Culturally Relevant Pedagogy in Multicultural Teacher Education:

A Paradoxical Objective

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BY

Chelda Smith

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Bic Ngo, PhD

Timothy Lensmire, PhD

June 2014

Acknowledgments

I would not have been able to finish my dissertation without the cooperation of Southeastern University, the guidance of my committee, help from friends and colleagues, and support from my village. Dr. Hernandez, you took in a stranger and allowed me to turn a proposal into a study. Such risks are indicative of your commitment to critical and just work. Thank you.

My sincere gratitude to Dr. Michelle Wittcoff Kuhl, to whom I remain profoundly indebted. While our acquaintance has been short, you have certainly made your mark. Also to my Mommas: Dionne Inman for stepping in as necessary; Janet Prime for praying steadfastly; and Ruth Okediji for your unyielding support. Thank you.

To my UMN crew: Brian Lozenski, Michelle Benegas, Senenge Andzenge, Tracey Pyscher, J. B. Mayo, Maggie Struck, Aditi Arur, Shannon McManimon, Martha Bigelow, Johanna Ennser-Kananen, Vicki Griffin, and Jessie Eastman. You made me feel welcomed, you helped me stay, and you kept Peik hallways safe. Your warm smile, sincere words, and engaging debates enhanced my days. Also, Marcuetta Williams, Kristina Alviz, and Evetta Inman. You helped me find balance in an otherwise intense situation. Lastly, Emily Thomsen—what an unexpected blessing you were. Thank you for your allegiance, reliability, and hard work. I cannot wait to see you soar!

Many thanks to my village—Maylissa Mondesir, Joanna Lowry, and Tashiba Nelson—because you allowed me to be weak with you, I could be strong with others. Furthermore, because you sometimes read my work before submission, it was not *always* rejected. Also, thank you to Aaron, Darren, Elfreda, and Peter Amado. Every holiday

season, you took me in and replenished me. You gave me space to work, but also room to play. It was always obvious that you "get it" and for that, I am grateful. To Erik Moore and Georgia Scott— in ways that only you and I truly understand, you were with me. You saw fit to make me a doctor and did your part accordingly. Thank you. My deepest love and appreciation to my father, my late mother, and my son. We did it!

Finally, I am thankful that each of my committee members was dedicated to transforming me into a scholar. Dr. Misty Sato, thank you for remaining invested, even as you challenged my ideas. Dr. Bhaskar Upadhyay, thank you for displaying curiosity and offering remarks that helped improved my work. Dr. Cynthia Lewis, thank you for teaching me the analytical skills to complete this dissertation and guiding me to see it through. Dr. Tim Lensmire, thank you for knowing the heights of my potential and trusting me to exceed them. In many ways, you sustained me. Special thanks to my primary adviser, Dr. Bic Ngo. Throughout this process, you have maintained a standard that, once met, makes the struggle worthwhile. Your culturally relevant pedagogy set the tone for this study and for what is possible in postsecondary education.

Dedication

To my Papa, Behrmann Smith. You had the wisdom to keep me as your little girl, forever. In that space, I find a strength that is unmatched, a vision to be realized, and love that cannot be replicated. Je t'aime.

To my departed mother, Amenada Chouloute. While my knowledge of you is limited, my adoration is boundless. I live to make you proud. Thank you for the spirit of bravery that walks with me daily.

Finally, to my son, Elijah Truth Moore. I am—because you are. Your sacrifices have made this all possible, and I will spend the rest of my life making it up to you. May this work and others like it positively impact the teachers who will educate you and your friends. And, if their pedagogy is not culturally relevant, may you find the voice to make it so.

Abstract

Widespread under-representation of teacher candidates of color in schools, set against the backdrop of a rapidly increasingly diverse student body, has resulted in a national effort to diversify the teaching force. Additionally, national accrediting agencies have charged teacher education programs (TEPs) with the responsibility of preparing all teachers to meet the needs of all students. However, much of the research on multicultural teacher education focuses on White pre-service teachers and their assumed cultural incompetency. One popular approach to addressing the cultural disparities in classrooms is developing teachers as culturally relevant pedagogues who are able to develop and maintain cultural competency, critical consciousness, and academic proficiency with traditionally marginalized populations. Empirical research explicating the preparedness of faculty to do such work is lacking. Moreover, the experiences of pre-service teacher candidates of color (TCCs) are under-explored.

This study seeks to explore how one teacher education program worked to develop culturally relevant TCCs. It explicates how TCCs enacted resistance to specific pedagogy, curriculums and content, but also the ways they negotiated engagement in multicultural education courses. Additionally, the study illuminates effective pedagogies employed by a teacher educator to facilitate transformations of consciousness that led to empowerment. Broadly, this project responds to gaps in education research regarding the academic and sociocultural experiences of TCCs and the salience of culturally relevant pedagogy in higher education.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Preparing teacher candidates for effective teaching in diverse schools is a contentious issue in education research and policy. Darling-Hammond, Holtzman, Gatlin, and Heilig's (2005) study of teacher impact on student achievement determined a correlation between the preparation quality of teacher candidates and their future students' performance. Criticisms of traditional teacher education programs focus on a discontinuity regarding best pedagogical practices, addressing diverse learners, and essential content (e.g., Lasley, Bainbridge, & Berry, 2003). Alternative licensure programs like Teach for America (TFA) or New York City Teaching Fellows (NYCTF) exist as competitors to produce effective teachers.

As a NYCTF alumna, I can recall feelings of under-preparedness as I began my teaching career. In many ways, the first two years resembled student teaching practicums. I had a pedagogical mentor who observed my lessons bi-weekly and a state-appointed mentor who acculturated me to the world of public elementary school teachers. At the end of two years, I earned district recognition for excellent teaching and felt prepared to teach any group of students. During my NYCTF tenure, I earned a master's degree in elementary education, thereby ensuring preparedness.

When I transitioned to Atlanta, Georgia, and began teaching at a school with similar demographics (e.g., Title I, urban, majority Black population), I expected comparable success. To my dismay, the cultural differences between my students and me (e.g., regional dialect, socioeconomic class, geographic position) mediated my pedagogy at an alarming rate. It was then that I realized my effectiveness with students in Brooklyn had less to do with formal preparation and mentoring and more to do with my embodied

cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1977). I grew up in Brooklyn and attended school in the same district where I taught. While teaching, I lived in the community and regularly interacted with my students and their families outside of school. I did not see the students as separate from me, or as what Delpit terms "other people's children" (1988). I was an insider who understood that teaching effectively was an investment in my best interest.

As I faced challenges in the classroom, my students in Atlanta suffered culturally and academically. I grew resentful upon considering my traditional (M.Ed.) and alternative licensure preparation(NYCTF), coupled with two years' experience. Then I looked around: I was a Black teacher teaching mostly Black students, with mostly Black colleagues teaching more Black students— and we were *all* failing. The students and their families were disengaged. They were not achieving academically and—even worse—no one was happy or safe. I queried: Why were my colleagues and I ill-prepared to teach children with whom we shared racial identification, despite all of us having undergone teacher education?

The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)— now the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP)—has declared multicultural education as a critical component of teacher preparation. Their impetus to do so is under-girded by achievement disparities between youth of color and their White counterparts, self-reported in-service under-preparedness (Eldridge & Gollnick, 2013), and the demographic imperative (Grant & Gibson, 2011). The demographic imperative references mismatches between teacher and student ethno-racial backgrounds, where teachers are mostly White but students are increasingly ethnoracially diverse. However, as teacher education programs (TEPs) respond to the challenge of developing quality teachers who can educate all students, they must consider *multiple* diversities: linguistic,

ethno-racial, geographic, religious, sexual, and socioeconomic. As we consider our increasingly diverse student population, so too must we deliberately consider teacher candidates and cultural capital that mediate their pedagogy.

The CAEP (2013) standards approach diversity differently than did NCATE (2008). In addition to emphasizing the development of cultural competency, CAEP stresses recruiting diverse teacher candidates. Standard 3 reads:

> The provider [TEP] presents plans and goals to recruit and support completion of high-quality candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations to accomplish their mission. The admitted pool of candidates reflects the diversity of America's P-12 students. The provider demonstrates efforts to know and address community, state, national, regional, or local needs for hard-to-staff schools and shortage fields, currently, STEM, English-language learning, and students with disabilities. (CAEP, 2013)

CAEP's appeal for candidates from "diverse populations . . . reflecting the diversity of America's P-12 students" implies cultural proficiencies on the part of the recruited. As TEPs respond to the petition for more diverse candidates, it is plausible that candidates of color may experience essentialism and have minimal cultural competency. For instance, Sheets (2001) argued, "Teachers of color should not be used as cultural carriers or perceived as experts in instructional strategies or curricular content for diverse students while at a novice stage" (p. 28). As my personal narrative demonstrated above, while cultural capital is valuable, it is neither a pedagogical substitute nor universally transferable. It is imperative that CAEP's "high-quality" standard is upheld to ensure that TEPs are critically diversified. Consistently, preparing teachers for diverse populations is framed as a need reserved for White teachers, as though race is the only mediating factor

in equitable pedagogy. Comprehensive development of *all* pre-service teachers is essential for addressing the achievement of *all* learners. The crux of this issue brought me to my dissertation study.

Statement of the Problem

National efforts to increase teacher diversity position teachers of color as the panacea to the achievement gap. According to Schmitz, Nourse, and Ross (2012), "despite the best intentions, White teachers do not have the experiences needed to understand their students' backgrounds" (p. 59). Inherent in this claim is an assumption that teachers of color instinctively have competencies needed to teach diverse learners. Such an oversimplification of identity properties negates the intersectionality of varying social locations. A White teacher from a working class background may relate better to Latino students from a similar economic class than a Latino teacher from an upper-class background.

Nonetheless, research on the experiences, dispositions, and development of TCCs is scarce (Kohli, 2009; Sheets, 2001). TEPs focus on White pre-service teachers because of assumed cultural inexperience, while limiting discourse about recruiting and retaining aspirants of color. Rarely is the quality of preparation for teacher candidates of color (TCCs) researched; scholars and policy makers instead relentlessly overhaul TEPs in the interests of White teacher candidates. Prospective teachers of color often lack emotional, financial, and personal support, and they feel marginalized in programs that have a majority of White students and faculty (Branch & Ranch, 2001; Miller & Endo, 2005). This project interrogates the experiences of 11 TCCs in a traditional TEP preparing them for diverse populations.

Purpose

I left my profession as a K-5 teacher to pursue and contribute to remedies for the visible and institutional problems that compromise learning opportunities for poor, racially and ethnically marginalized youth. But the solutions that are frequently proposed often fall short. For instance, I came to academia having taught in two racially homogenous public schools, where both teachers and students largely identified as people of African descent. However, the romanticized notion of such racially similar teacher-student pairings as (automatically) yielding exceptional instruction and student achievement was unsubstantiated in these settings. The role model designation that accompanies rationales to diversify teachers is uncorroborated (Sheets, 2001). Further, Ladson-Billings's (2009) work with eight excellent teachers of African-American students, three of whom were White, demonstrated the fringe nature of race in teaching. This is not to suggest that race is irrelevant in teacher identity or classroom social negotiations, but rather that we should attempt to put racial identity in perspective when compared to class, language, religion, ability, other social locations, and the overall preparedness of a teacher.

Yet while TEPs nationally espouse a desire to prepare a teaching force qualified to educate diverse populations, TCCs are marginalized in TEPs, just as diverse students are marginalized in schools. This marginalization of TCCs limits their potential to be quality teachers.

The purpose of this study, thus, is to understand the experiences of TCCs in two multicultural education classes in a TEP at a large research university. The goal of these classes was to transform teacher candidates into culturally relevant pedagogues. This critical ethnography examines the effects of assumed cultural competency on such a

process. Additionally, this project seeks to determine how teacher educators can approach such challenges through examining the practices of one educator, Dr. Hernandez. This study argues that while the demographic imperative is worth addressing, prioritizing candidate quality, particularly finding candidates whose epistemologies are oriented toward justice must be a paramount concern of teacher education, rather than the usual sole emphasis on teacher candidates' ethno-racial identification.

Research Questions

Gloria Ladson-Billings's (2009) theory of Culturally Relevant Pedagogy (CRP) conceptually frames this study. Although originally theorized for under-served P-12 populations, I argue that postsecondary education could greatly benefit from the implementation of CRP throughout TEPs. The three tenets of CRP work together to develop the whole learner. The tenets prioritize mastering course content through academic rigor, nurturing and maintaining cultural competence that honors students' home proficiencies, and developing sociopolitical consciousness in which learners develop an awareness and agenda to address social inequality. CRP encourages leadership that transforms students into change agents improving their lived realities (Ladson-Billings, 2009). CRP is the guiding framework for this study: I aim to analyze its use in courses designed for transformation, as well as the effectiveness of such practices with two cohorts of diverse teacher candidates.

I also, however, highlight the demographic imperative as a conceptual factor given its predominance in multicultural education research. In 2007-2008, teachers in the USA were 83% White, compared to a population of 44% students of color, according to the National Center for Education Statistics. The demographic imperative creates salient and critical issues that need to be addressed to ensure equal, equitable, and quality

instruction for all pupils (Grant & Gibson, 2011). In their review of the literature regarding successful efforts in teacher education to diversify teachers, Sleeter and Milner (2011) concluded that further research is necessary to understand the experiences of teachers of color in the classroom. As such, my questions are as follows:

1. How are teacher candidates of color prepared to teach diverse student populations?

2. How do teacher candidates of color respond to culturally relevant pedagogy/multicultural teacher education?

Significance of the Study

The responses to these research questions may require "significant changes in the way we design and implement teacher preparation programs" (Sheets, 2001, p. 28). The long-standing ideology and practice of most TEPs do not sufficiently address these questions. As education research pursues equitable education for *all* students, the conflation of the NCATE and the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) into CAEP makes this as opportune a time as ever to consider the questions at the heart of this study. Intentionality in the way institutions prepare future teachers would require ideological shifts that would disrupt White normative ways of functioning (Haviland, 2008). For future teachers who want and plan to teach students of marginalized identities, transformation toward critical consciousness will be a formidable challenge. Having institutional, departmental, programmatic, and curricular support as well as critical teacher educators prepared to be change agents will better facilitate that evolution. The prevalence of ethno-racial compatibility translating to effective pedagogy burdens TCCs with expectations to outperform their White counterparts in educating students of color.

The enormous challenge to teach diverse students is not easier for teachers of color, but rather more difficult as they are marginally situated and under-served in TEPs.

Overview of the Study

In order to understand the experiences of prospective teachers of color, I conducted a six-month critical ethnographic study that focused on the discourse and practices of TCCs in a traditional teacher licensure program. In his conception of ethnography, Malinowski (1984) encouraged ethnographers to illuminate cultural significances by situating practices in their interrelationships, linkages, and communicative interactions. In doing so, ethnography can provide a comprehensive understanding with emic distinction (Hall, 2002). I entered the educationally transformative spaces of TCCs and attempted to understand their collective narrative. Working across two multicultural education courses, I studied 11 focal participants representative of three of the four major ethno-racial groups (e.g., Asian, Black, and Hispanic). This project's findings illuminate potential answers to questions the field has about how to critically diversify the profession and enhance the capacity of teacher educators to be culturally relevant.

Key Terms

Diversity references differences among groups of people and individuals based on ethnicity, race, age, socioeconomic status, gender, exceptionalities, language, religion, sexual orientation, and geographical area (NCATE, 2008). The term is a colloquial category understood as "non-traditional/ non-White" which encompasses ethnic minorities, immigrants, and—in the case of teacher education— males. Diversity, for the sake of this project, is primarily linked to race and ethnicity. However, the participants of the study represented varying identity groups. Therefore, those dimensions inform and

are considered in the analysis of the experiences of both the students and professor in this study.

Diversity/Multicultural Education courses function to develop educators who can help all students learn and who can teach from multicultural and global perspectives that draw on the histories, experiences, and representations of students from diverse cultural backgrounds (NCATE, 2008). Future teachers bring epistemological biases with them to TEPs that often discriminate against communities and cultures with which they have limited experiences. Teacher perceptions inform teacher efficacy; therefore, they "lead to differential treatment, which leads to differential student outcomes" (Pohan, 1996, p. 5). TEPs are responsible for identifying and resolving candidates' issues with authentic inclusion; thus, the usage of diversity/multicultural education courses is one response.

All Students is defined as children or youth attending P-12 schools, including students with disabilities or exceptionalities, students who are gifted, and students who represent diversity based on ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, language, religion, sexual identification, linguistic, and geographic origin (CAEP, 2013). As a result of multicultural education, candidates are expected to create and maintain inclusive learning environments that embrace all students. Such environments would mitigate inequality in education and allow each child to reach their full potential across a range of learner goals (CAEP, 2013).

Cultural Competency speaks to knowledge, skills, and attitudes with regard to the influence and role that culture plays in individuals' or groups' lived realities (Nieto, 2000). It is a disposition that situates prior experiences and the school, family, and community contexts of students in relation to their learning. Developing cultural competency allows candidates to recognize and diminish bias (CAEP, 2013). As

candidates come to understand their individual positionality in relation to society, they also (hopefully) evolve to a social justice orientation. The construction and lived experiences of marginalized populations within society as it relates to their access to liberties, rights, and opportunities, as well as the manner in which resources are allocated by social institutions, constitutes social justice (Miller, 2003; Rawls, 2003).

Organization of the Remainder of the Study

Chapter 2 provides a brief overview of the history of multicultural education, its integral role in P-12 schooling, and its theoretical underpinnings. In addition, the chapter explores contemporary iterations of multicultural education in teacher development as well as the experiences of teachers of color with multicultural education. Chapter 3 addresses ethnography, specifically, critical ethnography as a research method and methodology. The chapter explores critical ethnography's viability as a tool for studying the preparation of teachers for diverse classrooms. Additionally, the chapter describes the research design, methods of data collection and analysis processes that led to empirically based findings, and the researcher's positionality. Chapter 4 focuses on the pedagogy of Dr. Hernandez, the instructor for both diversity courses. It examines her identity as a mediating factor for her pedagogy. Her culturally relevant pedagogy is deconstructed to illuminate areas of triumph and challenge. Chapter 5 discusses the resistive practices of teacher candidates of color in diversity courses. It illustrates how TCCs experience faculty efforts to be culturally relevant while elevating the emic perspectives of the students. The analysis unearthed content-specific resistance that speaks to how TCCs are typically positioned in multicultural education courses. Chapter 6 explicates the resistance of one Generation 1.5 student and her strategic practice of corporatized model student behaviors. Findings conclude that resistance tactics employed by students of color

can be friendly yet subversive, thus requiring hyper-vigilance on the part of teacher

educators. Chapter 7 reviews key findings from the study and their potential to inform the

construction and conveyance of multicultural education in teacher education programs.

Additionally, the chapter features a discussion of implications for future studies.

CHAPTER 2

A History of Multicultural Education

More than any other aspect of schooling, teachers make the greatest impact on student achievement (Pretorius, 2012; Townsend, 2001; Wyatt, 1996). That said, education research is inundated with scholars scouring the field looking for "best practices" and effective teacher traits (Hattie, 2003). While scholars and educators widely accept that teacher education has the greatest potential to shape quality teachers (Banks, Cochran-Smith, Moll, Richert, Zeichner, LePage, & Duffy, 2005; Darling-Hammond, 2006), there is reasonable doubt about its effectiveness, given the academic achievement gaps in our nation (Wideen, Mayer-Smith, & Moon, 1998; Zeichner & Gore, 1990). Of the many issues facing public education, the demographic imperative, "the disjunction between the sociocultural characteristics and previous experiences of the typical teacher candidate and those of many of our K-12 students" (Lowenstein, 2009, p. 166), is a foundational dynamic affecting the schooling experience.

The need for cultural competency development is pressing, given the cultural disparities in public education classrooms, with White, middle-class, monolingual women dominating both the current teaching force and teacher candidate enrollment, even as our nation's P-12 students become increasingly diverse (Villegas & Lucas, 2002). In an effort to formally reform teacher education, specifically in the interest of the least served in P-12 spaces, accreditation agencies have designed standards for preparing teacher candidates to better instruct students from diverse backgrounds. While some TEPs take a comprehensive approach to multicultural teacher education (whereby licensure courses infuse aspects of multiculturalism), others have designed individual courses that center cultural competency development.

In this chapter, I trace the roots and extensions of multiculturalism as an area of professional development in teacher education programs. To begin, I survey public education and its peripheral treatment of minoritized youth, including an exploration of the many controversial yet fluid understandings of the term "culture." Thereafter, I focus on the history, definition, and goals of multicultural education, including transformative approaches. I describe how teacher education programs (TEPs) address multiculturalism and the need for diversifying the teaching labor force. I then examine teacher candidates of color in multicultural education courses. Throughout, I explore the potential of culturally relevant pedagogy to enhance the capacity of teacher candidates to be effective with diverse populations. As well as the limitations of multicultural education to address issues of culture and schooling.

Public Education, Contexts, and Culture

National compulsory education laws require all children of a minimum age to attend school. Although this concept has been crystallizing since the Massachusetts Act of 1642, consideration of how to effectively teach children representing under-privileged positions (e.g., non-White, poor, linguistically diverse) has emerged only within the last 50 years (Grant & Secada, 1990; Liston & Zeichner, 1991). Cochran-Smith (2004) asserted that "bridging the chasm between the school and the life experiences of those with and without social, cultural, racial, and economic advantages requires fundamental changes in the ways teachers are educated" (p. 7). Schools, once considered merely spaces to educate children, are now responding to their fundamental role as socializing entities operating in dynamic communities.

Several major concerns merit mentioning in order to understand and contextualize the state of the U.S. education system, namely: national achievement scores compared to

other countries, the achievement gap, and unequal educational outcomes. First, the United States lags behind several countries in math and reading scores, which is a concern to national leaders, leading to a focus on standards and achievement. Second, there is a national achievement gap, defined by the National Assessment of Educational Progress as "when one group of students outperforms another group and the difference in average scores for the two groups is statistically significant" (NAEP, 2012). The National Center for Education Statistics has reported that since the early 1990s the achievement gaps in reading and mathematics between White and Black and White and Hispanic fourth and eighth graders have shown little measurable change (NCES, 2006). "By the end of fourth grade, African American, Latino, and poor students of all races are two years behind their wealthier, predominantly White peers in reading and math. By eighth grade, they have slipped three years behind, and by twelfth grade, four years behind [respectively]" (Columbia University, 2005). Further, according to the 2007 National Center for Education Statistics, 10.4% of African American students and 22.4% of Hispanic students dropped out of high school in 2005 (NCES, 2007). Educational scholars (Banks et al., 2005; Haberman, 1991; Ladson-Billings, 1999) have theoretically and empirically identified unequal educational outcomes for students located on the periphery of dominant social positions (e.g., students from single parent homes, students with lower socioeconomic status, English language learners). The unequal educational outcomes intersecting with the tracked and societally visible deleterious experiences of students of color who have disabilities, GLBTQ affiliations, live in poverty, non-Christian identifying— among many other stratifying classifications—are the features of the multicultural terrain that teachers must traverse.

Teachers in high need schools are often not prepared to teach diverse students and bring with them attitudes and biases that negatively impact student success. In their account, Cochran-Smith and Power (2010) identified a "teacher-quality gap" whereby "schools with large numbers of poor and minority students are most likely to have teachers who are inexperienced, teaching in areas outside their fields, or otherwise unqualified" (p. 8). They note that the caliber of teachers in low-performing schools is subpar and too often damaging, causing or sustaining academic under-performance and social displacement. Therefore, they advocated for the relocation of the most qualified teachers to the most under-served and high-need schools. Strategic redistribution requires consideration of teacher disposition, intentions, and experiences. Among the many contributing factors to ineffective teaching are sociodemographic biases that many teachers bring and maintain in the classroom (Ready & Wright, 2011). Arguably, teacher perceptions of students' academic abilities correlate with student success (Bright, Turesky, Putzel, & Stang, 2012; Muijs & Reynolds, 2002). Schools with "low teacher expectations and a lack of positive student-teacher relationships within the classroom setting perpetuate the self-fulfilling prophecy and low student achievement" (Green, 2010, p. 34). When teachers underestimate students, they also under-serve them.

Health, mobility, and class issues (also termed the socioeconomic gap) exist as obstacles to quality education for all youth (Ready, 2010). A 2007 National Center for Education Statistics report indicated that "in 2005, the percentages of families with children in poverty were higher for Black, American Indian/Alaska Native, Hispanic, and Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander families than for White and Asian families." That same year, Black, Hispanic, and American Indian/Alaska Native students were more likely to be eligible for the free and reduced-price lunch program than were their White

and Asian/Pacific Islander peers. Black and Hispanic students were also the most likely to attend high-poverty schools (NCES, 2007). Often, the socioeconomic gap links to the achievement gap, as exhibited by the results from the U.S. Department of Education's Early Childhood Longitudinal Study Kindergarten Class (ECLS-K):

> The average cognitive score of pre-kindergarten children in the highest socioeconomic bracket was significantly higher than the average score of students in the lowest socioeconomic bracket. The composition of these socioeconomic brackets was closely tied to race; 34% of Black children and 29% of Hispanic children were in the lowest socioeconomic bracket, compared with just 9% of White students. (Lee & Burkam, 2002, p. 2)

Issues related to socioeconomic status not only affect academic achievement, but also the geopolitical positioning of students and their families (Aud, Hussar, Planty, Snyder, Blanco, Fox, Frohlich, Kemp, & Drake, 2010). As a result, re-segregation, or—as some scholars refer to it— second-generation segregation, occurs as specific racial groups overwhelmingly occupy geographical spaces and school communities (Orfield & Eaton, 1996). In 2005, the majority of Black and Hispanic students attended schools with high minority enrollment, averaging 75% or more (NCES, 2007). Present day ethno-racial segregation resembles the separate and unequal conditions before the repeal of Jim Crow laws.

As mentioned before, the demographic imperative is the backdrop upon which many of these sociocultural issues materialize. As the nation's students become increasingly ethnically diverse, its educators remain mono-cultural (Achinstein, Ogawa, Sexton, & Freitas, 2010; Brown, 2013; Duncan 2010). According to the National Center for Education Statistics, in 2007-2008 American teachers were 83% White, despite

student populations hovering around 44% people of color. The data also showed that 77% of educators were female. These disproportions exacerbate challenges with equitable and quality instruction for all pupils (Irvine, 2003). Many scholars have identified this dilemma as the culture gap (Gay, 2000; Irvine, 2003; Sleeter, 2001). Myriad intersecting cultural differences can facilitate misunderstandings in classroom spaces, ranging from ethnicity and culture to social class, gender biases, or religious practices. These distinctions too often create barriers for instruction, relationship building, and dignified interactions.

Together, the previously stated "gaps" intersect to "divest youth of important social and cultural resources, leaving them progressively vulnerable to academic failure" (Valenzuela, 1999). School failures (academic and cultural) often further community marginalization. While the dissonance perpetuated by the education culture gap cannot remain static, the idealized notion of every student instructed by an individual with a comparable culture is problematic: It promotes segregated education in this globalized nation, where students learn in superficially homogenous classrooms. That said, there must be an intermediate place where culture and education can intersect to benefit all students and transform educational experiences while considering social inequalities that mediate schooling journeys. Multicultural education works against schooling related injustices and to empower those students historically disenfranchised by education.

The Ambiguity of Culture

Since this project is replete with mention of and emphasis on the term "culture," it is worth taking a moment to clarify my understanding of the word. Edward B. Tylor (1871), founder of cultural anthropology, stated, "Culture, or civilization, taken in its broad, ethnographic sense, is that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art,

morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man [*sic*] as a

member of society" (p. 1). Since then, the field has expanded to refine, contradict, or

validate Tylor's definition, but his core principle of habits has widely persisted. Some

contemporary ideas about culture, framed by the education discipline, include—but are

not limited to—heterogeneity (Gollnick & Chinn, 2009); commonalities among people

(Rogoff, 2003); "webs of culture" intersecting and diverging (Anderson-Levitt, 2002); or

values, traits, and beliefs (Henze & Hauser, 1999). Culture is among the most

complicated words in the English language (Williams, 1976).

> In the context of being learned and transmitted,
>
> the experiences of schooling, of peer groups, of religious congregations, of work
>
> situations, of adult avocations, of retirement situations, and of vicarious
>
> socialization through the various popular communications media (cinema,
>
> television, music, fashion in consumer goods) all provide exposure to differing
>
> cultures and subcultures. (Erickson, 2002, p. 303)

As culture interacts with people, it evolves. Hoffman (1996) criticized the field of

multicultural education as an entity that reduces the innate complexity of culture. While

she acknowledges culture as "the heart of multiculturalism," she condemns its co-

optation by educators and scholars limiting culture to "recipe" (that which "does things"

to people), "essentialized difference" (difference is diluted and stabilized), or "culture as

category" (that which is stereotyped). Bennett (2003) concurred with Hoffman's critique

of culture portrayed as a deterministic set of social behaviors. Likewise, postmodernists

in multicultural education advocate for understandings of the term that encompass all

forms of existence (e.g., learning, interacting, performing, translating) as a means to

transform and transcend the personal and the contextual (Nieto & Bode, 2012). The

complexity of culture and the inevitability of two or more cultures meeting—and sometimes competing—within one person is what Anzaldúa (1987) described as borderlands that resist fragmentation but rather thrive in the consciousness of the "both-and" nature of human existence. I acknowledge that culture can be *both* collective *and* individual and, most times, a negotiation of the two. That said, I resolve that existing culture is inaccessible, and as researchers we work with the residue of lived realities when we attempt to frame it. The perpetual evolution of culture fragments our capacity for comprehensive understanding.

What is Multicultural Education?

At its core, multicultural education addresses the diversity of the human race as it relates to our varying social demographics and our learning experiences. This study focuses on race and ethnicity as a dominant form of multiculturalism mediating learning experiences. According to Census Bureau reports (2011), people of color make up 37% of the U.S. population. Hispanics are the largest minority group, representing 17% of the population, followed by Blacks (13%), Asians/Pacific Islanders (5%), and American Indians/Alaska Natives (1%). As schools reflect national demographic transformations, equity in schooling experiences remains a public issue. Given the history of chronic scholastic failures among students of color in public education, the critical need to find alternative approaches to the "one size fits all" assimilation model is as pressing as ever.

History and Definition

Banks (1995) outlined four phases of multicultural education and its transformation to becoming a major component of addressing diversity and the academic achievement gap: the Ethnic Studies Movement; the Multiethnic Education Era; the Victims of Society Enlightenment Period; and the Relationship Development Period. The

first phase emerged during the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s, addressing the social justice needs of historically oppressed people, with scholars like Carl Grant, Geneva Gay, and James Banks transitioning from a singular focus of ethnic studies into an interdisciplinary effort that encompassed teacher education and schooling. The Multiethnic Education Era aimed "to bring about structural and systemic changes in the total school that were designed to increase educational equality" (Banks, 1995, p. 260). The third phase occurred as other marginalized groups such as women and people with disabilities joined the collective voice for equality and equity in the context of schooling. The extension caused a shift from multiethnic education to multicultural education (Banks, 2012). "The current, or fourth, phase of multicultural education consists of the development of theory, research, and practice that interrelate variables connected to race, class, and gender" (Banks, 1995, p. 393). In 1996, Sleeter argued that multicultural education should alter to become a social movement, manifesting theory into practice.

Multicultural education aims to revolutionize education in the interest of all people by imagining and practicing democratic human relations in and outside the classroom. Below, I share Nieto and Bode's (2012) definition of the term at length because it makes a valiant and effective attempt to collect and intersect the many facets of the field:

> Multicultural education is a process of comprehensive school reform and basic education for all students. It challenges and rejects racism and other forms of discrimination in schools and society and accepts and affirms the pluralism (ethnic, racial, linguistic, religious, economic, and gender, among others) that students, their communities, and teachers represent. Multicultural education permeates the curriculum and instructional strategies used in schools, as well as

the interactions among teachers, students, and parents, and the very way that schools conceptualize the nature of teaching and learning. Because it uses critical pedagogy as its underlying philosophy and focuses on knowledge, reflection, and action (praxis) as the basis for social change, multicultural education promotes the democratic principles of social justice. (p. 307)

As Nieto and Bode (2012) explain, multicultural education mediates unjust practices in schools that inhibit quality education for all students. Encircling all constituents of the schooling process, multicultural education aspires to function as a social change agent.

Many educational theorists agree that themes of developing a more just society, eliminating oppression, and educating students for high academic achievement are the fundamentals of multicultural education (Banks, 2004; Gay, 2002; Nieto & Bode, 2012; Sleeter & Grant, 2007). As Nieto and Bode (2012) remind us, "a multicultural approach values diversity and encourages critical thinking, reflection, and action. . . Its opposite is what Freire calls 'domesticating education' that emphasizes passivity, acceptance, and submissiveness" (p. 219). Nieto and Bode's (2012) articulation of multicultural education rejects teacher-centered pedagogy that assumes students are cognitively bankrupt and dependent upon the teacher to deposit knowledge, which results in stifled potential and the social reproduction of inequalities. Critical multiculturalism, an extension of multicultural education, "views teaching as a tool for establishing and maintaining social justice both in and out of schools by confronting and disrupting the issue of inequity" (Park, 2013, p. 105). Doing so involves "conscious reflections" where teachers introspectively take stock of their biases, perspective, values, agendas, and influences (Castro, Kelly, & Shih, 2010). At its core, multicultural education is activism-oriented.

Theorizing that multicultural education functions as platforms upon which to enact multicultural practice, Bennett (2001) identified four principles of multicultural education, namely: honoring cultural pluralism, working toward the ideals of social justice, affirming culture in the teaching and learning process, and envisioning educational equity and excellence in the education of all children and youth. Nieto and Bode's (2012) seven basic characteristics of multicultural education echo the social justice, cultural affirmations, and educational equity aspects highlighted in Bennett's analysis (2008). They theorize that multicultural education is antiracist, fundamental and important for all students, comprehensive in its pedagogical reach, social justice-oriented, process-oriented, and critical. Nieto & Bode (2012), as well as Bennett (2001), reflect on what Dewey (1897) described as education as being both the process and the goal. This duality exemplifies the complexity interwoven in the concept of multicultural education.

Approaches to Multicultural Education

Due to the dire state of public education, the lack of clarity related to the generalizability and practicality of educational theory, and the academy's emphasis on authorship and innovation, there are numerous iterations of multicultural education. Organized using Bruch, Jehangir, Jacobs, and Ghere's (2004) three themes (celebratory, critical, and transformative), I review various pedagogical approaches that take up the ideals of multicultural education.

The celebratory approaches teach skills for achievement, are often prescriptive, and are uncritical. Normalization of the dominant culture, as the superior way of being, oppresses diverse populations. These teaching practices promote tolerance and the improvement of self-esteem among diverse student populations while neglecting institutionalized dominance. They view cultural difference as the static "Other" and

therefore establish a false hierarchy. Although equity pedagogy (Delpit, 2006), cultural

difference (Cazden & Leggett, 1981), cultural congruence (Mohatt & Erickson, 1981),

and cultural compatibility (Jordan, 1985) were conceptualized as critical approaches,

their appropriations in schools are celebratory. Grounded in sociolinguistic studies, many

of these approaches focus primarily on dominant language acquisition. When

superficially adopted, as with most approaches, multicultural education manifests as

recognition of minoritized heroes, holiday recognitions, and the artifacts of culture

groups (Lee, Menkart, Okazawa-Rey, & Network of Educators on the Americas, 1998).

While problematically still in practice, the celebratory practices serve to delegitimize

pluralism and the ideals of multicultural education. Since this study is concerned with

approaches proven to affect positive change, I cease to further explore celebratory

approaches.

Critical approaches to multicultural education are inclusive of diverse

perspectives while challenging the status quo, but fail to act upon oppressive structures.

For example, Diversity Pedagogy Theory (DPT) (Sheets, 2009) is "a set of principles that

point out the natural and inseparable connection between culture and cognition" (p. 11).

Building upon Gay's (2000) assertion that "culture counts," Sheets stressed the

importance of effective teachers being conscious of the salient role that culture plays in

the teaching-learning process. DPT necessitates that "culturally inclusive teachers (a)

observe children's cultural behavioral patterns to identify individual and group cultural

competencies and skills, and (b) use this knowledge to guide their teaching decisions" (p.

11). Sheets (2009), like Martin (1994), advocated for the inclusion of the domesticated

lives of students into curriculum. DPT proposes that students and teachers continuously

develop consciousness of their thinking and form habits that transform them into culturally competent educators.

DPT is critical of the classroom teacher and a dearth of cultural familiarity that mitigate effective teaching practices. Sheets (2009) stated, "it needs to be understood that teacher pedagogical behaviors directly influence student cultural displays" (p. 12). While DPT resists marginalizing diverse youth, it fails to address the systemic structures maintaining such conditions. DPT highlights appropriate behaviors and attitudes that teachers should demonstrate in a classroom and outlines causative techniques claiming to produce corresponding student outcomes. However, that approach can "reinforce existing differences as entities in themselves rather than as relationships that are continuously renegotiated" (Bruch et al., 2004, p.13). In this critical approach, DPT appears to streamline the complexity of sociocultural schooling, thereby limiting its potential to affect sustainable change.

The transformative approaches recognize that people are both free individuals and members of social groups integrated—whether they like it or not—into systems of power that shape them (Bruch et al., 2004, p.13). These approaches span from cultural inclusivity to critical pedagogy, using content as a means to engage the students in reading the word in order to read the world (Freire, 1972). Major approaches that fall into the spectrum of transformative teaching practices are Culturally Relevant Pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1995), Culturally Responsive Teaching (Gay, 2000), and Empowering Education (Shor, 1992). I describe the major tenets of these approaches, as they are current and have been empirically proven to improve learning experiences and opportunities for marginalized youth. Although practitioners grapple with how to effectively implement these approaches, what Ladson-Billings (1995) called "good

teaching," the fundamental approaches of these practices uphold the ideals of multicultural education.

Culturally Relevant Pedagogy (CRP) is defined as "pedagogy of opposition not unlike critical pedagogy but specifically committed to collective, not merely individual, empowerment" (Ladson-Billings, 1995, p. 160). Ladson-Billings (1995) sketched out three propositions for CRP. The first addresses the development of academic success for students. This means fruitfully working alongside students in the areas of literacy, mathematics, technology, and civics to best prepare them to be contributors and active participants in a democracy. CRP advocates for advancing student academic competence through collaborative sharing, allowing students to be educationally competitive with their dominant counterparts. Secondly, CRP advocates a readiness to cultivate and maintain the cultural competence of each student in both home and school cultures. According to Ladson-Billings (1995), "culturally relevant teachers utilize students' culture as a vehicle for learning" (p. 161). In other words, teachers must value and build on the knowledge and skills that students bring from their home culture. Rather than discounting the lived experiences of individual students, which often leads to a sense of rejection and exclusion (Valenzuela, 1999), educators are encouraged to embrace home cultures as foundational and connected to classroom learning. The final criterion for CRP is that "students must develop a critical consciousness through which they challenge the status quo of the current social order" (Ladson-Billings, 1995, p. 160). This principle extends the achievement of students beyond academia and into sociopolitical arenas that investigate power differentials and critique injustice. Educators facilitate the expansion of students' critical consciousness by helping them to identify, analyze, and transform social inequities.

Howard (2003) asserted that critical teacher reflection is central to enacting culturally relevant teaching practices. He explained that critical reflection "attempts to look at reflection within moral, political, and ethical contexts of teaching," thereby mediating pedagogy guided by practices (p. 5). Culturally relevant pedagogues are internally reflexive while outwardly working to empower their students.

Another approach of multicultural education is Culturally Responsive Teaching (CRT). Much like CRP practitioners, culturally responsive teachers commit to educating the whole child (Gay, 2000). When defining the "whole child," it is imperative that the term not be confused with popular educational methods that often generalize education, promote assimilation, and impose mono-cultural, mono-linguistic, White middle class ways of existing and learning. Culturally responsive teachers are cognizant of and intentional about maintaining and developing cultural identity and traditions in addition to promoting academic achievement (Gay, 2000). Essentially, Gay, like Ladson-Billings, modified the constraints of culturally responsive education to move beyond language. Gay (2000) characterized culturally responsive teaching as a method to bring to light "the higher learning potentials of ethnically diverse students, simultaneously cultivating their academic and psychosocial abilities" (p. 20). She, like Ladson-Billings, echoed the call for educators to cultivate the relational competencies of every student in an endeavor to help students shape and pursue self-determination. Gay (2000) urged teachers to incorporate the cultural knowledge, past experiences, academic and social strengths, frames of reference, and performance styles of ethnically diverse students to successfully instruct and co-construct knowledge in learning environments.

Gay (2000) described CRT as having numerous distinctions. Among them is the validation of individual cultural heritages both as legacies that influence students'

outlooks, mannerism, and approaches to learning and as valuable content embedded in the formal curriculum. CRT also requires educators to identify individual pupils' learning styles to aid in differentiated instruction that will lead to academic achievement. Finally, CRT infuses multiethnic and multicultural information in all standard areas of study to promote a globalized educational experience. Echoing a major component of CRP, CRT bridges home and school life to best facilitate academic instruction in the context of sociocultural realities.

Empowering Education (Shor, 1992) resists traditional schooling methods as an iteration of critical pedagogy. With emancipation as his pedagogical agenda, Shor (1992) destabilized fixed or predetermined experts in the classroom, thereby foregrounding dialogic learning processes between students and teachers. This approach encourages participatory problem-posing pedagogy that minimizes teacher-talk and orients "students to democratic transformation of society by their active citizenship" (Shor, 1992, p. 29). hooks (1994), in her conception of feminist pedagogy, imagined a radically transformed schooling space that resembles Shor's collaborative model and balances the voices in the classroom to arrive at co-constructed knowledge. This echoes Culturally Responsive Teaching's advocacy for co-creation of knowledge between all participants in the schooling process.

Heavily influenced by Marxist theory, Empowering Education is intentional about addressing political oppression in the classroom. Transmitting liberatory theory into liberated practice, Shor (1992) outlined an "agenda of values of empowerment" where education insists on involving active participation on the part of the learner (p. 17). He avowed that all learning is value-laden and that the learner is always dealing with knowledge in the affective realms. Much like Gay (2000) and Ladson-Billings (1995),

Shor (1992) emphasized the significance of relevancy grounded in the community as well as students' past, present, and future lives. Shor (1992) situated Empowering Education as multicultural, dialogic, desocializing, and democratic; it values are interdisciplinary, highly researchable, and based on activism. He defined empowered education as "the exploration of subject matter in its social context with critical themes and bodies of knowledge integrated into student language and experience" (p. 144). The teacher in the classroom is the facilitator responsible for guiding students toward empowerment, but she herself cannot grant freedom.

According to Bruch et al. (2004), "celebratory," "critical," and "transformative" approaches to multicultural education often overlap, but "it is useful to conceptually distinguish them for purposes of highlighting the important contribution each can make to a vision of meaningful access through multicultural developmental education" (p. 13). Culturally Relevant Pedagogy, Culturally Responsive Teaching, and Empowering Education are all transformative approaches, but they also embed elements of the critical and celebratory categories. Their goal of empowering students and teachers as change agents and their emphasis on activism facilitate critical consciousness that analyzes the isms that oppress students. As each approach demonstrated, "critical consciousness is brought about not through intellectual effort alone but through praxis—through the authentic union of action and reflection" (Freire, 1972, p. 48). Materialization of critical consciousness in classroom spaces is largely the responsibility of teachers, with consideration of their capacity and willingness to work toward social justice.

Teacher Education

The academic achievement gap is the landscape upon which new teachers must prove themselves effective and, therefore, well prepared by their TEPs. Criticism of the

ineffectiveness of TEPs emanates from scholars, parents, politicians, policy makers, and teachers themselves (Korthagen, Loughran, & Russell, 2006). Thus, in their national evaluation of TEPs, NCATE's Blue Ribbon Committee (2010) recommended "a dramatic overhaul of how teachers are prepared" in order to meet the needs of public education's most disenfranchised groups (p. 2). The National Education Association (NEA, 2011), in conceptualizing strategies for closing the achievement gap, argued for improved teacher education programs that "recruit, develop, and retain qualified teachers and paraeducators" (p. 19).

Amid debates regarding empirically-based versus practically-oriented reforms in TEPs, there exists consensus that candidate predispositions toward culturally diverse populations are largely unacceptable (Cochran-Smith, 2004; Korthagen et al., 2006; Sleeter, 2001). As it stands, TEPs have made limited progress in facilitating dispositional transformation with teacher candidates (McDonald & Zeichner, 2009; Nieto, 2000; Sleeter, 2008). Among other benchmarks, as a directive of NCATE Standard 4, TEPs must design, implement, evaluate curriculum, and provide "experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn" to obtain accreditation (2008). Pre-service teachers must demonstrate and apply cultural competency resulting from experiences with diverse populations, including faculty. However, the pervasive homogeneity among teacher educators and their candidates (White, predominantly English-speaking, middle class, Christian, heterosexual, and suburban) functions as a marker of cultural inbreeding, thereby mitigating the transformative capacities of multicultural instruction in TEPs (Hodgkinson, 2002; Zeichner & Hoeft, 1996). The lack of diverse perspectives and

experiences in TEPs preparing students for pluralistic classrooms strengthens arguments for increased diversity among faculty and pre-service teachers.

Multicultural Teacher Education

In keeping with NCATE's spotlighting of candidate preparedness for diverse populations, CAEP (2013) incorporated cultural competency development throughout its standards, most notably in the Content and Pedagogical Knowledge (1) and Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity (3) standards. Standard 1.9 reads:

> Candidates reflect on their personal biases and access resources that deepen their own understanding of cultural, ethnic, gender, sexual orientation, language, and learning differences to build stronger relationships and to adapt practice to meet the needs of each learner. (CAEP, 2013)

This element of pedagogical knowledge requires pre-service teachers to take up the ideals of multicultural education by critically examining their predispositions and the implications of bigoted perspectives. According to Howard (2003), "critical reflection is the type of processing that is crucial to the concept of culturally relevant pedagogy" (p. 5). The standard situates teachers as adapters to learners' needs, according to students' cultural repertoires, which reflects practices of CRP. The designated spaces to critically reflect on one's prejudices and develop competencies to enact transformative approaches to multicultural education in TEPs are diversity courses.

In many TEPs, a multicultural education course is a prerequisite for licensure. The course(s) attempts to "help prospective and in-service teachers develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed for successfully working with diverse student populations," necessitating a shift in consciousness, otherwise understood as a transformation of self (Ukpokodu, 2009, p. 1). That said, one might conclude that an "A"

average in a course about diversity and multicultural education reflects a degree of

intercultural competency as deemed appropriate by authorities in a TEP (e.g., the

department chair, teacher educators, college dean, accreditation agency). Bennett (2011)

defined intercultural competence as "a set of cognitive, affective, and behavioral skills

and characteristics that support effective and appropriate interaction in a variety of

cultural contexts" (p. 4). As culture encompasses an amalgamation of race, ethnicity, age,

geographic region, sexuality, religion, social status, language, ability, sex and gender,

health status, and social class (Cushner, McClelland, & Safford, 2003), multicultural

education courses tend to address each descriptor independently and at their intersections.

A successful candidate would develop intercultural competencies and therefore be a

person who "possesses an intellectual and emotional commitment to the fundamental

unity of all humans and, at the same time, accepts and appreciates the differences that lie

between people of different cultures" (Gudykunst & Kim, 1984, p. 230). The terms

"intercultural" (Bennett, 2011) "cross-cultural" (Lynch & Hanson, 1998), and "cultural

competence" (NEA, 2011) each reference the skills, knowledge, and attitudes needed to

value student diversity and provide equitable education for all. They are used

interchangeably as objectives of multicultural education courses.

Yet, despite these intentions, research shows that candidate resistance and

defensiveness inhibit shifts in consciousness that could facilitate equitable teaching

practices (Cochran-Smith, 2004; Howard, 2006; Ladson-Billings, 2000). In Carpenter's

(2001) study of student teachers, she described resistant practices as:

avoiding discussion of any aspect of multiculturalism; dismissing the content as

based on biased/unbalanced information; dismissing the content as too baffling to

discuss further; dismissing the content as irrelevant; exhibiting discomfort; being

silent; absence from class; or hostile verbal challenges. (p. 5)

Resistance occurs when student perspectives, experiences, beliefs, values, and ideologies

are challenged, and the student disengages. Cranton (2002) explained that transformation

instead occurs when a student reengages to critically examine the disruption and opens

"herself to alternatives, and consequently changes the way she sees things" (p. 66). For as

much variance as there is between definitions of multicultural education, so too are there

discrepancies regarding approaches to developing cultural competencies and facilitating

transformation with pre-service teachers (Nieto, 2009). As I proceed to review studies

that assess multicultural education courses, I consider program structure, course

curricula, faculty pedagogies, and candidate demographics as factors influencing

effective transformation.

Critical education theorists push accreditation standards to include development

of teachers as social activists within TEPs (Athanases & Oliveira, 2008; Cochran-Smith,

Shakman, Jong, Terrell, Barnatt, & McQuillan, 2009; Whipp, 2013). Comprehensive

approaches to multicultural education that integrate social justice concepts into field

experiences and all licensure coursework prove effective for transformation (Athanases &

Oliveira, 2008; Whipp, 2013). With regard to structure, Sleeter (2001) advocated that

"rework[ing] whole teacher education programs, whether by collaborating with schools,

infusing multicultural course content, or both, might improve the preparation of teachers"

(p.101). However, Aronson and Anderson (2011) cautioned that neutral stances on social

justice by accrediting bodies like NCATE, CAEP, and the National Association of

Scholars (NAS) work against the development of high-quality teachers. In other words,

justice-oriented teacher education initiatives gain minimal traction with the most

powerful constituents in education reform, despite our nation's state of pervasive social inequality.

Interested in the content of multicultural education, Gorski (2008) examined the syllabi of 45 U.S.-based courses with stated goals of preparing teachers to (1) educate diverse learners, (2) enact social justice in schools, and/or (3) understand multicultural education enough to broach a combination of the first two objectives. He found that "most of the courses were designed to prepare teachers with pragmatic skills and personal awareness, but not to prepare them in accordance with the key principles of multicultural education, such as critical consciousness and a commitment to educational equity" (p. 1). His content analysis revealed that 71% of the courses failed to critically interrogate power relations and systemic inequity, thus stalling at the initial levels of multicultural engagement (Banks, 2008; Bruch et al., 2004; Kumashiro, 2000; Sleeter & Grant, 2007). The lack of criticality in the course syllabi echoes Wiedeman's (2002) criticism of multicultural education courses as having a "diversity orientation" rather than a "justice orientation." Cochran-Smith et al. (2009) found that even in circumstances where pre-service teachers articulated interest in teaching for social justice, structural critique (e.g., grading, tracking, and labeling of pupils) was minimal. Designing diversity courses to uphold the ideals of multicultural education requires engagement with the complex notion of social justice, but also pedagogies that facilitate dispositional shifts.

In her reflective study *Pedagogies that Foster Transformative Learning in a Multicultural Education Course,* Ukpokodu (2009) found that specific practices produced transformational gains among her pre-service teachers. She explained that creating a dialogic learning community nurtured through "student engagement in rational discourse is crucial to fostering transformative learning" (p. 5). Additionally, she credited

"immersing and actively engaging students in experiential learning activities" as the conductor of transformative learning (p. 5). In alignment with Howard (2003) and Cranton's (2006) centering of reflection, Ukpokodu (2009) confirmed the transformative potentials of learning activities. The work of multicultural pedagogy is as much concerned with teacher identity, curriculum, and sociopolitical climate as it is with the culture of the students. Therefore, multicultural education courses must reflect the pedagogues and teaching practices it espouses.

Diversifying Teachers

In response to the demographic imperative (among many other factors inhibiting positive schooling experienced for marginalized youth), Sleeter (2001) concluded that teacher education programs should "(a) bring into the teaching profession more teachers who are from culturally diverse communities and (b) try to develop the attitudes and multicultural knowledge base of predominantly White cohorts of pre-service students" (p.96). Villegas and Irvine (2010) also supported efforts to diversify the teaching force, arguing that: "(1) teachers of color [can] serve as role models for all students; (2) [there is] potential of teachers of color to improve the academic outcomes and school experiences of students of color; and (3) the workforce rationale [should be that the ethnicity of the faculty should reflect that of the student population]" (p. 176). The labor force argument suggests that teachers of color would fill detrimental educator vacancies in low-performing urban schools while raising the employment rate of communities of color. Although their review lacked empirical evidence validating the role model theory, Villegas and Irvine (2010) contended that "increasing the diversity of the teaching force is a crucial component of a comprehensive strategy for addressing the achievement gap that historically has existed between students of color and their White counterparts" (p.

187). Moreover, Téllez (1999), Au and Blake (2003), and Guyton, Saxton and Wesche (1996) reverberated role model motivations for recruiting more teachers of color. Participants in their study positioned their racial identities as vehicles for community reinvestment and advocacy, in the form of modeling.

As previously mentioned, CAEP (2013) established a standard focused on recruiting diverse teachers as an approach to enhancing multicultural efforts in TEPs (Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity). Standard 3.1 reads:

> The provider presents plans and goals to recruit and support completion of high-quality candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations to accomplish their mission. The admitted pool of candidates reflects the diversity of America's P-12 students. (CAEP, 2013)

The standard implies that it is problematic to have ethnic and racial mismatches between teachers and their students. Dee (2004) argued that teachers are more effective with students who share their ethnicity, meaning, "Black students learn more from Black teachers and White students from White teachers" (p. 1). In addition, Ladson-Billings (1991) and Sleeter (2001) purported that TCCs hold greater commitments to multicultural education than their White counterparts, thereby ratcheting up their value in TEPs. However, Brown (2013) cautioned TEPs against assuming developmental competencies among pre-service teachers, stating that "all teachers—regardless of their background or race—require appropriate and relevant teacher training if they are to acquire the skills, knowledge and dispositions needed to become teachers committed to relevant, responsive and socially just teaching" (p. 16). TCCs enroll in TEPs with particular perspectives and experiences, but not necessarily advantages.

TCCs in Multicultural Education Courses

While marginalized in the realm of education studies, multicultural education research largely focuses its investigations on the experiences of White pre-service teachers, thereby instituting a gap in literature regarding TCCs (Krummel, 2013). Within the narrow body of research, Sheets (2001) argued that TCCs are under-represented, under-researched, and therefore under-served. Framed as victims of White dominance and White dissonance, TCCs experience marginalized matriculation. As an example, Applebaum (2007) stated:

> Although it is important to help all students recognize the racial effects of practices and discourse, often the needs of systemically privileged students are tended to without consideration of the needs of marginalized students, who have the right to be able to be educated in a safe environment free from overt and covert forms of discrimination. Marginalized students must often listen to their privileged peers who are either, in the best case, educated or, in the worst, become further entrenched in their own privilege.(p.338)

Applebaum (2007) referenced teaching to the dominant group as a form of discrimination that occurs in multicultural teacher education. In mentioning the role of marginalized students as listeners, he designates TCCs as muted. Several studies corroborate Applebaum's assessment of TCCs as doubly disadvantaged in multicultural education courses.

For instance, Sheets and Chew's (2002) study claimed that disrespectful, violent, and hurtful racial and ethnic-based comments from White students in a multicultural education course caused Chinese American students to become silent. Similarly, Su (1997) found that overlooking and dismissing contribution efforts of TCCs caused them to eventually stop participating in class discussions. Burant (1999) described how one

Latina teacher candidate lost her public voice after a White peer's public resistance to multicultural education. More recently, Amos (2010) found that the power of White student discourse in diversity classes not only silences TCCs, but also brings about experiences of frustration, fear, and despair. Cultural insensitivity around race and ethnicity issues brought on frustrations that left the TCCs feeling dominated. As TCCs experienced volatile resistance from White candidates, TCCs became fearful of personal attacks as a consequence of speaking up. Each of these studies highlights how White counterparts in a diversity course can negatively impact the experience of students of color, but none discuss the ways students of color take up the varying non-race related topics discussed in such a course.

Applebaum's (2007) depiction of students of color as bystanders witnessing White students' cognitive dissonance process implies that students of color do not experience cognitive dissonance themselves. Since diversity encompasses any difference (e.g., language, sexual orientation, class, religion), it bears questioning why there is an accepted assumption that students of color have experienced and embraced all facets of diversity. Even in studies that attempt to highlight the experience of all students, Whiteness is standardized and quickly become synonymous with the term "pre-service teachers" and diversity is reduced to color. Such is the case with Krummel's (2013) analysis of differing dynamics between White pre-service teachers and TCCs in TEPs. She concluded, "education departments need to provide valuable experiences and pedagogy to their predominantly White pre-service teachers. With this goal in mind, education departments around the United States are taking steps to prepare their pre-service teachers to work with racially diverse populations of students and parents" (p. 1).

Further, in his syllabi analysis study, Gorski (2009) reported that "the authors of many of these syllabi seemed to assume that all their students would be White." Perhaps it is the lack of preparedness on the part of teacher educators and TEPs to be inclusive of their students of color that bolsters the silencing effect brought on by White students. Cochran-Smith (1995), in her reflective praxis as the director of a TEP and course instructor (brought on by analysis of course transcriptions and feedback from students of color), found that her course was indeed centering the needs of White students, at the expense of students of color. She advocated that teacher educators within all strands critically examine how their pedagogy and curriculum affects *all* students and the extent of their effectiveness.

More than a decade later, Vetter, Reynolds, Beane, Roquemore, Rorrer, and Shepherd-Allred Vetter (2012), in a case study of one multiracial student (James) and the pedagogy of two instructors, revealed pedagogical shortcomings with regard to meeting the needs of students of color. They explained:

As James's instructors, we made assumptions that it would be easy enough for him to discuss his multiracial identities with students because we assumed that his students did not view him as an outsider. . . We also explored our own reluctance to consistently push students to talk about issues of race in our courses. When reflecting on James's experience, we asked ourselves why we did not do more to push James and our students to engage in this kind of identity work. Was it because of our own fear of discussing race? Were we waiting for a safe space or opportunity that never came? We positioned ourselves as experts in English and left the identity work to other professors who specialized in diversity issues. . . We realized that by not asking students to tell their stories and not pressing

students to address or interrupt issues of race within their educational context, we were actually perpetuating and reinforcing White racial knowledge and experiences. (p. 6)

In their analysis of James, Vetter et al. (2012) found that James grappled with identity classifications and often felt left on the periphery of diversity discussions because he was a person of color. James's discourse sometimes reflected problematic assumptions that needed exploration in order to enhance his development as a culturally relevant pedagogue, yet they felt incapable of pursuing such a task. Vetter et al. (2012) concluded, "teacher educators would benefit from professional development about multicultural education that specifically discusses how to approach dialogue about race and other markers of difference throughout all educational courses" (p. 6).

Narratives about how and why TCCs come to TEPs illuminate vital information. According to Miller and Endo (2005), students of color who enroll in TEPs do so because of parental encouragement, family role models who are teachers, previous teaching experiences, positive relationships with their P-12 teachers, and a personal sense of service to their respective ethno-racial communities. Their study focused on recruitment tactics but failed to address issues of experience that impact recruitment and institutional retention efforts. In a study with 12 Asian American, Black, and Latina women enrolled in a social justice TEP, Kohli (2009) sought to understand each participant's personal history with cultural discrimination and its impact on their licensure matriculation. While each participant experienced racism, none found space in their TEPs to explore the effects of that lived reality. Kohli argued that TEPs "must continue to explore the racialized experiences of Teachers of Color" (p. 250). The findings of the study led to the development of a unique diversity course which Kohli (2009) argues is valuable within

any teacher preparation program with TCCs. In essence, Kohli (2009) challenges TEPs to be more inclusive and culturally relevant to TCCs.

Future Directions

Propagated in response to systemic inequities, multicultural education is inherently resistive to injustice. However, Nieto and Bode (2012) remarked that "the political and transformative theories of multicultural education have often been neglected when translated into practice. As a result, even though multicultural education has made an important contribution to schools and communities, few long-term institutional changes have taken root" (p. 178). Lamenting the complacency of liberals, Gorski (2006) argued that teachers, activists, and scholars depoliticize multicultural education, thereby abandoning its spirit and allowing its misappropriation. Conservatives argue that multicultural education is exclusionary to dominant groups, but that elevating silenced voices is its preeminent function. Therefore, it is political (Cochran-Smith, 2004; Sleeter, 1996; Vavrus, 2002) and must attend to its mission.

As teachers are challenged to meet the needs of all learners, multicultural education must and will "evolve and change in complex ways" (Banks, 2013, p. 80). One of the most difficult and persistent problems to address is what some researchers have identified as fundamental gaps between theory and practice in multicultural education (Brown & Kysilka, 1994; Cole, 1986; May, 1994; Merelman, 1993; Wilhelm, 1994). Perhaps the most obvious need for future research is conducting and replicating studies that take up the principles and approaches of multicultural education, as well as assessing teacher preparation programs that attempt to produce teachers prepared to teach students from diverse backgrounds. Furthermore, questions surrounding the identity and

positionality (Gorski, 2012) of the instructor during the implementation of culturally

relevant pedagogy require additional investigation.

CRP as Methodology

As an approach to multicultural education, culturally relevant pedagogy is

plausibly the most pervasive in P-12 classrooms (Morrison, Robbins, & Rose, 2008).

Through the approach, Ladson-Billings (1995) declared that "not only must teachers

encourage academic success and cultural competence, they must help students to

recognize, understand, and critique current social inequities" (p. 476). Originally

conceived for the education of African-American children, CRP has been appropriated to

address the needs of all learners, specifically those who are traditionally marginalized.

Shifting demographics in public education and the widening of the achievement gap have

popularized the approach. Operationalizing CRP has been an objective of practitioners

and its effectiveness has been well documented (Morrison et al., 2008). Given the

urgency of recruiting more teachers of color, it seems fitting that I would study CRP as a

teaching practice designed to meet the needs of a population traditionally under-served.

As previously documented, a gap in the literature exists regarding equitable development

of teachers of color in multicultural education courses.

<div align="center">

Concluding Thoughts

</div>

The U.S. education system is desperately in need of reform due to its culturally

diverse students. Multicultural education, with all of its complexities, variations,

misinterpretations, inadequacies, and hopes, is still worth pursuing and developing

because at its core, it is the champion for those students. The theory of culturally relevant

pedagogy has remained a dominant approach to multicultural education ever since the

publication of *The Dreamkeepers: Successful Teachers of African American Children*

(Ladson-Billings, 1994)*,* both in theoretical teacher training and P-12 classroom practice. In light of the success and popularity CRP has experienced with youth, the time has come to measure its effectiveness in TEPs. With the widening demographic imperative and academic achievement gap creating challenging environments for teachers, the need for effective TEP reform is critical. Because teacher effectiveness is the leading school-based indicator for student success, Pretorius (2012) asserted that "if teachers are to be effective, their initial training will have to be effective" (p. 310). Since multicultural education is the conduit used to prepare teacher candidates to teach diverse populations, this study investigates the quality of experiences for two neglected constituents, namely the instructor and the TCCs.

CHAPTER 3

Critical Ethnography

In response to the research gap on the development of teachers of color, this project interrogates the experiences of TCCs when university recruitment is successful. The absence of sufficient empirical studies that investigate the experiences of pre- and in-service teachers of color bring to question claims about their preparedness (Sheets, 2001). Through the employment of critical ethnographic methods, the study aims to explore the use of CRP in courses designed for transformation, as well as the effectiveness of such practices with populations of color. Assumptions among minoritized teachers who will be instructing diverse student populations and therefore generating positive schooling experiences are at the heart of this study. The objectives of this critical ethnography are not only to elevate the voice and identities of its participants, but also to illuminate the experience of TCCs in multicultural education courses as related to instructor pedagogies. Questions that guide this critical ethnographic study include:

1. How are teacher candidates of color prepared to teach diverse student populations?

2. What support structures enable the development of critical consciousness in a multicultural education course?

3. How are students' funds of knowledge utilized to provide meaningful learning opportunities?

4. How is academic rigor determined and sustained in a multicultural education class?

5. How do candidates enact content and pedagogical resistance in a multicultural education class?

6. How do teacher candidates of color respond to culturally relevant pedagogy/multicultural teacher education?

   a. How do candidates enact content and pedagogical resistance in a multicultural class?

   b. How do TCCs enact agency in a multicultural class?

In this chapter, I address the methodology of the study. I rationalize the use of critical ethnography and provide a description of the study's background (including the setting and brief descriptions of focal participants), data collection, and data analysis. I conclude with a discussion of researcher identity and ethics.

Critical Ethnography

Empirical research focusing on the experiences of TCCs in the United States is limited (Foster, 2005; Gay, 2000; Kohli, 2009), but critical ethnography, with its political commitments to social justice and the "plurivocal worlds of the speaking subject," could serve as a tool to explore the intersections of plurality and performance in the construction of critical consciousness and identity development (Tyler, 1987, p. 171). Moreover, "ethnographic research is doubly attractive for the qualitative child-centered and culturally sensitive insights it offers to a field of research traditionally preoccupied with quantitative measurements" (Yon, 2003, p. 412). Below, I rationalize my use of critical ethnography in this study.

Epistemologically, ethnographers subscribe to interpretivist traditions that highlight the perceptions and values of participants' social and cultural lives (Boas, 1943). The "critical" component in critical ethnography refers to the methodology's opposition to hegemonic assumptions of fact in the social sciences. Kincheloe and McLaren (2000) identified critical ethnography as critical theory in practice. Critical

theory is an anti-positivist paradigm that aims to uncover vested interests that act to perpetuate the oppression of others. Concerned with praxis (Kincheloe, 1991), critical theory's objectives are geared toward emancipation and democracy. "Merging these theories allowed critical theory to develop an empirical basis and allowed ethnography to move into the political realm" (Barton, 2001, p. 906). Ball (1994) spoke of the inherent "resistance" in critical ethnography as a result of its aggressive push back against dominant forces, while championing oppressed and "Othered" people. Lather (2001) wrote about the efforts of critical ethnography to uncover and challenge naturalized inequities internalized by both the oppressor and the oppressed. "Politicizing ethnography is a defining characteristic of critical ethnography because it is rooted in the belief that exposing, critiquing, and transforming inequalities associated with social structures and labeling devices (e.g., gender, race, and class) are consequential and fundamental dimensions of research and analysis" (Barton, 2001, p. 906). With its political underpinnings, critical ethnography is regarded as a mechanism by which the empowerment of marginalized populations can take place (Ball, 1994; Kincheloe & McLaren, 2000).

Any research with human participants has the potential to be damaging, even if not immediately; there may be lingering, indirect effects (Tisdale, 2004). Ethnographers, sometimes heralded as seekers of authentic truth, must humbly engage with participants (Smith, 1999). Barton (2001) encouraged "explicit conversations with the researched" (p. 914) to dignify their experiences. Critical ethnography is a limited yet agentic field that must be helpful in actually transforming the field for the sake of social justice. According to Yon (2003), educational ethnographies are "the means for engaging disjunctions between official goals and actual effects, as well as the symbolic meanings and adaptive

strategies evident in cultures of schools" (p. 424). The ethical responsibilities of conducting a critical ethnography are just as salient as and are in fact interconnected with the quality of the scholarship.

Amid various characterizations, the definition of multicultural education offered by Nieto (1992) clarifies that "developing a multicultural perspective means learning how to think in more inclusive and expansive ways, reflecting on what we learn, and putting our learning into action. Multicultural education invites students and teachers to put their learning into action for social justice" (p. 216). The pairing of ethnographic research with multicultural education efforts intersects at the place "action," whereby research outcomes stimulate justice oriented change.

Background of the Study

I negotiated entry into the study site by using various search engines to locate multicultural teacher educators that identified as critical scholars in the southeast region of the United States. I emailed several institutions and awaited responses. After making contact with a few instructors, I explained the goals of the study and the potential benefits of participating. As I discuss the process of gaining research site entry, I use pseudonyms to conceal the identity of participants. Through a series of email correspondences and two phone conversations, Dr. Hernandez granted me permission to collect data in her classes. Thereafter, Dr. Hernandez negotiated with her department to allow me to conduct the study, and I sought IRB approval from my home institution. On the first day of both class meetings, every student received a consent form (see Appendix C), and I verbally explained the purpose of my study and my role in the class.

Research Setting

Southeastern University (SU) is a large, urban research institution that is the leading single provider of classroom teachers within the region. The institution is among the most racially and ethnically diverse in the country, and its College of Education (CoE) reflected such demographics. According to SU's website, the CoE valued "competence, diversity, [the] well-being of child, collaboration." With such stated goals and a clearly diverse student body (50% students of color), SEU was the ideal place for my data collection.

In an effort to enhance the capacity of teacher candidates to teach students from all backgrounds and to reject the highly criticized "one shot" treatment of multicultural education (McDiarmid, 1990), SEU adopted a two-course model to work toward the development of culturally relevant pedagogues, with additional infusion of multicultural education concepts throughout the licensure program. A section of each course within the early childhood licensure track was the site of my study.

> Diversity 1000, as stated on its syllabus (see Appendix D), was designed to: provide the student with fundamental knowledge about the influence of Culture and Diversity in the educational process of children and adolescents. Specifically, this course is designed to examine: 1) the nature and function of culture; 2) the development of individual and group cultural identity; 3) definitions and implications of diversity; and 4) the influences of culture on learning, development, and pedagogy.

Diversity 1000, a foundations course, functioned as a prerequisite before official admittance into the Teacher Education licensure program. The course met weekly on Tuesday afternoons for 2.5 hours and consisted of 26 students. Thirteen of the students self-identified as Black; five identified as White; three as Latina; three as Asian; and two

as multiracial. There were five males in the class; one student who identified as queer; and six students who did not identify as Protestant Christians. In an activity about socioeconomic status, the class self-represented the spectrum of incomes and family educational backgrounds.

The other site of data collection for this study was the junior level diversity course that newly admitted candidates take upon acceptance into the program. Of the 22 students in the Diversity 3000 course, all were women, and seven self-identified as Black; two as Asian; four as Latina; seven as White; and two multiracial. In various activities and mediums, no one publicly identified as non-heterosexual, and the majority identified as Protestant Christians. Like the 1000 level course, Diversity 3000 also met once weekly for 2.5 hours during the spring semester (January 14, 2013, to May 7, 2013). According to the syllabus (see Appendix E), the purpose of Diversity 3000 was to

> introduce future educators to practices and understandings needed to provide an effective learning environment for culturally and linguistically diverse student populations. Course participants will explore foundation diversity issues related to culture, language, sexual orientation, ethnicity, religion, gender, exceptionality, socio-economics, and other topics. Additionally, the importance of the role of the educational context (social, cultural, political, and historical) in intercultural interactions and communication is addressed.

As both courses addressed the concerns of multicultural education, contextual conditions such as group dynamics, demographics, course content, and teacher educator identity mediate student experiences in the courses. Demographic diversity, for the sake of this study, is primarily linked to race and ethnicity. However, the participants of the study were representative of varying identity groups. Therefore, those dimensions inform and

are considered in the analysis of the experiences of both the students and professor. While I followed two courses, my analysis draws heavily from the Diversity 3000 group, given that the students in that course were officially a pre-service teacher cohort.

Of the 48 students, 11 were chosen as focal participants; however, the analysis features students from the larger population. Using mixed purposeful sampling (Patton, 1990), I recruited students from three of the four major ethnic/racial groups represented in each class (Asian, Black, and Hispanic). I employed opportunistic sampling (Lavrakas, 2008) as students willingly offered to work with me and convenience sampling as I intentionally sought out students of varying ethnic and racial identities. Overall, focal participants were selected based on their ethno-racial identification, their willingness to participate in the study, and their active engagement with the online forum related to their respective course.

Participant Identity

The following are fragmented descriptions of the focal participants, based on what I observed, what they shared in class, and what was shared in written mediums like the course blog and formal assignments. I appropriate Gee's (1989) theory of "identity-kit" to situate the participants as actors in a group, "complete with the appropriate costume and instructions on how to act, talk, and often write, so as to take on a particular social role that others will recognize" (Gee, 1989, p. 7).

Instructor. Dr. Hernandez self-identified as a critical scholar, specializing in critical pedagogy and multicultural education in an urban context. Prior to teaching in Southeastern University's Teacher Education Program, she briefly taught at two other universities, and she taught first grade for many years. Dr. Hernandez, hailing from southern Africa, was born to East Indian parents. She is the mother of two biracial

children, and her husband is an African-American education professor in the same college. A student once asked her, "What do you consider yourself culturally?" Dr. Hernandez hesitated and then responded, "Umm. . . I don't really. My family is from here. My parents live in Goah, I call Zambia home, and my brother and sister live in Namibia. Is that all right?" (Interview, March 11, 2013).

Dr. Hernandez has taught numerous iterations of diversity/inclusive/multicultural education courses, some of which were in collaboration with her husband. As a pedagogue, Dr. Hernandez consistently presented an optimistic and approachable attitude that mediated each of her class sessions as well as our interactions. By my observations, she was always prepared for class, she was knowledgeable about subject matters, and she provided students with course related feedback to improve their learning. She also made herself available to students outside of official class meeting times.

Diversity 1000 Participants. <u>Joy</u> was a 20-year-old student who self-identified as Chinese, even though she was born and raised in the United States. Joy was an active student in the sense that she sincerely engaged with course reading materials and actively participated in class. She was also very social, often balancing her attention between the off-topic conversations with her classmates and the central focus of the instructor. In both the online and class meetings, Joy had strong opinions about binary constructions and exclusionary practices with regard to global issues and course topics. Joy used her blog space to extend her learning and teach her peers about topics relevant to her culture because she felt they were unaddressed in formal course readings and discussions.

<u>Azra</u>, perhaps the most vocal of her peers in the Diversity 1000 course, was a Pakistani female student. As a Generation 1.5 student, Azra was raised in the Midwestern part of the United States and lived a self-described upper-middle class life. During an

interview about her demographic identity, she stated, "I have a double background, I guess," meaning she had Eastern and Western perspectives, values and practices. While Azra was very vocal in class discussions, she was also very distracted. She admitted to hardly ever finishing the course readings, often texted during class, enjoyed social media on her cellphone, and routinely initiated off-topic conversations. Azra had a very casual approach to the course. Sometimes, she would be late to class by five minutes or so because she stopped to buy fast food, which she would proceed to eat during discussions. However, in the online forum, she critically engaged with course issues and extended conversations to be inclusive of silenced groups. She often provided links and references to poignant texts; she challenged peers and their thinking and was not shy about disagreeing with the instructor.

Martin, a middle-aged Black man, was a very engaged student throughout the semester. He regularly took notes, photographed course activities and artifacts, and contributed in class. Through his discussion offerings, Martin would make connections between his 16-year-old son's schooling experiences, his observations in the field, and theoretical connections he explored in other courses. Martin identified himself as a Christian and often framed his position on social issues in a conservative manner. However, Martin also opened himself up for new knowledge with comments like "I'm willing to change my opinion" or "I'm trying to grow." Martin was a long-winded contributor, which many of the younger female students did not appreciate. They would roll their eyes or completely disengage whenever he spoke. On his online forum, Martin was very succinct and mainly used the space to summarize the class sessions.

Eliza was a contentious member of the class. She was a Peruvian 21-year-old who took pride in her liberal ideologies. In one instance, she championed LGBTQ rights and

in another mockingly described her 14-year-old brother as being "pretty gay." She dominated course discussions with her expansive vocabulary and obvious understanding (if only elemental) of social policies affecting particular communities. Eliza was forthcoming with her personal life, and although she rhetorically proclaimed a social justice orientation, she often framed herself as superior to her peers and "dumb people." There were instances when she would engage the professor in a power struggle, arguing that the instructor had little validity behind her claims. She sporadically engaged with the online space, despite its obligatory nature, and mostly did so to showcase grand gestures of community among the very peers she worked to alienate during class sessions.

Josefina, a Latina student who worked to keep her national origin private, was a 22-year-old psychology major. She shared in her first blog, "When it comes to what ethnicity I am, I hate when people ask me where I am from, already expecting a different answer that is not USA. If I had a nickel for every time that someone has 'told' me that I am Mexican without asking me first." She also shared that she was part of the U.S. Army Reserves and that any absences would be a result of that other commitment. Both in the online space and in person, Josefina made moderate contributions to the class. She only became passionate about issues with which she was personally connected: women on the frontlines and immigration policies. In both those sessions, Josefina shared willingly and defended her position. Otherwise, she remained subdued, and her engagement wavered as the semester progressed.

Janette was a 19-year-old African-American sophomore. She had a quiet and stern demeanor that countered her stylish sense of fashion. It was rare to see Janette without her cellphone in hand, which she admitted was an issue in all her classes. Janette described herself as "non-confrontational" and approached course topics as a bystander.

She did not participate in course debates but stated, "I find that listening to others' opinion can be enlightening." In her blog space, Janette often explained her discreetness in class and proceeded to share her opinion on course topics. Routinely, she avoided critiquing texts, authors, the instructor, or peers, but chose to focus only on the aspects she appreciated.

Diversity 3000 Participants. <u>Nurul</u> was a 22-year-old junior who self-identified as a Malaysian raised in the U.S. Virgin Islands. When asked about her knowledge about cultures other than her own, Nurul shared that she was very familiar with African-American, White, and island cultures. By my observations, Nurul was a very congenial student toward both her peers and the instructor. She cooperated with all assignments and activities, generally spoke when addressed, and situated most of her class contributions in a positive light. Her presence on the blogs was generally that of a cheerleader, often complementing and expressing enthusiasm and curiosity about course topics that featured limited confrontation.

<u>Ofelia,</u> a 26-year-old student, self-identified as a Salvadorian married to a White man. Her husband was also a student in the education department. She described herself as "talkative" and an admirer of children. A high achieving student, Ofelia was valedictorian of her high school class and a first generation college student. Throughout the semester, Ofelia exhibited enthusiasm toward community building and course topics. As she noted in her first blog post, "I am super excited for all the different knowledge that I will obtain this semester, especially in this class! We will see what the future has in store for us! Classmates, I know we can do this and make this semester a great one! Yay!" (Blog post, January 17, 2013).

Tiana, an African-American, non-traditional student, was a mother of two boys, a single parent, and a veteran of the U.S. military. She had a dominating presence in the class that often positioned her as the leading contributor, even more than the instructor. Often, as new concepts were introduced in the course, Tiana used class discussion time to publicly process the content. She consistently demonstrated engagement and curiosity about course topics and was often the only student able to accurately and specifically comment about course readings. Throughout the course, Tiana showed great effort to develop cultural competencies. However, her contributions were often problematic, framing various groups of people in a deficit context.

Carmen, a Brazilian born/American raised student, described herself as an individual—separated from community constructions. She stated, "I hate being asked what I am. I'm from Brazil, but I'm just me." She characterized the church as her family, and throughout the semester, she referenced God and the Bible as a source of rationale for the way she processed new or disturbing content. While she claimed to have extensive experience with children, Carmen feared her biggest in-service challenge would be classroom management. Carmen was an active contributor in the course and on the blog site, and was congenial with her peers. She started a Facebook page for the cohort, which she kept private from the instructor and me.

Imani, an African-American, 21-year-old student, had regularly made the dean's list since her enrollment at Southeastern University. She had taken Diversity 1000 with Dr. Hernandez and held critical orientations toward course topics. Her in-class contributions and blog space served as a platform to advance course discussions and promote her aspirations to be a change agent in her future classroom. Imani also

commented that she wished to be part of the social cohort developing in the course, which at times led to uncritical acts to elicit peer approval.

Data Collection

Wedeen (2010) asserted that "ethnography involves immersion in the place and lives of people under study" (p. 257), elaborating on the activities required to carry out an ethnography, including, but not limited to, time and ethical commitments to the people and space. As a guest in this research site, I understood the need to establish myself as dedicated to the students and their experience in the courses. I remained in the field for the entirety of the semester to practice "sustained engagement" (Lillis, 2008). I "enrolled" in both courses during the spring semester of 2013. The conditions of my enrollment entailed attending every session, completing course readings, and participating in course activities as deemed necessary to gain emic perspective. While in the classroom, I observed the lectures, group work, presentations, and various learning activities, and I partially participated in class discussions. On occasion, I followed up with both formal and informal interviews with participants to glean clarity and insight. During each class meeting, I took fieldnotes describing the physical, emotional, dialogical, and dynamic space. Sarangi (2006) would explain my approach as "thick participation," meaning that I applied continuous and engaged participation in a research site that resulted in insider understandings.

In addition to participant observations, I conducted several follow-up interviews with focal participants. I asked each participant a variety of these questions; no two participants had identical protocols. Appendices A and B provide a list of the interview questions. In the follow-up interviews, we discussed their introduction to teaching and their experiences in the College of Education. Specifically, we discussed how students

were engaging with the course topics and the pedagogy of the instructor. Interviews were open-ended to allow "long conversations," where participants could construct and cross-reference matters of importance to them (Lillis, 2008). Data were also collected by means of various artifacts (e.g., university literature, student blogs, student work, course assessments), most notably the student blog posts.

During interviews, I attempted a neutral researcher-participant relationship (Tisdale, 2004) with participants by reminding them (a) their confidentiality would be preserved throughout the course of study, (b) they had a right to terminate the interview at any time, (c) their responses had no bearing on their course grade, and (d) there were no known and harmful effects of participating in the study. It was made known to participants that I had no preexisting relationship with Dr. Hernandez and that they would never be identified with any particular response, comment, or materials that they shared with me. Audio recordings, handwritten notes, and typed transcriptions of all participant interviews have been placed in a locked safe that is stored in a secure environment. These data will remain secure in the safe for a minimum of seven years in order to uphold and maintain participant confidentiality.

Data Analysis

The various forms of records mentioned above together make up the data set of the study. Each interview was transcribed by a professional transcription company and prepared for analysis. In cases of obfuscation, I contacted available participant(s) via telephone or email for clarification. According to Barton (2001), "critical ethnography is grounded in a social-constructivist epistemological framework in which knowledge generation within research is understood as an active, context-based process influenced by the values, histories, and practices of the researcher and of the community in which

the research is done" (p. 905-906). With regard to data analysis, I incorporated insights provided by participants, insights from the existing body of literature, and my own critical readings of the field.

To begin, I compiled all the data in two bound books (one for each course), amounting to over 400 pages of single-spaced, 12-point font text. I read the data, cover to cover, to engage the "literal content and form of the text" (Crabtree & Miller, 1999, p. 39). Using a grounded theory approach, I began with an open coding process to create unanticipated analytic codes and categories that emerged from the data (Charmaz, 2006; Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Thereafter, I re-read the text and documented initial memos that helped me glean insights into the social space, which lead to focused coding (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 1995). As I read, I reflexively monitored how my personal orientations were shaping my interpretations and focus (Miller & Crabtree, 1999). In an effort to create distance, I employed Miles and Huberman's (1994) and Yin's (2003) cross-case/comparative analysis in my follow-up read in order to generate transferable findings. To systematize the analysis, I used Dedoose (Gilbert, Morgan, Zachry, & McDonald, 2013) to manage, organize, and electronically file transcripts, blogs, and fieldnotes.

Through this iterative analysis, I triangulated the data. Triangulation, a common cross-referencing tool employed by qualitative researchers, means capturing multiple perspectives, perhaps collecting data through various mediums, and being reflexive and transparent. Triangulation "reflects an attempt to secure an in-depth understanding of the phenomenon in question" (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p. 5). The methods' efforts to triangulate, a tactic under-girded by the depth and scope of the inquiry, redeems the suspended capacity for generalizability in ethnography, brought on by few case study

participants recruited through convenience sampling and the rejection of objectivity and positivism.

Researcher Identity and Ethics

From the onset, and as the study progressed, I understood that my various social locations would affect the experience and outcomes of the study. Given my person of color identity, my years of P-12 classroom experience as both teacher and student in urban schools, and my instructor experiences in a traditional teacher education program, I felt like an insider. However, Gallagher (2009) warned that "being an insider because of one's race does not mute or erase other social locations which serve to deny access, create misunderstanding or bias with those from the same racial background" (p. 69). As such, Smith (1999) highlighted the need for all researchers—but particularly insider researchers—to be reflexive. Although critical ethnography generally centers reflexivity, Smith (1999) cautioned that "insiders have to live with the consequences of their processes on a day-to-day basis for ever more, and so do their families and communities" (p. 137). She does not excuse outsiders, but rather calls for all researchers to be ethical, respectful, reflexive, humble, and critical (Smith, 1999, p. 139). Smith speaks of the inherent tensions of partially being an insider but also an outsider because of employment commitments, among other factors (in my case, graduation commitments). Disrupting discourses of "official insider voice," Smith (1999) illuminates the risks of an indigenous researcher having to confront "their own taken-for-granted views about their community" (p. 139). Humility is stressed because there is no official truth; additionally, not all social actors can be pleased. Finessing the art of social managements in the field of when to say "no," "yes," or "later," and to whom is arduous but necessary. Appreciating the complexity of being an insider, or possibly "the outsider within," Smith (1999) stated that

"indigenous research is a humble and humbling activity" (p. 5). In light of Smith's (1999) guidance to be careful, humble, ethical, and responsible, I prudently approached the participants.

Self-identifying as a Black woman allowed me to be a part of the majority racial and gender groups at the research sites. I believe my racial status proved advantageous when I interviewed the Black students in Diversity 3000. The relaxed nature of our conversations and their willingness to divulge personal dissent from the course's trajectory supports this assertion. In addition, the familiarity also caused instances of awkwardness to occur without friction. For instance, during a conversation about personal perceptions of hair, one woman argued that wearing dreadlocks signified drug use and hostility. When I gestured to my locked mane, she laughed and commented, "you already know!" I humbly nodded, as recognition of the popular stereotypes associated with locked hair. In an alternate context, I might have responded differently. The other students of color were also receptive to my presence in the room, often volunteering themselves for additional interviews or inviting me to observe their group work. Nonetheless, their contributions were less detailed and personal.

The White students were also eager to participate in the study; however, they were not my focus. Nevertheless, there were instances when I pursued informal conversations with particularly vocal and passionate White students. Most of the Diversity 1000 and 3000 students had difficulty understanding the nature of my study and perceived me as more of a guest than a researcher. They did not know about my P-12 or postsecondary teaching experiences. During group work, some students asked me to clarify course content. Overall, everyone was polite and cooperative, but unless I initiated conversation that yielded personal experiences, the students of color did not offer it.

Ethics

      "Representing others will always be a complicated and contentious undertaking" (Madison, 2005, p. 3-4). In her critique of a documentarian covering the activism in Ghana against sexual violence toward women, Madison (2005) wrote about good intentions and the danger of poor implementation. Like most people who attempt to represent another, the documentarian crafted a "single story" (Adichie, 2009), a story that often disenfranchises the presented and holds great consequences (Madison, 2005). Yet "critical ethnography begins with an ethical responsibility to address processes of unfairness or injustice within a particular lived domain" (Madison, 2012, p. 5). Madison (2005) described ethical responsibility as "a compelling sense of duty and commitment based on moral principles of human freedom and well-being, and hence a compassion for the suffering of living beings" (p. 5). Positionality invites researchers to reject neutrality, objectivity, and notions of truth. Ethnographic researchers cannot escape the responsibility of impacting and interrupting the field in which they work, nor can they avoid being affected by their participation: "Doing fieldwork is a personal experience" (Madison, 2005, p. 8).

Concluding Thoughts

      Smith (1999) argued that the "insider" view of one's marginalized experience "cannot be understood or analyzed by outsiders or people who have not experienced, and who have not been born into, this way of life" (p. 34). I, being a person of color and formerly a pre-service teacher, hope to offer insight into the teacher preparation experiences that once left me under-prepared to teach students from diverse backgrounds. Given that multicultural education is praxis-oriented and reliant upon learning meant to improve social conditions, it is clear that critical ethnography, being contextually

interpretative "in order to make change," is an ideal methodology for approaching education research (Madison, 2005). As I entered and dwelt in the research sites and engaged with the participants, I understood my advantages and limitations in making clear and pinning down the lived experiences of participants. In the data chapters that follow, I attempt to share my reading of various phenomena and to give space for them to be translated to other learning spaces with similar conditions.

CHAPTER 4

Dr. Hernandez as Culturally Relevant Pedagogue

The need to explore alternative approaches to pre-service teacher development becomes paramount as diversity issues exhaust traditional pedagogy in P-12 classrooms. "The responsibility for addressing this challenge rests mainly with the faculty and the curriculum" of teacher education programs (Donkor, 2011, p. 13). Nonetheless, "there has been little attention to development of a curriculum for educating teacher educators, or to local and larger policies that might support the development of what teacher educators need to know and do in order to meet the complex demands of preparing teachers for the 21st Century" (Cochran-Smith, 2003 p. 6). Furthermore, multicultural education research often neglects teacher educators and the dispositions, practices, and pedagogies that mediate their work (Gorski, 2012). This chapter discusses the complexities of developing culturally relevant teacher candidates from the perspective and experiences of a teacher educator at Southeastern University. I do so by talking about self-analysis as integral to CRP through a discussion of Dr. Hernandez's practices, the importance of CRP as a way of being, and how Dr. Hernandez addressed the tenets of CRP. The findings illustrate effective practices but also unearth challenges of enacting CRP with TCCs.

Self-Analysis as Integral to CRP

Implementing CRP has been a 21st century challenge of practitioners globally. Irvine (2010) claimed, "many teachers have only a cursory understanding of culturally relevant pedagogy, and their efforts to bridge the cultural gap often fall short" (p. 57). In an interview about practicing CRP, Ladson-Billings argued that teachers need "to understand that they, themselves, are cultural beings" (Lewis & Willis, 1998, p. 63).

Likewise, teacher educators must reflect on their cultural knowledge, subjectivity, biases, and motives (Cochran-Smith, 1995; Taguchi, 2005; Vetter et al., 2012). Within that analysis, many DME instructors (myself included) find they are personally motivated to effectively prepare teachers for a diverse study body. As Grace (2006) autobiographically explored the implications of how his personal life affected his professional pedagogy, he concluded that the melding of the two was inevitable. Similarly, Gay's (2003) work with a diverse group of teachers and teacher educators revealed that "our personal narratives serve the dual function of helping us to look inward and outward in becoming multicultural educators" (p. 7).

Dr. Hernandez attempted to provided opportunities for reflection in her classrooms that both modeled her own self-analysis and asked teacher candidates to do the same. As mentioned before, Dr. Hernandez was a very enthusiastic facilitator. Almost every week, for both Diversity 1000 and 3000, she began the session with a song laced with powerful messages of social justice, inequality, oppression, change, and revolution. In an interview, she explained that the songs fostered reflection, as students practiced lyrical analysis. The weekly post-song discussions reinforced her aim.

Like other diversity and multicultural education (DME) professors, she used her wealth of personal and professional experiences to build bridges between course theory and lived practice (Larke & Larke, 2009; Prado-Olmos, Rios, & Castañeda, 2007). While teaching, Dr. Hernandez often referenced her K-5 classroom experiences to demonstrate ways to be a social justice educator in the classroom. For example, during a discussion around the practicality of critical pedagogy with younger children, she explained:

> I was radical in some ways, but my seven years of teaching were very much about
> me learning how to teach. My preparation for being a teacher, so I was here four

years in the country before I became a teacher in a classroom, so I'd never gone to

school here. I never experienced the way schooling happens here, had very little

context and history about the United States, and my preparation for teaching

didn't do any of that. So, none of what you're getting I got before—very little in

the classrooms, so I was kinda thrown in. When Latino students were coming to

my classroom, I had no idea about their history, their background, their context

now, so I felt I learned as I worked with them over the seven years that I taught. I

was very critical in my teaching. . . teaching them to question things with regard

to some social issues. Those came up. We questioned morality in Goldilocks,

construction of "good and bad" in Jack and the Beanstalk. My students did write

letters to the President, so we did things outside of the classroom. I did build a

community within the classroom and with parents. I did things outside of school

where I invited parents to be with their kids, and so I was doing a lot of things that

kinda fall under this, but I could've done so much more. I always look back at

who I didn't understand, how I didn't know anything. . . my limited history with

African Americans. (Fieldnotes, March 11, 2013)

In discussing her lack of personal knowledge about schooling in the United States, what

Lortie (1975) termed the "apprenticeship of observation," Dr. Hernandez alluded to the

saliency of teachers' understanding of the context of U.S.-based education. In

understanding how schools function, teachers are versed in the hegemonic mediators

affecting quality schooling experiences for all youth, which is vital content in teacher

development (Britzman, 1988). In teaching her former students to "question things," she

described how her pedagogy helped students developed critical consciousness. When

students interrogated normalized conceptions of "good and bad," they were empowered

to construct knowledge. As she purposefully extended her pedagogy beyond the school walls, she practiced valuing the home knowledge of her students. Enacting CRP involves "developing relationships between the school and communities" of P-12 students (Morrison et al., 2008, p. 440). Although Dr. Hernandez was not formally trained to be culturally relevant, her "good teaching" resembled some of the very practices Ladson-Billings (1995) described in her conceptualization of CRP.

As Dr. Hernandez's in-service narratives informed her context, it also transformed her praxis. Ladson-Billings (2009) asserted that culturally relevant pedagogues "see themselves as part of the community and they see teaching as giving back to the community" (p. 28). By sharing accounts of her investment in P-12 students with whom she did not culturally identify, Dr. Hernandez illustrated the achievability of CRP. Ladson-Billings (1995) argued that practitioners must "reconsider what we mean by 'good' teaching, to look for it in some unlikely places, and to challenge those who suggest it cannot be made available to all children" (p.163). Her exposition modeled the flexibility of the approach, but also the need to reflexively commit to the practice. By stating, "I could've done so much more," she alluded to both the incompleteness of CRP and the contextual and preparation advantages the Diversity 3000 cohort had. In part, her under-preparedness during her P-12 teaching years informed her passion for alternate and more critical development of teachers.

Her current contexts also informed her passion. When I asked Dr. Hernandez "How do you think your children affect your pedagogy in preparing future teachers?", she responded:

Well. . . understanding that my children are growing up as Indian and African American, I mean that's a big deal to me. I kinda know how my son probably and

maybe my daughter is gonna be treated. The expectations of him, or the

judgments that people will make about them. I feel it in the stores. I feel it when

we walk by. I don't think I was as conscious of it either until . . . maybe . . .

probably not until I even married John. Conscious about who I was, and what I

looked like to people here. I mean, even though it was always brought to my

attention . . . but because I was not Black and not White, it was easy to fit in either

place in some ways. It was always, well you're one of us, and I got that from both

sides. And I go, "*No*, I'm not—neither one," but thinking about my son he is

immediately. These African-American people know who his dad is, and so I do

too. I want teachers that have thought about these things, that they think about

who he is, and what he's gonna walk into down the road. So yeah, it became a lot

more critical to me after having him. (Interview, February 11, 2013)

When Dr. Hernandez revealed that she wants "teachers that have thought about these

things," she is referencing the oppressive forces in our society that will marginalize her

Black son and potentially her daughter. Ladson-Billings concurred, declaring, "I think

that teachers have to recognize that, in racially stratified society, kids are coping with that

burden" (Lewis & Willis, 1998, p. 69). Historically, teacher "expectations" of Black boys

are deficit based, rendering them as low-achieving, disabled, and criminal (Brown &

Donnor, 2013). With teacher expectations one of the strongest predictors of student

success (Bright et al., 2012; Green, 2010; Muijs & Reynolds, 2002), Dr. Hernandez saw

fit to prepare teachers who would have high expectations of diverse children, much like

her own.

In understanding that her consciousness critically developed after marrying a

Black man, Dr. Hernandez sought to prepare candidates to have similar competencies,

without having to enter into interracial relationships. The fact that her children's biracial identities are a "big deal" suggests that such subjectivities mediate her pedagogy. Plausibly, Dr. Hernandez's personal stock in the outcome of her classes, desiring that pre-service teachers develop cultural competencies, is a pivotal driving force behind her commitment and innovative pedagogy. Delpit's (1995) argument that teachers must learn to appreciate other people's children as their own in order to teach them effectively reflects the goals Dr. Hernandez had for her students.

As Dr. Hernandez partly situated her motivation in the future of her children, she did so with consideration of varying social locations. Although a person of color, through self-analysis she acknowledged the unique nature of her ethno-racial status. She commented,

> I'm a special kind of person of color in the U.S., I think. I think, here, when we say "person of color," we're usually thinking about marginalized groups. We're thinking about African American and Latino, and I'm not any of those . . . if you ask me what's the identity that stands out for me, it would be that I'm a woman, and so I think that piece of me that I'm a woman and that I understand oppression from that angle, that I think that in any form oppression is oppression, and it's kind of the same, so that's how it affects me. (Interview, February 11, 2013)

The idea that "oppression is oppression," while debasing "Oppression Olympics" theories, served as an invitation for scholars of any social location to take up the work of multicultural education (Yuval-Davis, 2012). As Dr. Hernandez shared her personal distance from ethno-racial oppression, she enacted agency in recognition of the privileges afforded by her Indian identity. As a "cultural being," she understood the dominant lens through which she experienced oppression and used that knowledge as a bridge to

connect with students. Rather than falsely elevate her person of color identity as a marker of oppression, Dr. Hernandez conceived her gender identity as a more authentic entryway to develop community within her courses.

DME faculty belong to varying sociodemographic groups that overlap with those of pre-service teachers. Being humble and reflexive allows bridges to form along those locations. Prado-Olmos, Ríos, and Castañeda (2007), in their trilateral self-studies, found that "connections made between the students and faculty allowed [them] to humanize the curriculum" (p. 8). Ladson-Billings (1994; 2009) also argued that teachers need to connect with their students in order to be culturally relevant.

CRP as a Way of Being

On the first day of Diversity 3000, Dr. Hernandez presented her personal culture quilt, an assignment that each student would be required to complete. The quilt, made popular by multicultural education theorist Jacqueline Jordan Irvine (2003), featured a four by four grid with 16 distinctive squares that prompt students to discuss their family history, experiences with cultural "others," their personal culture, and their professional culture. After discussing her family history with colonization, the problematic nature of being Indian in Africa, her journey to teacher education, and the complexities of the ways in which marrying into an African-American family necessitated an unyielding commitment to cultural competency, she stated, "You are free to ask any questions" (Fieldnotes, January 14, 2013). Students ardently queried:

> When did you come to the U.S.? How many children do you have? Are you
> wearing a flex watch? How did you and your husband meet? Where did you do
> your master's? How did you become a professor? How long did you teach in the

classroom? Was it hard to combine the two cultures? How long have you been

married? Have you taught this course before? (Fieldnotes, January 14, 2013)

The nature of their questions ranged from intimately personal to questioning her

credentials, the latter being a common experience among women of color in the

professoriate (Turner, González, & Wood, 2008). Nevertheless, Dr. Hernandez answered

their questions gracefully, ending the segment by saying "I'm always open to questions if

you have more." Exhibiting vulnerability with her self-exposition was a humble act that

resulted in shared power between Dr. Hernandez and the students (Morrison et al., 2008,

p. 443).

Commitments to developing reflexivity, as a pedagogical disposition, mediated

her teaching as the semester progressed. During a discussion about using ethno-racial

slurs, Dr. Hernandez asked the Diversity 1000 class a series of questions like, "Is it a

wrong to say, 'Don't be a Jew'—being cheap?" or, with regard to instances of being

cheated or swindled, "Is it wrong to say 'I got gypped'?" Her intent was to highlight the

word association between Gypsies (Roma) and stereotypes about their economic

practices, but a White female student challenged her use of the term "Gypsies"

altogether. The student remarked, "You are wrong to call Romani people 'Gypsies'

because they are from Romania." Without addressing the error in the student's

"correction," Dr. Hernandez responded, "You're right, which leads to me ask: If it is not

your intention, and you are ignorant, is it wrong?" This inspired students to engage in a

lively debate where their preexisting epistemologies overtly clashed with their real-time

knowledge exposure. Martin raised his hand to share his conflict with wearing a

Washington Redskins shirt while coming to understand its exemplification of ethnic

stereotyping. Dr. Hernandez's humbled response to the female student had maintained

the focus of the discussion on language use and intent, rather than on criticisms of the instructor.

As Dr. Hernandez shared additional problematic terms and epithets, many students commented on the ways they inadvertently offend and stereotype members of other culture groups. According to Warford's (2011) adaptation of Vygotsky's zone of proximal development, which he terms the zone of proximal teacher development (ZPTD), the initial stages of development require partnership between the candidate-self and the instructor-assistant. Dr. Hernandez enacted the second stage of the ZPTD whereby the expert assists the learner using the prior experiences of the candidates. While the Diversity 1000 students were initially prepared to discuss "Others," Dr. Hernandez's questions prompted them to question themselves. Ladson-Billings (2009) termed this "instructional scaffolding [–] when teachers help students move from what they know to what they need to know" (p. 134). In an interview segment about the diversity courses and her pedagogical choices, Dr. Hernandez commented, "I feel you have to first go there with your heart and mind before you can do authentically good work" (Interview, March 11, 2013). "Authentically good work" references instructional scaffolding alongside Dr. Hernandez's humbled approaches. The Diversity 1000 students benefited from her humbled practice: Once they were comfortable, they exposed their incompetence and participated in communal dialogism (Holquist, 2002).

As evidenced by students' engagement, her pedagogical efforts to relate course content to the lives of students were effective with many of the TCCs, but comprehensive inclusion was a challenge. In their synthesis of classroom-based research on the implementation of CRP, Morrison et al. (2008) found that most studies were conducted in largely homogenous classrooms. Therefore, they concluded that the applicability of CRP

"to more heterogeneous classrooms may be limited" (Morrison, et al., 2008, pp. 443-444). When I asked Dr. Hernandez, "How does the student diversity of the courses affect your pedagogy?" she responded:

> I try to draw on their experiences. I rely a lot on what they bring to the class. . . I will say, though, that I kinda struggle sometimes with how well I'm pulling in the students' experiences. It's just today with Mina—she'd mentioned that she was an immigrant, and sometimes her experience as a Korean don't always seem to fit into the conversation. Then, you have an immigrant and a Korean, and so that's always in the back of my mind. Oh! And Azra too. I don't know how well I bring them in. I know—I may or may not get it when we're talking about religion, or when we talk about immigration or our language and things like that, but I don't know if I brought it in as well as I should. (Interview, March 11, 2013)

Dr. Hernandez's pedagogical reflections illuminate her humility with regard to being relevant with everyone in the courses. Additionally, she echoed sentiments of faculty of color who find that working with TCCs causes them "to reconsider [their] common approaches to the coursework characteristic of teaching primarily Euro-American students" (Prado-Olmos, Ríos & Castañeda, 2007, p. 2). "Drawing on" student experiences is central to CRP (Ladson-Billings, 1994; 2009). As students' funds of knowledge (González, Moll, & Amanti, 2005) are incorporated into the course curriculum, the learning becomes relevant.

Despite Dr. Hernandez's efforts to be relevant while teaching about diversity amidst diversity, some students noted a "hierarchy of oppression" that rendered select groups as under-served (Gorski & Goodman, 2011). Reflexive praxis led her to adopt an inquiry stance where she deliberately invited students outside of traditional binaries (e.g.,

Black/White, Protestant/ Catholic, poor/rich) to contribute to class discussions. For the remainder of the semester, she worked to diversify course discussions to be more representative of the class demographics. She altered course readings, facilitated broader discussions, and invited global perspectives. However, she still lamented programmatic limitations, stating, "Two and a half hours a week just isn't enough" (Interview, February 11, 2013). DME instructors are constrained; thus, our professional responsibility is to be flexible within external parameters. As Dr. Hernandez demonstrated, reflexive becoming makes possible the adaptability needed to be culturally relevant.

According to the formal Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) of both courses, students believed Dr. Hernandez "exhibited enthusiasm about the subject matter" at an exceptionally high rate. Chapter seven discuses those aspects of the SET, and my observations corroborated the student ratings. Dr. Hernandez's professional choice to remain a clinical instructor (as opposed to following the tenure track) in order to "focus on doing really good work in the classroom" best exemplified her commitment to the pedagogical responsibility of DME instructors (Interview, March 11, 2013). She regularly asked students to provide content for the whole group (be it a reading, website, or opening song). She facilitated rather than lectured; thus, her "good work" in the academy was collaborative and dialogic. Morrison et al. (2008) determined that "culturally relevant pedagogy is ultimately a constructivist pedagogy" (p. 444). While Dr. Hernandez self-identified as a culturally relevant pedagogue, our conversations and interviews revealed a reflexive becoming rather than mastery. In essence, she regarded CRP as praxis-oriented disposition that suspended her in a state of vulnerability and perpetual growth.

Addressing the Tenets of CRP

As I continue to provide examples of Dr. Hernandez's enactment of CRP, it is important to clarify how Ladson-Billings's (2009) broadly conceptualized pedagogy, whereby "noninstructional actions, such as smiling at a student and showing disapproval of a student" constitute pedagogy (p. 29). Oftentimes, Dr. Hernandez's CRP surfaced in her discretion and discernment when approaching student issues.

During my first formal interview with Dr. Hernandez, I asked, "Do you think you're culturally relevant?" She responded:

> I like to think I try to be. . . My struggle is: How am I really pulling the individual students into their learning so their experiences inform the learning? So I think it's just always going to be a bit of a struggle thinking about it from one group to another, but I do think that the issues that we talk about in general are very relevant to them. And I think I try to make those connections pretty obvious to them as people, and then to them as maybe future educators—connections that what we're learning about is relevant. (Interview, February 4, 2013)

As she self-evaluated, her humility and vulnerability refereed her appraisal. Hedging with terms like "I think" and "I try," Dr. Hernandez alluded to the "becoming" nature of culturally relevant pedagogues. When she said, "It's always going to be a struggle," she reiterated her commitment to praxis. The centrality of connection in culturally relevant pedagogy was marked by her aim to make known the intersectionality of course topics, and therefore the relevancy of social issues. Although Dr. Hernandez under-rated her teaching, the following examples reflect the quality of her pedagogy and provide potential insights for other DME instructors.

Developing and Maintaining Academic Success

Critics of DME courses challenge its intellectual rigor, citing the growing achievement gap and a lack of empirical evidence documenting successful preparation of teachers for diverse learners (Steiner, 2003). Academic rigor is centered in P-12 implementation of CRP and therefore must be a foundation in multicultural teacher education. Academic rigor entails cognitive growth in disciplinary knowledge and the capacity to analyze and critically manipulate course material. In the case of DME courses, rigor also requires sustained commitment to the discipline and praxis in educational spaces. Rigorous pedagogy "pose[s] dilemmas, subvert[s] obvious or canonical 'truths' or force[s] incongruities upon our attention" (Bruner, 1996, p. 127). Pragmatically, it maintains a standard of performance that repudiates "busy work" (Bruner, 1996, p. 127). Draeger, Prado Hill, Hunter, and Mahler (2013) argued that "learning is most rigorous when students are actively learning meaningful content with higher-order thinking at the appropriate level of expectation within a given context" (p. 267).

Just as Ladson-Billings (2009) centered rigor as a CRP criterion, Dr. Hernandez implemented it as foundational to Diversity 1000 and 3000. While explaining the syllabus in the beginning of the semester, she explained:

> I do not accept late work for credit, but everything must be done. My reasoning is that when you finish/pass this course, I'm telling someone that you have completed everything. . . . There is a rubric for participation—being truly present and engaged. Not just talking, but also listening. . . . In your blogs, I'm not looking for a summary of what happened in class. The second part of the blog is analysis. (Fieldnotes, January 14, 2013).

Requiring that students complete all classwork, despite the loss of credit, was a novel approach to assignment completion. Presumably, it motivated students to meet course criteria in a timely manner, given the inevitability of the tasks. In addition, it addressed the ethical issue of students fully experiencing the objectives of the course, in light of their advancement. The choice to uphold such an uncommon standard speaks to the rigor of Diversity 1000 and 3000, mitigating attempts to delegitimize DME courses (Au, 2009; Milner, 2012). The comprehensive participation rubric, necessitating both active listening and sharing, echoed Ladson-Billings's (2009) belief that "teachers with culturally relevant practices encourage a community of learners" (p. 74).

The emphasis on blog posts as an opportunity for analysis as opposed to reiterations of readings and class discussions further confirmed the rigor of the course. When asked about her grading system, Dr. Hernandez shared,

> I'm looking at content as well as timeliness. So, there were one or two people that posted very basic, didn't say much in their blogs, but they posted every week. They're not getting full credit 'cause it's more about the quality of their blogs. . . The way I've talked to them about quality is that you're really being reflective in your blog, so you're really delving deeper, asking questions, noticing things about your own learning that you're doing, making connections to the readings. . . I'll tell them that one of the things to try to do is focus on if they've been thoughtful, and it's not easy. I mean I'm also looking at them as whole people, so maybe in class they're quieter students who say a lot in their blogs. That helps, so that's part of participation too. . . It's difficult for me to grade and really know what's fair, but I have to find the balance between a letter grade and what they learned. (Interview, February 4, 2013)

By giving more importance to "quality," Dr. Hernandez maintained high expectations of her students. As she acknowledged that thoughtfulness is "not easy," she explained potential methods to help students arrive at critical reflections. This practice resembles a "clarification of the challenging curriculum," which Morrison et al. (2008) deem instrumental in helping student achieve academic success (p. 435). Dr. Hernandez encouraged her students to "ask," "notice," "make connections," and "delve deep"—all intellectually rigorous tasks (Draeger et al, 2013). Her approach to grading quality, while measuring quantity, resulted in complicated ratios with which she grappled. To triangulate, she balanced participation, assignment completion, and thoughtfulness, with the last requirement being least tangible.

While she rarely commented on blog posts (a measured choice to allow students to dominate that learning space), when she did, it was to stress the importance of critical reflection and analysis. For example, on Martin's blog for Diversity 1000, she wrote:

> Your blogs offer a nice recap of class and you could do more by making connections to the readings and/or offering more details about your thoughts. Consider connections to other texts, class activities and to your own experiences. The intention is not simply to summarize class, but to offer a critical reflection. (Blog post, February 23, 2013)

On Cindy's blog for Diversity 3000, she wrote:

> Overall, your blogs are well thought-out and you do a nice job of discussing parts of the reading that stood out to you and also making connections to your experiences. Consider ways in which you can make text-to-text connections with course readings in our class or even those from other courses. Also, try to develop

your reflections on previous classes by expanding upon a concept or idea that

intrigued or confused you. (Blog post, February 24, 2013)

Her feedback validated students' efforts while insisting on greater criticality—elements

of higher order thinking (Draeger et al., 2013).

The complexity of class assignments also demonstrated academic rigor. Students

in Diversity 3000 were required to write a children's book related to a course topic. They

independently authored and illustrated their books, conducted peer reviews, modeled a

read-aloud of the text, and graded the work of another student. The semester-long project

yielded a unique volume of books addressing multifaceted social justice issues in an

elementary context. Students developed literary resources that will last beyond the

duration of the course, potentially affecting their in-service practice (as many suggested).

Arguably, the rigor of the course was based as much on its cognitive objectivity as on its

workload. The breadth of assignments, coupled with the complexity of their design,

provided ample opportunities for "digging knowledge out of students," a mainstay of

CRP (Ladson-Billings, 2009, p. 56).

Developing Cultural Competence

Cultural competence in teacher education relies heavily upon individualized

progression models. "Teacher cultural competence is defined as their abilities to

recognize their own world views, to understand and embrace the cultural diversity of

their students, and to confront their potential biases and assumptions in their interactions

with diverse students and their families" (He, 2013, p. 58). Meanwhile, Ladson-Billings

(1995) theorized cultural competence as a pedagogy that affirmed students' family and

community perspectives, values, and knowledge, serving as a pedagogical instrument to

"maintain some cultural integrity" (p. 160). In this study, I applied a parallel framework

of the term that promotes both intercultural and intracultural development as two aspects of cultural competency. Bridging students' home cultures with that of school curricula facilitates inclusive learning spaces. As home culture is legitimated, empowerment is fostered. I argue that as teachers prepare to practice cultural competency, teacher educators must commit to helping them first develop "intracultural competency." Ladson-Billings (1995) agreed, commenting that researchers are obligated to help "prospective teachers understand culture (their own and others) and the ways it functions in education" (p. 483).

Gay and Kirkland (2003) asserted that successful development of teachers with cultural competencies relies upon transparent learning expectations that are communicated at the onset of courses and revisited throughout the semester. Correspondingly, Morrison et al. (2008) noted that "clearly outlining expectations" and "closely monitoring student learning" are effective ways to implement CRP (p. 435). To illustrate, Dr. Hernandez explained, "You're doing this assignment because you carry all of this with you into the classroom. The purpose of this is to help you know you" (Diversity 3000 fieldnotes, Jan 14, 2013). The assignment referenced was the culture quilt, and "all this" signifies the biases, values, and perspectives that will certainly mediate their future pedagogy, most pressingly with those of diverse backgrounds. As Dr. Hernandez made known her agenda, students relaxed their postures and devoted more effort and energy to completing the project. Modeling the quilt aided in the stress alleviation process, but also reflected the ideals of ZPTD. Warford (2011) posited that assignments like a culture quilt promote "self-assistance" as "learning autobiographies create a space for candidates to get in touch with the experiences that led to their choice of teaching as a vocational path" (p. 254).

Developing cultural competency requires a "reshaping of the prescribed curriculum" whereby content is nontraditional (Morrison et al., 2008, p. 437). Over the course of the spring semester, there were four guest facilitators in Diversity 3000. Jamie, the Director of Education and Training at a national collaborative that promotes cross-cultural relations among foreign-born and U.S.-born Americans, was one guest who visited both cohorts. While explaining the pedagogical choice to diversify knowledge sources in the courses, Dr. Hernandez shared:

> For me, if you've noticed, I don't use a textbook in this course. I don't with any of my courses. I want to give them various perspectives of different peoples. I don't like textbooks that have one author, or even one author that's chosen those articles I don't care for that. . . . But so bringing in guests I feel if somebody else could bring in a different perspective or a different understanding of it, and I think that's how I choose. . . Jamie's work with immigration . . . it exposes them to a resource with [Southeastern State] teachers. It's certainly a topic I could talk through, I could talk about. I could do exactly what she did, but I feel they'd learn about one more person in the community that could actually help them with their work. (Interview, March 11, p.187)

The emphasis on building resources, both human and material, allowed students to become independent from the TEP, but remain in-network with Southeastern University's activism reach. In this instance, the cultural competency was both interpersonal and intrapersonal, as guest speakers commonly belonged to sociodemographic groups with which the students identified. They spoke about topics of intense importance to the student groups, but also extended conversations beyond comfort zones.

During Jamie's visit, students in both sessions had the opportunity to share their personal relation to immigration issues, and many revealed legally compromising information. Initially, almost half the group, in both sessions, expressed indifferent attitudes toward immigration issues, but later, an overwhelming majority of both sections reported connectivity. Outsourcing topic discussions to community members exposed students to varied pedagogies addressing multicultural education. This strategy modeled relations that validate community knowledge and demonstrated collaborative approaches to teaching and learning. Building bridges that operationalized course ideologies authentically invited pre-service teachers to engage similarly.

In an activity to build intrapersonal and interpersonal competence with the Diversity 1000 class, Dr. Hernandez facilitated an exercise using the Keirsey Temperament Sorter personality tests. After students self-assessed, they formed groups along their temperaments and explored pedagogical implications of their orientations. Thereafter, students were charged with exploring effective teaching and learning practices for their respective personalities. Dr. Hernandez cautioned:

> This is one way that you might teach in your future classrooms. It's *one* way to categorize people. Knowing this information tells you about your learning and teaching style. This helps you develop culturally relevant pedagogy. Who you are as teacher is going to influence how you teach. (Fieldnotes, March 12, 2013)

Valuing introspection, while relating it to professional responsibilities, makes known the importance of the students' self-knowledge and its presence in classrooms. The term "you" functions to disrupt yet engages students as they are challenged to study themselves. As Dr. Hernandez accentuated "*one* way," differentiated approaches to teaching were ignited but not brightened, thereby promoting student-led inquiry after the

session. Intentional guidance to develop CRP corresponds with transparent practices that encourage students to invest in their own learning. Dr. Hernandez reoriented the task to encourage a critical mass, even as individual dispositions and personal epistemologies were addressed. Shunting between the individual and the collective demonstrated the interdependent nature of intra- and intercultural competency.

Students eagerly participated in the activity and later blogged about their appreciation of greater self-awareness in relation to others. Martin professed:

> This test made me realize as i further pursue my career in being a teacher every student will have a different personality and we as future teacher have to have a strategy to go about the situation. we have to adjust to certain students if it goes about changing a lesson plan slightly. it was crazy, cause now its like i connect with those students who i had the same color with. (Blog post, March 17, 2013)

Meanwhile, Eliza noted, "I really enjoyed the activities with the flashcards! It not only helped me understand what type of learner I am but also how to work with and teach other groups of kids how to express themselves" (Blog post, March 12, 2013). With regard to differentiated instruction, Joy commented:

> I think that as a teacher there is a challenge that not every student will learn the same way and it is up to us to bridge the divide, and personality can help play a role because it would not make sense to have . . . orange students force[d] to sit still and take notes and not challenge the gold to let loose. It is important to have [a] variety of ways to present info. (Blog post, March 18, 2013)

Dr. Hernandez's pedagogical considerations used students' culture and learning styles as a "vehicle for learning" (Ladson-Billings, 1995, p. 160).

Developing Critical Consciousness

Critical consciousness is action-oriented because students "must develop a broader sociopolitical consciousness that allows them to critique the cultural norms, values, mores, and institutions that produce and maintain social inequities" (Ladson-Billings, 1995, p. 162). When DME instructors provide opportunities for students to critique society, students are empowered to change oppressive structures to develop critical consciousness. However, Gorski (2009) found that less than 30% of DME courses were designed for "critical multiculturalism . . . where education was discussed in sociopolitical context [and] participants explored power relationships, oppression in society and schools, and the ways in which educators reify or dismantle inequity" (p. 312). Surface approaches to multiculturalism highlight the range of preparedness amongst DME instructors. In addition, if social justice is truly a priority, these surface approaches indicate the need for further faculty development.

Dr. Hernandez actively practiced critical multiculturalism in her courses. In an effort to empower her students politically, she regularly explained her agenda and mission in the course. As recommended by Gay (2003), doing so allowed students to consciously invest in the course, thereby reducing instances of resistance. For instance, as she observed Diversity 3000 becoming enchanted with Cowhey's (2006) pedagogy, she reminded the cohort: "Each of you has the power to do the things that Cowhey is doing. You can change your classroom, your school and the community around you. You can speak back to larger systems" (Fieldnotes, March 19, 2013). Likewise, after surveying the Diversity 1000 group for future teachers, Dr. Hernandez commented, "Teachers don't always realize they are going in the field to change things. Teachers don't always understand the larger context" (Fieldnotes, January 28, 2013). Overt centering of sociopolitical contexts affecting teaching spaces facilitated critical consciousness

development as students maintained simultaneous conversation with macro and ground level issues in education. Moreover, students were forced to orient and rationalize their positions.

Student blogs in both courses revealed perpetual grappling with positionality that suggests an internationalization of course ideals. As an illustrative example, Tiana, after reading about banking education (Freire, 1972), commented:

> Children should feel comfortable in asking those questions about how the world works without feeling ashamed. When you question certain things, I feel some teachers get upset that you even asked a question like that. I can remember asking questions to my teachers about why does this method work, or who said that it's the best way, and I would repeatedly get "because it just does". I could never get an answer and now I know why, because just like we are programmed so were my teachers. (Blog post, February 2, 2013)

As Tiana examined her own experiences with banking education, she recognized the institutionalization of restrictive pedagogies that limit dialogic possibilities. In commenting that "children should feel comfortable in asking questions," she made known her position relative to problem-posing pedagogies.

Developing critical consciousness, in conjunction with cultural competency, leads to students affecting change. Throughout the semester, Dr. Hernandez maintained the importance of sustained critical inquiry. Below I highlight a few instances where her direct approach functioned as a guide for the future teachers.

> You have to go into it with that "'I don't know—but I want to find out" attitude . . . looking at the context and the system that we're in, seeing yourself as a part of

that larger/outside context. This course is trying to get you to think about the

outside world and how you affect it. (Diversity 3000 fieldnotes, January 14, 2013)

You have to go out and know your information. Be informed. . . . Do it in a smart

way. I'm going to read this critically, I'm going read it. (Diversity 1000

fieldnotes, March 4, 2013)

It's easy to get caught up with let's be nice. This is a bigger deal. The

inconvenience and hurt that comes with discrimination. For you as teachers, you

have to say that "I won't allow anything that is racist or discriminatory." "I won't

accept bullying, sexual discrimination, religion, ableism, etc." Don't be afraid to

use that language. Being inclusive in your language. (Diversity 3000 fieldnotes,

February 12, 2013)

Teaching is political—every book you choose, thing you say, etc. Also, take care

of yourself. Keep feeding your soul or you will burn out. Build communities with

like-minded educators. (Diversity 3000 fieldnotes, April 15, 2013)

The "'I don't know—but I want to find out' attitude" that Dr. Hernandez promoted

resonates with Cochran-Smith and Lytle's (2009) inquiry as stance theory, whereby

teachers are called to explore "how to change things and what needs to be changed" (p.

152). Cochran-Smith and Lytle (2009) conceptualized teachers as knowledge holders,

researchers, and change agents able to make "visible some of the many personal,

professional and political decisions and struggles practitioners face every day in their

work in classrooms, schools, and other educational contexts" (p. 344). While Dr.

Hernandez did not explicitly require formal research, the emphasis on being informed

(e.g., "You have to go out and know your information") and being critical (e.g., "I'm

going to read this critically") are at the heart of inquiry as stance. In essence,

> inquiry as stance is grounded in the problems and the contexts of practice in the first place and in the ways practitioners collaboratively theorize, study, and act on those problems in the best interests of the learning and life chances of students and their communities. (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009, p. 123)

To "theorize, study, and act" on problems is to be reflexive about "every book you choose, thing you say." These processes are sustainable when collaboratively pursued. In other words, teachers must "build communities with like-minded educators" to grasp the "bigger deal" that is their power in schools and communities. When Dr. Hernandez commented that "it's easy to get caught up with let's be nice," she was referencing complacent practices of multicultural education approaches that uncritically celebrate difference, but fail to bring about social justice and equity (Bruch, et al., 2004). Inquiry as stance, as a theory aiming to equitably enhance learning experiences for all students, is fundamentally linked to transformative pedagogies. Regularly, students were reminded of the larger objective put forth by historical and present day disparities in schools. Dr. Hernandez made an effort to explain both the need and difficulty of taking up justice work, always couching it in professional ethics. Contesting niceness, complacency, apathy, and neutrality, her declarations standardized sociopolitical engagement. To empower her students' developing consciousness, she modeled inquiry, opposition, and community-based action.

> In an interview about her capacity to do critical work in the college, she shared: John and I talk about this all the time. Here, we are the gatekeepers. . . When we see a bad attitude for teaching, do you say, you can't be a teacher And we've had conversations with students . . . if they're just so far off on their beliefs and attitudes then we don't want them teaching. (March 5, 2014)

DME instructors have unique insight into student dispositions that permeate future pedagogy. Taking up agency, Dr. Hernandez invited departmental colleagues to serve as critical friends who would balance her standpoint. As the department's faculty worked to be selective about candidate quality, the pre-service teachers witnessed collective mobilization for change. As Diversity 3000 students engaged with various faculty members in the department, they came to understand the comprehensive approach of the program. By challenging students to assess issues of inequity and justice across licensure classes, the sociopolitical standard positioned students to be critically conscious.

Concluding Thoughts

Although the course activities, readings, and overall curriculum served as resources to help develop the teacher candidates of Diversity 1000 and 3000 as culturally relevant pedagogues, I argue that Dr. Hernandez existed as the most effective model. Understanding that self-analysis is fundamental to and continuously necessary to enact CRP, Dr. Hernandez publicly explored the subjectivities under-girding her practice and used those moments as bridges to form relationships with her students. Moreover, the designs of the courses encouraged students to build relationships among themselves. While I cataloged the three tenets of CRP to illustrate her operationalization of it, the tenets are interdependent and complex (Ladson-Billings, 1994; 2009). CRP is not a set of strategies and tricks, but rather a way of being that facilitates adaptability. In order to take up this work, practitioners must perpetually explore their motives, privileges, and disadvantages, as well as work to build learning communities that interrogate those identity properties (Morrison et al., 2008).

Within both courses and throughout the semester, Dr. Hernandez maintained a commitment to pedagogical practices that honored students' funds of knowledge, held

them to high achievement standards, and developed their critical consciousness (Ladson-Billings, 1994; 2009). While some practices proved effective, some students of color at times found her approaches to CRP to be unsuccessful. The degree of heterogeneity in both courses complicated Dr. Hernandez's attempts to be inclusive, to which she responded with reflexivity. Student responses to her pedagogy are detailed in the remaining chapters.

CHAPTER 5

Resistance as Practice

DME courses in TEPs are called to develop pre-service teachers into practitioners who effectively teach diverse learners (Chou, 2007; Ladson-Billings, 1995). As the majority of participants in multicultural education studies are middle-class, White women, research on the transformative effectiveness of diversity courses focuses largely on that population. Theorists contend that the complex and political nature of multicultural content has a history of alienating and offending White students, thereby inciting resistance (Carpenter, 2001; LaDuke, 2009). Since White women dominate TEPs, studies about resistance typically frame them as the main perpetrators, and by omission, assume the opposite of students of color.

Among other objectives, this study troubles the notion of resistance to multicultural content as an exclusive practice of White pre-service teachers. What follows is an explication of how the TCCs in each course at Southeastern University exercised resistance to aspects of multicultural content and pedagogy. Using data collected from focal participants, as well as the larger group, I illustrate how social epistemologies, competing agendas, and preexisting dispositions held by TCCs affected their capacity to fully participate in either course (for example, self-imposed and racially segregated seating arrangements in Diversity 3000). I detail student experiences of resistance (such as experiencing a class session on Ebonics as "front street") and highlight examples of content acceptance (exemplified by Dr. Hernandez's pedagogical practices).

Why Are All the Black Pre-service Teachers Sitting Together in Diversity 3000?

After the first session of Diversity 3000, the desks remained in six optional table groups that comfortably sat five students. The class self-divided into four demographic

groups according to table arrangements: one African diaspora group (six/seven students),

one European-American group (six students), and two representative of the class's

remaining ethno-racial diversity (five and four students). One African-American student,

Letitia, after sitting with the African diaspora group twice, elected to sit alone at a table in

the back of the class. While the African diaspora table was exclusively Black (with

six/seven young women squeezing in each week), the European-American table was

nearly all White, with the exception of Carmen. Two focal participants, Tiana and Imani,

sat at the African diaspora table; their interviews provide insight about their decision to

self-segregate.

After three weeks of classes, I sat with Tiana to discuss her experiences in

Diversity 3000. Tiana had an animated personality in class and that energy transcended

her blog space and our interviews. She unreservedly shared her concerns about excelling

in the course, her goals of improving special education because of her son's diagnoses

with autism, her trials with family relationships, her failed marriage, and her contentious

time in the military. Although she initially did not think a course about diversity was

necessary, she shared that she was "starting to see that it's important" (Interview,

February 11, 2013). During our conversation, Tiana revealed that she rarely thought

about members outside of her socio=demographic group and was glad this course would

help her build greater awareness. In her words, "I was real Afrocentric in my thinking."

Her blog posts echoed these statements:

> This Cultural Diversity/Awareness class is just that. We are covering all angles of
>
> diversity and not just exploring the varying ethnicities and cultures that exist in
>
> classrooms and around the world, but we are dissecting and pulling at the core of

injustices and discrimination and learning about ourselves in the process. (Blog

post, February 9, 2013)

While the course title read "Cultural Foundations in Early Childhood Education," Tiana

summed it up as a diversity and awareness course. Her follow-up summary of the course

goals made known her orientation to the objectives of the course. Congruent with her in-

class practice, Tiana showed excitement toward learning about her personal culture, that

of other groups, and the roots of injustice. Although the course was a program

requirement, Tiana quickly acquiesced to course objectives. As her thinking evolved, so

too did her social participation in the course.

When I asked Tiana why she sat with only the Black women in the class, she

shrugged and responded, "I didn't notice that." I prodded by asking, "Did you notice that

. . . that there are not enough seats at the table for everyone and that each week, two

people have to pull up extra chairs?" Tiana paused. She looked away, and after a short

time she responded, "I will move now that I know. That's not what I was tryin' to do. I

want to get to know everyone in the class and be friends with everyone. I'm sorry." I felt

awful. My attempt to gain understanding caused her discomfort. As I repeatedly tried to

convince her to sit wherever she liked, even if that meant staying with the group of Black

women, she refused. She assured me that my insight was helpful because she felt her

learning would be "better if I moved to be with other types of people" (Interview,

February 11, 2013).

Tiana did not sit with the homogenous African diaspora table any longer, but

instead moved to sit with a diverse group of students who were biracial (Turkish &

Black), Dominican, White, and Chinese. Observable differences in her behavior from one

table to the next were negligible. According to Helms (1990) and Tatum (1992), people

vacillate between stages in coming to understand their ethno-racial identity and the role of difference in a racialized society. According to Chan and Treacy (1996),

> most students in college-level classes move from an initial stage of disavowing that differences really matter, to one in which they acknowledge and recognize inequities based on difference. This then leads to a stage in which there is a strong desire among students of color to be with others of one's group. . . (p. 214)

Perhaps Tiana began the course in the Immersion/Emersion racial identity development stage characterized by an Afrocentric approach to living, and my segregation question drove her back to the pre-encounter stage that exoticizes other ethno-racial groups (Cross, Parham, & Helms, 1991).

As I continued to interview participants, I avoided self-segregation questions to mitigate further researcher-imposed disruptions. However, during my final group interview with the remaining five of six members of the African diaspora group (Nova, Cindy, Imani, Erika, and Kenya on April 15, 2013), I asked, "Why do you all sit together?" Initially the answers varied:

> "Just sort of front-and-center." (Nova)

> "It's kind of like assigned seats." (Imani)

> "I like to sit close to the board." (Cindy)

Then Erika blurted, "I'm just going to tell the truth." She proceeded:

> A lot of African American students tend to drift towards the other African American students, and a lot of Caucasian students tend to drift toward Caucasian students. It's been like that since we've been alive really. I mean I grew up in an all-Black neighborhood—I didn't know White kids. So when I went to middle school and that's the first experience I had with people of other races that were

like in the higher hierarchy or whatever, it's been like that. I've always noticed it.

All the Black kids sit with each other in the cafeteria; even at the schools that we

interned at. Like, it's not so much prevalent that I see right now, because I'm

basically in a, like, majority Black. But where I'm from, like, in Gemville, that's

how it is. (Focal group interview, April 15, 2013)

The initial denial of intent is reminiscent of "cognitive dissonance" behavior (Festinger,

1957). Although the group members had formed a bond among each other (evidenced by

their inside jokes, common social planning for weekend events, assignment

collaborations, and in-class support of one another's contributions), they did not want to

admit their self-segregation. Cognitive dissonance facilitated claims of arbitrary seating,

while their behaviors suggested otherwise. Moreover, post-racial rhetoric (Adjei & Gill,

2012) would have the young women deny their uniting force for fear of reverse-racism

labeling.

Nevertheless, Erika's confession rang true to Tatum's (1997) theory of "sitting at

the table" in order to collectively develop identity. Erika's discussion of her interracial

middle school experience highlighted the pecking order of racial groups that placed

Whites at the top. Her claim that "it's been like that since we've been alive" speaks to the

collective histories or shared practice that the women have in common. In a sociopolitical

move, she asserted that Whites self-segregated equally. To concur, Imani added:

When I first got in here, I sat in the back. I wanted to sit at this table because I

knew Nova. She was really the only person I knew before I got in here. . . . And,

yeah, me too, I sat here, basically because all of the Black people are over here, I

guess. (Interview, April 8, 2013)

Nova added, "You feel comfortable with I guess people that you're familiar with, you're like" (Interview, April 8, 2013). Imani and Nova's echoing of Erika's defense of racial homogeneity contradicted their earlier claims of indiscriminate and routinized behavior. Although Imani hedged her choice to sit with her Black peers, she made it clear that the presence of even one Black student had the force to relocate her.

Although none of the students articulated experiences of overt hostility or discrimination, their shared understanding about socio-learning spaces and race relations as Black people and Black women laid a foundation upon which they bonded in the course. While this agentic move generated comfortable social experiences in the class, at times it also hindered their cultural competency development because they had limited cultural perspectives to draw from. The Black students mostly worked together on in-class tasks and activities, and they remained segregated during peer reviews of student work. Gentry, Lamb, Becker, and Hall (2012) attested that "diversity experiences, within a program preparing teachers, are essential elements in shaping diversity awareness and understanding" (p. 3). However, the Black students resisted integration during class meetings, which limited their exposure and, potentially, their cultural competency development.

Experiencing Front Street

For the most part, topic discussions in both courses were ethno-racially inclusive and typically focused on hegemonic forces that institutionally oppressed certain communities (e.g., based on religion, sexual orientation, exceptionality). For instance, during the immigration discussion, undocumented immigrants were not limited to Mexicans or Latinos (McManus, 2013). There was extensive discussion during which students problematized racial and linguistic privileges that Canadians and Europeans had

over their Hispanic counterparts. However, two sessions triggered offense among the majority of Black students in Diversity 3000. The students described the pedagogical approach as "front street."

The term "front street" is a colloquial term, popular in African American Vernacular English (AAVE), which according to the urban dictionary means "to call someone out or put them in an embarrassing position" or "to reveal something about them despite their desire to keep it secret" (Brad, 2004). Placement on "front street" is an externally enforced act, given the undesirable nature of the position. "Front street" acts typically bring about feelings of shame, embarrassment, or vulnerability for an individual or members of the exposed group. As Dr. Hernandez began to place varying sociodemographics in conversation with one another, race, at times, dominated the content. For example, the session on socioeconomic class disparities featured Oprah Winfrey's (2006) high school swap experiment between an all-Black and a predominantly White group of students. The video showed a dilapidated, unsafe, and educationally-deficient Black high school in Chicago's inner city contrasted with a $62 million, state of the art, academically thriving White high school in a nearby suburb. Frustrated with deficit constructions of African Americans, Imani cried, "But they don't really put like—Caucasians on front street" (Interview, April 8, 2013). Imani felt that Dr. Hernandez's curricular choices disproportionately portrayed Blacks as underachieving, poor, and marginalized. She felt that the monolithic construction of the diaspora marginalized her and her friends, thereby necessitating resistance.

The second occurrence happened during a session where Dr. Hernandez's husband (John) guest facilitated a discussion of language diversity, specifically Ebonics. To begin the session he queried, "What are your feelings on Ebonics? Is Ebonics a

language? Is there any value to using Ebonics in the classroom?" (Fieldnotes, April 8, 2013). In response, a White student retorted, "Do you mean Black dialect?" To which another White woman clarified, "It's technically a dialect, more than a language." Then John posed another question to the group: "Any Ebonics speakers?" Letitia, sitting alone at a table in the back of the class, was the only student who responded. Softly, she offered, "I feel I do" (Fieldnotes, April 8, 2013).

The African diaspora group and Tiana remained silent. After a few moments, John asked, "Is there any value to teaching Ebonics in the classroom?" to which Tiana quickly responded, "I don't think it should be taught in schools." Through their vocal participation, the non-Black students showed great interest in the Ebonics discussion. Meanwhile, the Black students largely observed and listened, until John asked about the *Lau v. Nichols* case, of which only Imani had background knowledge. As she shared the details of the case and its relation to the Oakland Ebonics proposal, her classmates marveled at her contextual knowledge. Pleased with her contribution, John proceeded to show nuanced differences between Ebonics and the language of wider communication (as used in schools). He shared, "If the number indicates plurality, we do not need to add the 's.' " Next, he wrote "50 cents=50 cent" on the board. Puzzled, Nova asked, "Which one is right?" John responded, "You're an Ebonics speaker. They're both right." Further explaining his argument, John requested that someone translate the amount in Spanish, and a White woman responded, "50 centavos de dólar." He explained, "Is that wrong? No. It is another language. . . When you tell a child that their language is wrong, you're telling them that their entire community is wrong in the way they speak." As John prepared to end the session, Tiana commented, "My kids haven't been exposed to Ebonics. Should I expose them to it?" John responded, "What communities do you want

your children to be connected to? It's about being bilingual!" (Fieldnotes, April 8, 2013).

Letitia's meek participation signified embarrassment in contrast to the African diaspora's group performance of detachment. When her Black peers, whom I regularly observed speaking Ebonics, failed to identify as speakers, her allegiance to the African diaspora group came into question. Tiana's argument against Ebonics instruction in schools aligns with "front street" aversion practices, meaning she feared that Black children speaking Ebonics would detrimentally affect their schooling experience. Society undervalues Ebonics, rendering it illegitimate and marking its speakers as undereducated. As members of the African diaspora group evaded the stereotype, Letitia's admission created tension. Conceivably, John's line of questioning, and perhaps even the topic itself, was the "front street" activity that offended Imani. Certainly, when John publicly characterized Nova as an Ebonics speaker, even after she chose not to self-disclose, he put her on "front street." Although this was an isolated incident and not the act of Dr. Hernandez, students perceived guest instructors as extensions of her pedagogy.

The "they" Imani mentioned, meaning those who commit "front street" acts, could be limited to John and Dr. Hernandez, or an all-encompassing "they" of cultural outsiders. Given the departmental effort to address issues of diversity throughout all the courses, "they" likely referenced departmental faculty and staff. Although both Dr. Hernandez and John were persons of color, with one self-identifying as Black, their status as university employees created a barrier. Within their group, the Black students were not prepared to be content nor did they agree that the topic directly addressed their learning objectives (i.e., effective teaching). As John attempted to be inclusive of a characteristic of Black culture that is often marginalized, the young women withdrew. His attempt to be culturally relevant backfired because permission to discuss a controversial aspect of their

lives was not requested, nor granted, in advance. Perhaps, if he had developed a trusting relationship with the African diaspora group prior to the session, their participation and comfort level would have been different (Ladson-Billings, 1994; 2001).

When I conducted a focus group interview with the African diaspora table, Cindy extended the "front street" argument to include any discussion that created binaries between Blacks and others. She shared:

> I mean the only thing that I can say that really offends me is like how like when we talk about Black people or African American people like that's basically all we talk about like really culturally. A lot of stuff is all about Black people. Like . . . I don't know why that is. But, I can't really say it offends me, but I guess it bothers me. It makes me think like, "Well how come we don't talk about Caucasians, you know, what they do and da-da-da." It's all African American—the Ebonics, we do this, we do that. (Interview, April 8, 2013)

Although John's presentation attempted to establish the validity of Ebonics as a dialect, one with complexity and rules, Cindy maintained that fluency in Ebonics did not have value in the professional world, and thus its discussion might have further alienated the group.

Kenya immediately concurred by adding:

> Yeah! Like I mean, yeah. In this class, they made it important for us to view Ebonics as something that is like a home language. But we all know in all actuality, in the real world, Ebonics isn't looked at as that. Like, it's looked at as a negative thing. (Interview, April 8, 2013)

Despite the legitimated value and merit of Ebonics, four of the five members of the African diaspora group intentionally resisted John's assertion. Cindy and Kenya's

assessment emphasized that their non-Black counterparts would continue to devalue the language outside of the immediate learning space. Due to language stratification, they were not convinced that transformation among their White peers occurred after exposure to John's counter-narrative. Understanding the social capital behind the language of power (Delpit, 1988), they opted to comply with mainstream standards. As the young women sat in the session, they modeled various forms of resistance by "dismissing the content as based on biased/unbalanced information"; "dismissing the content as irrelevant'" "exhibiting discomfort'" and "being silent" (Carpenter, 2000, p. 5).

However, within our racially-segregated interviewing group, a "homeplace" (hooks, 1990) of sorts, they found space to communicate their complex reading of the session. Erika, Imani, Kenya, and Cindy all identified as speakers of Ebonics. Nova shared:

> I feel like that was a well-needed workshop or seminar that just gave us another— I feel like that was the best PowerPoint we've had thus far, because learning about—it just explained a lot. Like in my field experience when I see kids write out stuff, I realize, "Okay, they're doing that for a reason, not just because they're dumb or they don't know how to write." It gave me an explanation. (Interview, April 8, 2013)

As Nova spoke, the others listened but did not openly support her sentiments. In their racially segregated group, it was possible for Nova to share her approval of the content discussion in private, but maintain solidarity during the session. As Nova described her transformative learning experience, the other members of the group attended and perhaps were learning alongside her. As silence fell upon the group, Nova returned the conversation to binary framings of Blacks and Whites. Once more, Imani commented:

But the race and social class—like she was talking about when she showed us that Oprah video about these schools in Chicago. . . . Like, why do Black schools got to be poor and White schools got all the money. I just kind of feel like her examples are very polar. (Interview, April 8, 2013)

Boisterously, the members engaged in crosstalk that expressed agreement. Cindy added, "I feel like it's the truth though," to which Imani replied, "It is. But like, how come we can't read articles about Hispanic people?" Kenya bent over slowly toward me and audibly whispered, "I don't think *they'll* want that," and the members laughed. To crystallize her point, Imani said, "I just feel like everything we talk about is a Black/White issue," and with finality Nova reacted, "That's just how it is" (Interview, April 8, 2013). My participant observations document a more nuanced and balanced distribution of ethnic and racial group discussions; however, the perceptions of the African diaspora group are salient for understanding their experience.

Nova's "that's just how it is" revealed a sense of powerlessness in relation to changing the content and perhaps overall perception of the African diaspora. This is an interesting paradox, given that a mission of the course was to develop students' sense of agency. Although the Black students found the content distribution unjust (with an exaggeration of issues in the Black community), they did not feel heard or seek official avenues to speak. Nova's statement suggested broad commentary on the department, or perhaps the college, whereby Black voices endure silencing. Kenya's reference to "they" not wanting Hispanic issues to be discussed implicated both the education faculty of Southeastern University and Latino students. She implied that Latinos received preferential treatment that avoided placing them on "front street."

For the African diaspora group, the conversation about binary framing of course topics was not limited to race. The young women were arguing against the "Black is bad and White is right" binary (Fanon, 1965). Some (Imani, Kenya, and Cindy) felt that portraying negative stereotypes of their respective racial group made it difficult for them to engage in class. Nova and Erika accepted that it was a pedagogical choice to benefit the most uninformed. To illustrate, Erika shared:

> A lot of the students in this classroom talk about how they grew up in a bubble and how this is all new to them, and being in diverse classrooms. I feel like that's something they do need to see because it is the truth. I don't feel like – I mean it may not be the truth for us, but it's out there. (Group interview, April 8, 2013)

When Erika determined that her peers "need" to see "the truth," she rationalized DME curricula that cater to White teachers; however, the class was ethno-racially diverse. Thus, underexposure was ubiquitous and perhaps mediated by students' SES class and regional locations. Her concession situated the Black students in the larger mission of the class (namely becoming better teachers) even as it disenfranchised them. The members of the African diaspora group delayed their engagement with the topics until after class, when they were among each other.

Although CRP (Ladson-Billings, 2006) argues for diverse representation in the curriculum, interpretations of the pedagogy might limit particular groups to deficit constructions. As multicultural theorists advocate for representations beyond heroes and holidays (Banks, 2008; Gay, 2010; Gorski, 2006; Nieto, 2009), discussions that attempt more balanced portrayals can produce unintended consequences. The framing of African Americans as under-performing and under-privileged, while questionably effective for racial outsiders, served as a debilitating mechanism for some in-group members.

Although John's session honored Ebonics, the preexisting mindset of some Black students regarding both Ebonics and the public's perception of its value lessened the potential for consciousness shifts in real time. During the session, the African diaspora group members participated at a significantly lesser rate than their non-Black peers. This contrasted with the usual balance of participation among the ethno-racial groups in the cohort. Although this was a worthy topic to discuss, when attempting to enact transformative processes, King (2005) contended that "keeping the focus on persons rather than solely on content provides a foundation for learning that can change the lives of all involved" (p. 137). Such considerations might have produced alternate responses from the African diaspora in Diversity 3000.

In the weeks that followed the Ebonics class, I monitored the blog sites of all seven of the students who identified as Black to track any residual discussion of the session (as was the norm for most blog posts). Nova and Imani never discussed Ebonics on their blog site after the Ebonics session. Perhaps their online silence signified a continuation of their diverged appreciation of the seminar. It is worth mentioning that prior to the Ebonics session, Imani discussed language, stating:

> The notion that language diversity is a deficit is complete nonsense. Bilingual children are an asset, not a problem, to classrooms. They may not understand English well, but they are able to provide priceless cultural experiences with their classmates as well as the entire school. Language diversity is an asset to the United States because we are able to communicate with our neighbors. (Blog post, April 7, 2013)

While Imani framed bilingual children as speakers of both English and a foreign language, her lack of discussion about Ebonics marked the topic as dismissive—an act of resistance that mirrored her performance in the class and our group interview.

>After two weeks, Kenya shared:

>I loved the class about Ebonics. . . . It's was funny to see Ebonics actually written out and broken down, but it sad to see as well. Ebonics is usually only connected as a language for African Americans, but a lot of ethnicities speak Ebonics. As an adult, I still speak Ebonics but only with a certain group of people. I am professional when I need to be without speaking any Ebonics at times, and at other times I can be somewhere and only speak Ebonics. As a child, I never really saw any problems with speaking Ebonics. Both of my aunts are school teachers and they hated to hear me speak incorrectly. It would irk my nerves when both my aunts corrected me every time I opened my mouth. I knew how to speak correctly, but I liked to speak Ebonics. Depending on a student's environment, Ebonics may be the only language some students know, as a future educator I plan to teach my students that Ebonics is what we speak outside of school and correct them when necessary. (Blog post, April 25, 2013)

As was the practice of students in the Diversity 3000 class, she began her blog by praising the session and then revealing her dissonance. Kenya maintained her social epistemology of Ebonics being "unprofessional" and "incorrect," perhaps most evident by her characterization of the written form as "funny" and "sad." Even as she explained her negative educational history with the language and her plans to "correct" her students, she maintained the perception of Ebonics as inappropriate. Kenya's summation of

Ebonics equated it to slang, thus limiting its linguistic properties and value (Perry &

Delpit, 1998).

Cindy also discussed the topic on her blog. She shared:

Class was phenomenal. . . He made us aware of a dialect that most African

American use, called, Ebonics. Most African Americans, and other backgrounds,

use Ebonics unwarily. I have been using it since I was a kid. He showed us a way

to scaffold, and be able to build on to students prior knowledge, instead of

correcting them and telling them that they are using incorrect grammar. I will be

able to relate to my students because I did grow up using the dialect, however I

will make them aware that there is a time and a place for everything. (Blog post,

April 29, 2013)

Even though Cindy celebrated the class, she maintained that Ebonics was a language

reserved for particular settings, meaning outside of school. This flawed appraisal of

Ebonics' appropriateness in schools speaks to the lack of scaffolding in the assigned

course readings. Perhaps, Hoover's (1998) "Myths and Realities" chapter in *The Real*

Ebonics Debate would have been a helpful resource. Nevertheless, while praising John's

pedagogical approach, Cindy felt able to enact culturally relevant pedagogy with her

future students, given her linguistic compatibility.

Erika responded to Cindy's blog, commenting, "I never knew Ebonics is its own

language. It's crazy because it is always seemed to be less than anything else. No one

understands that it is a culture thing" (Blog post, April 30, 2013). On her own blog, she

wrote:

I never knew that Ebonics was a language of its own. Where I come from that is

just considered ignorance to the higher society. If you speak differently you will

always be considered ignorant. It's a part of life, American life. We stole our

language from England but I'm pretty sure they say we don't speak right. It's all

the same with Ebonics. It makes a person who they are. (Blog post, April 30,

2013)

Erika's description of coming to know Ebonics as a sovereign language as "crazy"

reveals her initial deficit perceptions of AAVE, but also her newly awakened

consciousness. Perry and Delpit (1998) argued that among a variety of factors, some

African Americans resist Ebonics because of an "absence of a counter-conversation led

by African Americans—a counter-conversation that refuses to disconnect discussions of

education from our sociopolitical position in the larger society, our cultural formations,

from our position as a racial caste group" (p. 9). Although there remained ambiguity

around her disposition and pedagogical intentions in her future classroom, in both of

Erika's posts, she recognized language as inextricably linked to culture. Furthermore, the

acknowledgment that "no one" and "the higher society" do not understand that cultural

linkage relayed her understanding of cultural stratification and, therefore, language

dominance (Delpit, 1995).

On her blog, Letitia offered:

Dr. John's lecture was very informative to me. I did not know teachers could use

Ebonics in schools to help assist students that speak it. I learned it is a language

specific to a culture, and it should not be labeled as an incorrect way to speak.

Being an African American I feel I naturally speak the language of Ebonics;

because, non-standard English was spoken in my home as a child. It was

interesting to learn that Creole (if I remember correctly) is a dialect of Ebonics or

vice versa. I do think it's important not to tell children they speak incorrectly, and

I learned it is essential to encourage them to speak formal English in school. It

also very necessary to know that children who speak Ebonics may have phonemic

spelling that is different, but when they sound out their words it sounds the way

some of us speak. I now realize that this culture can be bilingual or multilingual

and it will be my job as a future educator to help students accomplish and realize

this just the same. (Blog post, April 13, 2013)

Just as Letitia showed curiosity in class, her blog post confirmed her appreciation of the

session. Throughout the reflection, she made content-to-self connections that reveal

transformative learning and intent to apply culturally relevant teaching with her future

students. Electing to "encourage" formal English as opposed to requiring it demonstrates

Letitia's understanding of cultural competency development, where "teachers allow the

students to be who they are, so the kids come with what some may call dialect. . . . The

teachers don't spend time trying to rid them of that language" (Lewis & Willis, 1995, p.

62).

Just as Letitia did, Tiana considered pedagogical implications of the Ebonics

session. She shared:

I appreciated Dr. John's seminar. He was very knowledgeable about the

perspectives of languages and the root of their categorizations. The class was very

interesting, informative, and fun. It is good that Ebonics can be looked at as

another language in itself. I used his suggestions regarding Ebonics with one of

my kindergarten students a few weeks ago. (so that is the positive about posting

this while playing 'catch-up lol). At any rate, the little boy always said things like,

"We be going home," or "Me and my brudder went to da pahk yesterday." I asked

the teacher if it was ok if I spoke to him and worked with him on his speaking and

writing skills, and she gave me the go-ahead. I simply made it seem as though he was learning a new language just like some of his classmates Spanish speaking classmates. I told him that sometimes I speak differently at home when I am around my family, but when I am at school or work, I speak a different kind of English. I said that we all can practice on the kind of English we should speak at school, so that everyone can understand each other and communicate better. I made some flashcard and practiced with the 'th' diphthong and included pictures on them, like thumb, thimble, bath, math, brother, mother, etc. By the time I left he was so proud that he was being respectful by saying the other persons' names first when sharing with the class about family events. He also stuck his tongue far out of his mouth when he said words with the 'th' diphthong, so that I could notice him saying the words properly. Had I not had the experience in our ESOL class that day, I would have missed out on a great opportunity to teach, and the little boy would have missed a proud lesson that did not degrade of minimize the importance of his home language, but accepted it while neatly stashing it out of the way during school. (Blog post, April, 29, 2013)

Tiana's appreciation of Ebonics is complex. Her code-switching reference between home, work and school related to Perry's (1998) assertion that African American "language use is fundamentally and exquisitely contextual" (p. 10). This signifies an understanding of Standard English as cultural capital in White-dominated spaces, but it also resembles assimilationist pedagogy. While Tiana's blog post initially appeared as critical cognitive transformation, her strategy to help students "neatly stash" Ebonics away from school echoed her original sentiments voiced during the class discussion that Ebonics is invalid. "Neatly stashing" one's home language is a silencing act that minimizes its importance.

Perhaps a code-meshing approach would have been more socially just and culturally relevant (Michael-Luna & Canagarajah, 2007; Young, 2010).

Furthermore, the correlation between speaking school English and being respectful implies social deficits among speakers of Ebonics. Lastly, she characterized the student's alternative pronunciations of the diphthong as "properly," which further delegitimizes Ebonics. Tiana's framing of Ebonics reiterated Hoover's (1998) suggestion that some African Americans reject Ebonics because of their "desire to avoid the stereotypes of the Exotic Primitive and the Comic, with the Exotic Primitive perceived as so different and exotic that his/her language is a joke" (p. 73). Distinguishing Standard English as "proper" Others Ebonics and therefore maintains language hierarchies.

As the Black students preserved a distancing of Ebonics from formal school spaces, with recognition of its delegitimized construction, with the use of terms like "a time and a place" and "formal English," they negotiated an acceptance of what Heller (1999) termed "parallel monolingualism" or what Gafaranga (2000) called a language separation approach. Whether through a blog post, group interview, or in-class session, each Black student identified as an Ebonics speaker. While their fluency had the potential to enhance relationship-building with bilingual students in their future classrooms, their resistance during the session, as confirmed during our post discussion, but complicated in their blog posts, allowed for marginal growth. Their hesitance toward being part of course content stifled their openness to transformation. In an attempt to remain off "front street," the African diaspora group experienced selective learning. Even as they processed the session during their blog discussion, they maintained the hierarchy between Ebonics and the language of wider communication (Perry & Delpit, 1998). None of them

expressed interest in deconstructing "proper" English or inviting students to code-mesh (Young, 2010).

While it is true that a single diversity course may not bring about "immediate, substantive change in attitudes towards diversity issues in classroom instruction per se," consciousness development is possible if the pedagogy is culturally relevant (Riegle & Warsame 2012, p. 7). In the case of the Ebonics session, while the content was culturally relevant, the pedagogy was problematic for the Black students. Therefore, John's attempt to be relevant was at times culturally insensitive. While each Black student expressed exposure to new content, only two showed potential to change their future pedagogy, thereby confirming Bandura's (1977) theory that learning something does not produce a change in behavior.

Avoiding Front Street

Operationalizing CRP is a complex endeavor, both for the instructor and the curriculum (Morrison et al., 2008). CRP requires instructor humility and flexibility, critical knowledge of self, and extensive familiarity with and appreciation for students and their communities (Ladson-Billings, 2009). Piaget (1969) noted that "the heartbreaking difficulty in pedagogy . . . is, in fact, that the best methods are also the most difficult ones" (p. 69). That said, teacher educators need appropriate conditions and resources to best employ CRP. This is not to suggest that CRP is a panacea for educational disparities or the best approach to multicultural education. Rather, it is a pedagogy that, once employed, as Ladson-Billings (2009) conceptualized, can be very effective with traditionally marginalized populations (Irvine, 2010; Morrison, et al., 2008).

Ladson-Billings (2009) asserted, "Culturally relevant teaching honors the students' sense of humanity and dignity" (p. 82). Perhaps it is with this standard in mind that Dr. Hernandez approached instances of student disengagement, resistance, or incompetency. Taking up CRP requires an understanding of student's lives, patience with their present state, and a vision for their future. When asked about student disengagement in the Diversity 1000 course, Dr. Hernandez explicated:

> They're just doing school. Many of them are parents, or they have parents that they're taking care of, or they're traveling here with public transportation from pretty far distances. They have jobs. They have sometimes more than one job, and, yeah, I mean they're dealing with a lot of real life things that grownups deal with. And it's just a part of who they are. So many of them are also first generation college students that don't really know how to play school, and sometimes I find myself talking to them about that, giving them that kind of advice that if you're gonna be absent, it doesn't look good for you to just be absent and not say anything to me. And you should do that with all your instructors. So, I mean I try to keep that in mind too, and either way, yes this is school, and, no, it wasn't my experience. I was in the dorm and woke up, then went to class almost in my pajamas, so, yeah, I can't imagine having kids and coming to this and then running home and picking them up. I don't know . . . it's tough for them. (Interview, April 11, 2013)

In her explanation, Dr. Hernandez described the circumstances of many students at Southeastern University, but also the circumstances students face at postsecondary institutions across the country. Bearing in mind the competing "real life things that grownups deal with," such as family responsibilities, economic hardships, or social

displacement, Diversity 1000 and 3000 students led complicated lives. Managing personal demands that competed with school-related responsibilities caused many students to "play" or "do" school. In other words, students demonstrated expected behaviors in associated domains, but may have otherwise been distracted. In my interviews with students, they readily discussed challenges to maintaining the priority of school, in light of life circumstances. By insisting on the completion of all assignments, Dr. Hernandez did not compromise the academic standard, but rather allowed multiple paths to the same destination. Consideration of the students' social complexities fostered a sense of belonging (O'Keeffe, 2013) and preserved the integrity of the courses.

Dr. Hernandez applied the same cultural consideration when students made socially hostile or insensitive comments in class. In an effort to build trust and connectedness, she met with students privately to discuss their problematic contributions. This allowed students to maintain their dignity while exploring alternative perspectives. In Diversity 1000, student feedback described the learning as "safe" or "wonderful." One student remarked, "we were allowed to be ourselves without criticism." Another commented, "students could express themselves and learned from each other," while another stated, "the classroom felt like a safe place to be ourselves, and I think you're responsible for that. Gracias" (Fieldnotes, April 16, 2013).

Diversity 3000 students equally applauded the opportunity to build community and the value of a forum to discuss difficult topics. Their comments celebrated the importance of each course in light of its dignified cultural relevancy. Essentially, the pedagogical discernment of Dr. Hernandez facilitated avoidance of "front street," which many students appreciated. Exposing or humiliating students for their ignorance and underexplored bigotry is "front street" pedagogy. It is hostile and counterproductive to

culturally relevant pedagogy. Creating space to explore incompetency, prejudice, and intolerance without judgment requires teacher educator vigilance brought on by CRP. Multicultural educators are charged to honor each student at their present state (however problematic) while working to develop cultural competency and critical consciousness. At times, Dr. Hernandez's approach to developing cultural competency captured the duality of such work.

Concluding Thoughts

TCCs in both courses grappled with assessing their cultural competency in relation to their development in the Diversity courses. At times, their imposed expertise regarding matters of oppression or their assumptions of the incompetency of their peers caused them to concede to dominant multicultural curricula that aim to expose and educate White women (Sheets & Chew, 2002). This limited the potential for the transformation of many TCCs, even as their individual developmental needs proved necessary. The Black students of Diversity 3000 accepted that the "needs" of their White counterparts were more aligned to the course's objective of cultural exposure; thus, they remained marginalized. They self-segregated as a means to be a supportive collective, while individually developing and resisting as they saw fit.

Pedagogical attempts to be culturally relevant require cultural considerations and curricular discernment, in addition to well-established relationships. While discussing culturally relevant pedagogues, Irvine (2010) proclaimed, "If you have a true, caring relationship with your students, you will know what their interests are, what information they relate to" (p. 61) That said, Dr. Hernandez worked to be increasingly inclusive of all the students, especially the TCCs. The resistance exhibited in the Ebonics session might have stemmed from the lack of an established "true, and caring relationship" with the

Black student group in Diversity 3000. TCCs, much like their White counterparts, come to multicultural courses with social epistemologies and dispositions that must be explored, both in dialogue and also in official curriculum. Getting to know our TCCs means discerning "what information they relate to" and how to avoid putting them on "front street." Otherwise, teacher educators risk validating TCC resistance as a necessary practice for their existence in Diversity courses.

CHAPTER 6

Friendly Resistance as Matriculation Strategy

Ahlquist (1991) described the archetype of multicultural education students as "apolitical, individualistic, and non-confrontational, and most often they view situations and people from a personal point of view" (p. 158). My review of the literature for multicultural education highlighted consistent reference to ethnic and racial disparities between students and teachers as a natural cause of the achievement gap. The standard introduction to these studies describes the teaching force as largely European, middle class, monolingual, Christian, female, and originating from rural and suburban backgrounds (Liggett & Finely, 2009; Silverman, 2010). The immediate description of the student body is as increasingly diverse (racially, ethnically, and linguistically), sometimes with a mention of its socioeconomic status (poor) and regional designation (urban). Implied, and sometimes overtly stated, in these introductory paragraphs is a correlation between White teachers and students of color as culturally disconnected and therefore the result being that students undergo negative schooling experiences. As a reader progresses through the text, she reached a point where empirical studies highlight the demographics of their participants. More often than not, the participants are mainly middle class, monolingual females of European descent originating from rural and suburban backgrounds, and, thus, the findings of the researcher are crafted for a correlated brand of highly specific pre-service teachers. As such, there are national calls and initiatives to aggressively recruit teachers of color (Villegas & Irvine, 2010), and within these studies, there is usually at least one teacher candidate of color. However, this student's perspective is rarely explored or is lumped in with that of the White majority.

In this chapter, I explore the unique perspective of one student enrolled in Diversity 3000. As a Generation 1.5 student, Carmen was born in Brazil but had the majority of her P-12 schooling in the United States. Generation 1.5 youth are often English language learners who have assimilated into American culture while dually maintaining characteristics from their home country (Forrest, 2006; Rumbaut & Ima, 1988). Carmen's experiences in the course provide insight into how students of color from affluent and non-native backgrounds might approach activism-related topics in a multicultural education course. What follows is an explication of her intentional shunting between engagement (Kuh, 2001), where students exert energy and interest toward course topics, and disengagement (Applebaum, 2007), where students resist course information and employ "a premature disengagement and refusal to engage" (p. 336). Disparities between her level of participation and departure exemplify a theory I call "friendly resistance."

The idea of "friendly resistance" stems from learned behaviors taken up by students in order to portray an external sense of academic investment that pleases the instructor while maintaining the student's internal dissent and cognitive divestment. "Friendly resistance," as a behavior, could be linked to what Hytten and Warren (2003) called "the discourse of yes, but. . ." Although Hytten and Warren's terminology was designed to interpret White students' discourses of resistance in multicultural education courses, the term captures the subtle form of resistance that other students also enact to affirm their private exclusionary positions while publicly presenting an inclusive front.

One aspect of "friendly resistance" is the performance of "buy-in," which is a type of student engagement. For the sake of this study, I conceptualize buy-in as a student's willingness to critically analyze course concepts and their own personal

identity. Moreover, buy-in implies continued engagement outside of class meetings and beyond the course. Students who buy-in often make connections between course topics and other knowledge, often extend discussions outside of the classroom, ask provocative questions and reveal their own biases, research the backgrounds and works of course-related scholars, and introduce more topics to be discussed in relation to course goals and objectives. Students who buy-in take ownership of their learning and the course, and they align themselves with the stated objectives of the course and instructor. They are perpetually reflective as they grapple with new information. They are attentive in class, both physically and socially present, and their contributions reflect careful reading of course texts. Lastly, students who buy-in make known the need to take action and therefore make commitments to affect positive change in their present lives and future classrooms.

Another characteristic of "friendly resistance" is cognitive dissonance (Festinger, 1957). This theory refers to human reactions when new information and experiences contradict existing attitudes, behaviors, or principles. As Festinger (1957) explained, "in the presence of an inconsistency, there is a physiological discomfort" (p. 2). This discomfort may threaten a person's sense of self in relation to their epistemologies and ideologies. Substituting inconsistency with the term dissonance, Festinger (1957) purported that "when dissonance is present, in addition to trying to reduce it, the person will actively avoid situations and information which would likely increase the dissonance" (p. 3). Cognitive dissonance is a motivating factor that leads people to resolve imbalances between what they believe and what they are experiencing. Three main internal approaches to reducing dissonance are changing one's attitudes or beliefs,

challenging the dissonant belief, or minimizing the significance of the cognition (Festinger, 1957; Festinger & Carlsmith, 1959).

As students embody "friendly resistance," they practice buy-in in one social sphere, while working to reduce their cognitive dissonance in another. In the case of Carmen, I explore how she successfully demonstrated buy-in, while at times challenging and underrating the importance of course objectives (cognitive dissonance). Festinger and Carlsmith (1959) argued that forcing someone to do or say something that is contrary to their private opinion may change their outlook; however, friendly resisters are strategic in maintaining their beliefs, attitudes, and practices. Thus, displays of buy-in are temporary and ineffective in facilitating dispositional transformation. Unlike overt resistance modes (Bonilla-Silva, 2002; Carpenter, 2001; Haviland, 2008; McIntyre, 1997), friendly resisters appear to be both compliant and resistive. They exhibit calculated participation as an investment in their overall matriculation.

Carmen as Friendliest Resister

It was clear from the first day of class that Carmen had mastered ideal student performances. She demonstrated many behaviors that signified that of a model student: She was prompt to every meeting, her contributions during discussions referenced the assigned readings, she was courteous and pleasant towards her peers, and her blog posts were timely and lengthy while exhibiting thought and effort in their construction. By most measures, Carmen was an excellent student, well on her way to being a licensed teacher. That she was a student of color was an added benefit for educationalists arguing to narrow the demographic imperative. What follows is a close analysis of Carmen's course-related online activity juxtaposed with her in-class performance.

On the first day of class, Dr. Hernandez set an agenda that featured creative introductions and reviewed the syllabus and special assignments—a beginning typical of most university courses. The agenda also included a brief article about the importance of caring in education, which led to a lively discussion about the role of teachers, the purpose of schooling, and the rationale of Diversity 3000 as a required licensure course. Carmen's contribution was the first to mention teaching as an activist-oriented profession, stating, "This is a way to combat stereotypes" (January 14, 2013). As Dr. Hernandez facilitated the session, Carmen emerged as an attentive and active participant who asked relevant questions. In the second class meeting, Carmen maintained her studious alignment with the stated course ideology. Speaking in reference to working with students from economically disadvantaged backgrounds, Carmen shared, "I struggle with being done. Our work is never done and you just have to go home and let it go unfinished." Her facial expression was solemn and slightly dejected as the majority of her classmates turned toward her and nodded in agreement.

After reading the first chapter of *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (Freire, 1972), Carmen used her first blog post to express a desire to learn more about herself in the course and "getting to know everyone better." She recounted the events in the first class meeting, her perception of the activities, and then addressed Freire's notion of liberation and her interpretations of his words. She wrote:

> He talks about how freedom can be achieved by putting to practice what you
> believe and by committing to transformation and realizing your oppression
> through dialogue. I think he's saying that perhaps the best ground for this to be
> reached is in education and it makes me so excited that I can be a part of bringing
> freedom to people! (Blog post, January 25, 2013)

In an earlier class discussion, Carmen shared that she had previously read Freire, but "although he's a fellow Brazilian [she] didn't really get him." The "getting" she referenced alluded to understanding his work and mission and empathizing with his identified cause. The statement above illustrates her attempt to "get" Freire and, furthermore, to adopt his principles into her teaching practices. Her eagerness to bring "freedom to people" situates her as a holder of freedom and thus complicates her membership status between oppressed peoples and oppressors. If she thinks of herself as being predominantly oppressed, she is referencing the collective struggle for in-group liberation, which her "part of" mention suggests.

However, the very idea of bringing anything—let alone liberation—to another being is evocative of oppressor discourse in that it locates freedom in certain people and outside of the oppressed collective. That Carmen spoke of her future students as "people," undiluted by terms like "little people," "kids," or "empty vessels," shows potential in the teacher she will one day be. Similarly, her reference to "people," as opposed to just students, extends her liberating work to her students' families and communities. The communal implications of her statement reveal a conviction for long-term investment into the lived realities of her students. In these respects, one might conclude that Carmen was beginning to "get" Freire as she actively engaged the text and nurtured her capacity to do transformative work in classrooms.

Carmen was one of the first sets of students to present their "culture quilts." The assignment, which was discussed in Chapter 4, required students to locate themselves in relation to specific aspects of their culture (e.g., family history, leisure experiences, self-perception, learning style). During the exhibition, she requested pardon for being sick, explaining, "I really wanted to be here." Although her ailment was not observed, when

Carmen commented that she wanted to be in class despite her ill state, she demonstrated professionalism, commitment, and ideal student behaviors. Her follow-up blog post showcased text-to-text and text-to-self connections that are associated with engaged learning and concept processing strategies (Keene & Zimmerman, 1997). Moreover, she demonstrated great anticipation of course readings and emotionally identified with its content. She wrote:

> I was really looking forward to finding out what this *Black Ants and Buddhists* book was all about. As soon as I started reading the prologue, I couldn't put it down. . . Which is very surprising to say about a textbook! I don't know what it is but I love multicultural education and I'm so drawn to it. I love the concept of teaching critically and I hope that one day I can teach in the way that Mary Cowhey was talking about. Teaching critically breaks away from what Freire talks about with his concept of "banking education." It means engaging in dialogue with our students and learning together by questioning instead of just depositing knowledge into their heads. Like Cowhey said, it means that the students learn the basic skills they need to pass the standardized tests while thinking critically and being an active member in their community. It means working to end oppression and bring justice. However, I couldn't help but wonder as I was reading the prologue if there are any schools in [southeast state] that even allow teachers to teach critically in the way that Cowhey described. I can't imagine a school in [southeast state] allowing teachers to talk about different religions so openly the way that she did while trying to find answers to the black ant issue. I love these concepts and ideas of being activists and being part of

bringing social justice through education but is it realistic and how can it be

implemented where we are? (Blog post, January 31, 2013)

In keeping with her good student practice of analyzing text and making connections,

Carmen defines critical teaching in opposition to banking education. Given her earlier

claims to emulate the pedagogy of Cowhey (a Freirian scholar), her construction of

criticality situates Carmen as a hopeful change agent in the classroom and displays her

competence with regard to course objectives. Morrison et al. (2008) stressed that

"students are empowered with the tools to transform their lives and ultimately the

conduct of our society" when critical consciousness is developed (p. 443). Carmen's

reflections suggest that she understood the pairing of the Cowhey and Freire texts as

theoretical tools for developing activist dispositions.

The ease with which Carmen pragmatically acknowledged the need for academic

achievement while helping students to sustain justice work in their respective

communities articulates the foundation of culturally relevant pedagogy. Her question of

feasibility (e.g., imagining "a school in [southeast state] allowing teachers to talk about

different religions so openly") regarding CRP in a classroom, while couched in issues of

the separation of church and state, alludes to structural and organizational aspects of

schools and the inherent limitations placed upon teachers. Morrison et al. (2008) asserted

that "schools are currently set up to privilege the transmission theory of learning over the

constructivist theory, and the rise of a standardized curriculum and high-stakes tests has

only tipped the scales more toward this transmission theory" (p. 444). Moreover, the

censorship of curriculum content, as policed by local official and popular opinion, limits

exploration of controversial topics like LGBT issues, religion, racial insensitivity, etc.

(Reichman, 2001). Thus, the restrictive southeast state classrooms that Carmen

envisioned would not support CRP as constructivist pedagogy where students are involved in the curriculum.

Amidst her state of slight deflation, she rounded out her blog with a public request for solutions. Having stumbled upon a challenge to her ideal activist-oriented pedagogy, she (like a true dialogic pedagogue) opened the floor for suggestions from her future colleagues. Although that particular instance did not yield direct solutions, it allowed a Nigerian student to express equal concern for the potential of critical pedagogy in today's schools. Dr. Hernandez required that all students comment on another's blog at least twice in a given week. While the course required Carmen to comment on at least two blog posts a week, she did not follow up with that classmate. The decision to ignore the seeds of alliance within a course preparing future teachers for activism is suggestive of *buy-in* performance, as opposed to authentic engagement. Had Carmen responded to her Nigerian peer, she might have formed an alliance around bringing change, but her silence illustrates divestment—and therefore pretense. As the 2012 Chicago Teachers Strike demonstrated, the "necessity of an alliance among teachers and parents and community organizations" is crucial for the success of efforts addressing inequality (Rethinking Schools, 2013, p. 1).

Carmen's buy-in performance was not limited to a particular course space. While she was more explicit about her cognitive dissonance in the online forum, there were moments in the class meeting that illustrated her misalignment with the course objectives. During the Diversity 3000 session dedicated to LGBTQ issues, Carmen exhibited less than ideal buy-in performance. The class read *Just the Facts about Sexual Orientation and Youth: A Primer for Principals, Educators, and School Personnel* (2012) and GLSEN's *National School Climate Survey* (2011). The articles campaigned for greater

attention to LGBTQ issues in schools and debased efforts by religious ministries to alter individual sexual orientations toward heterosexuality. Carmen, who usually avoided off-topic chatter during active class time and otherwise never held private conversations in class, began to disengage. She whispered with her neighbors, did not contribute to class discussions, and actively monitored her cellphone.

Later in her blog post, she stated:

The readings, especially "GLSEN School Climate Survey" makes me sad. Regardless of my personal opinion about this topic, no child should ever be harassed or discriminated against at school, period. School, of all places, should be a safe haven for children. It should be a place where children can learn, grow and explore themselves and the world around them. It should be a positive, encouraging and judgment free environment. (Blog post, February 9, 2013)

With the dismissal of personal opinion, Carmen separated her bias from her future pedagogy as though the two are not interlinked. She asserted her allegiance to justice with an itemization of ideals in school spaces, all while ignoring how her personal beliefs might undermine the fulfillment of such goals. As Whitlock (2010) suggested, "anti-bullying curricula and pedagogy stress tolerance as a goal, yet tolerance does nothing to question the production—by the bullies in this case—of heteronormativity, and also gendered and ethnic normative identities" (p. 100). Carmen's generous characterization of schools as safe spaces for all students, including LGBTQ community members, failed to recognize her own responsibility in creating systemic change. Feeling "sad" is an insufficient response to injustice in school, yet Carmen failed to recognize that "every educational discourse, approach or practice makes possible some anti-oppressive changes while closing off others" (Kumashiro, 2002, p. 9). In choosing to set aside her "personal

opinion," her tolerance discourse closed off the potential for activism for what Britzman (1998) termed a "queer pedagogy." Britzman (1998) explained that queer pedagogy "begins with an ethical concern for one's own reading practices, one that is interested in exploring what one cannot bear to know, and one interested in the imagining of a sociality unhinged from the dominant conceptual order" (p. 226). Carmen evaded her own reading of the world, thereby mitigating her capacity to accept difference, and moved to the dominant rhetoric of anti-bullying.

While Carmen previously crafted a bridge between justice ideology and the practice of critical education, here she intentionally severed ties between the two, as it would otherwise require transformation of the educator (herself) toward an LGBTQ ally orientation. At this juncture, Carmen's "friendly resistance" surfaced as a thriving mechanism. I use the term "thriving mechanism" as opposed to "surviving mechanism" in order to highlight the goal of buy-in performance. Within her blog, she had to straddle the line of buying-in while experiencing cognitive dissonance. The friction between the two performances caused her to couch her difference of opinion in religious doctrine and therefore be relieved of any personal backlash.

Students who take up buy-in performance aim to excel in multicultural education courses as a sign of sociopolitical validation. The cultural tolerance climate of the United States, under-girded by post-racial discourses, functions as the backdrop for students in such courses (Dawson & Bobo, 2009; Ford & Quinn, 2010). As society gives credence to cultural competency, evidenced by the institutionalization of diversity across universities and major social institutions, political correctness is standardized (Bowman & Betancur, 2010). Moreover, because the CoE of Southeastern University formally declared social justice as its ideal, students who rebel might be perceived as problematic and risk

repercussion. Everyone, including the religious right, must acknowledge oppression and exhibit care for the "Other" in order to get an "A" in such a space (Said, 1979). Even the Diversity 3000 syllabus stated that "professionalism in this cohort is determined by . . . responsiveness and open mindedness."

> Nonetheless, unable to contain her disturbance, Carmen wrote on her blog site:
>
> I thought that the booklet "Just the Facts" was extremely biased and it didn't give an equal representation of both sides. The way that they presented their information made the therapies and ministries who have attempted to tackle the issue of sexual orientation look putrid. . . . I can't and won't go into the nature versus nurture debate about people's sexual orientation but I do think that every single situation is different and there should be room for both. There are absolutely times when a child needs the support and encouragement to fully come into who they are. But there are also times when a child has suffered extreme trauma and/or abuse and their sexual orientation is a manifestation of something much deeper that is going on and needs to be addressed. In those cases, encouraging or "letting them be" would be detrimental to their development because of other issues that are not being cared for. I think that therapy or religious efforts could be extremely helpful in those situations. I think it is important to be open-minded to every perspective and approach on issues such as these. I don't think that change in our society will come from either extreme. (Blog post, February 9, 2013)

Carmen's above comments anchored her in a state of ideological defense, which is counterproductive in courses geared toward transformative learning. Although the Diversity 3000 syllabus stated that professionalism required commitment, defined as

"perseverance when faced with challenges," Carmen was not prepared to be ideologically offended. Feeling tension between her professional and personal commitments, Carmen rationalized a dysfunctional understanding of homosexuality (rendering it an issue or situation) and legitimized therapy and religion as potential treatments for queer sexuality. Still, mindful of her drastically intense response, Carmen attempted to professionally balance her post by reiterating her open-mindedness to "every perspective" to align with the course stated ideological standards and the present climate of cultural tolerance in the United States.

The following class presented an opportunity for Carmen to further balance her "friendly resistance." Dr. Hernandez began the session with a lyric video of Vanessa Williams's song "Colors of the Wind" from the motion picture *Pocahontas*. As the class discussed hidden messages in the song, Carmen exhibited attentiveness. Throughout the session, she maintained focus on the course topic and larger group discussion. She wavered between critical and uncritical remarks. Carmen noted that children's media content has political agendas that subliminally influence youth consciousness. In a text-to-self exposition, she explained that she recently realized that "Shame, Shame, Shame" (a popular United States childhood song/game) typecasts "Mexicans as illegal border crossers, policemen as abusive, and women as victims." The class responded in awe of her analysis, and the professor legitimized her contribution by prompting the rest of the class to analyze the discourse of "every game and nursery rhyme like 'Ring around the Rosie' " (Fieldnotes, February 13, 2013). Later, as the class discussed the historical accuracy of school textbooks with regard to the establishment of the United States, Carmen pronounced, "The Columbus story is still true. It's not about truth and lie. We celebrate Thanksgiving as a time to be thankful." Although her group discussion

suggested she understood that Native Americans were the first inhabitants of the

Americas, Carmen was concerned with the contemporary evolutions of the holiday and

the benefactors of Columbus's false heroism. Once more, as the course content proved

threatening to her beliefs, values, and experiences, Carmen retreated to a more narrow

perspective.

Carmen's Unraveling Friendly Resistance

Maintaining "friendly resistance," a balance between buy-in performance and

cognitive dissonance, can be difficult when ideologically disruptive instances are

persistent. Thus, as the semester progressed, Carmen was more consistent about

challenging dissonant beliefs and minimizing the significance of course objectives. As

the voice of transformation and social justice became dominant in class, Carmen reserved

her opposition for the online forum, where her posts were often twice as long as the other

cohort members. Nevertheless, Carmen was present for every class session and was

attentive and polite during course discussion; she completed all required assignments.

Although her contributions in class shifted toward assignment-oriented questions and

clarifying queries, as opposed to disposition-based statements, her participation

functioned as buy-in. Her choice of avoiding anything that made her reveal her opinion is

a clear example of her exhibiting the false behavior of buy-in. Once Carmen entered the

blogosphere, she proceeded to undermine any progress made toward critical

consciousness during the in-person meetings. In response to Bowles's (1972) *Unequal*

Education and the Reproduction of the Social Division of Labor, she wrote:

> I've been thinking about the term "meritocracy." The idea that we are not bound
>
> to our social class. Having come from a family where both of my parents came

from very low income backgrounds and now have their PhD's; I'd say that I

support his idea. (Blog post, March 1, 2013)

Although mistaken, Carmen understood Bowles's (1972) argument that meritocracy is a

myth to validate her belief that it is indeed an accessible path to upward mobility. Once

more, she relied on her personal and limited experiences to determine the validity of a

text. As Carpenter (2001) described, Carmen dismissed "the content as based on

biased/unbalanced information" (p. 5). Taking up Bowles's theory to support her beliefs

may appear as buy-in behavior, but in reality, she was actively working to debase his

theories, as they did not align with her individual experience.

At the ten-week mark of the semester, the escalation of Carmen's disenchantment

with multicultural education manifested in cultural arrogance during an in-class meeting.

The session, which featured Jamie as a guest facilitator, visibly awakened intellectual

curiosities among all the candidates, except for Carmen. Unlike the disinterest displayed

during the LGBTQ discussion, Carmen listened attentively, but without emotion. I noted

that Carmen "stared blankly as Jamie spoke . . . just sitting up still. No notes taken"

(Fieldnotes, March 11, 2013). As her peers divulged personal stories of discrimination,

financial burdens brought on by immigration–related issues, or even their own journey to

lawful residency, Carmen remained stoic. When asked about her knowledge of

immigration, she curtly responded, "My mom and I are from Brazil. My mom married

my stepdad after two years for a visa. It took 10 years for us to get our citizenship. My

parents both work closely with the immigration ministry" (Fieldnotes, March 11, 2013).

In the statement above, and with the attitude with which it was delivered, Carmen

affirmed her expertise with the topic to indicate that her funds of knowledge have

outpaced the class. Doing so also confirmed her perception of relative superiority to her

peers who are actively engaged in developing their understanding of the matter. Finally, her linkage to her church (e.g., immigration ministry) confirmed her primary source of education through which all other knowledge is sifted. Carmen grimaced as her peers recounted immigration narratives. With 15 minutes left in the session, Carmen decided to join the discussion. I hypothesize that Carmen did so because she did not want to risk tarnishing her reputation as an actively participating student, given that participation was 20% of the final course grade.

At the time of Carmen's reengagement, Ofelia was discussing the role of coyotes in helping undocumented immigrants cross the border between Mexico and the United States (Spener, 2009). Ofelia framed the coyotes as servants responding to an expressed need by people who might otherwise die in their homeland. Lisa, a nontraditional European woman and self-proclaimed "history maven," connected the work of the coyotes to that of Harriet Tubman and the Underground Railroad. Nods of agreement filled the classroom as students grappled with the plight of border crossers. Realizing her distance from the shared experience of her peers, Carmen added, "My boyfriend is an optometrist and although he cannot legally treat people for free, he does. That is someone's right." Her weak attempt to draw parallels between her boyfriend and the coyotes generated admiration from her peers, expressed though smiles and one audible "Exactly!" Carmen's input, while tangential, effectively restored her "good student" status.

Shortly after Carmen's contribution, she briefly engaged the cellphone resting on her lap, perhaps to observe the time. There were 12 minutes remaining in the session, and Carmen did not voluntarily comment again. When asked by the facilitator to share "a take away and one question" from the session, Carmen answered "Obviously, this is a topic

close to my heart." She proceeded to tell the story of a friend's husband's deportation and

how the husband was unable to make it to the wife's funeral (Fieldnotes, March 11,

2013). Her sensational response failed to answer either prompt while the "obviously"

signified her assumed entitlement to immigration-related social capital (Bourdieu, 1986).

Although one-third of the class identified themselves as first-, 1.5-, or second-generation

immigrants, Carmen was the only student who overtly assumed expertise of the topic.

The recounting of a third-party deportation narrative, while irrelevant to the prompt,

garnered sympathy from neighbors and centered Carmen as an empathetic being. While

her peers commented that the session "made me appreciate the [naturalization] process

that my mom had to go through," or "[made me] respect the immigrants a lot more" or

observed that "we are just taking advantage of what we have," Carmen was unmoved.

That she never shifted to a humble state of inquiry and empathy exhibited her over-

reliance upon her Latina and immigrant assumed identities, even as she exercised

"flexible membership" (Lozenski & Smith, 2012). Much like the way she employed an

oppressor standpoint in order to validate her prior dissent, she was at that moment

reversing the orientation to authenticate her buy-in performance.

Last Call for Continuity

As the final weeks of the semester drew near, Carmen found herself at the

junction between her online reality and her in-class pretense. With only two course topics

remaining ("Exceptionalities" and "Families"), Carmen's dueling profiles became

unpredictable. After the "Family and Community" session, she revealed:

> I've struggled this semester with the idea that the purpose of schooling is to teach
>
> about diversity and social justice because of the difficult issues that it brings up. . .
>
> Although I think that talking about the difficult issues that separates us is

important, I think that our actions alone, can hugely impact the way that children

see others that are different from them. (Blog post, March 29, 2013)

Initially, her reflections suggested introspection, but they quickly reversed to a space of

discourse avoidance. Without discourse, the potential for dialectical engagement is

literally muted. Carmen shifted from inaction to "action alone," signifying ideological

grappling, a characteristic of buy-in. This practice of shunting between the possible and

actual is advantageous for a course aiming to facilitate transformation given the nonlinear

nature of the phenomenon (Helms, 1995; Mezirow, 2000). This minor advancement

toward the course objectives was further exhibited once the topic of students with

disabilities was broached. While reflecting about the session, she wrote:

I thoroughly enjoyed our class on Monday. I loved getting to listen to people's

stories and perceptions of people with disabilities. It seems like this is a subject

that is very near to all of our hearts. The video that we watched about Tyler was

so enlightening to me. So often when I think of people with disabilities, I allow

their disability to define them. Although I don't have any cognitive disabilities

like Tyler does, I still have character flaws and my own set of issues but I expect

people to give me the grace of looking past my imperfections to see my abilities.

Tyler, and everyone else with noticeable disabilities, aren't any different.

Can I just add that I just love our cohort and I love how close we're all becoming

and how much we support and encourage each other! 😃 (Blog post, April 3,

2013)

Given the course's popularity among cohort members, Carmen's initial statement of

course enjoyment signified manipulation of social capital because it served to articulate

sincere engagement. The emotive tone of the blog post, characterized by phrase like "I

just love our cohort," "I love how close we're all becoming," or "I loved getting to listen to people's stories and perceptions" each signified a distancing from the topic. Elevating her communal affirmations amid reflections about communities with disabilities signified a lack of importance attributed to disabilities.

Unlike in her previous blog post, Carmen did not interrogate the text, but instead implicated herself. While she admitted to judging people with disabilities, she did not problematize doing so. Her only attempt to counterbalance the limiting of disability communities was to comment that they also dislike judgment. Her lack of commitment to taking action and the couching of her self-analysis between multiple love proclamations implied negligence. The entire engagement was a pretense aimed at portraying a sense of depth and solidarity. As Carmen acquiesced toward the societally marginalized, she flattened disabilities to visible traits, and she drew equivalences between her struggles and that of a person with disabilities, which served to trivialize the matter (Gilson & Depoy, 2000). Although she "expected" people to give her a chance, she failed to commit to giving chances to those with disabilities.

The final three sessions of Diversity 3000 were reserved for student presentations of their self-authored children's books and a trip to the area's Civil Rights Center. Carmen's book was an autobiography entitled "Mila from Brazil." For her presentation, she dressed in traditional Brazilian garb and shared homemade *brigadeiros*, a traditional Portuguese dessert. The only other student to provide food with her presentation was Ofelia. After reading her book, Carmen discussed her shame growing up Brazilian in the United States and her abandonment of the Portuguese language. These public displays of course assignment investment (through creative planning and self-exploration) are in

direct alignment with course professionalism and model student behaviors—also known as buy-in performance. In the blog post that followed, she confessed:

> I have loved this class for so many different reasons but if I'm completely honest, I don't think that the point of education is to bring social justice. I just don't. I think that social justice is important but it's not everyone's platform. It's definitely not mine. . . . at least not in the way that this program is pushing for.
>
> (Blog post, April 21, 1013)

Earlier signifiers of Carmen's resistance toward the mission of the course, and overall program, are confirmed within this post as she sets herself apart from its ideals. With a desire to still represent the image of a cooperative student, Carmen reiterated her "love" of the class. Her tactic, however, framed the semester as one that was so stifling that she could not pronounce her truth until this very moment. The separation between social justice and education goes against every culturally relevant pedagogical goal she previously mentioned (e.g., "teaching critically" or "working to end oppression and bring justice"). Even as she gave credence to social justice as a worthy pursuit for others, she castigated the program for its aggressive approach, as signified by the word "pushing."

Moreover, Carmen's confession undermined the pedagogy of the instructor, casting her as "the way" the program was "pushing." Embedded in the critique was a glimmer of hope for alternative ways that these issues could be addressed, meaning perhaps if "the way" (Dr. Hernandez's pedagogy) were improved, then Carmen would have genuinely bought into the program. The extent to which she felt confident enough to take up a pretense role for the semester, and—by institutional measures—pull it off, is suggestive of her respect for the instructor. The "just" of the statement quantifies the negligible effect the course had on critical consciousness development.

Prior to this instance, most of Carmen's resistance was laced with Christian doctrine, thereby relieving her of personal responsibility for her dissent. The shift to a more personal onus confirms Carmen's rootedness in complacency. In other words, Carmen illustrated the disposition that many pre-service teachers have toward diversity courses. For instance, Ford and Quinn's (2010) study of student perceptions of multicultural education had a population of 163 potential teacher education candidates: 59.8% of the 122 European American students and 87.5% of the 41 other students felt they had "the ability to teach poor minority students successfully" before taking a multicultural education course. Teacher candidates often view such courses as redundant obstacles before licensure. Carmen's point to clarify that social justice was not her platform marked a departure from issues of inequality (fairness related) that she addressed further in her final blog post.

To avoid misunderstanding, Carmen's concluding blog post amplified the discord presented above and revealed her alternative approach to the ills in schools and in society overall. After visiting the Civil Rights Center and participating in a post-course discussion regarding the trip and final class assignments, Carmen wrote:

> The second thing that impacted me was how much MLK was influenced by Jesus. I honestly don't know how anyone could look deeply into who he was and what he did and not see how he could not have done any of it without the Lord. I actually think that he wanted people to follow in his own footsteps as much as he wants people to know Jesus and see the love He has for all of his people. (Blog post, April 27, 2013)

As she had done in previous blogs, Carmen directed the text (the narrative of Martin Luther King Jr. presented at the center) to reinforce her personal values and

epistemology. She paralleled his justice efforts with his evangelizing ones and in the spirit of non-action crusading, she minimized his personal role in his justice work. The term "deeply" qualifies the degree to which one would need to evaluate the source of Dr. King's accomplishments in order to understand the spiritual undercurrents, which suggest that those who disagree are not as thorough in their assessment. According to Carmen, Dr. King was a vessel and tool utilized by "the Lord" to bring forth good works. It is likely that she felt that Dr. King was called to do peace work, and perhaps her calling is different. Conceivably, her earlier delineation between platforms was actually an effort to draw distinction between individual "callings" ordained by God. Addressing the subject of narrow-mindedness, she mentioned: "This was truly one of the most challenging and frustrating classes that I have ever taken. I questioned and searched myself a lot this semester" (Blog post, April 27, 2013).

Her reference to the class as a challenge did not invoke gratitude, given its pairing with frustration. Typically, "challenge" is used as an expression to capture a growth experience, but Carmen's use of the term reestablished her dissatisfaction with the course and lack of personal transformation. Throughout the semester, as her resistance flourished, Carmen anchored herself in Christian doctrine and gradually developed her capacity to evangelize. In an effort to maintain some semblance of buy-in, while steadfastly spreading the gospel, she wrote:

> Although I support social justice, I don't think that the way to it is by eliminating the things that separate us. What if there was something, or someone, that could transcend race, nationality, gender, sexual orientation and anything else that we see as dividers, and has the power and grace to unite us? I think there is and I think that He's the only way to true freedom. (Blog post, April 27, 2013)

This pronouncement, while appearing as a contradiction on the surface ("Although I support social justice"), is actually a clarification. Where she initially stated, "I don't think that the point of education is to bring social justice," she did not suggest that social justice should not be carried out. Carmen, from the beginning of the semester, showed great enthusiasm for the education profession, citing, "I've always worked with kids. Ms. Hines was my first teacher when I moved here. She was really patient and made my transition easy. I want to be an excellent teacher like her" (Interview, January 28, 2013). Her separation of justice work from the education profession is based on her faith that Jesus will alleviate the world of its troubles, as promised in the Bible. For example, Philippians 4:19 reads: "But my God shall supply all your need according to his riches in glory by Christ Jesus." Taken out of context, one could interpret this to mean that action is unnecessary, as divine power will make right any wrongs and provide what is lacking—even if the deficiency is educational justice. Thus, the prerogative of an educator is to transfer course content and surrender the facilitation of justice work to the Lord.

Feeling liberated by her faith exhibition, Carmen proceeded to overtly debase the course, accusing it of the very intolerance it denounced:

I thought that this class was put in place to encourage us to assimilate to one specific way of thinking. Although social justice is important, that's not the only issue that needs to be addressed and fought for. As educators, we have different experiences that have impacted and molded us into who we are today. We definitely take those experiences into the classroom but I don't think that it's such a bad thing. I think that our beliefs, desires, values, likes and dislikes all serve a

purpose and the best thing that we can do for ourselves and our students is be true to who we are. (Blog post, April 27, 2013)

Carmen's offense taken from the course and instructor's agenda to "assimilate" teacher candidates into social activist roles is like that of conservative opponents to multicultural education (Ehrlich & Colby, 2006; Horowitz, 2007), who argue that it brainwashes students toward leftist ideals. Critical multiculturalism is meant to disrupt students and challenge taken-for-granted knowledge; however, if students are closed to identity exploration, their sense of self is threatened by course content (Chou, 2007; Haberman, 1991). Carmen's argument is supported by a well-articulated argument for diversity in teacher identity and experience, which is instrumental in the culmination of her "friendly resistance" practice. Like a model student, she was able to extrapolate course theories and concepts to argue that teacher education should be tolerant of diverse perspectives and people, just as it encourages teacher candidates to be within their diverse student populations. In arguing for honoring "the things that separate us," Carmen argued for the inclusion of varying ideologies in the profession and the valuing of funds of knowledge as touted by culturally relevant pedagogues: "I think it's important to remember that we are such a small piece of the puzzle and that there is something much bigger at work and we can't see the finished product yet" (Blog post, April 27, 2013).

She completed her argument with a reminder of human limits. The continuous self-imposed restrictions couched in Christian doctrine allowed Carmen to exist in a state of pretense and "friendly resistance" for an entire semester. Her successful performance garnered a passing grade in the course and brought her one step closer to licensure.

Concluding Thoughts

By following Carmen's experience in the class, I do not mean to imply that others were not struggling with course content in relation to their preexisting ideologies, but rather to exemplify how we can easily misread performance of buy-in as sincere engagement—especially when stemming from a student of color. "Sincere" here means in relationship with course content and with a degree of alignment with the mission of the department. Carmen's resistance to both the course and the College of Education implied a misalignment of priorities; however, the course's mission is oriented toward justice pedagogy for all youth. This mission is widely regarded as a beneficial ideal for marginalized youth (Banks, 1995; Ladson-Billings, 2009; Nieto & Bode, 2012). As Haberman (1991) asserted, recruiting better candidates into teacher education programs is more effective than changing those less oriented toward critical multiculturalism.

The friction brought on by the competing agendas (e.g., Christian doctrine versus social justice activism) to which Carmen was exposed—one promoting inaction, the other aggressive action—complicated her experience. Throughout all of Carmen's resistance, she never denied inequality; she understood and accepted that it was the lived reality of a community with which she partially identified. She also felt confident that activism was ineffective, at least in her social context. To combat the oppressor (who was implicitly characterized as White, male, and Christian) might imply opposing her stepfather, the choices of her mother, her church, and/or her fiancé—in essence, her personal life. It is unclear the distance each one of us has to travel in order to reach a state of activism in our profession, and it is therefore unprofessional for teacher educators to assume students of color have a shorter journey.

Carmen, through her frustration, questioning, vacillation, buy-in pretense, and overt grappling, demonstrated the hazards of engaging in sincere buy-in. For many of us,

schooling is a means to an end: We do not knowingly engage with transformation. For the most part, we are satisfied with who we are before entering a classroom, and we certainly don't enroll in courses to change ourselves, our values, ideologies, life plans, and communities. As I discuss in the concluding chapter, TEPs must embrace multicultural education as foundational in licensure programs. Furthermore, we must evaluate selection and recruitment processes for students. Although Carmen passed the course and will likely receive her degree from Southeastern University, her ideologies mark her as an unsuccessful example of the department and its mission to produce critical educators.

CHAPTER 7

Insights and Future Considerations

Examining the lived experiences of teacher candidates of color (TCCs) in a multicultural education course was the focus of the study. The goal was to understand students' learning outcomes, their formation of resistance, and their appreciation of course objectives in relation to learning outcomes. The study also examined the teaching practices of a teacher educator of multicultural content who was attempting to enact culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1994; 2009). Findings of the study speak to notions of resistance to multiculturalism being ethno-racially exclusive, as implied throughout education research (Bonilla-Silva, 2002, Carpenter, 2001; Haberman, 1991 ; Howard, 2006). In this chapter, I return to the study's context and synthesize my results from Chapters 4, 5, and 6 to arrive at the implications of this research. Additionally, I revisit the research questions guiding this study, provide recommendations for teacher education, and propose avenues for future research.

Dr. Hernandez as a Culturally Relevant Pedagogue

With multicultural education research heavily focusing on pre-service teachers, little is known about the practices or "intricacies" of its instructors (Gorski, 2012). Chapter 4 looked at Dr. Hernandez, the instructor of Diversity 1000 and 3000, as an example of pedagogical possibilities for critical multiculturalism, but also as a model of the dispositions, epistemologies, and ethics needed to do justice-oriented work in teacher education. According to Gorski (2012), "as in the case of P-12 teachers, the personal dispositions and biases of teacher educators can be a considerable barrier to MTE [multicultural teacher education] practice" (p. 219). As Dr. Hernandez understood, the impact of her children being biracial—specifically, her son being read as a Black male—

necessitated that consciousness to productively impact her work. That the schooling and social futures of her biracial children were a motive for critically preparing teachers for diverse classrooms begs the question of the impetus of other teacher educators. Because of the cultural homogeneity of education faculty (largely White and middle class), "they might not be able to promote an understanding of diversity among their students who may be teaching in a culturally diverse setting" (Chou, 2007, p. 142). The backgrounds of teacher educators (e.g., cultural experiences, ethno-racial identity, dispositions) are a crucial starting point for understanding their pedagogical approach.

With an appreciation of the varying—and often insufficient—approaches to multicultural education, Dr. Hernandez designed her courses to move beyond heroes and holidays. Her justice-oriented agenda aimed to help students understand their identities, their communities, the social responsibility of teaching, and the importance of being change agents. The linguistic, national, and ethno-racial diversity of the student cohorts exacerbated this already challenging task (Morrison et al., 2008). In response, Dr. Hernandez employed culturally relevant pedagogy as a process to be inclusive of all students in the course (Ladson-Billings, 1994), but also to develop them holistically.

To maintain academic rigor, Dr. Hernandez mandated completion of all assignments to ensure students interacted with all facets of the course. She also standardized open engagement as student professionalism, which was outlined in the syllabus. Course activities, such as writing a children's book, were cross-listed with the literacy methods course, which counteracts the stigmatization of multicultural education as separate from mainstream curriculum (Chou, 2007; Gorski, 2008). Critical consciousness was developed in many facets. One example was the lyrical analysis activities that took place at the beginning of each session. By allowing students to

deconstruct songs from their socialized library of depoliticized music, students came to understand the pervasiveness of hegemony. She also explicitly problematized systems and structures that enable injustice in schools and helped students to recognize that their teaching would require advocacy and activism if it will be equitable (Park, 2013). Lastly, Dr. Hernandez encouraged introspection as a method to build cultural competency. Each student created and presented a culture quilt that explored facets of their lives, but also biases and privileges that mediated their perceptions of Others. The autobiographical assignment was effective in helping students understand their dispositions toward teaching and their selves as cultural beings (Warford, 2011).

Ladson-Billings (1994) made clear that community is central to culturally relevant pedagogy; thus, building and maintaining it among students in class is ideal. By remaining reflexive, Dr. Hernandez's pedagogy evolved to accommodate the dynamics of each group, which regularly led to self-exposition and vulnerability. She leveraged her K-5 classroom teaching experience, her lived experiences with oppression, and an array of both human and material resources to build connections with students. This broadening of resources allowed students to interact with community members, build community among one another, and interact with diverse course content. Gentry et al. (2012) contended that these experiences are crucial for developing teachers' cultural awareness, and Gay (2003) agreed that such practices are responsive to learning and to the cultural distinctiveness of the students. The communal approach to Dr. Hernandez's multicultural education honored CRP as a pedagogy "specifically committed to collective, not merely individual, empowerment" (Ladson-Billings, 1995, p. 160).

Student Resistance

While Dr. Hernandez's CRP was effective with many students, in Chapter 5, I

discussed outliers who felt that her pedagogy was, at times, exclusionary or offensive.

Students collectively described faculty as "they" and accepted guest facilitators as

extensions of Dr. Hernandez's pedagogy. Thus, triumphs and failures were reflected in

their assessment of Dr. Hernandez. As an illustration, when Dr. Hernandez's husband

John led a session on Ebonics, his assumption that the Black students in the cohort were

fluent speakers of Ebonics was met with silence (Carpenter, 2001). While alienating

White students in multicultural education is a common concern, Sheets (2001) argued

that positioning TCCs *as course content* is also problematic. In other words, students of

color are not experts on their culture group, nor can they comprehensively represent any

specific demographic with which they identify. As the " I Too Am Harvard" campaign of

2014 demonstrates, students of color do not come to predominantly White institutions as

representatives of their entire race, nor do they appreciate being framed as alternative

content (Nahar, 2014). Sheets (2001) contended, "while one can argue that teachers of

color may possess valuable cultural and linguistic resources, [TEPs] also must recognize

that these strengths need to be acknowledged, enhanced, and developed as pedagogical

tools" (p. 28).

As Dr. Hernandez moved away from surface content in multicultural education

that simply celebrated Others (Banks, 1995; Bruch et al., 2004), the curriculum

inadvertently led to deficit constructions of particular groups. The Black students in

Diversity 3000 felt that course content focused on negative aspects of Black life and

therefore placed the students on "front street," a term indicating actions that expose

private or disreputable content about an individual or community. The Ebonics discussion

caused some Black students to disassociate with language or condemn it as incorrect or

subordinate to Standard English. This reaction is reminiscent of the many anti-Ebonics

Black voices that surfaced after the Oakland Ebonics controversy of 1996 (Perry & Delpit, 1998). Just as White students resist discussions of racism, oppression, and privilege (Carpenter, 2001), so too might TCCs resist content that constructs them as deficit.

The Black students in Diversity 3000 self-segregated as a means to develop a collective identity (Tatum, 1997) and maintain a "homeplace" (hooks, 1990). Within their group, students created a space that honored their various backgrounds, but presented a united front. For example, although Nova enjoyed and appreciated the Ebonics session, in contrast to several of her Black peers, she waited until the Black group was alone to share her experience. Group members generously listened and offered their alternate reading of the session, but the in-session performance remained intact. This collective was beneficial for identity maintenance during the semester, but the limiting properties of segregation placed the Black students on the periphery of cross-cultural exchanges in the course. Realizing the potential and aims of the course required integrated participation, since interactions with multicultural peers are foundational for building intercultural competence (CAEP, 2013).

As exemplified through naming Nova as an Ebonics speaker, the pattern of cultural competency as an inherent privilege of TCCs surfaced through participant observations and interviews (Ford & Quinn, 2010). This is reflected in the literature, as White teachers are framed as underexposed, culturally insensitive, and incompetent (Carpenter, 2001; Cochran-Smith, 2004; Schmitz, Nourse, & Ross, 2013), or emphasis is placed on uncritically recruiting more Black and Brown teachers to address the achievement gap (CAEP, 2013; Dee, 2004; Sleeter, 2001). As an illustration, when TCCs reflected on the disproportionate attention to issues affecting Black communities, they

rationalized that White students needed the exposure. Correspondingly, a White female student in Diversity 1000 commented, "My fellow African American students already know this stuff" (Fieldnotes, February 12, 2013). This competency premise is counterproductive for transformative student engagement, but dangerous when teacher educators assume the same (Applebaum, 2007; Gorski, 2009; Sheets, 2001; Vetter et al., 2012). While Dr. Hernandez did not explicitly assume such competencies, navigating resistant practices of TCCs, without putting them on "front street" was challenging.

Friendly Resistance

Overt student resistance in multicultural education courses manifest as disengagement, hostility, or departure (Carpenter, 2001). Typically, resisters did not enthusiastically participate in course discussions, sustain engagement in all course forums, or complete course assignments with a high degree of effort—except in the case of Carmen, whose practices associated with course ideological alignment were co-opted to convey sincere engagement. While displaying this sincere engagement, Carmen experienced cognitive dissonance (Festinger, 1957); I term this dichotomized way of experiencing the course as "friendly resistance." Gorski (2012) noted:

> Rarely has student resistance to MTE been discussed in more complex ways, such as in ways that differentiate the act of resisting on political grounds from the act of resisting due to, say, cognitive dissonance or a well-intentioned desire to focus on color-blindness rather than racial equity. (p. 229)

In his assertion, Gorski (2012) clouded the notion of students being open-minded. Throughout the first half of the course, Carmen celebrated critical pedagogy ideologies, professing to love the class and multicultural education. She discussed her aspirations to be a critical educator in the classroom and a change agent in the communities where she

would work, but as the semester ended, she retracted.

After the second-to-last class meeting, Carmen confessed on her blog post, "If I'm completely honest, I don't think that the point of education is to bring social justice (Blog post, April 21, 1013). According to Rogers (1998), "social justice entails seeing that each person's dignity gets honored, each person's needs get recognized and addressed, and any person's group's claims to extras are anchored in merits or needs widely agreed upon and open to debate among members" (p. 4). Dr. Hernandez extended that understanding to include teachers as change agents who would take up the work of facilitating justice through their pedagogy. As Carmen distanced herself from social justice, it was not an act of irresponsibility but rather a logical response to her Christian faith and conservative political commitments (Gorski, 2012).

Carmen condemned the course and the teacher education department as assimilative sites of liberal ideology (Ehrlich & Colby, 2006; Horowitz, 2007). TEPs, and specifically diversity courses, intend to socialize students; that is what the field expects of them. Olstad, Foster, and Wyman (1983) proclaimed that:

> Teacher educators must ask themselves to what degree their teacher preparation programs (a) facilitate increased cultural self-awareness, (b) cultivate appreciation of diversity, (c) increase cultural competency, and (d) prepare teachers to work effectively with a variety of students and parents, to the extent that education programs achieve these ends, to that extent do they prepare culturally competent teachers? (p. 138)

Cultivating appreciation and increasing self-awareness and competency are all socializing practices. A fundamental problem in our recruitment and enrollment of pre-service teachers is that we do not seek candidates who have a predisposition to such

transformations (Haberman, 1991). Assuming ideological alignment between TCCs and multicultural education courses, based on skin color, flattens the nuanced social locations mediating student identities.

Recommendations

As the field of education grapples with diversity issues in P-12 schooling, the recruitment of more TCCs surfaces as a potential area of resolution (Chou, 2007; Villegas & Irvine, 2010). CAEP's (2013) Standard 3 explicitly calls for "high-quality candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations." My findings suggest that an aspect of "high quality" entails an epistemology oriented toward justice. Leaders in the field of multicultural education acknowledge the centrality of justice in its implementation (Banks, 2004; Gay, 2002 ; Gorski, 2008; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Nieto & Bode, 2012; Sleeter & Grant, 2007). Thus, teacher candidates in firm opposition to social justice exist as threats to the mission of equitable education for *all* students. TEPs would do well to screen candidates prior to program admittance. According to Haberman (2001), recruitment of "high quality" candidates involves a maturity to be reflexive in the molding process that is teacher education. Yang and Montgomery (2013) contended, "In order to cultivate attitudinal change toward a given diversity issue, existing attitudes need to be determined" (p. 28). Therefore, I recommend candidate predisposition to transformation as an instituted criterion in our quest for "high quality" teachers.

In the case of Southeastern University, the two-course approach allowed candidates to explore social justice topics in the first section and consider whether applying for the licensure program was the best course of action. I recommend this two-tiered model as a way to introduce students to critical multiculturalism and gauge their responses. In addition to content exposure, the preliminary course would allow candidate

interaction among diverse groups. This is a prominent method for assessing and providing opportunities for cross-cultural experiences. Perhaps students who are staunchly opposed to course concepts or interacting with their multicultural peers may be counseled to seek other majors or additionally developed before admittance to a teacher licensure track. However, while such a model may be effective, Carmen demonstrated the potential for oversights. Under such circumstances, teacher candidates still need to develop the competencies necessary to meet the needs of diverse learners; therefore, buy-in is still required. Students that buy-in monitor their development, are reflexive, and transfer course topics into society and their personal lives. They exhibit the basic markers of engagement but exceed them to experience greater authenticity. Buy-in cannot be assumed when DME courses are required; thus, engagement may have to be the course goal rather than its starting point. Put differently, students who are required to take any course, much less one emphasizing transformation, may need to be developed toward such flexibility and ideological molding. Such a process may have to be the teacher educator's semester goal.

Engagement as a course goal means that teacher educators come to know the dispositional locations of their students and modify their pedagogy accordingly. Gorski (2012) purported that "different educational strategies may be required to facilitate through different types of resistance emanating from varying ideological sources" (p. 229). This differentiation exemplifies what Ladson-Billings (1995) described as "just good teaching." De facto syllabi and curricula will not suffice in a multicultural education course, nor can they be culturally relevant. Multicultural teacher educators must work diligently to identify and engage resisters because "our efforts are compromised by (in part because they are predicated on) the moral necessity of excluding the very students

who, arguably, we need to reach" (Trainor, 2002, p. 636). In other words, the expressions of our commitments to social justice may, at times, exclude the very students whom we aim to include.

Engagement as a course goal also reflects time constraints. As Dr. Hernandez noted "two and a half hours a week just isn't enough" (Interview, February 11, 2013). If teacher educators can work to engage all students, but especially resisters within the course, students may pursue social justice content and practices long after the semester ends. Moreover, a single course (or in the case of Southeastern University, two courses) devoted to multicultural education is insufficient (Nieto, 2009; Vavrus, 2002). I recommend that TEPs restructure their course requirements to "ensure that completers demonstrate skills and commitment that afford all P-12 students access to rigorous college- and career-ready standards" (CAEP, 2013). Students should be required to take a minimum of four diversity courses. The first would be a survey course, much like Diversity 1000, that discusses varying social groups and their experience of marginality, reviews the sociopolitical landscapes under which oppression is maintained, and introduces the germane seeds of activism. The other prescribed course would be a variation of a disability and special education course that emphasizes early diagnostics, legal aspects of meeting the needs of special education students, and educational teaching, assessment, and guidance of students with a range of disabilities. (As a disability course requirement is standard practice in TEPs, I am simply endorsing its retention.) Thereafter, students could elect to take two more courses that address specific social issues such as:

- Gender & sexuality in schools;
- Socioeconomic diversity: Issues and trends in education;

- Race & ethnicity in education;

- Immigrant families and schools; or

- Local issues of equity in education.

A choice of topics would allow students to buy-in and better develop their capacity to empathize. Indeed, the course themes would intersect with other cultural classifications and perhaps address issues of language, politics, and religion. I recommend a field-based and research component to each course that would facilitate self-motivated learning and low-stakes practice. This programmatic design would allow students to build their social justice portfolio, but also encourage dispositional transferability across diverse groups.

According to Chou (2007), "the entire climate and culture of department, schools, or colleges of education and cooperating schools [must] radiate a consistent, pervasive, and comprehensive appreciation for and promotion of cultural diversity" (p. 155). Likewise, Cochran-Smith et al. (2005), Darling-Hammond (2006), Athanases and Oliveira (2008), Whipp (2013), and Sleeter (2001) argued for a revolutionizing of TEPs to better address the needs of diverse students. I agree with their assertions and furthermore contend that increasing TCC representation in our programs to reflect student diversity means that we risk facing the same instructional challenges of P-12 schools unless we alter our perception of diversity and change our pedagogical approaches.

As was exemplified by the African diaspora group of Diversity 3000, TCCs in diversity courses may not always feel comfortable or safe in TEPs (Amos, 2010; Applebaum, 2007; Sheets & Chew, 2002).With recruitment comes the likelihood of diverse perspectives and experiences, but perspective does not negate development.

Diverse perspectives and experiences are complementary to multicultural education, not substitutes. "It is unfair to assume that just because one is of a diverse cultural background, one will know how to transfer this experience into meaningful pedagogical experiences in the classroom" (Miller & Endo, 2005, p. 3). Indeed, "the preparation of pre-service teachers/students of color to enter the teaching profession should not be taken lightly" (Prado-Olmos et al., 2007, p. 3). Teacher educators must be vigilant.

Dr. Hernandez remained humble and reflexive throughout the semester as a signifier of her culturally relevant pedagogy (Morrison et al., 2008). She acknowledged that being inclusive and meeting the needs of all students will always "be a bit of a struggle, thinking about it from one group to another" (Interview, February 4, 2013). Similarly, Gorski (2012) maintained that teacher educators must "contend with incessant challenges in their practice" as a pedagogical commitment (p. 219). As multicultural educators, we must understand our role in the classroom. Commonly, multicultural teacher educators teach content that is distinct from what our colleagues are teaching; thus, we must be attentive to modeling our ideologies. It is not enough to simply say "be relevant"; we ourselves must practice relevancy. That process is difficult, but it ought to be the basis of our professional stance.

Culturally relevant pedagogy in higher education compels instructors to "walk the talk," which means that teacher educators must model learning about diversity, even as they teach it (Ukpokodu, 2009, p. 7). As Dr. Hernandez made herself available to her students, designed assignments that incorporated and valued students' home knowledge (e.g., culture quilt), and pushed students to build relationships with community activists (e.g., guest facilitators), she too grew. Each time she resisted assumptions of students' cultural competency, while never questioning their intellectual capacity (evidenced by

her empowering discourse), she demonstrated inclusive and equitable teaching. Often, TCCs experiences imposed cultural competencies that complicated their student role in classrooms (e.g., Sheets, 2001). Teacher educators need to remember that all students are individuals first, and community members, after. Such considerations could mitigate instances of "front street" pedagogy that leave TCCs feeling exposed and exploited as course content. Our approach to students must leave room for individual divergence from popular conceptions of group-specific cultural repertoires. Doing so would allow candidates like Carmen to receive tailored support in her development toward culturally relevant teaching.

Future Research

The findings from this research unearthed alternative and complementary avenues of inquiry that would allow a more complete understanding of diverse student experiences in teacher education. First, an inclusive sampling of students from traditionally marginalized backgrounds would heighten the transferability of the results. The limited sociodemographic pool, while allowing for greater depth, minimized the role of intersectionality. A survey instrument controlling for various forms of diversity would speak to a broader range of issues in teacher identity development. In addition, given the regional context of the study, replication in other geographic locations, and at other types of institutions, would bolster the findings. It would be particularly interesting to measure if and how resistance takes shape at minority-serving institutions (i.e., Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU's), Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSI's), Tribal Colleges and Universities (TCU's)) with licensure programs.

Future studies may do well to examine the use of online forums as a space to extend cultural competency developed in multicultural education courses (Miller &

Williams, 2013). The online forum of Diversity 1000 and 3000 heavily influenced my data set, and the participation rate and quality of several TCCs suggested unique interactions with this medium. Duffy (2008) contended,

> The growing popularity of blogs suggests the possibility that some of the work that students need to do in order to read well, respond critically and write vigorously might be accomplished under circumstances dramatically different from those currently utilized in higher education. (p. 122)

Likewise, students used their blogs to push political agendas, give voice to relevant issues, and complicate course discussions. Future studies examining the potential of online spaces in multicultural education courses, especially because of time constraints, may reveal opportunities for teacher educators to personally understand their students and continue conversation well after the semester ends.

Another point of inquiry born from this study is the notion of TCCs resisting multicultural education. While mainstream resistance (Carpenter, 2001) is well researched, less overt forms of rebellion like "friendly resistance" are overlooked. Seeing "friendly resistance" as a combination of cognitive dissonance and buy-in performance, these practices must be studied to better understand how TCCs experience multicultural education, especially at predominantly White institutions. Sheets and Chew (2002) argued that Asian American, as well as indigenous, teacher candidate experiences are neglected in educational research. Perhaps similar studies observing the engagement practices of those groups would corroborate or extend the theory of "friendly resistance." Kohli (2009) maintained that TCCs need to explore not only their current ethno-racial experience in schools, but also their racialized histories with schooling. Thus, an

exploration of "friendly resistance" as a matriculation strategy could be an appropriate theoretical framework to conceptualize such work.

With regard to faculty, studies of culturally relevant pedagogy in higher education are nonexistent. This is in contrast to the dominant presence of Culturally Relevant Pedagogy in Diversity/Multicultural Education content (Morrison et al., 2008). Moreover, education research standardizes modeling "best" practices, yet a reflective turn has not occurred in higher education. Education researchers need to take note of how Dr. Hernandez enacted CRP through relationship building, student empowerment, and developing critical consciousness and cultural competence. Gorski (2012) and Chou (2007) called for research that specifically explores the pedagogy of multicultural educators. Perhaps future research can address some of the challenges Dr. Hernandez faced in practicing CRP. Thus, more studies that examine the use of Culturally Relevant Pedagogy in teacher education programs would inform the field of teacher education broadly and multicultural teacher education specifically.

References

Achinstein, B., Ogawa, R. T., Sexton, D., & Freitas, C. (2010). Retaining teachers of

color: A pressing problem and a potential strategy for "hard-to-staff" schools.

Review of Educational Research, *80*(1), 71-107.

Adichie, C. (2009). The danger of a single story. *TED Ideas worth spreading.*

http://TED.com

Adjei, P. B., & Gill, J. K. (2012). What has Barack Obama's election victory got to do

with race? A closer look at post-racial rhetoric and its implication for antiracism

education. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *16*(1), 134-153.

Ahlquist, R. (1991). Position and imposition: Power relations in a multicultural

foundations class. *Journal of Negro Education*, *60(2)* 158-169.

Amos, Y. T. (2010). "They don't want to get it!" Interaction between minority and White

pre-service teachers in a multicultural education class. *Multicultural Education,

17(4),* 31-37.

Anderson-Levitt, K. (2002). *Teaching cultures: Knowledge for teaching first grade in

France and the United States.* Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Anzaldúa, G. (1987). *Borderlands/la frontera.* San Francisco, CA: Spinsters/Aunt Lute

Book Company.

Applebaum, B. (2007). Engaging student disengagement: Resistance or disagreement?

Philosophy of Education Yearbook, 335-345.

Aronson, B., & Anderson, A. (2011). Critical teacher education and the politics of

teacher accreditation: Are we practicing what we preach? *Journal for Critical

Education Policy Studies, 9(1)*, 244-262.

Athanases, S. Z., & Oliveira, L. C. (2008). Advocacy for equity in classrooms and beyond: New teachers' challenges and responses. *Teachers College Record, 110*(1), 64-104

Au, W. (2009). *Unequal by design: High-stakes testing and the standardization of inequality*. New York: Routledge.

Au, K. H., & Blake, K. M. (2003). Cultural identity and learning to teach in a diverse community findings from a collective case study. *Journal of Teacher Education, 54*(3), 192-205.

Aud, S., Hussar, W., Planty, M., Snyder, T., Blanco, K., Fox, M., Frohlich, L., Kemp, J., & Drake, L. (2010). *The Condition of education 2010.* (NCES 2010-028). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences.

Ball, S. (1994). *Education reform: A critical and post-structural approach*. Buckingham, PA: Open University Press.

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Banks, J. A. (1995). Multicultural education: Historical development, dimensions, and practice. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 3-24). New York: Macmillan.

Banks, J. A. (2004). Approaches to multicultural curriculum reform. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (pp. 247-69). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.

Banks, J. A. (2008). *An introduction to multicultural education* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Banks, J. A. (Ed.). (2012). *Encyclopedia of diversity in education* (Vol. 1*)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Banks, J. A., (2013). The construction and historical development of multicultural education, 1962–2012. *Theory into Practice*, 52(1), 73-82.

Banks, J., Cochran-Smith, M., Moll, L., Richert, A., Zeichner, K., LePage, P., Duffy, H. (2005). Teaching diverse learners. In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do* (pp. 232-274). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Barton, A. C. (2001). Science education in urban settings: Seeking new ways of praxis through critical ethnography. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, *38*(8), 899-917.

Bennett, C. (2001). Genres of research in multicultural education. *Review of Educational Research, 71(2)*, 171-217.

Bennett, C. (2003). *Comprehensive multicultural education: Theory and practice* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Bennett, J. (2011, February). Developing intercultural competence: For international education faculty and staff. Paper presented at the 2011 AIEA Conference, San Francisco.

Boas, F. S. (1943). The teacher of nations. Addresses and essays in commemoration of the visit to England of the great Czech educationalist, Comenius, 1641. *English*, *4*(22), 135-a.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2002). The linguistics of color-blind racism: How to talk nasty about Blacks without sounding "racist." *Critical Sociology, 28*(41), 41-64.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice* (Vol. 16). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241-258). New York: Greenwood.

Bowles, S. (1972). *Unequal education and the reproduction of the social division of labor*. Center for Educational Policy Research.

Bowman, P. J., & Betancur, J. (2010). Sustainable diversity & inequality: Race in the USA & beyond. In M. Janssens et al. (Eds.), *Sustainability of cultural diversity: Nations, cities, & organizations*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elger.

Brad (2004). *Urban dictionary: front street*. Retrieved January 2014, from http://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=front%20street

Branch, A. J., & Ranch, A. J. (2001). Increasing the numbers of teachers of color in K-12 public schools. *The Educational Forum, 65(3),* 256-261.

Bright, D. S., Turesky, E. F., Putzel, R., & Stang, T. (2012). Professor as facilitator: Shaping an emerging, living system of shared leadership in the classroom. *Journal of Educational Leadership*, *11*(1), 157-177.

Britzman, D. (1998). Is there a queer pedagogy? Or, stop reading straight. In W.F. Pinar (Ed.), *Curriculum toward new identities* (pp. 211-231). New York: Garland.

Brown, A. L., & Donnor, J. K. (Eds.). (2013). *The education of Black males in a "post-racial" world*. Hoboken, NJ: Taylor and Francis.

Brown, K. D. (2013). Trouble on my mind: Toward a framework of humanizing critical sociocultural knowledge for teaching and teacher education. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *16*(3), 316-338.

Brown, S. C., & Kysilka, M. L. (1994). In search of multicultural and global education in real classrooms. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 9*(3), 313-16.

Burant, T. J. (1999). Finding, using, and losing (?) voice: A preservice teacher's experiences in an urban educative practicum. *Journal of Teacher Education, 50*(1), 209-219.

Bruch, P. L., Jehangir, R. R., Jacobs, W. R., Ghere, D. L. (2004). Enabling access: Toward multicultural developmental curricula. *Journal of Developmental Education, 27*(3), 12–19.

Bruner, J. (1996). *The culture of education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

CAEP (Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation). (2013). *CAEP Accreditation standards*. Retrieved from CAEP Board of Directors website: http://caepnet.files.wordpress.com/2013/09/final_board_approved1.pdf

Carpenter, A. (2000). An ethnographic study of preservice teacher resistance to multiculturalism: Implications for teaching. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Carpenter, V. (2001). Curriculum and the (re)production of education. In V. Carpenter, H. Dixon, E. Rata, & C. Rawlinson (Eds.), *Theory in practice for educators* (pp. 109–136). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press Ltd.

Castro, A. J., Kelly, J., & Shih, M. (2010). Resilience strategies for new teachers in high-needs areas. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26*(3), 622-629.

Cazden, C.B., & Leggett, E.L. (1981). Culturally responsive education: Recommendations for achieving Lau remedies II. In H. Trueba, G. Guthrie, & K. Au (Eds.), *Culture and the bilingual classroom: Studies in classroom ethnography* (pp. 69-86). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Census Bureau (2011). Overview of race and Hispanic origin: 2010. Retrieved from 2010 Census Briefs website: http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-02.pdf

Chan, C. S., & Treacy, M. J. (1996). Resistance in multicultural courses: Student, faculty, and classroom dynamics. *American Behavioral Scientist, 40*(2), 212-221.

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Chou, H. (2007). Multicultural teacher education: Toward a culturally responsible pedagogy. *Essays in Education*, *21*(1), 139-162.

Cochran-Smith, M. (1995). Color blindness and basket making are not the answers: Confronting the dilemmas of race, culture, and language diversity in teacher education. *American Educational Research Journal, 32*(3), 493-522.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2003). Learning and unlearning: The education of teacher educators. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *19*(1), 5-28.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2004). *Walking the road: Race, diversity, and social justice in teacher education.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (2009). *Inquiry as stance: Practitioner research for the next generation.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Power, C. (2010). New directions for teacher preparation: Ten trends spell out where teacher preparation is heading. *Educational Leadership*, 67(8), 7-13.

Cochran-Smith, M., Shakman, K., Jong, C., Terrell, D. G., Barnatt, J., & McQuillan, P. (2009). Good and just teaching: The case for social justice in teacher education. *American Journal of Education, 115*(3), 347-377.

Columbia University. (2005). The academic achievement gap: Facts and figures.

    Research, 71(2), 171-217. Retrieved from

    http://www.tc.edu/news/article.html?id=5183

Cole, M. (1986). Teaching and learning about racism: A critique of multicultural

    education in Britain. In S. Modgil, G. K. Verma, K. Mallick, & C. Modgil (Eds.),

    Multicultural education: The interminable debate (pp. 123-147). Lewes, UK:

    Farmer.

Cowhey, M. (2006). *Black ants & Buddhists: Thinking critically and teaching differently*

    in the primary grades. Portland, ME: Stenhouse.

Crabtree, B. F., & Miller, W. L. (1999). Using codes and code manuals: A template

    organizing style of interpretation. In B. F. Crabtree & W. L. Miller (Eds.), *Doing*

    qualitative research (2nd ed., pp. 163-177). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cranton, P. (Ed.). (2006). *Authenticity in teaching* (Vol. 111). San Francisco: Jossey-

Bass.

Cranton, P. (2002, Spring). Teaching for transformation. In J. M. Ross-Gordon (Ed.),

    Contemporary viewpoints on teaching adults effectively (New Directions for Adult

    and Continuing Education, No. 93, 63-71). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Cross, W. E., Jr., Parham, T. A., & Helms, J. E. (1991). The stages of black identity

    development: Nigrescence models. In R. Jones (Ed.), *Black psychology* (3rd ed.,

    pp. 319-338). San Francisco: Cobb and Henry.

Cushner, K., McClelland, A., & Safford, P. (2003). *Human diversity in education: An*

    integrative approach (4th ed.). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). *Powerful teacher education*: *Lessons from exemplary*

    programs. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Darling-Hammond, L., Holtzman, D. J., Gatlin, S. J., & Heilig, J. V. (2005). Does teacher preparation matter? Evidence about teacher certification, Teach for America, and teacher effectiveness. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, *13*(42).

Dawson, M. C., & Bobo, L. D. (2009). One year later and the myth of a post-racial society. *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race*, *6*(02), 247-249.

Dee, T. S. (2004). Teachers, race, and student achievement in a randomized experiment. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, *86*(1), 195-210.

Delpit, L. D. (1988). The silenced dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other people's children. *Harvard Educational Review*, *58*(3), 280-299.

Delpit, L. D. (1995). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York: New Press.

Delpit, L. (2006). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York: The New Press.

Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (Eds.). (2005). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dewey, J. (1897). My pedagogic creed. *School Journal, 54*, 77-80.

Donkor, A. K. (2011). Higher education and culturally responsive teaching: A way forward. *The Journal of Multiculturalism in Education*, *7*, 1.

Draeger, J., Prado Hill, P., Hunter, L., & Mahler, R. (2013). The anatomy of academic rigor: The story of one institutional journey. *Innovative Higher Education*, *38*(4), 267-279.

Duffy, P. (2008) Engaging the YouTube Google-Eyed Generation: Strategies for Using Web 2.0 in Teaching and Learning. *The Electronic Journal of e-Learning,* 6 (2), 119 – 130.

Duncan, A. (2010). Speech given to the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

Eldridge, D., & Gollnick, D. M. (2013). Diversity: Where and how? Retrieved from CAEP Conference website:

http://caepnet.files.wordpress.com/2013/09/diversity_where_and_how.pdf

Ehrlich, T., & Colby, A. (2006). Political bias in undergraduate education. *Carnegie Perspectives*. Retrieved from http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/perspectives/

Emerson, R. M., Fretz, R. I., & Shaw, L. L. (1995). Processing fieldnotes: Coding and memoing. In R. M. Emerson, R. I. Fretz, & L. L. Shaw, *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes* (pp. 142-168). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Erickson, F. (2002). Culture and human development. *Human Development, 45*(4), 299-306.

Fanon, F. (1965). *The wretched of the earth*. New York: Grove Press, Inc.

Festinger, L. (1957). *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Festinger, L., & Carlsmith, J. M. (1959). Cognitive consequences of forced compliance. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 58*(2)*,* 203.

Ford, T. N., & Quinn, L. (2010). First year teacher education candidates: What are their perceptions about multicultural education? *Multicultural Education*, *17*(4), 18-24.

Forrest, S. N. (2006). Three foci of an effective high school Generation 1.5 literacy program. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, *50*(2), 106-112.

Foster, A. (2005). Realising the potential: A review of the future role of further education colleges. London: DfES.

Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Gafaranga, J. (2000). Language separateness: A normative framework in studies of

language alternation. *Estudios de Sociolinguística, 1*, 65–84.

Gallagher, C. A. (2009). White like me?: Methods, meaning, and manipulation in the

field of White studies. In W. Luttrell (Ed.), *Qualitative educational research:

Readings in reflexive methodology and transformative practice* (pp. 67-92).

London: Routledge.

Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice.* New

York: Teachers College Press.

Gay, G. (2002). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. *Journal of Teacher

Education, 53*(2), 106-116.

Gay, G. (2003). *Becoming multicultural educators: Personal journey toward

professional agency*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Gay, G. (2010). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd Ed.).

New York: Teachers College Press.

Gay, G., & Kirkland, K. N. (2003). Developing cultural critical consciousness and self-

reflection in preservice teacher education. *Theory into Practice*, 42(3), 181-187.

Gee, J. P. (1989). Literacy, discourse, and linguistics: Introduction. *Journal of Education,

171*(1), 5-25.

Gentry, J., Lamb, H., Becker, M., & Hall, R. (2012). Can pre-service teachers'

perspectives on diversity change? *The Journal of Multiculturalism in

Education*, *8*(1), 1-18.

Gilbert, M., Morgan, J. T., McDonald, D. W., & Zachry, M. (2013). Managing

complexity: Strategies for group awareness and coordinated action in Wikipedia.

In *Proceedings of the 9th International Symposium on Open Collaboration* (p. 5). ACM. Retrieved from opensym.org/wsos2013/proceedings/p0104-gilbert.pdf

Gilson, S. F., & Depoy, E. (2000). Multiculturalism and disability: A critical perspective. *Disability & Society*, *15*(2), 207-218.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research.* Chicago, IL: Aldine.

GLSEN: Gay, Lesbian & Straight Education Network. (2011, February). Retrieved February 2014, from http://glsen.orghttp://glsen.org

Gollnick D., & Chinn, P. (2009). *Multicultural education in a pluralistic society* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

González, N., Moll, L., and Amanti, C. (2005). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Gorski, P. C. (2006). Complicity with conservatism: The de-politicizing of multicultural and intercultural education. *Intercultural Education, 17*(2), 163-177.

Gorski, P. C. (2008). Good intentions are not enough: A decolonizing intercultural education. *Intercultural Education, 19*(6), 515-525.

Gorski, P. C. (2009). What we're teaching teachers: An analysis of multicultural teacher education coursework syllabi. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 25*(2), 309-318.

Gorski, P. C. (2012). Instructional, institutional, and sociopolitical challenges of teaching multicultural teacher education courses. *The Teacher Educator*, *47*(3), 216-235.

Gorski, P. C., & Goodman, R. D. (2011). Is there a hierarchy of oppression in U.S. multicultural teacher education coursework? *Action in Teacher Education*, 33,

455-475.

Grace, A. P. (2006).Writing the queer self: Using autobiography to mediate inclusive

teacher education in Canada. *Teaching and Teacher Education: An International*

Journal of Research and Studies, 22(7), 826–834

Grant, C., & Gibson, M. (2011). Diversity and teacher education: A historical perspective

on research and policy. In A. F. Ball & C. A., Tyson (Eds.), *Studying diversity in*

teacher education (pp. 19-61). Lanham, MA: Rowman & Littlefield.

Grant, C. A., & Secada, W. G. (1990). Preparing teachers for diversity. In W. R. Huston

(Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 403-422). New York:

Macmillan.

Green, K. E. (2010). *Student performance: The impact of teacher expectations and*

student–teacher relationships. (Master's thesis). Retrieved from

http://www.ohio.edu/

Gudykunst, W. B., & Kim, Y. Y. (1984). *Communicating with strangers: An approach to*

intercultural communication. New York: Random House.

Guyton, E., Saxton, R., & Wesche, M. (1996). Experiences of diverse students in teacher

education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *12*(6), 643-652.

Haberman, M. (1991). The rationale for training adults as teachers. In C. Steeler (Ed.),

Empowerment through multicultural education (pp. 275-286). Albany, NY: State

University of New York Press.

Hall, J. P. (2002). Narrowing the breach: Can disability culture and full educational

inclusion be reconciled? *Journal of Disability Policy Studies, 13*(3), 144-152.

Hattie, J. (2003). *Teachers make a difference: What is the research evidence?*

Melbourne: Australian Council for Educational Research.

Haviland, V. (2008). Rearticulating the silencing power of Whiteness in education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 59*(1), 40-54.

He, Y. (2013). Developing teachers' cultural competence: Application of appreciative inquiry in ESL teacher education. *Teacher Development: An International Journal of Teachers' Professional Development, 17*(1), 55-71.

Heller, M. (1999). *Linguistic minorities and modernity: A sociolinguistic ethnography*. London and New York: Longman.

Helms, J. E. (1990). *Black and White racial identity: Theory, research, and practice*. New York: Greenwood Press.

Helms, J. E. (1995). An update of Helms's White and people of color racial identity models. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), Handbook of multicultural counseling (pp. 181-198). United States of America: Sage Publications.

Henze, R., & Hauser, M. (1999). Personalizing culture through anthropological and educational perspectives. (Educational Practice Report No. 4) Santa Cruz, CA: Center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence.

Hodgkinson, H. (2002). Demographics and teacher education: An overview. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *53*(2), 102-105.

Hoffman, D. M. (1996). Culture, self, and multicultural education: Reflections on discourse, text, and practice. *American Educational Research Journal, 33*(3), 545–569.

Holquist, M. (2002). *Dialogism: Bakhtin and his world* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

hooks, b. (1990). *Yearning: Race, gender, and cultural politics*. Boston: South End Press.

hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York: Routledge.

Hoover, M. R. (1998). Ebonics: Myths and realities. In T. Perry & L. D. Delpit (Eds.), *The real Ebonics debate: Power, language, and the education of African-American children* (pp. 71-76). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Horowitz, D. (2007). *Indoctrination U: The left's war against academic freedom*. New York: Encounter Books.

Howard, T. C. (2003). Culturally relevant pedagogy: Ingredients for critical teacher reflection. *Theory into Practice*, *42*(3), 195-202.

Howard, G. R. (2006). *We can't teach what we don't know: White teachers, multiracial schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Hytten, K., & Warren, J. (2003). Engaging Whiteness: How racial power gets reified in education. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *16*(1), 65-89.

Irvine, J. J. (2003). *Educating teachers for diversity: Seeing with a cultural eye.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Irvine, J. (2010). Culturally relevant pedagogy. *Education Digest, 75*(8), 57-61.

Jordan, C. (1985). Translating culture: From ethnographic information to educational program. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 16* (2), 104-123.

Just the Facts Coalition. (2012). *Just the facts about sexual orientation and youth: A primer for principals, educators, and school personnel.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. Retrieved from www.apa.org/pi/lgbc/publications/justthefacts.html.

Keene, E., & Zimmerman, S. (1997). *Mosaic of thought: Teaching comprehension in a Readers Workshop*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Kincheloe, J. L. (1991). Educational historiographical meta-analysis: Rethinking methodology in the 1990s. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 4*(3), 231-245.

Kincheloe, J. L., & McLaren, P. (2000). Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 279-313). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

King, K. P. (2005). *Bringing transformative learning to life*. Malabar, FL: Krieger Pub Co.

Kohli, R. (2009). Critical race reflections: Valuing the experiences of teachers of color in teacher education. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 12*(2), 235-251.

Korthagen, F., Loughran, J., & Russell, T. (2006). Developing fundamental principles for teacher education programs and practices. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *22*(8), 1020-1041.

Krummel, A. (2013). Multicultural teaching models to educate pre-service teachers: Reflections, service-learning, and mentoring. *Current Issues in Education, 16*(1). Retrieved from http://cie.asu.edu/ojs/index.php/cieatasu/article/view/1059.

Kuh, G. D. (2001). Assessing what really matters to student learning: Inside the national survey of student engagement. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, *33*(3), 10-17.

Kumashiro, K. K. (2000). Toward a theory of anti-oppressive education. *Review of Educational Research, 70*(1), 25-53.

Kumashiro, K. K. (2002). *Troubling education: Queer activism and anti-oppressive education*. New York: Routledge Falmer.

LaDuke, A. E. (2009). Resistance and renegotiation: Preservice teacher interactions with and reactions to multicultural education course content. *Multicultural Education, 16*(3), 37-44.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1991). Beyond multicultural illiteracy. *Journal of Negro Education*, *60*(2), 147-157.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal, 32*(3), 465-491.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2000). Fighting for our lives: Preparing teachers to teach African American students. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *51*(3), 206-214.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2006). Yes, but how do we do it? Practicing culturally relevant pedagogy. In J. Landsman & C. W. Lewis (Eds.), *White teachers/diverse classrooms: A guide to building inclusive schools, promoting high expectations, and eliminating racism* (pp. 29-42). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2009). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children* (2nd Ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Larke, P., & Larke, A. (2009). Teaching diversity/multicultural education courses in the academy: Sharing the voices of six professors. *Research in Higher Education Journal*, *3,* 1-8.

Lasley, T. J., Bainbridge, W. L., & Berry, B. (2003, March). Improving teacher quality:

Ideological perspectives and policy prescriptions. *The Educational Forum, 67*(1), 14-25.

Lather, P. (2001). Postmodernism, post-structuralism and post (critical) ethnography: Of ruins, aporias and angels. In P. Atkinson, A. Coffey, S. Delamont, J. Lofland, & L. Lofland (Eds.). *Handbook of ethnography* (pp. 477-492). London: Sage.

Lavrakas, P. J. (Ed.). (2008). *Encyclopedia of survey research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Lee, V., & Burkam, D. (2002). *Inequality at the starting gate: Social background differences in achievement as children begin school.* Washington, D.C.: Economic Policy Institute.

Lee, E., Menkart, D., Okazawa-Rey, M., & Network of Educators on the Americas (1998). *Beyond heroes and holidays: A practical guide to K-12 anti-racist, multicultural education and staff development*. Washington, D.C: Network of Educators on the Americas.

Lewis, K. C. & Willis, A. I. (1998). Focus on research: a conversation with Gloria Ladson-Billings. *Language Arts, 75*, 61-71.

Liggett, T., & Finley, S. (2009). Upsetting the apple cart: Issues of diversity in pre-service teacher education. *Multicultural Education*, *16*(4), 33-38.

Lillis, T. (2008). Ethnography as method, methodology, and deep theorizing: Closing the gap between text and context in academic writing research. *Written Communication*, *25*(3), 353-388.

Liston, D. P., & Zeichner, K. M. (1991). *Teacher education and the social conditions of schooling*. New York: Routledge.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago, IL: University of

Chicago Press.

Lowenstein, K. L. (2009). The work of multicultural teacher education:

Reconceptualizing White teacher candidates as learners. *Review of Educational

Research, 79*, 163-196.

Lozenski, B., & Smith, C. (2012). Pen 2 paper 2 power: Lessons from an arts-based

literacy program serving Somali immigrant youth. *Equity & Excellence in

Education*, *45*(4), 596-611.

Lynch, E. W., & Hanson, M. J. (Eds.). (1998). *Developing cross-cultural competence: A

guide for working with young children and their families*. Paul H. Brooks

Publishing: Baltimore, Md.

Madison, D. S. (2005). Introduction to critical ethnography: Theory and method. In D. S.

Madison, *Critical Ethnography: Method, Ethics & Performance* (pp. 1-16).

Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Madison, D. S. (2012). *Critical Ethnography: Method, Performance, and Ethics* (2nd

Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Malinowski, B. (1984). The role of myth in life. In A. Dudnes (Ed.), *Sacred narratives:

Readings in the theory of myth* (pp. 193-206). Berkeley, CA: University of

California Press.

Martin, M. (1994). Developing a feminist participative research framework: Evaluating

the process. In B. Humphries & C. Truman (Eds.), *Re-thinking social research.

Anti-discriminatory approaches in research methodology* (pp. 123–143).

Aldershot, UK: Avebury.

May, S. (1994). *Making multicultural education work*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

McDiarmid, G. W. (1990). Challenging prospective teachers' beliefs during early field experience: A quixotic undertaking? *Journal of Teacher Education*, *41*(3), 12-20.

McDonald, M., & Zeichner, K. (2009). Social justice teacher education. In W. Ayers, T. Quinn, & D. Stovall (Eds.), *Handbook of social justice in education* (pp. 595-610). Philadelphia, PA: Taylor and Francis.

McIntyre, A. (1997). *Making meaning of Whiteness: Exploring racial identity with White teachers*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

McManus, J. F. (2013). New wave of illegal immigrants is not Mexicans. *The New American*, *2*(14), 9.

Merelman, R. M. (1993). Black history and cultural empowerment: A case study. *American Journal of Education*, *101*(4), 331-358.

Mezirow, J. (2000). *Learning as transformation: Critical perspectives on a theory in progress*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Michael-Luna, S., & Canagarajah, S. (2007). Multilingual academic literacies: Pedagogical foundations for code meshing in primary and higher education. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *4*(1), 55-77.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Miller, D. L. (2003). *Principles of social justice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Miller, P. C., & Endo, H. (2005). Journey to becoming a teacher: The experiences of students of color. *Multicultural Education, 13*(1), 2-9.

Miller, W., & Williams, R. M. (2013). Preservice teachers and blogs: An invitation to extended reflection and conversation. *Art Education, 66*(3), 47-52.

Milner, R. H. (2012). Beyond a test score: Explaining opportunity gaps in educational practice. *Journal of Black Studies*, *43*(1), 693-718.

Mohatt, G., & Erickson, F. (1981). Cultural differences in teaching styles in an Odawa school: A sociolinguistic approach. In H. Trueba, H. Gutherie, & K. Au (Eds.), *Culture and the classroom* (pp. 105-120). Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.

Morrison, K. A., Robbins, H. H., & Rose, D. G. (2008). Operationalizing culturally relevant pedagogy: A synthesis of classroom-based research. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *41*(4), 433-452.

Muijs, D., & Reynolds, D. (2002). Teachers' beliefs and behaviors: What really matters? *Journal of Classroom Interaction, 37*(2), 3-15.

NAEP. (2012). Achievement Gaps. National Assessment of Educational Progress. Retrieved June 11, 2012, from http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/.

Nahar, A. (2014). ICYMI: I, too, am Harvard. *The Harvard Crimson*. Retrieved from http://www.thecrimson.com/article/2014/3/3/icymi-i-too-am-harvard/.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2006). Trends in the achievement gaps in reading and mathematics. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/2006/section2/indicator14.asp.

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). (2007). Digest of education statistics: 2007. Retrieved from http://www.fairtest.org/norm-referenced-achievement-tests

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) (2008). Unit

    standards in effect in 2008. Washington, DC: NCATE. Retrieved from

    http://www.ncate.org/Standards/NCATEUnitStandards/UnitStandardsinEffect200

    8/tabid/476/Default.aspx#stnd2.

National Education Association of the United States (2011). *C.A.R.E: Strategies for

    closing the achievement gaps* (4th Ed). Retrieved from National Education

    Association website: http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/CAREguide2011.pdf

Nieto,S. (1992). *Affirming Diversity: The Sociopolitical Context of Multicultural

    Education*. New York: Longman Publishing Group.

Nieto, S. (2000). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural

    education*. New York: Longman.

Nieto, S. (2009). Multicultural education in the United States. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *The

    Routledge international companion to multicultural education* (pp. 79-95). New

    York and London: Routledge.

Nieto, S., & Bode, P. (2012). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of

    multicultural education* (6th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education.

O'Keeffe, P. (2013). A sense of belonging: Improving student retention. *College Student

    Journal*, *47*(4), 605-613.

Olstad, R. G., Foster, C. D., & Wyman, R. M. (1983). Multicultural education for

    preservice teachers. *Integrated Education, 21*, 137-139.

Orfield, G., & Eaton, S. E. (1996). *Dismantling desegregation: The quiet reversal of

    Brown v. Board of Education.* New York: New Press.

Park, G. C. (2013). Critical Multiculturalism for Immigrants of Color. *Anthropology and

    Education Quarterly*, *17*, 101-108.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative education and research methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Perry, T. (1998). "I'on know why they be trippin'". In T. Perry & L. D. Delpit (Eds.), *The real Ebonics debate: Power, language, and the education of African-American children* (pp. 71-76). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Perry, T., & Delpit, L. D. (1998). *The real Ebonics debate: Power, language, and the education of African-American children*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Piaget, J. (1969). *The psychology of the child*. New York: Basic Books.

Pohan, C. A. (1996). Preservice teachers' beliefs about diversity: Uncovering factors leading to multicultural responsiveness. *Equity, and Excellence in Education*, 29(3), 62-69.

Prado-Olmos, P., Rios, F., & Castañeda, L. (2007). "We are multiculturalism": A self study of faculty of colour with preservice teachers of colour. *Studying Teacher Education, 3*(1), 85-102.

Pretorius, S.G., (2012). The implications of teacher effectiveness requirements for initial teacher education reform. *Journal of Social Sciences*, *8*(3), 310-317.

Rawls, A. (2003). Conflict as a foundation for consensus: Contradictions of industrial capitalism in Book III of Durkheim's *Division of labor in society. Critical Sociology*, *29*(3), 295-335.

Ready, D. D. (2010). Socio-economic disadvantage, school attendance, and early cognitive development: The differential effects of school exposure. *Sociology of Education, 83*(4), 271-286.

Ready, D. D., & Wright, D. L. (2011). Accuracy and inaccuracy in teachers' perceptions of young children's cognitive abilities: The role of child background and classroom context. *American Educational Research Journal, 48*(2), 335-360.

Reichman, H. (2001). *Censorship and selection: Issues and answers for schools* (3rd ed.). Chicago, IL: American Library Association.

Rethinking Schools. (2013). New teachers' union movement in the making. *Rethinking Schools, 27*(2), 1-2.

Riegle, S., & Warsame, K. (2012, April). Understanding the challenges of diversity: Analyzing a restructured curriculum. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Vancouver, Canada.

Rogers, M. F. (1998). *Contemporary feminist theory: A text/reader*. Boston: McGraw Hill.

Rogoff, B. (2003). *The cultural nature of human development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rumbaut, R. G., & Ima, K. (1988). The adaptation of Southeast Asian refugee youth: A comparative study. Washington, DC: Final Report to the US Office of Refugee Resettlement.

Said, E. W. (1979). *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.

Sarangi, S. (2006). The conditions and consequences of professional discourse studies. In R. Kiely, P. Rea-Dickins, H. Woodfield, & G. Clibbon (Eds.), *Language, culture and identity in applied linguistics* (pp. 199-220). London: Equinox.

Schmitz, S. A., Nourse, S. W., & Ross, M. E. (2013). Increasing teacher diversity: Growing your own through partnerships. *Education Digest, 78*(5), 59-63.

Sheets, R. H. (2001). Trends in the scholarship on teachers of color for diverse populations: Implications for multicultural education. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 34*(1), 26-31.

Sheets, R. H. (2009). What is diversity pedagogy theory? *Multicultural Education, 16*(3), 11-17.

Sheets, R. H., & Chew, L. (2002). Absent from the research, present in our classrooms Preparing culturally responsive Chinese American teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*(2), 127-141.

Shor, I. (1992). *Empowering education: Critical teaching for social change.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Silverman, S. K. (2010). What is diversity? An inquiry into preservice teacher beliefs. *American Educational Research Journal*, *47*(2), 292-329.

Sleeter, C. E. (1996). Multicultural education as a social movement. *Theory into Practice*, *35*(4), 239-247.

Sleeter, C. E. (2001). Preparing teachers for culturally diverse schools: Research and the overwhelming presence of Whiteness. *Journal of Teacher Education, 52*(2), 94-106.

Sleeter, C. E. (2008). Preparing White teachers for diverse students. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feinman-Nemser, & D. J. McIntyre, (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts* (pp. 559-582). New York: Routledge.

Sleeter, C. E., & Grant, C.A. (2007). *Making choices for multicultural education: Five approaches to race, class, and gender.* Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Sleeter, C. E., & Milner, H. R. (2011). Researching successful efforts in teacher education to diversify teachers. In A. F. Ball & C. A. Tyson (Eds.), *Studying diversity in teacher education* (pp. 81-103). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. New York: Zed Books.

Spener, D. (2009). *Clandestine crossings: Migrants and coyotes on the Texas-Mexico border*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Steiner, D. (2003). Preparing teachers: Are American schools of education up to the task? *Education Consumers Foundation Education Briefs, 3*(11), 1-4.

Su, Z. (1997). Teaching as a profession and as a career: Minority candidates' perspectives. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 13*(3), 325-340.

Taguchi, H. L. (2005). Getting personal: How early childhood teacher education troubles students' and teacher educators' identities regarding subjectivity and feminism. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, *6*(3), 244-255.

Tatum, B. D. (1992). Talking about race, learning about racism: The application of racial identity development theory in the classroom. *Harvard Educational Review*, *62*(1), 1-25.

Tatum, B. D. (1997). Racial identity development and relational theory: The case of Black women in White communities. In J. V. Jordan (Ed.), *Women's growth in diversity: More writings from the Stone Center* (pp. 91-106). New York: Guilford.

Téllez, K. (1999). Mexican-American preservice teachers and the intransigency of the elementary school curriculum. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 15*(5), 555-570.

Tisdale, K. (2004). Being vulnerable and being ethical with/in research. In K. DeMarrais & S. Lapan (Eds.), *Foundations for Research* (pp. 13-30). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Townsend, B. K. (2001). Blurring the lines: Transforming terminal education to transfer education. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, *2001*(115), 63-71.

Trainor, J. S., (2002). Critical pedagogy's "other": Constructions of Whiteness in education for social change. *College Composition and Communication, 53* (1), 631-650.

Turner, C. V., González, J. C. and Wood, J. L. (2008). Faculty of color in academe: What twenty years of literature tells us. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 1*, 139–68.

Tyler, T. R. (1987). Procedural justice research. *Social Justice Research*, *1*(1), 41-65.

Tylor, E. (1958/1871). *Primitive Culture.* New York: Harper & Row.

Ukpokodu, O. N. (2009) Pedagogies that foster transformative learning in a multicultural education course: A reflection, *Journal of Praxis in Multicultural Education*, 4(1), 1-9.

Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive schooling: U.S.-Mexican youths and the politics of caring*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Vavrus, M. J. (2002). *Transforming the multicultural education of teachers: Theory, research, and practice* (Vol. 12). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Vetter, A., Reynolds, J., Beane, H., Roquemore, K., Rorrer, A., & Shepherd-Allred, K. (2012). Reframing resistance in the English classroom. *English Journal, 102*(2), 114-121.

Villegas, A. M., & Irvine, J. J. (2010). Diversifying the teaching force: An examination of major arguments. *The Urban Review, 42*(3), 175-192.

Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2002). *Educating culturally responsive teachers: A coherent approach*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Warford, M. K. (2011). The zone of proximal teacher development. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *27*(2), 252-258.

Wedeen, L. (2010). Reflections on ethnographic work in political science. *Annual Review of Political Science*, *13*, 255-272.

Whipp, J. L. (2013). Developing socially just teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education, 64*(5), 454-467.

Whitlock, R. (2010). Getting queer: Teacher education, gender studies, and the cross-disciplinary quest for queer pedagogies. *Issues in Teacher Education, 19*(2), 81-104.

Wideen, M., Mayer-Smith, J., & Moon, B. (1998). A critical analysis of the research on learning to teach: Making the case for an ecological perspective on inquiry. *Review of Educational Research*, *68*(2), 130-178.

Wiedeman, C. R. (2002). Teacher preparation, social justice, equity: A review of the literature. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *35*(3), 200-211.

Wilhelm, R. (1994). Exploring the practice-rhetoric gap: Current curriculum for African-American history month in some Texas elementary schools. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, *9*(2), 217-33.

Williams, B. (1976). *Manual for evaluating content of classroom instructional materials for bilingual-multicultural education.* San Diego, CA: San Diego State University, Institute for Cultural Pluralism.

Winfrey, O. (2006). Harper High School's turnaround - Video [Video file]. Retrieved from http://www.oprah.com/oprahshow/Harper-High-Schools-Turnaround-Video

Wyatt, T. (1996). School effectiveness research: Dead end, damp squib or smouldering fuse? *Issues in Educational Research*, *6*(1), 79-112.

Yang, Y., & Montgomery, D. (2013). Gaps or bridges in multicultural teacher education: A Q. study of attitudes toward student diversity. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 30*(1), 27-37.

Yon, D. A. (2003). Highlights and overview of the history of educational ethnography. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *32,* 411-429.

Young, V. A. (2010). Nah, we straight: An argument against code switching. *JAC: A Journal of Composition Theory*, *29*(1-2), 49-76.

Yuval-Davis, N. (2012). Dialogical epistemology—An intersectional resistance to the "Oppression Olympics." *Gender & Society*, *26*(1), 46-54.

Zeichner, K., & Gore, J. (1990). Teacher socialization. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 329-348). New York: Macmillan.

Zeichner, K. M., & Hoeft, K. (1996). Teacher socialization for cultural diversity. In J. Sikula, T. J. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (2nd ed., pp. 525-547). New York: Macmillan Library Reference.

Appendix A

Instructor Questions

1. How do you think your ethnic identity affects your capacity to teach these classes?

2. How does your being a person of color affect your pedagogy?

3. What do you imagine would be an ideal outcome out of students taking either or both of these courses?

4. How do you select the readings? Themes?

5. Do you sincerely believe that your colleagues believe in the work that you do and have the consciousness to be able to identify and extend the work that you do?

6. How would you describe your pedagogical style?

7. How does the racial and ethnic diversity of each course affect your pedagogy?

8. Are you consciously trying to avoid Black and White binaries? Why or why not?

9. How do you think you would teach this class differently if the dominant group was Latina? Do you think that the Black/White binary would still dominate how the students think about and discuss these issues?

10. Do you think student disengagement is a reflection of your pedagogy, the reading selection, or who they are as students?

Appendix B

Diversity 1000 & 3000 Questions

1.   Do you think you need this course to teach children with whom you share ethno-racial identification?

2.   Is this information affecting the way you think and live?

3.   What do you think the goal of this class is?

4.   Do you think you've changed as a result of this class?

5.   When we talked about racism in class, how do you feel you've been treated in those conversations by two groups of people, your fellow classmates, and also Dr. Hernandez?

6.   Do you think the blog is important? Is it necessary?

7.   Do you think Dr. Hernandez is culturally relevant to you?

8.   Do you think privileging happens in this class? If yes, who is privileged? How do you know?

9.   Why do you think you have to take this course?

10.   Do you think this course relates to you?

Appendix C

CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION
CRITICAL ETHNOGRAPHY RESEARCH STUDY
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities

Title of Study: "Developing Critical Consciousness with TCCs:
   A Critical Ethnography" (*working title)*

Principal Investigator: Chelda Smith, College of Education & Human Development,
   UMN, Minneapolis, MN 55455.

Office: 678-462-4142 *Email*: smit5881@umn.edu

Timeline: This study would correspond with the spring 2013 academic calendar
   (January 14, 2013- May 9th, 2013).

Purpose: Southeastern University's College of Education is being invited to participate in the above research study. The purpose of this study is to develop a better understanding of the experiences of TCCs in an accredited teacher licensure program and their development of critical consciousness. This project will involve the students enrolled in the Diversity 1000 course and the lead professor. Participation will not be used in any way to evaluate students, nor will it interfere with their matriculation.

Procedures: With permission to conduct this study in SU's College of Education, I would commit to attending your EDUC 1000 diversity course on a regular basis. There, I would observe the happenings in the classroom, and partially participate in class discussions. On occasion, I would follow-up with both formal and informal interviews with participants to glean clarity and insight. During each course session, it is expected that I would take fieldnotes, intended to describe the physical, emotional, and dynamic space. In the interviews, I would talk about what brought participants to teacher education, their experiences in the College of Education and specifically how they are engaging with the course topics.

Risks: There are no known risks for participating in this study.

Benefits: It is possible that participants will not benefit directly by participating in this study. However, this study should provide participants with a valuable opportunity to think and talk about their experiences and their professional development. In addition, the information gathered from this study will be presented to College of Education faculty and will be vital to their efforts to continually improve the program in order to meet students' needs and help students reach their goals. Finally, while working with the institution, I intend to volunteer my services with designated programs, like the PAC Plus or Research Wednesdays initiatives.

Confidentiality: Absolute confidentiality cannot be guaranteed, since research documents are not protected from subpoena. However, the confidentiality of project records will be maintained to the fullest extent possible. Responses by participants to interview questions will be coded in such a way that her or his identity will be concealed. Participants will never be identified with any particular response, comment or materials that he or she might share with me. The use of pseudonyms will be systematically enforced.

Costs: There is no cost to Southeastern University beyond the time and effort required to participate in the activities described above. I will schedule interviews at times that are agreeable to voluntary participants.

Right to refuse or withdraw: Anyone may refuse to participate in this study. Upon agreeing to participate, participants have the right to not answer any questions I might ask. Even if a participant initially agrees to participate, they may change their mind and withdraw at any point.

IRB: My application to the University of Minnesota Institutional Review Board (IRB) is in progress and therefore does not bear an IRB approval stamp. Upon acceptance, I will confer with the Southeastern University IRB office to obtain local permission to conduct the study.

Questions: If you have any questions, please contact me at the phone number or e-mail address above.

Appendix D

Diversity 1000 Syllabus
College of Education
Southeastern University
Diversity 1000
Spring 2013
Preparing informed, empowered, committed, and engaged educators

Mission:
The SEU PEF represents a joint enterprise within an urban research university between the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Education, working in collaboration with P-16 faculty from diverse metropolitan schools. Grounded in these collaborations, our mission is to prepare educators (e.g., teachers and other professional school personnel) who are:

informed by research, knowledge and reflective practice; *empowered* to serve as change agents; *committed* to and respectful of all learners; and *engaged* with learners, their families, schools, and local and global communities.

The following conceptual framework learning outcomes are integrated in the course:
1.1 Our candidates use their knowledge of child, adolescent, and adult development and theories of learning to design meaningful educational opportunities for all learners.
1.2 Our candidates possess and use research-based, discipline-specific knowledge and pedagogy to facilitate learning for all.
1.3 Our candidates reflect critically upon data as part of a recursive process when planning, implementing and assessing teaching, learning, and development.
1.4 Our candidates critically analyze educational policies and/or practices that affect learners in metropolitan contexts.
2.1 Our candidates know and respect individual differences, establish productive and ethical relationships with students, and modify the learning environment to positively impact student learning.
2.2 Our candidates create engaging learning communities where the diverse perspectives, opinions, and beliefs of others are acknowledged and respected.
2.3 Our candidates commit to continuing personal and professional development.
3.1 Our candidates use knowledge of students' cultures, experiences, and communities to create and sustain culturally responsive classrooms and schools.
3.2 Our candidates coordinate time, space, activities, technology and other resources to provide active and equitable engagement of diverse learners in real world experiences.
3.3 Our candidates implement appropriate communication techniques to provide for learner interaction within local and global communities.

Required Materials:
Freire, P. (2005). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M. B. Ramos, Trans., 30th anniversary ed.). New York: Continuum. (Original work published 1970)
Selected Readings provided on uLearn or by email
Class Binder

Course Description and Goals: This course is designed to provide the student with fundamental knowledge about the influence of Culture and Diversity in the educational process of children and adolescents. Specifically, this course is designed to examine 1) the nature and function of culture; 2) the development of individual and group cultural identity; 3) definitions and implications of diversity; and 4) the influences of culture on learning, development, and pedagogy.

Objectives:
The student will
1. Explore the nature and function of culture. *(CF 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 3.3)*
2. Explore how history and culture shape world views. *(CF 1.3, 2.1, 2.2)*
3. Examine the development of her or his own cultural identity and learning styles. *(CF 1.3, 2.1, 2.3)*
4. Develop and apply strategies for observing, analyzing, and comparing differences related to family structures, socioeconomic status, abilities/disabilities and culture. *(CF 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 3.3)*
5. Articulate strategies for teaching culturally diverse students in the classroom. *(CF 1.1, 1.4, 2.2, 3.1, 3.2)*
6. Identify school practices and policies that perpetuate and maintain achievement gaps, including negative stereotypes, related to race, class, persons with disabilities, gender, sexual orientation, and other forms of prejudice and discrimination. *(CF 1.3, 1.4, 3.3)*
7. Identify educators' cultural practices and *expectations* that perpetuate and maintain achievement gaps. *(CF 1.1, 1.2, 1.4)*
8. Identify strategies that creatively deal with challenges and differences between the cultures of educators and students. *(CF 2.1, 2.2, 2.3)*
9. Identify assets and values of diverse populations to bring student learning to higher levels. *(CF 1.1, 1.2, 3.2)*

Attendance and Participation: Attendance is required at all class meetings unless there is a compelling reason for an absence as described in the SEU Policy on Class Attendance in the *College of Education Graduate Bulletin*. Information will be presented in each class that is not available through any other means; therefore, any student who misses two or more classes (excused or unexcused) may be administratively withdrawn from the course. In addition, missing two half classes is equivalent to missing one whole class. If any class is to be missed, it is the student's responsibility to make **prior** arrangements with the instructor to make up assignments. Each student is responsible for all material covered in class. Do get the name and contact information for someone in the class from whom you can collect handouts, notes, etc. regarding class. Write it below. Your Class Contact: Name: Contact Information: _____

Professional Behavior: Professional behavior is expected of all students and includes issues of conduct and academic honesty as described in the College of Education Bulletin. Students are required to follow the policies stated in the SEU Student Code of Conduct found at http://www.SEU.edu/codeofconduct/. Pay careful attention to policies related to cheating, academic honesty, unauthorized collaboration, multiple submissions

and plagiarism. Violations of academic honesty are taken seriously and claiming not to have known the policies is not an acceptable excuse.

Students with disabilities requiring accommodations must be registered with the Office of Disability Services at SEU before an instructor can modify instruction or expectations. The Office of Disability Services may be contacted at (555) 555-5555. Any student with a disability who may require special accommodations is requested to make an appointment with the instructor at the beginning of the class session. Students must self-identify so that arrangements can be made according to the University's policies and guidelines provided by the Office of Disability Services.

Course Evaluations: Your constructive assessment of this course plays an indispensable role in shaping education at Southeastern University. Upon completing the course, please take time to fill out the online course evaluation. You will not be able to access your final grade until you have completed the evaluation or indicated that you do not wish to complete it.

Professional Standards: This course meets the following as contained in the Conceptual Framework Integration for Initial Programs.

Component	Description	Degree of Emphasis*
1	Subject matter content and pedagogy	2
2	Human growth and development	2
3	Teaching diverse groups of learners	3
4	Using a variety of instructional strategies, including technology	2
5	Creating a positive learning environment	3
6	Has effective communication skills	2
7	Plans for instruction based in subject matter, students, & curriculum	3
8	Uses assessment to evaluate learning	1
9	Reflective practice and professional growth	3
10	Foster relationships with colleagues, parents, & community	3

* 0= Not addressed, 1=Minor, 2=Moderate, 3=Extensive

Diversity: This course will frequently examine the roles played by biology, culture, race, ethnicity, ability/disability, gender, and other forms of diversity in development. Students are strongly encouraged to participate so that learning within the course is enhanced by a diversity of thought, experiences, knowledge, and background.

Technology:
All students enrolled at SEU use email for official correspondence. Students enrolled in this course will use uLearn and email to access supplemental materials and some required readings. Students will also use weblogs as a means to reflect upon and record their responses to class content.

Writing Intensive: This section of Exploring Socio Cultural Perspectives on Diversity is writing intensive. Therefore, much of your performance in this class will be assessed through writing related activities and assignments.

Required Assignments & Opportunities for Learning

1. Class Attendance & Participation

Attendance is required for all class meetings. If you must miss a class, make every effort to discuss with me, prior to (if possible) or immediately after, ways to make up the class. An unexcused/missed class without a completed make-up plan will result in a lowered final grade for the course. Due to the nature of the course, participation is essential for learning to occur. Note that participation involves speaking as well as listening actively to understand. As a future advocate for all students, it is necessary that you take on the responsibility and opportunity to improve your own as well as your colleagues' understandings, knowledge, and perspectives. Thus, I encourage you to challenge yourself and others so that you might expand your own mind as well as the minds of your colleagues.

2. Reading Responses

I expect you to read *all* of the required readings prior to the day they will be discussed in class. For each article you read, complete a Reading Response using the electronic template provided on uLearn. Be prepared to discuss each article in class. Use highlighters, Post-It notes, underlining, and notes in the margins to help you remember your questions, thoughts, ideas, and connections to other course material. We will incorporate your responses to the readings into class discussions. Bring a hard copy of your assignment to class on the day the article is discussed (handwritten work will not be accepted – no exceptions). After the discussion, you will submit the assignment.

3. Media Logs

The purpose of the Media Log is to prompt you to pay attention to the subtle messages that people, including young children receive and accept daily. Such messages often go unquestioned and eventually become a part of what is normal. Only by developing a critical eye is one able to protect one's way of thinking. A minimum of 10 media items need to be described and analyzed in a Media Log. Attempt to view a range of media items such as TV shows or commercials, video games, movies, children's books, magazines, print advertisements, billboards, newspapers, radio, music, web sites, etc. You should not go out of your way to look for media, but should look critically at what you or your future students would typically encounter. If you wish, you may include newspaper or magazine items in scrapbook form.

Your critical written analysis should not simply be your *opinion* or how you *feel* about the media item. Instead, your evaluations should be based on ideas from our various class readings. Every question below will NOT apply to each media item, but will give you ideas on what to look for and discuss.
Check the images
a. What are people doing? Why? Are they typecast?
b. Do any of the images reflect stereotypes?

c. How many of the images are of people of color? Women? Disabled people?
d. Are there images of people of color helping Whites?
e. Are there images of women serving men?

Check the language
a. Do the words themselves reinforce stereotypes and build negative images of people (e.g., "savage hordes of Indians", "inscrutable Chinese")?
b. Do the characters' names reflect a variety of racial cultural backgrounds (e.g., Ms. Gonzalez, Mr. Ogura, Ms. Ortiz, Mr. Walkingstick, Ms. Kaminski, etc.)?

Check the lifestyles portrayed
a. Are the lifestyles of people of color portrayed only in a very narrow scope (e.g., Blacks and Puerto Ricans living in poverty, Native Americans dealing with alcoholism, Chicanos as migrant laborers, etc.)?
b. Are there lifestyles presented which would act as a counterforce to stereotypes (e.g., African American families with two parents, strong Asian women who are neither "China dolls" nor "sexy dragon-ladies," African people who have advanced artistic and intellectual capabilities)?
c. Are the lifestyles and situations of people of color presented as inferior to Whites?
d. Are the lifestyles and situations of poor or working class people presented as inferior to upper class?
e. Values - What is portrayed as valuable? What are the standards for success?
f. Are capitalist values such as love of money, spending, materialism, or competition glorified?

Check the heroes and other role models
a. Are people shown who have worked and are working for the rights of their own racial group?
b. Are people of color shown in positions of authority?
c. Self-Image - What effect would this media have on different readers'/viewers' self-image?

Look at the relationships between people
a. Power - Who has power? Based on what? What are the relationships between the people?
b. Are people from different racial/cultural groups shown working together toward common goals?
c. Conflict - What is at stake? What is being negotiated, or who is engaged in a struggle and why?
d. Do the minorities function mainly in roles that put them in a position of inferiority with regard to others?

Consider disability portrayal
a. Is the depiction of the disability accurate? Why or why not?
b. Is the disability portrayed in a positive or negative light? How?

c. Will people gain a better understanding of this disability from the film? Why or why not?
d. Are there any stereotypes being reinforced through the media?

Consider institutional racism
a. Is there any indication in this media of the problems that people of color face in this society?
b. Does the story tend to "blame the victim;" in other words, does it leave the reader with the impression that victims of racism can get out from under oppressive situations if only they work hard enough?
c. Is there any indication that solutions to racism demand more than individual good will; that structures must change?

Consider ideology and political positioning
a. Ideology - Can you identify suggested belief system, political positioning, or broader point of view?
b. Relations - How does the work relate to broader issues and contexts? To the public realm or politics? To economic, social, or cultural factors?

(This assignment is partially adapted from the Council on Interracial Books for Children, l0 Quick Ways to Analyze Children's Books for Racism and Sexism.)

4. Reflective Blogs

A vital aspect of your learning is the capability to critically reflect upon what you are learning and the shifts of consciousness that are occurring for you. You are also encouraged to challenge and advance your classmates' thinking and learning. The purpose of this assignment is to offer you an opportunity to extend our class discussions. For each specified week, you are required to reflect upon and maintain a web log (blog) based on the readings and class discussions, of your thoughts, your learning and your shifts of consciousness. The intention is for you to respond to any lecture/class discussion of a reading(s), class activity, etc. that elicits a strong response from you. This could also be an opportunity for you to share your thoughts if you were not able to share them during class, possibly because you were processing and listening to your colleagues. You will need to post your blog by the Friday following class by midnight. In addition, you are required to read each other's blogs and comment on at least two of your classmates' blogs each week by the Monday night following class. To set up your blog, go to http://edublogs.org/ and click on "Free" then follow the instructions for setting up your blog. NOTE two things: (1) Include your first name in your username so that you can be identified when you leave comments for others and (2) Include your name in the title of your blog, e.g. "Rachel's Ramblings" or "What's up With Watson?" For your convenience, create a blogroll with all your classmates' blog addresses that will show up on a sidebar on your blog page.

If absent, you should talk with someone in your cohort about what was missed, read EVERYONE'S blogs, and then post a particularly thoughtful blog that synthesizes the readings with your thoughts as well as the content of your classmates' blogs. In

essence, the content of your blog should make it evident that you attempted to catch up with what you missed out on. Since you were not in class to participate, be sure to offer challenging questions and/or ideas that will contribute to your classmates' understandings.

5. Field Experience

You are required to participate in a field experience which will help you gain a deeper understanding of diversity and culture. **The field experience should take place in a COMMUNITY-BASED site that reflects a cultural community that is RADICALLY DIFFERENT from your own experience or background**, providing insight into the lives of your future culturally diverse students. Make every effort to choose the group with consideration to your personal experiences, biases, curiosity, prejudice, ignorance, etc. These field experience sites may include homeless shelters, volunteer programs, community centers, church-related facilities, day treatment programs, adult day centers (for individuals with disabilities), work in adult literacy, refugee services or other relevant community based sites. **Your field experience should not take place in a K-12 formal schooling environment.** The institution has or may have contacts with local programs, but it is up to you to make the actual arrangements for scheduling and involvement. Field sites must be **pre-approved** by me, thus, you will need to submit a one page Field Experience Proposal **(due March 13)** on uLearn which includes the name of the site, a description of the purpose/work of the site, your plans for involvement and what kind of contact you have had with people at the site**.** You are required to be present at your placement at least three times over the course:

1) The first time you should observe – take notes prior to and immediately after the visit about your expectations, feelings, beliefs, concerns, questions, etc. You should have at least one visit completed by March 24 when the Field Experience Update is due.

2) The second time you will be a participant observer – attempt to do this without someone you know and take notes on the same as #1.

3) The third time you will be a participant observer – do the same as above, but also conduct an informal interview with a member of the group. Challenge yourself to ask the questions you noted for #1 & #2 and probe to genuinely deepen your understanding of the group member's authentic experiences and perspectives as well as her or his individuality.

The field placement should be a minimum of 10 hours total with a mandatory 6 hours in the field across the 3 or more visits. Write an essay providing:

A detailed description of the site and participants, including the purposes and objectives of the organization (this can be copied/modified from the proposal)
What did you observe? What did you learn about yourself? Your biases? (This can be copied/modified from the Field Experience Update)
What did you find particularly difficult during the experience?
How did it make you feel? How did it change you (or not)?

What do you wish you had done or not done or done differently? What more would you like to understand about the group?
How did it relate to culture/diversity in society? How did it relate to culture/diversity in K–12 schools?
What influence do you think it will have on your future teaching or other work?

The essay should adhere to the *Publication Manual of the America Psychological Association* (APA, 5th ed.) style of writing, citation, organization, and formatting. On the day that your essay is due, we will spend some time in class discussing your experiences.

6. News Talk

As a potential educator of young children and to develop yourself as a socially responsible citizen, it is important that you maintain an active awareness of what's in the news, particularly in the areas that influence education in the United States. Within a group of 4-5 students, you will need to bring in a news clip (hard copy or weblink) of interest to share with the class. The news clip should be relevant to education and to the content of the course. You will be given 3-5 minutes to share the news clip and 15 minutes to engage the class in a discussion about the news clip. Come prepared with thoughtful, critical and engaging questions as well as any supplemental information, background, statistics, perspectives, etc. so that your classmates will leave with a deeper understanding and knowledge of the news you chose to share. By the Monday prior to your presentation, email me the topic and a paragraph outlining your plan for presentation. Attach supplemental material, e.g. PPT, Prezi, weblink, etc. and copy all members on the email.

7. Final Exam

A final exam will be given and will consist of short answer and essay questions. I am aware that "final exam" conjures up unpleasant feelings and some trepidation. Know that this is simply one way of gaining an understanding of what you have learned and how you have developed in your thinking regarding the topics covered in the course and also insights into yourself as a learner. If you read diligently, take good notes, and participate fully in the course, you should view the final exam as an opportunity to shine.

ASSESSMENT OF YOUR LEARNING

Grading Scale
A+ (100-98) A (97-94) A-(93–90)
B+ (89–88) B (87–84) B-(83–80)
C+ (79–78) C (77–74) C-(73–70)
D (69–60)
 F (60 and below)

Assignments	Points Possible
Class Participation	15
Reading Responses	10

Media Logs	**10**
Reflective Blogs	**15**
Field Experience	**15**
News Talk	**15**
Final Exam	**20**
TOTAL	**100**

Appendix E

Diversity 3000 Syllabus Department of Education
Southeastern University
Diversity 3000
Spring 2013

Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful committed citizens can change the world;
indeed, it's the only thing that ever has.
- *Margaret Mead*

Instructor: Dr. Hernandez
Email:
Office:
Phone:
Fax:
Office Hours: By appointment
Class Meetings: Mondays 9-11:30AM

NOTE
This syllabus attachment is part of a comprehensive set of documents describing the BSE
program policies and course requirements. Please refer to the Cohort Overview Syllabus
for complete program requirements and policies. ***The course syllabus provides a general***
plan for the course; deviations may be necessary.

MISSION STATEMENT
The SEU PEF represents a joint enterprise within an urban research university between the
College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Education, working in collaboration with
P-16 faculty from diverse metropolitan schools. Grounded in these collaborations, our
mission is to prepare educators (e.g., teachers and other professional school personnel)
who are: informed by research, knowledge and reflective practice; empowered to serve as
change agents; committed to and respectful of all learners; and engaged with learners,
their families, schools, and local and global communities.

COURSE PURPOSE
The purpose of Diversity 3000 is to introduce future educators to practices and
understandings needed to provide an effective learning environment for culturally and
linguistically diverse student populations. Course participants will explore foundation
diversity issues related to culture, language, sexual orientation, ethnicity, religion, gender,
exceptionality, socio-economics, and other topics. Additionally, the importance of the
role of the educational context (social, cultural, political, and historical) in intercultural
interactions and communication is addressed. Participants will also have continuous
supervised field placements in diverse classrooms.
Prerequisites: Admission to ECE Program

REQUIRED TEXTS AND MATERIALS

Cowhey, M. (2006). *Black Ants & Buddhists: Thinking Critically and Teaching Differently in the Primary Grades*. Stenhouse: Portland, ME.
Freire, P. (2006).*Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, 30th anniversary edition. Continuum: New York.
All other required readings will be available in electronic format and/or on uLearn.

CANDIDATE LEARNING OUTCOMES/OBJECTIVES
Upon completion of readings, presentations, activities, discussions, course assignments, and field experiences, the students will acquire the following broad outcomes:
1)   Students will discuss key concepts and terms relevant to cultural, ethnic, and linguistic diversity. (INTASC #1, #6; GAFT: 1.1, 3.5)
2)   Students will examine cultural diversity and demographics within the school population. (INTASC # 10; GAFT 6.6)
3)   Students will reflect upon personal identity, attitudes, and perceptions of cultures other than their own, as well as areas of diversity. (INTASC #9; GAFT: 1.4, 4.4, 6.4)
4)   Students will discuss key concepts, terms, and laws relevant to students with exceptionalities and whose language is one other than English and reflect the need for differentiated instruction for these students. (INTASC #2, #3, #6; GAFT: 1.2, 2.5, 3.5)
5)   Students will demonstrate an understanding of roles of local, community, and state resources to assist in programming for students in general as well as special education settings. (INTASC #10; GAFT: 2.5, 3.2)
6)   Students will apply multi-modal and multimedia techniques when addressing key multicultural concepts. (INTASC #4, #6; GAFT: 1.5, 5.6)
7)   Students will explore, plan, implement, and evaluate activities with a multicultural theme. (INTASC #7; GAFT: 5.1, 5.2, 5.6)
8)   Students will identify and practice teaching strategies that promote anti-bias (INTASC #2)
9)   Students will explore principles and celebrate students' home cultures. (INTASC #7; GAFT: 3.5, 5.3, 5.6)

CANDIDATE LEARNING OUTCOMES/OBJECTIVES: ESOL
Upon completion of readings, presentations, lectures, activities, discussions, videos, course assignments, and field experiences, the students will meet the following objectives and TESOL Standards as specified by the Professional Standards Commission:

Standard 1.b. Language Acquisition and Development
   1. Demonstrate an understanding of the effect of a positive and motivating learning environment on English Language Learners. S.1.b.4
   2. Locate and use resources to learn more about students' home languages and cultures. S.1.b.7
   3. Understand and apply knowledge of socio-cultural, political, and individual learner variables to facilitate second language acquisition. S.1.b.8-9

Standard 2.a. Nature and Role of Culture
   4. Demonstrate an understanding of home/school communication in a culturally responsive manner with student's family. 2.a.3

5. Develop and apply strategies to integrate home, school and community cultures; build partnerships that enhance the education of the ELL student. 2.a.3

Standard 2.b. Cultural Groups and Identity
6. Continually pursue knowledge of the student's culture and demonstrate this by integrating elements of the student's culture in instruction. S.2.b.2-4
7. Demonstrate an understanding of U.S. immigration history, patterns, and laws. S.2.b.5

Standard 5.c. Professional Development and Collaboration
8.   Demonstrate an awareness of the importance of prior schooling and learning experiences of the ELL student. S.3.a.3-4

TECHNOLOGY
The use of technology in providing services is critical in today's classrooms. A working knowledge of e-mail, Internet, word processing, Edublogs, and PowerPoint is necessary for completion of assignments and effective communication. Some of our assignments will explicitly address technology usage; these assignments will include the corresponding **National Education Technology Standards (NETS)** which these assignments meet.

Standard 3. Model Digital-Age Work and Learning
Teachers exhibit knowledge, skills, and work processes representative of an innovative professional in a global and digital society. Teachers:

a. demonstrate fluency in technology systems and the transfer of current knowledge to new technologies and situations.
b. collaborate with students, peers, parents, and community members using digital tools and resources to support student success and innovation.
c. communicate relevant information and ideas effectively to students, parents, and peers using a variety of digital-age media and formats.
d. model and facilitate effective use of current and emerging digital tools to locate, analyze, evaluate, and use information resources to support research and learning.
e. develop and model cultural understanding and global awareness by engaging with colleagues and students of other cultures using digital-age communication and collaboration tools.

PROFESSIONALISM
Because you are a future professional educator of young children, the BSE program strives to ensure that you understand and practice professionalism while enrolled in the certification program and will make every effort to be attentive to and guide you throughout the program. Your professionalism in this cohort is determined by the following:
1. **Dependability and Reliability** - shows responsible attendance; arrives punctually for class and remains for entire class; completes assignments on time and is organized and prepared.

2. **Respect** – shows respect towards others (peers, instructors, speakers, etc.); deals with frustrations, problems, and differences in opinion that are inherent in any learning environment in mature ways

3. **Commitment** – takes assignments seriously; demonstrates a commitment to learning and children rather than just completing assignments for a grade; perseveres when faced with challenges

4. **Responsiveness** – seeks and values constructive feedback from others; utilizes suggestions for improvement; continuously self-assesses own development and works toward improvement; relates well to others

5. **Collaboration** – helps create positive relationships in the classroom; participates in the learning process by sharing diverse experiences and perspectives; is an active member of the learning community; keeps a sense of humor

6. **Open Mindedness** – demonstrates a willingness to be flexible when dealing with uncertainty and complexity of educational issues; asks insightful questions

7. **Knowledgeable** – is aware of current educational issues; models and facilitates reflective and critical thinking; is developing the knowledge and ability to engage children in developmentally and appropriate learning events; demonstrates effective written and oral communication

8. **Confidentiality** – reflects on information about children and specific anecdotes in confidential and respectful ways; shares this information only with those who need to know

9. **Academic Honesty** – accepts responsibility when a mistake has been made; takes responsibility for producing independent work when required; credits others' work in appropriate way

POLICIES

Academic Integrity and Honesty: You are responsible for following the policies stated in the *Student Code of Conduct Handbook found at* http://www.seu.edu/studenthandbook/Student_Code_of_Conduct.html, including those related to cheating, academic honesty, unauthorized collaboration, multiple submissions, and plagiarism. Please take the time to become familiar with the policies as claiming not to have known them cannot be used as your defense.

Communication: It is the policy of Southeastern University that all written, official electronic communication is sent to your SEU email address. It is possible to forward your student email account to your home email if you wish. Please also use my SEU email address to contact me outside of class.

Students with Disabilities: Students with disabilities requiring accommodations must be registered with the Office of Disability Services before I can modify instruction or expectations. The Office of Disability Services may be contacted at (555)555-5555. Any student with a disability who may require special accommodations is encouraged to make an appointment with the instructor at the beginning of the semester. You must self-identify so that arrangements can be made according to University policy.

Faculty & Course Online Evaluations: I welcome your feedback and sincerely hope you will take the time to thoughtfully complete the GoSolar faculty evaluation online. You will be notified through your SEU student email account when the evaluations will be available online. You will not be able to retrieve your final grade unless you submit a completed evaluation online or indicate that you do not wish to participate. I will not be able to access individual responses; therefore, this process allows you the critical opportunity to provide constructive and anonymous feedback about the instruction you received in this course.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS
You are expected to read all assigned materials and be prepared to actively participate in class discussions. A significant emphasis is placed on academic performance as well as your suitability for responsible participation in your chosen professional field. To meet this obligation, the Department continuously monitors and evaluates students' academic and non-academic behaviors in on-campus classes and field-based experiences.

All assignments will be discussed in detail in class. Written assignments must be typed in *Times New Roman 12 point font*, double-spaced (unless otherwise noted), proofread for spelling and grammar, and must adhere to APA Sixth Edition guidelines. I do not require a cover page. However, <u>do use header and put your name, course #, title of assignment and date on ALL work you turn in</u>. **When submitting work online**, you must use your first and last name, course number and title of assignment as the file name, e.g. *JohnDoeDiversity3000Children'sBookReflection*. You can download information concerning APA style on the APA website. Assignments will be evaluated for professional appearance as well as accuracy, quality, and completeness of information. Up to 10% of the total grade value may be deducted from written or oral assignments that show evidence of inaccuracies in format, incomplete submissions, problems with grammar, usage, mechanics, structure and/or cohesiveness.

As a general rule, ***I do not accept late work for credit***. However, you <u>MUST complete all required assignments</u> to receive a passing grade in the course. If you foresee issues that will prevent you from completing an assignment on time, do talk with me about your options.

LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES
 INTASC #6, 9; GAFT 1.1, 1.2, 1.6; 2.1-2.6; 6.1, 6.4, 6.5,6.6; TESOL-all
<u>1.</u>   Class Attendance and Participation **(100 points)**
Because you are a member of the learning community and a professional educator, I expect you to demonstrate conscientious attendance, arrive punctually for class, remain for the entire class period, and schedule all appointments (medical, work, etc.) outside of class time. **Arriving late for class will result in a deduction of one point from your <u>final</u> grade (Therefore if you had a 98, it will be a 97). Absences will result in TWO points being deducted from your final grade (98 becomes 96).** In case of an emergency or illness, contact me via e-mail or phone prior to the beginning of class. If you are absent, your assignment is still due during class. If you have an unavoidable absence, have a plan for how you will catch up on any information pertaining to course

assignments, content, or handouts as you will be responsible for it. Below is a space for you to write in two classmates' names and contact information in case you need it:

Name: _____ Best way to contact:

_____

Name: _____ Best way to contact:

_____

*Cell Phones – a special note
Please turn off your cell phone before class. **Your cell phone should be kept in your bag during class and NOT out on the table.** Text messaging during class is distracting; please refrain. Feel free to bring your laptop to class; however, all use must be limited to what we are working on in class that day. *If I observe you using a cell phone during class or using your laptop for anything other than our class work, I will consider you absent from class and the attendance policy will apply.*

Expressing a diversity of opinions is encouraged during discussions. We learn the most when we keep an open mind to new ideas and *actively* listen to and consider different points of view. Refer to the following rubric on participation expectations.

90-100 points Students always take a voluntary, thoughtful, and active role in their own learning, challenging themselves on a daily basis. Through participation and inquiry, they consistently demonstrate a genuine desire to learn and share ideas with the teacher and their classmates. They initiate discussions, ask significant questions, and act as leaders within the group. They are willing to take risks, assert an opinion and support it, and listen actively to others. These students are always well prepared to contribute to the class as a result of having thoughtfully completed assignments, and the thoroughness of their work demonstrates the high regard they hold for learning.

80-89 points Students consistently take an active role in their own learning. They participate regularly in class discussions and frequently volunteer their ideas, ask thoughtful questions, and defend opinions. They listen respectfully to their classmates and are willing to share ideas as a result of having completed assignments. Though never causing disruption to the class, these students do not always demonstrate a consistent commitment to make the most out of our class time each and every day.

70-79 points Students sometimes take an active role in their own learning, sharing relevant ideas and asking appropriate questions. Although reluctant to take risks, they contribute regularly to class discussions. These students listen to their classmates and respect their opinions. As a result of having completed assignments, these students are prepared to answer questions when called upon, but may not offer well thought out responses.

60-69 points Students rarely take an active role in their own learning. They often do not participate and rarely share ideas or ask questions. These students display poor listening skills, and they may be intolerant of the opinions of others. As a result of being unprepared for or disengaged from class, these students often refuse to offer ideas even when called upon.

2. *Reading Response & Reflection Blogs (100 points)*
INTASC#1-10; GAFT 1-6; TESOL 2, 3, 5

An important component of this course is the opportunity to reflect on course activities, discussions, and readings and how they apply to one's personal and professional development as a teacher in the 21st century. To do this, you will maintain a web log (blog) that you will post PRIOR to each class meeting. To set up your blog, go to http://edublogs.org/ and click on "Free" then follow the instructions for setting up your blog. NOTE two things: (1) Include your <u>first name in your username</u> so that you can be identified when you leave comments for others and (2) Include <u>your name in the title of your blog</u>, e.g. "Rachel's Ramblings" or "What's up With Walter?" For your convenience, create a blogroll with all your classmates' blog addresses (to be compiled) that will show up on a sidebar on your blog page. Your blogs will be <u>due by midnight on the Saturday prior to class</u>. Each blog post needs to consist of the following three components:

      a. An open-ended reflection/response to the previous class content, e.g. discussion, presentations, activities, connections between your field placement and course content, assignments on which you are working, etc. Note that this should not be a summary, but rather thoughtful and/or thought-provoking.

      b. A focused, critical discussion of the reading for that week. Discuss what you got out of the reading, questions you have, connections to other readings and/or discussion, what did or did not resonate with you and how you might apply the content to your teaching. Note that this is NOT a summary, either. It is intended as an opportunity to begin the discussion about the reading record your thoughts about the reading.

      c. Each week, you are also required to read several blogs posted by your classmates and comment on at least <u>two</u>. Doing this enables our limited class conversations to continue and also offers you the opportunity to learn about others' thoughts that may not have been voiced in class or to voice your own if you were not able to do so in class. Your comments on others' blogs will be due by midnight on Monday.

*Use the Blog Log (found in the Handouts folder on uLearn) to record your blog postings (brief sentence that will jog my memory of your blog content) and the names of those on whose blogs you left comments. Do this each week to avoid the nightmare of having to find your comments on others' blogs at the end of the semester. You may hand write or type into the Blog Log. Really. Do this each week.

The Culture Quilt (50 points, due _____)
INTASC #1, 2, 3, 5, 10; GAFT2-6; TESOL Standards: 2, 3, 5
A quilt is a large covering stitched together from many smaller pieces of cloth. Similarly, a number of different characteristics define an individual's culture and identity. Construct your own culture quilt. Each of the sixteen boxes below contains a short statement related to a specific aspect of culture. On a standard piece of poster board, replicate the grid and fill in each square with a symbol (sentence, picture, drawing, poem, etc) that relates the statement to your own life experience. **BE CREATIVE!** You will present your culture quilt to the class on an assigned day.

Culture Quilt adapted by J. J. Irvine from Bennett, C. (1999). Multicultural Education. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Family History	Cultural Other	Cultural Self-Personal	Cultural Self-Professional
What country, other than the United States, do you identify as a place of origin for you and your family?	With what culture, other than your own, are you familiar?	What is your preferred learning style?	Why did you choose to become a teacher?
What word or concept best describes your family?	With what culture, other than your own, are you least familiar and would like to learn more about?	How would you describe your schooling experience?	Who was your most influential K-16 teacher?
What piece of advice or wisdom (one that reflects the values of your family) has been handed down through the generations?	What has been your most challenging cultural experience?	What is your most valuable trait?	What is your greatest challenge as an educator?
What celebration, ceremony, or ritual do you and your family value and observe?	What negative comment or stereotype have you heard people make about the members of a group with which you identify?	How do you like to spend your spare time?	What is your role as a teacher?

3. Multicultural Children's Literature: Original Children's Book, Presentation & Reflection (100 points, due _____)

INTASC 1.3, 1.4, 1.6, 2.2, 3.5, 4.1; GAFT 1, 2, 5, 6; NETS 1a, 1d; TESOL 3

Throughout this course, you are exploring, discussing and attempting to understand a variety of issues related to diversity. The topics are difficult and the dialogues occur at a "grown-up" level. Your challenge as a teacher of young children will be to notice and engage them in such dialogues as necessary within the classroom. One way to do this, is through the use of children's books that address the topics. For this assignment, and after having explored a particular topic related to diversity, you will create and present your very own children's book to address a critical topic of diversity that may be absent or misrepresented in the available children's books.

This is a collaborative assignment between DIVERSITY 3000 and DIVERSITY 3600. The first part of this assignment is for your ECE 3600 course and involves completing the Multicultural Children's Literature Text Set. Any questions regarding the requirements for this assignment should be directed to your DIVERSITY 3600 course instructor. The second part of this assignment is the creation of an original children's book that addresses a diversity-related topic. The connections between the ECE 3600 & DIVERSITY 3000 requirements are in the topic you choose as well as in the presentation of your original children's book in DIVERSITY 3000. It is strongly recommended that you stick with the topic or cultural group that you chose for the first part (DIVERSITY 3600) of this assignment. If not, you will have to complete a similar exploration of your chosen topic and related children's literature that you did for your text set. It is imperative that you give much time, thought, and consideration to this project. Carefully read and use this description as well as the rubric so that you can successfully complete each component of this project.

There are 3 components to this assignment for DIVERSITY 3000: (1) Creating an original children's book, (2) Presenting the book to the class, and (3) Written reflection.

1.   Create an original children's book that could be used in a classroom to convey a particular concept about diversity of language, culture, ethnicity, class, gender, etc. This assignment is intended to challenge you to think about ways that you might present some of the topics discussed in class to the children you will teach. Furthermore, writing a children's book requires that you reduce complex topics to a set of fundamental ideas. You will need to submit possible topics to your DIVERSITY 3000 course instructor for approval before pursuing the assignment. The book's cover should have the title of the book and author (you). On the Title Page, you should include the title, author, and dedication. On the inside of the cover of the last page, provide an Author's Note that includes a rationale for why you chose the specific subject of your book and the objective(s) you intend to accomplish. Be sure to specify the age range of the readers for whom the book is intended. Also, suggest some possible uses for your book. Your book should be written so that an elementary-aged student could understand and enjoy it. It should also contain illustrations or other visual aids that support the content of the book and are appealing to children (consider the ideas presented in ECE 3600). Avoid the use of animal characters. When you have completed your book, you will use the *Quality*

Children's Picture Book Checklist to assess your work. Attempt to critically assess your book based on the criteria included on the checklist. There is no perfect children's book, so it isn't expected that you will be able to mark every box on the checklist. However, you should strive to address as many relevant criteria as possible within your book. You have the opportunity to have your book published by *Student Treasures* and you will be given a kit for your book. You must follow particular guidelines to ensure your book can be bound correctly. All instructions are included in the kit. If you decide not to send in your book for publishing, be sure the final product is well done. You may find this assignment somewhat challenging, so begin thinking about it early and drafting your ideas as they come to you.

2. <u>In-Class Presentation</u>: During your children's book presentation, you will be responsible for articulating the title, the rationale for selecting this topic, and your dedication. Additionally, you are asked to think deeply about how you will engage the audience (e.g. making predictions, think aloud, prompting, questioning, etc.). While reading your book, remember to display the illustrations for the audience. **When designing your children's book, focus on what you can do to be creative in the presentation.** In the past, authors have dressed up like a character or brought in items that accentuated the theme of the book; thus, you should begin thinking about how you will be unique in your presentation. After you have finished reading your book, be prepared to answer questions from the audience within your time limit. Practice your read-aloud presentation several times prior to the due date to ensure you (a) stay within your time limit, (b) utilize read-aloud strategies, (c) Use VIBES and POPS (from your Alliance Theatre workshops) techniques when presenting the book. The order of the presentation should be:
a. Introduction (title, reason for selection, intended grade level, and dedication)
b. Read the text and display the illustrations utilizing the following read-aloud strategies:
Making predictions
Text-to-text connections
Text-to-self connections
Text-to-world connections
c. Question and answer session

3. <u>Reflection on Writing a Children's Book (3-4 pages, not including the reference list)</u>: if you choose to work in pairs to create the children's book, each student will still need to write an individual reflection. In a reflective and thoughtful essay, answer the following questions describing the process of writing multicultural children's literature:
   a. Why did you choose this topic and these characters? How is this topic important to you, personally?
   b. What events, people, or text informed your writing of this book?
   c. What did you learn while creating the text set about biases, prejudice, misunderstandings, etc. of the topic?
   d. What did you learn about your own biases, prejudice, misunderstandings, etc. of the topic during the process of completing this assignment?
   e. How will this process of writing your own children's book inform your **teaching of reading and writing** of diverse learners, including ELLs and

students with special needs? (Remember to talk about both reading and writing.)

    f.   What was the most challenging part of this assignment and why?

    g.   What do you wish you had done differently? Explain.

The following resources will help you as you work on this assignment. Be sure to use it.
Preparing an annotated bibliography:
       http://www.library.cornell.edu/olinuris/ref/research/skill28.htm
Locating titles of books you might consider using:
       http://multiculturalchildrenslit.com/
       http://www.childpeacebooks.org/cpb/Protect/antiBias.php
       http://www.childpeacebooks.org/cpb/Protect/teachPeace.php
       http://bbpbooks.teachingforchange.org/best-recommended/earlychildhood
Reviewing Children's Literature:
       http://www.oyate.org/ (Specifically look at the section on *Books To Avoid*)

4.   *Miscellaneous (75 points)*

Throughout the semester you will be asked to complete miscellaneous assignments during and outside of class. Details will be provided as needed.
*Do note that one of these is attendance at the Benjamin E. Mays Lecture.

ASSESSMENT & GRADING

Attendance and Participation	100 points
Reading Response Blogs	100 points
Culture Quilt & Presentation	50 points
Multicultural Children's Literature:	
Children's Book, Presentation & Reflection	75 points
Miscellaneous Assignments	75 points

TOTAL   **400 points**

Grading Policy:
The following guidelines, based on the Department of Early Childhood Education policies, will be used to determine letter grades.

A+	98-100
A	93-97
A-	90-92%
B+	87-89%
B	83-86%
B-	80-82%
C+	77-79%
C	73-76%
C-	70-72%
D	60-69%
F	0-59%

I was taught that the world had a lot of problems; that I could struggle and change them; that intellectual and material gifts brought the privilege and responsibility of sharing with others less fortunate; and that service is the rent each of us pays for living — the very purpose of life and not something you do in your spare time or after you have reached your personal goals.-*Marian Wright Edelman*

Tentative Schedule of Classes – Spring 2013

Date	Topic	Assignments* Due on this day!
Jan. 14	Introduction Course Overview	*Reading(s):* *Caring in Education by Nel Noddings (in class)* *Assignment(s)* *Create blog on* www.edublogs.org *and post link on uLearn* *Sign up for CQ due date* *Purchase Black Ants & Buddhists by Mary Cowhey*
Jan. 29	The Context of Education *Culture quilts (5)*	Readings: Freire: Ch. 1 of Pedagogy of the Oppressed Click to open Freire's Pedagogy of the Oppressed (full text) *Assignment(s)* *Reading Response Blog*

Feb. 5	Culturally Responsive Pedagogy *Culture quilts (5)*	*Freire - Ch. 2 of Pedagogy of the Oppressed* [Click to open Freire's Pedagogy of the Oppressed (full text)](#) *Cowhey, M. – Prologue & Ch. 1*
Feb. 12	Social Class *Culture quilts (5)*	Readings: Bowles: Unequal Education and the Reproduction of the Social Division of Labor http://www-rohan.sdsu.edu/~rgibson/BowlesEducation.htm Cowhey, Ch. 2 *Assignment(s):* *Reading Response Blog*
Feb. 19	Exceptionalities *Culture quilts (5)*	*Readings:* *Holding Nyla* *Ten Quick Ways…* *Assignment(s):* *Reading Response Blog* *Children's Book Topic/Main Idea*
Feb. 25	Immigration Dialogue	*Readings:* *TBA* *Assignment(s):* *Reading Response Blog*
March 4	*Sexual Orientation*	*Reading(s):* *Just The Facts* *GLSEN School Climate Survey* *Assignment(s):* *Reading Response Blog*
March 13	*Religion* *Work on Children's Book* Culture Quilts (5)	*Reading(s):* *Responding to Religious Diversity* *A Teacher's Guide to Religion in Public Schools* *Collection on uLearn* *Assignment(s):* *Reading Response Blog* *Children's Book Overview (hardcopy)*
March 25	*Family & Community* *Culture quilts (5)*	*Reading(s):* *Cowhey, Ch.4 & 9* *Assignment(s):* *Reading Response Blog*

April 1	*Rethinking What We Know* Culture Quilts (5)	*Reading(s):* *Cowhey, Ch. 7* *Collection on uLearn* *Assignment(s):* *Reading Response Blog*
April 8	*Language* *Story Time*	*Readings:* *Cummins – The Two Faces of Language Proficiency* *Nieto – The Languages We Speak* *Assignments:* *Reading Response Blog* *Children's Book, Reflection and Presentation*
April 15	*Story Time*	*Reading(s): None* *Assignment(s) :* *Reading Response Blog* *Children's Book, Reflection and Presentation*
April 22	*Field Trip*	*Reading(s):* *Childs - The Story of Rachel and Sadie* *Cowhey, Ch. 5 & 6* *Assignment(s):* *Reading Response Blog*
April 29	Revolutionary Teaching Culture Quilts (4)	*Reading(s):* *Freire, Ch. 4* *Assignment(s) :* *Reading Response Blog* *Self Assessment & Critical Analysis* *(*Miscellaneous Assignment)*