et al., 2021). Cultural competence is embedded within a mastery model that is underpinned by colonialism and the hegemony of white supremacy (Franco, 2021). This notion of mastery pushes an all-knowing approach where individuals can develop expertise in another culture (Franco, 2021). Cultural competence norms whiteness and others communities of color while conflating culture with non-whiteness (Franco, 2021; Wagaman et al., 2019). Cultural competence sets white students up to learn about the "other" without any critical reflection of their own racial identities or how they uphold racist systems (Wagaman et al., 2019) and also overlooks intersecting identities within systems of oppression (Franco, 2021).

Both of these haphazard pedagogical models of diversity, inclusion, and equity often utilize experiential learning, perpetuating harm against students of color while maintaining white privilege. Experiential learning allows for students of color and other minoritized and marginalized students to draw from their lived experiences; however, white students are then able to absorb knowledge abstractly through others' experiences (Craig et al., 2021), often at the expense of their marginalized peers. The onus is always placed upon people of color to identify racism or "difference," thus reinforcing the othering – allowing the dominant group to spectate instead of doing their own actual work (Yee, 2016). Research has shown that white comfort is linked to the pain and suffering of BIPOC students, staff, and faculty (Beck, 2019). Social work perpetuates voyeurism and trauma tourism at the expense of students of color for the sake of white learning and comfort.

II. Implicit Curriculum: Neoliberalism in the Academy

The social work profession is embedded within the broader neoliberal system of the academy and continues to support the existing social order by enforcing the dominant (white) status quo (Brady et al., 2019). There is substantial literature on the role of neoliberalism within the academy and how market-driven logic has changed institutional practices (Yee, 2016). The academy is not culturally, politically, or ideologically neutral (Dumbrill & Green, 2008) and continues to reproduce inequality (Bhuyan et al., 2017). The influence of the market system on the academy, seen through consumerism, professionalism, and capitalism, creates students as paying customers thus devaluing radical and transformative work for stakeholder fear of losing profit (Bhuyan et al., 2017). Capitalist market logic makes social work a commodity defined by standardized competencies and skills, thus narrowing the field to secure employment and reducing the profession to the logic of cultural capital production (Bhuyan et al., 2017). Social work has embraced the dominant narratives of capitalism and for-profit market-based solutions to social welfare problems (Brady et al., 2019).

Neoliberalism is in direct opposition to the goals of social work and the curriculum taught within social work education (Brady et al., 2019). Neoliberalism encourages a one-size-fits-all approach (Brady et al., 2019) instead of valuing the inherent dignity and worth of the person. Further, neoliberalism devalues professional intellect and undermines the emancipatory nature and liberatory goals that social work strives to meet for its clients (Brady et al., 2019). Two main structures contribute to neoliberal social work education: governing bodies and the academy (Brady et al., 2019). Governing bodies in social work provide accreditation and licensure standards through competencies; these competencies are inherently behavior-focused and fail to encourage critical thinking and reflection (Brady et al., 2019). The academy contributes to neoliberalism within social work through the increased corporatization seen through increases in tuition as financial support from the government decreases (Brady et al., 2019). Further, neoliberalism is seen in the professionalization of diversity and equity, in which students become consumers, assessed on their future contributions to the economy, thus rendering social justice as contradictory to the needs of the market (Bhuyan et al., 2017). The influence of neoliberalism also manifests in social work in the form of symbolic anti-racism, which is purported through the notion that anti-racism, anti-oppressive, and anti-colonial work must be consumable and palatable, making colorblindness ideology preferable and ensuring race is kept invisible (Lerner, 2021). Ultimately, whiteness and respectability politics reinforce settler colonialism and provide the foundation for the perpetuation of neoliberal policy (Haley, 2020).

III. Field Education

Field education, the third pillar of social work education, is often described as the profession's signature pedagogy, yet very little attention has been paid to addressing oppression within field education (Razack, 2001). Field education exists largely at the margins of social work education, often taught externally to the curriculum and the school (Razack, 2001). The practice of field education overall can be oppressive to minoritized or

marginalized communities as the profession sends emerging social workers to cut their teeth in these communities, often at the risk of those already most vulnerable. Internships or practicum becomes a real-life lab in which marginalized individuals and communities become the guinea pigs with which up-and-coming social workers can try and fail, at times hurting these communities in the process, all the for the sake of the student's learning and growth. Some students can exhibit poor boundaries, behavior and attitudes that are incongruent with social work values, and other challenging behaviors (Street, 2019), which ultimately affect the people whom they are supposed to work with. The revolving door nature of these positions is also inherently problematic. Sending social workers in training into a community for a time-limited stay, ranging from a few months to about a year, can further perpetuate social problems and is the epitome of placing student Band-Aids rather than addressing radical social justice solutions. While having student interns or practicum students increases the capacity of social services agencies to serve vulnerable individuals and communities, there are inherent challenges and power issues with having students with varying training and skill levels practice with marginalized communities. Students may lack investment in the agency or work, have wanting experience and skills, or have generally problematic behavior (Street, 2019) which impact the experience and quality of service received by individuals and communities. These individuals and community members may have no choice or believe they have no choice but to accept subpar service, which can indirectly and directly reinforce marginalization and oppression. This is exacerbated by the fact that there are currently no requirements for agencies to seek client and community input on their experience working with interns. Other harms in field education have been identified in the role of field instructors and at practicum sites themselves. Field instructors play a significant role in facilitating harm against practicum students of color. Field instructors can choose to avoid or hesitate discussions of diversity and identity and often take a color-evasive approach to field education by denying racial differences (Gooding & Mehrotra, 2021; Johnson et al., 2021; Razack, 2001). This approach can gaslight practicum students of color and further exacerbate systemic issues they may already be contending with. Further, practicum sites can be potential triggers for internalized oppression among students of color (Razack, 2001), as students describe experiences of code-switching to survive and display professionalism. Social work students of color are forced to remain vigilant, even in field placement, to successfully navigate their environments (Gooding & Mehrotra, 2021; Johnson et al., 2021; Razack, 2001).

Social Work Practice

The bifurcation of social work into micro versus macro practice reflects the broader debate in the field's overall mission of achieving social justice. Some say social work has an inherent contradiction between individual versus societal level change (Edwards et al., 2006). Social work is more concerned with symptom management and ignores structural influences (Tang Yan et al., 2021) as individuals would rather do recognition-based or representational work (e.g., identity-based politics) rather than examining structural issues and interlocking systems of oppression (Yee, 2016). Social work reproduces the settler state through social service delivery that supports white communities at the expense of

Black, Indigenous, and other communities of color (Fortier & Hon-Sing Wong, 2019). This can be seen in how social work and welfare are utilized as a mechanism of control to manage and assimilate communities of color into the dominant (white) society (Fortier & Hon-Sing Wong, 2019). The settler state replication in social work is best described as a structure of elimination and is readily apparent throughout the removal of Indigenous children, extraction of natural resources from Indigenous land, and the overall racialization and dispossession of Indigenous peoples overall (Fortier & Hon-Sing Wong, 2019).

As social work has become an increasingly regulated profession, it has shifted towards competency-based learning as opposed to evaluating students' critical inquiry of and engagement with social injustice. (Hurley & Taiwo, 2019). Social work competencies reinforce the split and eventual hierarchy between clinical work and social justice, devaluing social justice theory as a non-transferrable skill (Bhuyan et al., 2017). Competency-based social work centers on thinking and acting where critical social work-hallmarked by critical reflective practice, critical consciousness, and reflexive thoughts-values analyzing discrepancies between what is said versus what is done (Hurley & Taiwo, 2019). As social work moves away from critical theories in order to prepare students for clinical practice, the struggle to bridge the gap between critical theory and competency-based practice greatens (Hurley & Taiwo, 2019).

While some support enhancing micro-skills for effective practice (Katz et al., 2021), social work needs to get more involved in policy and macro practice in order to prepare students to be true agents of change in championing social justice to dismantle oppression at all levels (Dyson et al., 2020). Macro social work is often devalued as "too big" to tackle; however, when we view things as static or immutable, we collude with the dominance in systems, reinforcing the narrative that there's "nothing we can do" (Yee, 2016). We fail to teach students how to think critically about the relevance of micro skills; for example, micro skills are necessary to engage in advocacy work and political activism. Overall, social work students are less exposed to macro content, with United States-based social work programs offering twice as many micro or clinical specializations than they do for macro social work (Friedman et al., 2020). Previous research has found that students report valuing knowledge that translated into micro or clinical practice more than they did macro or systems knowledge (Bhuyan et al., 2017). Scholars call for a more robust macro skillset but merely adding concentration competencies are not enough (Apgar, 2021).

Macro social work, including work in the political realm, is one such avenue to advocate for societal-level change in the pursuit of social justice. Social workers have debated throughout time how "professional" it is to advocate for social change, particularly in the political arena (Brill, 2001), stating there is a thin line between policy practice and politics (Friedman et al., 2020). Social workers have been critiqued as lacking political sophistication and having limited aspiration toward systemic change (Hurley & Taiwo, 2019). Social work has avoided social justice, inclusion, and equity conversations for fear of partisanship (Goode et al., 2021) and has been de-politicized in favor of emphasizing micro resilience over structural change (Tang Yan et al., 2021). Ultimately, the majority of social work political involvement stops with voting (Apgar, 2021). Scholars purport at the turn of the century to be moving away from the belief that political activity is unprofessional, with Charlotte Towle stating that the "role of social work is to mobilize the

conscience of the community” (Brill, 2001, p. 233). Ultimately, social work cannot avoid political engagement if we are to challenge existing social inequalities (Friedman et al., 2020).

Code of Ethics

Social work has four distinct ethical periods throughout time: morality, values, ethics theory and decision-making, and ethical standards and risk management (Chase, 2015). There were attempts as early as 1919 to draft a code of ethics in social work (Reamer, 1998). Starting in the late 1900s, the morality period is defined by Jane Addams’ Hull House, a paternalistic approach to wayward individuals, and a shift in evaluating the client’s morality as opposed to the morality of the profession or practice (Chase, 2015; Reamer, 1998). The first Code of Ethics was adopted in 1960 by the National Association of Social Workers (Brill, 2001), and the values period began in the 1970s with the adoption of NASW’s new code that included more than 70 ethical principles (Chase, 2015). The values period marked the shift in focus to professional values and ethics (Reamer, 1998). The ethical theory and decision-making period began in the early 1980s and introduced ethical theory and ethical dilemmas (Reamer, 1998). It was later revised and then had a major rewrite in 1996, which is when the first time NASW had an official mission statement (Brill, 2001). Also beginning in 1996, the NASW Code of Ethics extended social work guidelines and standards and ushered in the era of ethical standards and risk management (Reamer, 1998). Some scholars suggest we are entering a new period of ethics, the digital period, as the profession begins to reckon with the role of technology on values and ethics in social work practice (Chase, 2015).

There is a wide critique of social work values as ambiguous, privileging white epistemologies, and reinforcing colonialism (Brady et al., 2019). Codes of ethics are described throughout the literature as windows into a profession (Brill, 2001), and the social work code of ethics leaves much to be desired. Present social work ethical codes reflect the ambivalence of the profession. While originally developed to hold social workers accountable to the profession, they actually protect them from individual moral accountability (Chase, 2015).

How can our values be interpreted without a colonial lens? Our lens determines how our ethics are interpreted and applied; the current lens is white supremacy and thus stipulates how social workers are seeing and interacting with the world. Ethical codes are not synonymous with the morality or sanctity of a profession. For example, the German medical profession had one of the most highly developed ethical codes in their time, yet still participated in the Holocaust (Chase, 2015). The Code of Ethics prohibits discrimination by social workers and calls us to prevent and eliminate discrimination (Lerner, 2021). How can we achieve the elimination of discrimination without centering social justice in our teaching, practice, and research? As such, it is imperative that the NASW Code of Ethics truly commit to social justice by explicitly calling upon social workers to actively confront and dismantle colonialism, white supremacy, and other forms of oppression.

Implications for Social Work

Uprooting White Supremacy

Scholars like Craig and colleagues (2021) call for an increase in curriculum to focus on diversity and teach students to be allies. Some have recommended models to develop allyship, such as the Ally Model of Social Justice (Ally Model) which centers on difference, oppression, and privilege and encourages a focus on self-awareness (Craig et al., 2021). While beneficial for navigating allyship, these methods of training fall short in addressing structural and systemic issues in social work education. Merely teaching students to be allies is not synonymous with dismantling harmful structures. From our experience, individuals may become hyper focused on demonstrating or proving their allyship, often to the point of being performative at best and white saviors at worst.

To address colonialism in the classroom, scholars recommend social work pedagogy seriously and actively consider the matrix of colonization (Almeida et al., 2019). Social work pedagogy can disrupt coloniality by practicing critical consciousness within an intersectional framework by emphasizing critical consciousness, empowerment, and accountability (Almeida et al., 2019). Hudson and Mountz (2016) recommend utilizing tools from intergroup dialogues such as identity-based caucusing, also referred to as affinity groups. These identity-based caucuses utilize a small group process to discuss privilege and oppression within an intentional space (Hudson & Mountz, 2016; Lerner, 2021). These spaces allow open discussions without shame, guilt, or denial, and most importantly shield students of color from potential harm of having to witness their white peers process their whiteness (Hudson & Mountz, 2016). Affinity groups are a great formative step to uprooting whiteness in social work education.

Several interventions and programs exist to help white people process their whiteness. Combs and Perron (2020) have developed a 12-step model of recovery from white conditioning and encourage white individuals to embrace their responsibility to undo the systems of privilege they benefit from, while others have formed antiracist alliances (Blitz et al., 2014). Some scholars recommend the acknowledgement and identification of bias in order to appreciate social justice in social work (Rogerson et al., 2021); however, these individual actions are not enough. Lerner (2021) has several recommendations for helping students reflect on their whiteness, including critical race theory, acceptance and commitment therapy, acknowledging mistakes, not comforting discomfort, countering white fatigue, and practicing cultural humility. Social work must begin to address whiteness to fully acknowledge and uproot white supremacy.

Dyson and colleagues (2020) propose racial reconciliation and forgiveness as a path to healing and liberation. This reconciliation would eradicate both conscious and unconscious societal processes that perpetuate harm and encourage a grieving and mourning period to expose the denied effects of colonization (Dyson et al., 2020). However, it remains unclear what truly counts as reconciliation and forgiveness. In a critique of Canada's reconciliation efforts towards First Nations communities, Fortier and Hon-Sing Wong (2019) describe that this process did more to pacify white guilt and uphold a white savior complex in social work and the state while avoiding truly transformative change. Ultimately, reconciliation

is hard work, which can lead individuals to live in a state of injustice-related dissonance thus leading to immobilization (Wagaman et al., 2019). Uprooting whiteness in social work will require continued social action and must move beyond dissonance and discomfort.

Social Work Education

I. Explicit Curriculum

In order to reorient the profession towards dismantling systems of oppression, scholars recommend starting with social work education (Goode et al., 2021). Scholars recommend a critical pedagogy of white supremacy, involving more than theory-based discussions of privilege but analyses of domination (Beck, 2019). This pedagogy would credit Ida B. Wells just as much as Jane Addams (Beck, 2019). Further recommendations for teaching diversity and inclusion include creating an open classroom environment and reshaping the role of the instructor to be more caring in order to facilitate conversations (Craig et al., 2021). Others recommend teaching teams for an anti-oppressive approach to teaching social justice courses, centering power differences and a shared generation and production of knowledge (Garran et al., 2015). Some recommend adding a particular course to critically analyze structural barriers and client-centered interventions in order to form a critical-competency perspective (Hurley & Taiwo, 2019). Finally, scholars recommend using the Power, Privilege, and Oppression framework (PPO) to guide the integration of social justice into social work education; by incorporating PPO in addition to social justice and diversity, social work can reshape its trajectory and reckon with the power in training the future of the profession (Atteberry-Ash et al., 2021).

II. Implicit Curriculum

Scholars have made recommendations addressing the institution at large, such as disrupting Eurocentric-dominated curriculum, removing mainstream concepts like cultural competence, neoliberalism, standardization, diagnosis, and the medical model (Lerner, 2021). Further suggestions call for social work schools to own up to their outdated, offensive, and inaccurate curriculum and shift values towards practice-based knowledge as much as academic training (Lerner, 2021). To realign the social work profession, we must choose empowerment over charity and actually encourage students to engage with systems to produce meaningful change, not just accept or collude with existing structures (Lerner, 2021). Some recommend combining theories such as anti-oppressive practice and intersectionality in order to fix social justice shortcomings in the social work profession like the overemphasis on cultural competence (Franco, 2021). This combination approach would address both implicit and explicit bias, racism, and oppression in social work curriculum by naming and addressing white supremacy, power, and privilege (Franco, 2021). Ultimately, white social workers and academics need to move over and make space for other ways of knowing (Dumbrill & Green, 2008).

III. Field Education

Simulation-based learning can disrupt the harmful cycle of field education for both marginalized communities and social workers of color. Research has found that simulation-based learning is effective to develop student competence without harm to the client (Asakura & Bogo, 2021). Others have enacted simulations in order to bridge class knowledge with field education (Bogo et al., 2017). This represents an innovative approach to circumvent the issue of white students harming marginalized communities for the sake of learning. Simulated experiences encourage skill, knowledge, and attitude development while facilitating the demonstration of student understanding and competencies to instructors (Fulton et al., 2019). Simulation-based learning can also interrupt the experiential learning models which allow white students to learn about privilege, oppression, and power at the expense of their peers of color (Craig et al., 2021). Further, simulation-based practicums can provide a more equitable and flexible option for students who may be challenged with the logistics of completing traditional placements. While simulation-based placements can be used to establish and develop skills, real world placements can then be used to enhance or strengthen these skills once students have demonstrated sufficient mastery to engage in practice that does not create harm.

Social Work Practice

We need to bring social action back to social work, especially in response to calls to reform systems (Apgar, 2021). Social work education can (and should) encourage students' political involvement and engagement. Crowell (2017) recommends encouraging students to explore their political interest, or lack thereof, by utilizing a teaching tool they call policy genograms. These genograms map political and civic engagement of the student's family of origin as a pedagogical tool (Crowell, 2017).

The entire social work assessment process needs an overhaul. Scholars recommend including a structural analysis of race, class, and gender in order to understand health inequalities (Almeida et al., 2019) from a systems level rather than blaming the individual. This can be achieved through raising critical consciousness using the matrix of coloniality in order to assess dimensions of power, privilege, and oppression (Almeida et al., 2019).

Scholars have recommended praxis as the way forward in abolishing the dichotomy between theory and practice by teaching students how to implement theory into practice (Gregory, 2020; Franco, 2021; Ladhani & Sitter, 2020). Emphasizing praxis would encourage students to apply social justice theories to all areas of practice, not merely stopping at individual level clinical work. Consciousness-raising is essential to liberation; however, we must overcome the overvaluing of practice and competency more than critical thinking and theory. Praxis offers a pathway to disrupting the micro-macro divide and reorient the profession toward taking social action in order to achieve social justice.

Code of Ethics

Most CSWE-accredited curricula do not have a specific ethics course, but rather embed the ethical code throughout (Groessler, 2015). We recommend instituting critical ethical conversations in each of these courses. These conversations should critically discuss the lens of white supremacy and how simply knowing the ethical standards is not enough. We must teach upcoming social workers how to critically think and apply these ethical standards in practice, through a decolonial, social justice-centered lens. Instructors can present an ethical dilemma, process various pathways and action with students, and ultimately discuss and debrief implications of applying the Code of Ethics from these varied perspectives.

Conclusion

In order for social work to live up to its social justice mission, our profession must lead in truth telling and challenging white supremacy. We must hold ourselves and the profession accountable (Beck, 2019). By knowing our colonial history and learning about our current collusion with white supremacy, social work can reckon with our past, take a critical look in the mirror, and start to plan for a more equitable future centered on social justice. Social work must be antiracist, anti-oppressive, and anti-colonial (Lerner, 2021). Once social work acknowledges our reality, we can re-envision a better future, one that lives up to our mission, through critical, progressive, and unflinching advocacy (Brady et al., 2019).

References

- Almeida, R. V., Werkmeister Rozas, L. M., Cross-Denny, B., Lee, K. K., & Yamada, A.-M. (2019). Coloniality and intersectionality in social work education and practice. *Journal of Progressive Human Services, 30*(2), 148-164. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10428232.2019.1574195>
- Alvarez-Hernandez, L. R. (2021). Teaching note—Teaching intersectionality across the social work curriculum using the intersectionality analysis cluster. *Journal of Social Work Education, 57*(1), 181-188. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10437797.2020.1713944>
- Apgar, D. (2021). Developing the next generation of social work activists: Support for eliminating the micro-macro divide. *Journal of Community Practice, 29*(1), 62-78. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705422.2021.1881856>
- Asakura, K., & Bogo, M. (2021). Editorial: The use of simulation in advancing clinical social work education and practice. *Clinical Social Work Journal, 49*(2), 111-116. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10615-021-00810-2>
- Atteberry-Ash, B., Nicotera, N., & Gonzales, B. (2021). Walk the talk of power, privilege, and oppression: A template analysis. *Journal of Social Work Education, 57*(1), 7-15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10437797.2019.1661917>

- Baretti, M. A. (2011). Women, feminism, and social work journals 10 years later: 1998-2007. *Affilia: Journal of Women and Social Work*, 26(3), 264-277. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886109911417688>
- Beck, E. (2019). Naming white supremacy in the social work curriculum. *Affilia: Journal of Women & Social Work*, 34(3), 393-398. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886109919837918>
- Bhuyan, R., Bejan, R., & Jeyapal, D. (2017). Social workers' perspectives on social justice in social work education: When mainstreaming social justice masks structural inequalities. *Social Work Education*, 36(4), 373-390. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02615479.2017.1298741>
- Blitz, L. V., Greene, M. P., Bernabei, S., & Shah, V. P. (2014). Think creatively and act decisively: Creating an antiracist alliance of social workers. *Social Work*, 59(4), 347-350. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/swu031>
- Bogo, M., Lee, B., McKee, E., Ramjattan, R., & Baird, S. L. (2017). Bridging class and field: Field instructors' and liaisons' reactions to information about students' baseline performance derived from simulated interviews. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 53(4), 580-594. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10437797.2017.1283269>
- Brady, S., Sawyer, J. M., & Perkins, N. H. (2019). Debunking the myth of the 'radical profession': Analysing and overcoming our professional history to create new pathways and opportunities for social work. *Critical and Radical Social Work*, 7(3), 315-332. <https://doi.org/10.1332/204986019X15668424193408>
- Brill, C. K. (2001). Looking at the social work profession through the eye of the NASW Code of Ethics. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 11(2), 223-234. <https://doi.org/10.1177/104973150101100209>
- Chase, Y. E. (2015). Professional ethics: Complex issues for the social work profession. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 25(7), 766-773. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10911359.2015.1032654>
- Combs, C. B., & Perron, K. M. F. (2020). Developing the model of recovery from white conditioning. *Social Work with Groups*, 43(1/2), 119-125. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01609513.2019.1639986>
- Craig, S. L., Gardiner, T., Eaton, A. D., Pang, N., & Kourgiantakis, T. (2021). Practicing alliance: An experiential model of teaching diversity and inclusion for social work practice and education. *Social Work Education, Online*, 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02615479.2021.1892054>
- Crowell, J. H. (2017). Teaching note—Fostering political awareness in students through the use of genograms. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 53(4), 765-770. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10437797.2017.1283271>
- Crudup, C., Fike, C., & McLoone, C. (2021). De-Centering Whiteness through revisualizing theory in social work education, practice, and scholarship. *Advances in Social Work*, 21(2/3), 654-671. <https://doi.org/10.18060/24120>

- Dumbrill, G., & Green, J. (2008). Indigenous knowledge in the social work academy. *Social Work Education, 27*(5), 489-503. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02615470701379891>
- Dyson, Y. D., del Mar Fariña, M., Gurrola, M. A., & Cross-Denny, B. (2020). Reconciliation as a framework for supporting racial, ethnic, and cultural diversity in social work education. *Social Work & Christianity, 47*(1), 83-95. <https://doi.org/10.34043/swc.v47i1.137>
- Edwards, R., Shera, W., Nelson Reid, P., & York, R. (2006). Social work practice and education in the US and Canada. *Social Work Education, 25*(1), 28-38. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02615470500477821>
- Fields, L. N., & Cunningham-Williams, R. M. (2021). Experiences with imposter syndrome and authenticity at research-intensive schools of social work: A case study on Black female faculty. *Advances in Social Work, 21*(2/3), 354-373. <https://doi.org/10.18060/24124>
- Fortier, C., & Hon-Sing Wong, E. (2019). The settler colonialism of social work and the social work of settler colonialism. *Settler Colonial Studies, 9*(4), 437-456. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2018.1519962>
- Franco, D. (2021). Revisiting cultural diversity in social work education through Latino critical race theory testimonio. *Social Work Education, 40*(4), 522-534. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02615479.2020.1740191>
- Freeman, M. L. (1990). Beyond women's issues: Feminism and social work. *Affilia: Journal of Women and Social Work, 5*(2), 72-89. <https://doi.org/10.1177/088610999000500206>
- Frey, W., Mann, N., Boling, A., Jordan, P., Lowe, K., & Witte, S. (2021). Uprooting (our) Whiteness. *Advances in Social Work, 21*(2/3), 954-977. <https://doi.org/10.18060/24140>
- Friedman, L., Karim, M., Feiler, K., Padner, S., & Eyrich-Garg, K. (2020). Political social work: An essential component of the profession. *Journal of Health & Human Services Administration, 43*(4), 359-381. <https://doi.org/10.37808/jhhsa.43.4.3>
- Fulton, A. E., Dimitropoulos, G., Ayala, J., McLaughlin, A. M., Baynton, M., Blaug, C., Collins, T., Elliott, G., Judge-Stasiak, A., Letkemann, L., & Ragan, E. (2019). Role-playing: A strategy for practicum preparation for foundation year MSW Students. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work, 39*(2), 163-180. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08841233.2019.1576573>
- Gambrill, E. (2001). Social work: An authority-based profession. *Research on Social Work Practice, 11*(2), 166-175. <https://doi.org/10.1177/104973150101100203>
- Garran, A. M., Aymer, S., Gelman, C. R., & Miller, J. L. (2015). Team-teaching anti-oppression with diverse faculty: Challenges and opportunities. *Social Work Education, 34*(7), 799-814. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02615479.2015.1062086>

- Goode, R. W., Cowell, M., McMillan, D., Deinse, T. V., & Cooper-Lewter, C. (2021). Preparing social workers to confront social injustice and oppression: Evaluating the role of social work education. *Social Work, 66*(1), 39-48. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/swaa018>
- Gooding, A., & Mehrotra, G. R. (2021). Interrupting White supremacy in field education: Experiences of microaggressions in placement settings. *Advances in Social Work, 21*(2/3), 311-330. <https://doi.org/10.18060/24095>
- Gregory, J. R. (2020). The imperative and promise of neo-abolitionism in social work. *Journal of Social Work, 21*(5), 1203-1224. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468017320952049>
- Groessler, J. (2015). Teaching note—Conceptualization of a contemporary social work ethics course. *Journal of Social Work Education, 51*(4), 691-698. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10437797.2015.1076276>
- Haley, J. M. (2020). Intersectional and relational frameworks: Confronting anti-Blackness, settler colonialism, and neoliberalism in U.S. Social Work. *Journal of Progressive Human Services, 31*(3), 210-225. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10428232.2019.1703246>
- Healthy People 2030, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion. (n.d). *Social determinants of health*. <https://health.gov/healthypeople/objectives-and-data/social-determinants-health>
- Hudson, K. D., & Mountz, S. E. (2016). Teaching note—Third space caucusing: Borderland praxis in the social work classroom. *Journal of Social Work Education, 52*(3), 379-384. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10437797.2016.1174633>
- Hurley, D., & Taiwo, A. (2019). Critical social work and competency practice: A proposal to bridge theory and practice in the classroom. *Social Work Education, 38*(2), 198-211. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02615479.2018.1533544>
- Jeffery, D. (2005). ‘What good is anti-racist social work if you can’t master it’?: Exploring a paradox in anti-racist social work education. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 8*(4), 409-425. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13613320500324011>
- Jeyapal, D. (2017). The evolving politics of race and social work activism: A call across borders. *Social Work, 62*(1), 45-52. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/sww069>
- Johnson, N., Archibald, P., Estreet, A., & Morgan, A. (2021). The cost of being Black in social work practicum. *Advances in Social Work, 21*(2/3), 331-353. <https://doi.org/10.18060/24115>
- Katz, E., McPartland, S., & Rines, J. (2021). Exploring micro-skills as the underpinnings of effective social work practice. *Journal of Social Work Practice, 35*(2), 177-190. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02650533.2020.1737514>
- Ladhani, S., & Sitter, K. C. (2020). The revival of anti-racism. *Critical Social Work, 21*(1), 54-65. <https://doi.org/10.22329/csw.v21i1.6227>

- Lerner, J. E. (2021). Social work the 'white way': Helping white students self-reflect on a culture of whiteness in the classroom and beyond. *Social Work Education, Online*, 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02615479.2020.1868422>
- National Association of Social Workers [NASW]. (2021) undoing racism through social work: NASW report to the profession on racial justice priorities and action. <https://www.socialworkers.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=29AYH9qAdXc%3D&portalid=0#:~:text=We%20apologize%20for%20supporting%20policies,work%20profession%20and%20in%20society>
- Phillips, R., & Cree, V. (2014). What does the 'Fourth Wave' mean for teaching feminism in twenty-first century social work? *Social Work Education*, 33(7), 930-943. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02615479.2014.885007>
- Razack, N. (2001). Diversity and difference in the field education encounter: Racial minority students in the practicum. *Social Work Education*, 20(2), 219-232. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02615470120044310>
- Reamer, F. G. (1998). The evolution of social work ethics. *Social work*, 43(6), 488-500. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/43.6.488>
- Rogerson, C. V., Prescott, D. E., & Howard, H. G. (2021). Teaching social work students the influence of explicit and implicit bias: Promoting ethical reflection in practice. *Social Work Education, Online*, 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02615479.2021.1910652>
- Simon, J. D., Boyd, R., & Subica, A. M. (2021). Refocusing intersectionality in social work education: Creating a brave space to discuss oppression and privilege. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 58(1), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10437797.2021.1883492>
- Street, L. A. (2019). Field instructor perspectives on challenging behaviors in social work practicum. *Field Educator*, 9(1), 1-22.
- Tang Yan, C., Orlandimeje, R., Drucker, R., & Lang, A. J. (2021). Unsettling reflexivity and critical race pedagogy in social work education: Narratives from social work students. *Social Work Education, Online*, 1-24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02615479.2021.1924665>
- Wagaman, M. A., Odera, S. G., & Fraser, D. V. (2019). A pedagogical model for teaching racial justice in social work education. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 55(2), 351-362. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10437797.2018.1513878>
- Yee, J. Y. (2016). A paradox of social change: How the quest for liberation reproduces dominance in higher education and the field of social work. *Social Work Education*, 35(5), 495-505. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02615479.2016.1170113>
- Zuberi, T., & Bonilla-Silva, E. (2008). *White logic, White methods: Racism and methodology* (7th ed.). Lanham, Rowman, & Littlefield Publishers.

Author note: Address correspondence to Autumn Asher BlackDeer, Graduate School of Social Work, University of Denver. Email: a2blackdeer@gmail.com