Journal of Teaching and Learning

Initial Development of the Intersectionality Pedagogy Scale

Jenae D. Thompson et Walter L. Frazier

Volume 19, numéro 1, 2025

URI : https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1117475ar
DOI : https://doi.org/10.22329/jtl.v19i1.8904

Aller au sommaire du numéro

Éditeur(s)

University of Windsor

ISSN

1492-1154 (imprimé)
1911-8279 (numérique)

Découvrir la revue

Citer cet article

Thompson, J. & Frazier, W. (2025). Initial Development of the Intersectionality Pedagogy Scale. *Journal of Teaching and Learning*, *19*(1), 170–184. https://doi.org/10.22329/jtl.v19i1.8904

Résumé de l'article

In this study, an instrument was developed to measure an instructor's value and incorporation of intersectionality theory in the classroom. Through a Delphi study, a list of items was devised, and then a pilot study was conducted to collect responses from 161 participants. The result is the development of the Intersectionality Pedagogy Scale, a 23-item scale with a single factor that measures intersectionality pedagogy. The implications for this study will be discussed, along with recommendations for further research.

Journal of Teaching and Learning
Vol. 19, No. 1 (2025), pp. 170–184
https://doi.org/10.22329/jtl.v19i1.8904
www.jtl.uwindsor.ca

Initial Development of the Intersectionality Pedagogy Scale

Jenae D. Thompson
Walden University

Walter L. Frazier
Walden University

Abstract

In this study, an instrument was developed to measure an instructor's value and incorporation of intersectionality theory in the classroom. Through a Delphi study, a list of items was devised, and then a pilot study was conducted to collect responses from 161 participants. The result is the development of the Intersectionality Pedagogy Scale, a 23-item scale with a single factor that measures intersectionality pedagogy. The implications for this study will be discussed, along with recommendations for further research.

Introduction

Intersectionality, as a pedagogical tool, was first coined by Kimberle Crenshaw in the late 1980s, but as a theory was being discussed amongst multiple groups prior to this. The Combahee River Collective formed to clarify the place of women of colour and queer women in the politics of feminism, while also demanding a separate space to distinguish their struggles apart from White feminism and the experiences of Black men (Golpadas, 2013; Moraga & Anzaldua, 2015; Thompson, 2018). The members of the collective, including Audre Lorde, labeled the discriminatory experiences, and also called for changes that Black women wanted in The Black Feminist Manifesto. The manifesto is broken down into four key sections: genesis of contemporary Black feminism, what we believe, problems in organizing Black feminists, and Black feminist issues and projects (Moraga & Anzaldua, 2015; Thompson, 2018). The manifesto was the starting point for political, social, and cultural changes due to the acknowledgement of multiple interlocking and oppressive structures experienced by women of colour (Gumbs, 2014; Thompson, 2018). Kimberle Crenshaw, who first came up with this term, was a law professor,

who noticed a significant problem in the way that attorneys were applying case law to the experiences of Black women who were incarcerated (Crenshaw, 1989). Crenshaw found that the experiences of Black women were often categorized as either a racial experience or a gender experience, which often meant that their experiences as both were dismissed (Crenshaw, 1989).

Intersectionality theory helps to identify individuals' lived experiences in the context of their social locations throughout their lifetime. It was first used to identify the unique experiences of Black women, and it has evolved to identify the experiences of other minoritized individuals who deserve to have their experiences acknowledged. Emphasis must be placed on the fact that although intersectionality theory has evolved to shed light on how almost anyone can have intersecting marginalized identities at some point in their lifetime, it was created to identify those who have been routinely minoritized in the United States due to White supremacy, which includes Black cisgender women, queer, transgender, and individuals with disabilities. In this paper, we use minoritized or marginalized rather than terms like "minority" or "underrepresented" to show that these experiences were caused by oppressive structures wanting to maintain power differentials, not by the individual experiencing them.

What is intersectionality theory?

Intersectionality theory is the understanding that multiple marginalized identities cannot, and should not, be recognized in isolation from one another (Almeida et al., 2019; Chapman, 2011; Cheshire, 2013; Thompson, 2018; Thompson & Bridges, 2019). The theory allows those who utilize it in practice to emphasize that the personal is political, and this is why separating identity categories only appeases those who seek to further isolate, rather than capture the lived experiences of those who are minoritized (Cheshire, 2013; Lopez et al., 2017; Thompson, 2018). In contrast to Critical Race Theory, which focuses upon the structural racism intrinsic within legal and political institutions in the United States (Reed, Figueroa, & Carpenter, 2022), Intersectionality theory emphasizes the unique experiences of multiple marginalized identities that any one individual may experience at a given point during a lifetime. For example, a Black woman who is a lesbian has three intersecting marginalized identities due to her race, gender, and sexual orientation (Cheshire, 2013). Additionally, if this same person were to experience a car accident that changed her health in a way that rendered her disabled temporarily or long-term, then that is another marginalized identity she would have (Cheshire, 2013). Ability status is considered a marginalized identity as much as any other social location that experiences oppression, because the intentional care and equity in legal justice actions that should accompany an individual's lived experience, often does not. For example, McDonough et al. (2023) found that when measuring the significance of ability discrepancy among older adults who are diagnosed with Alzheimer's Disease (AD), the more marginalized identities an adult with AD had (i.e., non-white, elderly, limited education), the greater the ability discrepancy of those who have AD and those who do not.

History of intersectionality in the United States.

The due diligence of those in history regarding this topic will be noted, because researchers often discuss intersectionality without explaining the history of its development. This oversight will not be repeated here. Out of respect to those who paved the way, we present here the history of intersectionality in the United States. In this country, the Women's Rights Movement spans the timeframe from the late 19th century all the way to the present day. There

are four waves within the movement that contributed to the development of intersectionality theory over time. The first wave took place from the late 19th century until the first half of the 20th century. This wave saw the expansion of legal rights to property, voting, formulation of career identity, and educational rights for women in the United States (Bazin & Waters, 2017; Bunkle, 2016; Thompson, 2018). Many of these changes occurred during the World Wars as women were motivated to enter the workforce to financially support themselves and their families. During that same time, prominent White women leading the movement sought to expand women's rights, but excluded Black and Brown women from the movement (Few-Demo, 2014; Phillips & Cree, 2014; Thompson & Bridges, 2019).

The second wave took place from the early 1960s to the latter part of the 1980s, and during this time there was an expansion on issues related to women's health, including, but not limited to, reproductive health, domestic violence support, rape crisis centres, and employment support (Bazin & Waters, 2017; Bunkle, 2016; Thompson & Bridges, 2018). During this time, many women of colour and queer women began speaking out about the lack of inclusivity they were experiencing during the Women's Movement. The Combahee River Collective, a feminist group comprised and led by African American, Latinx, and Queer women, was formed during this wave, and created a call to action to ensure accountability in the inclusion of women of colour and queer women in the movement. Their objective was to distinguish their experiences from White women, who were often at the helm, with consideration of all Women's Rights initiatives (Cheshire, 2013; Goldenberg, 2007; Gumbs, 2014; Moraga & Anzaldua, 1983; Thompson, 2018). Prior to these initiatives, White women leading the activism in the women's rights movement often disregarded the experiences of women of colour and Queer women (Few-Demo, 2014). During this same wave, Kimberle Crenshaw, an attorney and professor of Law, coined the term *Intersectionality* to describe the experiences of incarcerated Black women, because their experiences were significantly different from other inmates, especially White men and White women. Crenshaw found that Black women were often forced to pick either their race or their gender, and not allowed to choose both when working with attorneys who wanted to respond to racial or gender-based discrimination independently (Crenshaw, 1989; Ramsay, 2014). The perpetuation of White supremacy due to a lack of regard, convenience, and outright inaction by those in leadership highlighted the need for the contribution of Black and Queer women to the women's rights movement. Crenshaw (1989) found that dismissing minoritized individuals' lived experiences in this way had significant repercussions that caused harm, and with a criminal justice lens, that harm was often deadly.

The third wave of feminism took place from 1990 through the early 2000s and included responses to the failures of the second wave including, but not limited to, discussions about gender, sexual orientation, and fluidity within those lived experiences (Mahoney, 2016; Thompson, 2018). This significant period highlighted a shift when individuals and groups within the many different minoritized communities began to reclaim previously derogatory terms or phrases (i.e., queer) as a means to feel and promote empowerment (Mahoney, 2016; Thompson, 2018). The fourth and current wave of the movement expounds on all of the previous eras while also adding technology, especially social media, to the discussion of rights and access to information (Phillips & Cree, 2014; Thompson, 2018).

Previous educational research encouraging this study

Current research provides limited, but very important findings that give support for researchers to continue exploring the impact of adopting an intersectionality theory lens with education and pedagogy. Collins and Bilge (2020) discussed six major tenets of intersectionality theory for education and research including social inequality, power, relationality, social context, complexity, and social justice. S*ocial inequality* can be defined as understanding and recognizing the multiple layers of complexity that create stratification and marginalization based on various categorical compartmentalization that society uses to define groups of people. *Power* is the relationship of variables to each other based on their intersections. For example, race, gender, and sexual orientation all relate to each other and can create constructs with varying power depending on the person experiencing them. A White, cisgender, heterosexual man has a lot more power than a Black, nonbinary, queer person. *Relationality* is the effort to build relationships across social categories (Collins & Bilge, 2020). The authors emphasize that intersectionality is not a condition that someone experiences; instead, intersectionality highlights that marginalization and oppression is an overt act of persons in power imposed upon those without power. Relational thinking or reflexivity (Cunliffe, 2004) rejects dichotomous or binary thought processing and practices in education and research that fail to adequately account for the multiple marginalized identities some people experience. *Social context* provides insight about the lived experiences of marginalized individuals. For example, application of intersectionality in education affords Black women who may be victims of misogynoir, or the deeply ingrained contempt for Black women, the space to share those experiences across settings, age ranges, interpersonal and/or professional relationships. *Complexity* is the recognition of nuance in understanding lived experiences, especially in education focused on creating change. Policy and procedures around education, community organizing, and research developed from the standpoint of intersectionality honor the voices of those multiple marginalized experiences (Collins & Bilge, 2020). *Social justice* is an analytic tool used most commonly in policy, activism, and research to ensure the common experiences of the majority are legally and socially sanctioned experiences for the marginalized, also. Rather than equality, the goal is to push for equity, justice, and liberation through the intersectional framework for individuals who have multiple marginalized social identities.

In 2018, Chan et al. (2018) found that the research directly discussing intersectionality theory was incredibly complex because of the potential for privilege and oppression experienced across multiple social identities for a single person. They presented the challenge, yet the need, for faculty members in educational settings to engage students in productive dialogues about privilege and oppression, and they encouraged future researchers to incorporate the tenets founded by Collins and Bilge (2020) and to highlight the intricacies of discussing multiple marginalized identities in the context of privilege and oppression (Chan et al., 2018). With this in mind, this study sought to find ways to measure the application of intersectionality theory in educational and research contexts.

Almeida et al. (2019) discussed how intersectionality moved social work pedagogy from the trenches to decoloniality. The authors discussed how intersectionality can directly affect structural and transformational change, by unlinking it from its white supremacist roots. The same argument is made to focus on the issues affecting individuals being oppressed, rather than

the oppressors for meaningful change. For example, calling crime *Black on Black* can ignore the fact that there is overfunding for police, police brutality when there is contact, and underfunding of community resources that can meaningfully provide supports to marginalized communities (Almeida et al., 2019).

Additionally, intersectionality pedagogy is applicable to K-12 settings and higher educational settings. Educators may need to utilize intersectionality theory in practice to better understand and accommodate the varying and unique experiences of students at all levels. For example, Wright and Chan (2022) stated that power is a significant factor in applying the responsibility of intersectionality theory in each experience and situation. Working within the school system, especially during the COVID-19 pandemic, required that school counselors exercise a higher level of awareness of the social determinants of health affecting a student's wellbeing. The authors argued for the inclusion of the K-12 experiences in intersectionality pedagogy. By doing so, educators directly addressed a need that is still relevant, and will have lasting effects on the health of many students beyond the current understanding of the disease.

Purpose

In our previous research, conducted in 2019 (Thompson & Bridges, 2019), we interviewed six education counselors and supervision faculty members to better understand their personal and professional experiences with intersectionality theory, and how they used it as a pedagogical tool. We found that a small number of counselor educators are using the theory appropriately in their professional experiences with students, but our findings left more questions for us to investigate. Intersectionality theory comes from the identification of Black Women's experiences, and has been expanded in today's context to identify the intersecting identities that people experience. This study seeks to identify how educators incorporate and value intersecting identities in the classroom. We hypothesize that intersectionality pedagogy is a measurable construct and there is a way to measure it in a survey instrument. This study is about the psychometrics around a survey instrument measuring the variable that we call intersectionality pedagogy. The application of the theory is to measure cultural experiences in the classroom, from the educators' point of view, particularly the interaction between people and how they recognize and identify their own identities, and incorporate those identities into the classroom experience. Therefore, the development of a self-rated scale to measure intersectionality pedagogy gives instructors a tool to self-evaluate and learn, in order to broaden their utilization of cross-cultural exposure and experiences in the classroom.

Researchers' positionalities/social locations

To show transparency and engage in ethical social justice research, we describe our social locations while developing this instrument. intersectionality theory was employed throughout the development of this instrument as we sought to understand how our lived experiences informed our engagement with this topic, both personally and professionally. We acknowledge some of our experiences shared in this article change, as some identity categories are contextual, and others are fixed. We acknowledge that our experiences were informed by the systems of power, privilege, and oppression in which we operated. We also acknowledge that reflexive knowledge,

our thought processes, and goals were shaped by our social locations and that these experiences can and will hopefully evolve with continued advancement of similar research in the educational field.

Dr. Thompson is currently a Core Faculty member in the Counseling Department at Walden University. She is a Black, Queer, cisgender woman from the Southern United States. She comes from a lower middle-class family and grew up in the suburbs of Richmond, Virginia. She went to a diverse high school, but most of her higher-educational experiences were at predominantly white institutions. She is active in her local midwestern community organizations that advocate for abolition and transformative justice. In the academic setting, she is very passionate about researching and using non-traditional (i.e., not westernized) approaches in her pedagogical, clinical, and supervision practices. She is also passionate about understanding how to incorporate the best practices for quality clinical care, teaching, and supervision when using these approaches. She strives to impart meaningful knowledge and wisdom that involves decentering whiteness in praxis.

Dr. Frazier is currently an Associate Dean and faculty member in the School of Counseling at Walden University. He is white, heterosexual, male from the south. He grew up in the southern region of the state of Mississippi, where his school was made up of a majority of students of colour, but his privileged status was maintained by the social structure and school leadership of the day. Upon completion of a bachelor's degree, he pursued a Master of Divinity and became an Ordained Deacon in the United Methodist Church. Since then, he completed educational requirements for license as a counselor, and then earned his PhD in Counselor Education. In recent years, he has served as an ethics trainer for both ministry and counseling professionals. In both areas, he has focused on methods of incorporating intersectionality as part of the training for ministry education and counselor education, particularly in the areas of ethical practice.

Methodology

The process began by reviewing definitions of intersectionality and identifying phrases that reflected instructors' beliefs and practices around intersectionality, intentionally creating statements that were both supportive and contradictory to incorporating intersectionality in the classroom experience. The key items that are contradictory were reversed, which allows for a broader representation of perspectives about intersectionality. Initially, 76 items were identified, and then edited to emphasize singular, clear statements, while eliminating redundant ideas.

Delphi study

A Delphi study was conducted to select and evaluate the items that were included in the instrument. This is a method of seeking consensus among a panel of experts on a particular topic (Strear et al., 2018). In this case, the panelists reviewed the proposed items, and made recommendations for inclusion or exclusion of those things that fit the intended measurement tool. Four colleagues were contacted, who had backgrounds in multicultural education and pedagogy, as well as familiarity with the methodology of instrument design. These experts were tasked with reviewing each item, and rating each for both content and structure, based upon a

scale of poor, good, or excellent (0, 1, and 2, respectively), as a statement of intersectionality pedagogy. They were also asked to provide editorial suggestions. For each item, the two averages of the four raters were combined, and then sorted by the computed scores from highest to lowest. Based upon the editorial recommendations and ratings of the expert team, the item pool was reduced to 60, and edited where needed. In some cases, the items were split to further simplify the stated idea. The list of items was then returned to each of the reviewers, again asking them to rate each item as poor, good, or excellent in both content and structure. After computing the items in the same fashion as before, 28 items were finally identified (DeVellis, 2017; Vernon, W. 2009).

These items include statements such as, "I believe everyone has intersectional identities," and "I use structured group activities to help my students reflect upon their own experiences and reactions." Item responses included four options in a Likert-type scale for level of agreement, ranging from 1 equaling "strongly disagree," to 4 equaling "strongly agree." Fourteen of the items were written to be reverse-keyed, so that the higher values are paired with the level of disagreement. Examples of these items include, "I do not teach about White fragility in the classroom," and "I teach multiculturalism to reflect whole group experiences (i.e., Black, Asian, LGBT, Disabled)."

Institutional research ethics approval was obtained to collect data, beginning by sending the survey to a small group of educators (N = 22), to get further confirmation that the selected items appeared to be a good fit. This initial group included colleagues from the authors' counselor education degree programs and personal friends who serve as educators. These first participants responded to invitations that were sent over Facebook Messenger. All but three self-identified as university instructors. The others indicated that they were clinical supervisors or workshop presenters. Seventeen participants identified as female. When asked to select a racial identity, 14 selected White, three Black or African-American, three Asian, and two multiple races. All the participants indicated they had earned a graduate degree, for education level, and that their field was counselor education. When asked about their regional location, the participants were evenly spread across the United States, with one participant living outside of the country.

In an online platform, the participants anonymously completed the survey, and then provided responses to open-ended questions about their experiences, along with suggestions for any changes. Several participants pointed out that they thought that the items clearly reflected intersectionality practices, or that their experiences provoked reflection about the level to which they incorporate intersectionality in their classrooms. Three participants stated that some of the items were difficult to understand, or were tricky, mentioning that they had to read the items closely. As a result, these concerns were addressed by identifying some of the items that were compound statements, using the word "and." Thus, two items were split into four different, more simplified statements, resulting in a total of 30 items, with 15 that were reverse-keyed.

Recruitment of a developmental sample

With this 30-item instrument, a developmental sample was administered (DeVellis, 2017) in the same fashion as the first one. Participants were sought through numerous outlets, representing educators at all levels. The invitation was publicized on social media. Where there was access, advertisements were put on listservs, which were for counselor and counselor educators, as well as some in research pools for two large universities which recruits educators

from across disciplines, and at any educational level. Finally, attendees at several national education-related conferences received invitations. After a year of soliciting participants, 165 completed surveys were accumulated. While more participants would have been preferred, this number falls within the recommended sample size of 5 to 10 participants per item in the instrument (Tinsley & Tinsley, 1987).

Demographic characteristics of the sample

Open-ended demographic items were included to collect gender, sexual identity, race/ethnicity, and age characteristics of the participants. Most participants in the survey (n = 75) reported their ages by selecting a category of a 10-year range. The spread of ages was fairly even across the ranges (See Table 1.). Most of the participants (83%) identified as female or female cisgendered. Another 15% identified as male or male cisgendered. The remaining 2% provided no response, or indicated that they identified as non-binary. Nearly two-thirds of the participants indicated they identified as heterosexual (62%), while another 6% indicated bisexual, 3% lesbian, 2% pansexual, and 4% queer. About a quarter of the participants either indicated a preference to provide no answer, or provided a response that did not reflect sexual orientation. An open-ended item was included that asked participants to indicate their race or ethnicity, and 61% identified as White or Caucasian, another 27% identifying as Black or African-American, 3% multi-racial, 2% Latin or Hispanic, and the remaining 7% indicated a desire to refrain from responding.

Table 1: Age ranges of participants.

Age Range	Percentage
21-29	3.2%
30-39	20.5%
40-49	19.1%
50-59	19.5%
60 and over	12.7%

Other characteristics of the development sample

Educational level, instructional setting, and geographic region of the country was also asked of the survey participants. Almost all the participants reported holding a graduate degree (95%), while another 3% reported having a bachelor's degree. Half of the participants indicated they teach in two or more settings, and the frequencies in Table 2 include all the locations the participants indicated where they teach. Two-thirds of the sample reported teaching at the

university level, while 39% and 17% reported teaching at conferences, and provide continuing education courses, respectively. Nearly one-quarter of the participants specified that they teach in pre-school or K-12 settings. Finally, the participants reported residencies across the United States with the largest group in the Southeast (47%) (See Table 3.). The next largest group was from the Mid-West (39%).

Table 2: Instructional settings of participants.

Instructional Setting	**Frequency**
University Instructor	108
Continuing Education Provider	29
Clinical Supervisor	55
Conference/Workshop Provider	65
K-12 Instructor	34
Pre-School Instructor	5

Table 3: Geographic region of participants.

Geographic Region	**Frequency**
Southeastern U.S.	78
Northeastern U.S.	26
Western U.S.	15
Mid-western U.S.	39
Outside the U.S.	6
No Response	2

Exploratory factor analysis

An initial exploratory factor analysis of the 30 items of the intersectionality pedagogy Survey was conducted using the principal-components-factor method and promax oblique rotation. This method was chosen because it is not reliant on multivariate normal data, and it allows any factors to correlate, since many of intersectionality pedagogy items would likely be correlated (Costello & Osbome, 2005).

Results

The 30 items were evaluated to determine suitability for factor analysis. The correlations of the items to one another were reviewed to establish that each of them measured something different, and while many of the items were moderately correlated, as expected, no items were found to have a very strong correlation. This finding coincided with the result of the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy, which was .883, and the Bartlett's test, which calculated to be significant $p < .0001$ (Tinsley & Tinsley, 1987). Thus, the 30 survey items were appropriate for factor analysis.

Next, the normality characteristics of the items was reviewed. The range of responses for all but three of them was 1 to 4, with the remaining three ranging from 2 to 4. Mean scores ranged from 2.01 to 3.57. To evaluate the impact of skewness and kurtosis of each of the survey items, particularly given the smaller sample size, the skewness and kurtosis statistics were computed and then the z-values calculated at the .05 level (Hair et al., 2010). This showed that only seven of the items had normal distributions, while the other 23 items demonstrated statistically significant skewness or kurtosis, most often both non-normal characteristics. Rather than attempting to transform variables to create normal distributions, principal axis factoring was used, because it is not dependent upon the items representing normal distributions (Costello & Osbome, 2005).

The results of the factor analysis reflected that the seven factors computed eigenvalues greater than 1.00, but the scree plot showed a distinct elbow at the second factor. This characteristic was interpreted to be that there should be only one factor for this instrument. This was verified by conducting a two-factor analysis, which demonstrated that only two items loaded on the second factor, both at less than .50. A one-factor analysis was then conducted, and this model explained 30.4% of the variance. Additionally, the model reflected 23 items with values greater than .35. It was concluded that these items should be included in the final version of a single-factor instrument. The following table reflects the final instrument with means and loading values for each item. Those in the table that begin with "R" are reverse-keyed.

Table 4: Intersectionality pedagogy scale item.

Item	**Factor Loading**	**Mean**
R I think White fragility does not exist.	0.49	3.37
I understand that many social identities are contextual, and can change over time.	0.37	3.39
R Instructors should not discuss social inequalities that they experience, or those that their students may experience, because this is not a way to improve critical-thinking skills.	0.57	3.49

Being a good professional means reflecting on your social identities over time, not just in the present moment.	0.55	3.57
R I prefer to know nothing about my students' social identities.	0.68	3.56
R Instructors should not share experiences related to their privileged and oppressed identities.	0.70	3.34
I routinely use intersectionality theory in my instructional practices to ensure accountability.	0.61	2.89
R Instructors should refrain from accounting for students' different social statuses.	0.59	3.05
I understand that many social identities can change over time.	0.44	3.40
Students should be approached as if everyone in the classroom, including the instructor, comes from different social statuses and identities.	0.63	3.30
I allow students to incorporate personal experiences as examples in their assignments.	0.65	3.46
R I teach multiculturalism to reflect whole group experiences (i.e., Black, Asian, LGBT, Disabled).	0.42	3.20
Academic leaders have an ethical responsibility to ensure that students understand how to engage in intersectional dialogues with their future clients.	0.64	3.53
Instructors should share their privileged and oppressed identities as a means of understanding how each person moves through the world.	0.57	3.01
R I encourage students to refrain from describing their backgrounds or personal experiences in the classroom.	0.60	3.31
An instructor needs to create experiences with students, integrating their voices into the educational experience itself.	0.71	3.60
R I think that labels for different forms of oppression or oppressive experiences are unnecessary.	0.69	3.04
Instructors should ask that their students share their privileged and oppressed identities as a means of understanding how each person moves through the world.	0.42	2.79
Instructors are responsible for evolving in their understanding of multiculturalism as research is expanded and updated.	0.73	3.69
R I do not teach about White fragility in the classroom.	0.53	2.47
I use structured group activities to help my students reflect upon their own experiences and reactions.	0.57	3.20
As an instructor, learning about the interactions of my social identities and the social identities of my students has helped me promote collaborative experiential learning in the classroom.	0.67	3.42
I believe everyone has intersectional identities.	0.64	3.52

Recommendations for Further Research

Recommendations for Use of this instrument

The Intersectionality Pedagogy Scale is a 23-item measure that can be used to solicit participants' level of agreement on several statements that represent the incorporation of intersectionality theory in the classroom. Items reflect the extent to which the instructor values the intersectional experiences of class members, recognizes the instructor's own privilege and oppression experiences as impactful in the classroom environment, and incorporates intersectionality in the classroom discussions and activities to enhance class members' exposure and awareness of others' experiences. The scale was developed utilizing a Delphi study approach including experts in pedagogy and multicultural education to assure the validity of the items selected. After conducting a factor analysis, it was determined that the 23-item scale is a single factor.

The next step in the development of the Intersectionality Pedagogy Scale was to identify additional validity characteristics. For instance, researchers could compare the scores of the Intersectionality Pedagogy Scale to other instruments that measure similar constructs, such as multicultural competence, in order to identify concurrent validity. Additionally, further analysis of the scale could help with categorization of higher and lower scores, particularly identifying cutoffs that discriminate between high and low presence of intersectionality pedagogy in an instructor's approach to classroom management. Discerning between lower and higher scores of intersectionality pedagogy may help instructors who are seeking to gain a better understanding or enhancement of their own pedagogy and instructional practices.

The utility of this scale could be further developed with the adaptation of an observer-rated scale. The current version of the Intersectionality Pedagogy Scale is self-rated by the instructor. The intent was to develop a scale that would help identify where instructors exhibit strengths and weaknesses in their incorporation of intersectionality in their teaching activities. The development of an observer-rated version of the scale can be used by managers, instructors, and supervisors to evaluate the performance of instructors.

Limitations and future directions

A limitation of the current study is the self-reporting structure of the assessment. Although this is a useful tool for gauging understanding for insight related to intersectionality, it is not an adequate assessment tool for evaluation of performance. More research with the current survey instrument is needed to better understand its limits and strengths in an evaluative capacity. Further research is recommended which implements the intersectionality pedagogy Scale in practice educationally and clinically for evaluative performance. Observing students and supervisees, while using this tool to evaluate their performances, will make the survey stronger, and hopefully, more applicable over time.

As social circumstances change in the world, so too do the experiences and circumstances of the classroom, as well as the people who teach and learn in them. For instance, during the time of this data collection, social and political responses to the worldwide pandemic included dramatic shifts in the delivery of education. Traditional educational environments were quickly adapted for hybrid and virtual delivery. At the same time, whole new forms of marginalization were compounded by vulnerability to COVID-19, such as access to vaccinations and adequate treatments for the complications of the virus, geographic and socio-political location, as well as pre-existing health conditions. With ongoing changes, the Intersectionality Pedagogy Scale may need to be reviewed and updated for to reflect the changes in society and the classroom of the future.

Conclusion

We have developed a self-rated, 23-item instrument that measures an instructor's values and practices using intersectionality in the classroom. The applicability of this study is still in its infancy, but our goal is to increase awareness, education, and practice of intersectionality pedagogy in all educational preparation programming. This study is a step in accomplishing that goal, because it helps to quantify the level of intersectionality that instructors use in the classroom. More importantly, this instrument creates opportunities for enhancing teacher preparation. Intersectionality theory is an underpinning pedagogy, regardless of the environment. Primary, secondary, and higher-educational settings are all important for teaching and utilizing this pedagogy. We expect that intersectionality pedagogy to be a foundation of instructors' engagements in the classroom. We hope that instructors utilize this scale can be used to self-assess instructors, and can be implemented in teacher-preparation programs to introduce, reinforce, and evaluate intersectionality pedagogy in numerous environments.

References

Almeida, R., Wermeister Rozas, L. M., Cross-Denny B., Lee, K., & Yamada A. (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

Bazin, V., & Waters, M. (2017). Mediated and mediating feminisms: Periodical culture from suffrage to the second wave. *Women: A cultural Review, 27*(4), 347-358. https://doi.org/10.1080/09574042.2017.1301125

Bunkle, P. (2016). The 1944 Education Act and second wave feminism. *Women's History Review*, 25(5), 791-811. https://doi.org/10.1080/09612025.2015.1132877

Chan, C. D., Cor, D. N., & Band, M. P. (2018). Privilege and oppression in counselor education: An intersectionality framework. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 46, 58-73. https://doi.org/10.1002/jmcd.12092

Chapman, C. (2011). Resonance, intersectionality, and reflexivity in critical pedagogy (and research methodology). *Social Work Education*, *30*(7), 723–744. https://doi.org/10.1080/02615479.2010.520120

Cheshire, L. C. (2013). Reconsidering sexual identities: Intersectionality theory and the implications for educating counsellors. *Canadian Journal of Counselling and Psychotherapy, 47*(1), 4-13. http://cjc-rcc.ucalgary.ca/cjc/index.php/rcc/article/view/2659

Collins, P. H., & Bilge, S. (2020). *Intersectionality* (2nd ed.). Polity Press.

Costello, A. B. & Osborne, J. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation*, 10(7). https://doi.org/10.7275/jyj1-4868

Crenshaw, K. (1989). *Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics*. University of Chicago Legal Forum, 1989(1), 139-167.

Cunliffe, A. L. (2004). On Becoming a Critically Reflexive Practitioner. *Journal of Management Education, 28*(4), 407–426. https://doi.org/10.1177/1052562904264440

DeVellis, R. F. (2017). *Scale Development: Theory and Applications. (4th ed.).* Sage.

Few-Demo, A. L. (2014). Intersectionality as the 'new' critical approach in feminist family studies: Evolving racial/ethnic feminisms and critical race theories. *Journal of Family Theory & Review, 6*, 169-183. https://doi.org/10.1111/jftr.12039

Goldenberg, M. J. (2007). The problem of exclusion in feminist theory and politics: A metaphysical investigation into constructing a category of 'woman'. *Journal of Gender Studies, 16*(2), 139-153. https://doi.org/10.1080/09589230701324603

Gopaldas, A. (2013). Intersectionality 101. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, *32*(1) 90-94. https://doi.org/10.1509/jppm.12.044

Gumbs, A. P. (2014). Prophecy in the present tense: Harriet Tubman, the Combahee pilgrimage, and dreams coming true. *Meridians: Feminism, Race, Transnationalism*, *12*(2), 142. https://doi.org/10.2979/meridians.12.2.1

Hair, F. H., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate Analysis* (7th Ed.). Harlow: Pearson.

López, N., Erwin, C., Binder, M., & Javier Chavez, M. (2017). Making the invisible visible: advancing quantitative methods in higher education using critical race theory and intersectionality, *Race Ethnicity and Education, 21*(2), 180-207, https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2017.1375185

Mahoney, K. (2016). Historicising the 'Third Wave': narratives of contemporary feminism. *Women's History Review,* (6), 1006. https://doi.org/10.117/0011000099273008

McDonough, I. M., Cody, S. L., Harrell, E. R., Garrett, S. L., & Popp, T. E. (2023). Cognitive differences across ethnoracial category, socioeconomic status across the Alzheimer's disease spectrum: Can an ability discrepancy score level the playing field? *Memory & Cognition, Suppl. Special Issue: Exploration of Human Cognitive Universals and Human Cognitive Diversity, 51*(3), 543-560. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13421-022-01304-3

Moraga, C., & Anzaldua, G. (Eds.). (2015). *This bridge called my back: Writings by radical women of color.* (4th Ed.). SUNY Press.

Phillips, R., & Cree, V. E. (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

Ramsay, N. (2014). Intersectionality: A model for addressing the complexity of oppression and privilege. Pastoral Psychology, 63(4), 453- 469. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11089-013-0570-4

Reed, E., Figueroa, E. & Carpenter, M. (2022). What Critical Race Theory is, what it isn't, and why it is important, you should know: A call to action. *Research Issues in Contempory Education, 7*(2), 112-127.

Thompson, J. (2018). *Exploring the multicultural pedagogy of CES faculty through an intersectional lens*. (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (Order No. 10828742).

Thompson, J, & Bridges, C. W. (2019). Intersectionality pedagogy in the multicultural classroom: Experiences of Counselor Educators. *Teaching and Supervision in Counseling, 1*(2), 98-112. https://doi.org/10.7290/tsc010207

Strear, Forbes, & Henninger (2018). Procedures, pitfalls, and product: Delphi methodology in counseling research. *Counseling Outcome Research and Evaluation, 9*(1), 55-66. https://doi.org/10.1080/21501378.2017.1403847.

Tinsley, E. A. & Tinsley, D. J. (1987). Uses of factor analysis in counseling psychology research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 34*(4), 414-424. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.34.4.414

Vernon, W. (2009). The Delphi technique: A review. *International Journal of Therapy and Rehabilitation, 16*(2), 69-76. https://doi.org/10.12968/ijtr.2009.16.2.38892

Wright, G. G., & Chan, C. D. (2022). Applications of intersectionality theory to enhance career development interventions in response to COVID-19. *Professional School Counseling*, 26(1b). https://doi.org/10.1177/2156759X221106807