

What We're Teaching Teachers:
An Analysis of Multicultural Teacher Education Courses

Paul C. Gorski
Founder, EdChange
Assistant Professor, Graduate School of Education
Hamline University

<http://www.EdChange.org>
gorski@EdChange.org

April 2008

A broad range of scholars has conducted an equally broad range of scholarship on multicultural teacher education (MTE)—scholarship that explores national and state policy initiatives (Gollnick, 1995), teacher education program curricula (Jennings, 2008; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Zeichner & Hoeft, 1996), approaches to MTE (Jenks, Lee, & Kanpol, 2001; McAllister & Irvine, 2000; Moss, 2008), the social and political contexts for MTE (Weiner, 2000), the nature of session offerings at national multicultural education conferences (Amosa & Author, in press), and the body of related literature itself (Cochran-Smith, Davis, & Fries, 2004; Sleeter, 2001a, 2001b; Trent, Kea, & Oh, 2008). These scholars reach a variety of conclusions, but on this they generally agree: what passes for MTE in most cases is not *multicultural* at all—at least not when assessed against multicultural education paradigms as conceived by Banks (2004), Grant and Sleeter (2006), Nieto (2004), and other theorists. Instead, according to Cochran-Smith (2004), Vavrus (2002), Author (2006), and others, MTE initiatives (whether degree programs, staff development workshops, or individual multicultural education courses) tend to focus on *celebrating diversity* or *understanding the cultural “other”*—the first developmental stage of multicultural practice according to Grant and Sleeter’s (2006) typology of multicultural education approaches.

Unfortunately, there exists very little empirical research examining how these discrepancies play out *in practice*. In order to help fill a portion of this hole, I analyzed syllabi for teacher education courses on multicultural education, cultural diversity, and related topics—courses taught in teacher education programs at colleges and universities across the United States. I focused specifically on uncovering the ways in which these courses frame and conceptualize multicultural education. Do they tend to encourage pre- and in-service teachers to practice multicultural education in a tokenizing *celebrating diversity* manner, consistent with concerns expressed by Cochran-Smith (2004), Vavrus (2002), Author (2006), and others? Or do they transcend such approaches, presenting multicultural education with a more critical, social reconstructionist framework, consistent with the field’s foundations of social justice, equity, and critical pedagogy?

I share here the results of this analysis. I present, as well, an unexpected outcome of this study: a new typology for approaches to MTE coursework.

An important distinction must be drawn here. As a teacher educator, I often have diverted from an official course design once the classroom door was closed. I am confident that I am not alone in doing so. Teacher educators, like all educators, bring our philosophies, strengths, and limitations into our teaching. Therefore, I cannot claim to have discerned what, exactly, occurred in any particular course by examining its syllabus. It is reasonable to believe that some people teaching the courses engaged a more critical approach than outlined in the respective syllabus while others engaged a less critical approach. This, then, is not a study of individual instructor practice, of the *explicit curriculum* of MTE. Rather, it is a study of the philosophies that underlie the *official curriculum* of MTE—what institutions that prepare teachers codify within syllabi as their approaches to MTE.

Context of the Study

Most of the published scholarship on MTE can be grouped into one of four categories:

- (1) scholarship that critically analyzes MTE practice from a purely theoretical or philosophical position, without analyzing original or existing data (Cochran-Smith, 2003; Díaz-Rico, 1998; Dressman, 1998; Gay, 2005; Author, 2006; Jenks, Lee, & Kanpol, 2001; Kiesier, 2005; Rao, 2005; Rubin & Justice, 2005; Valentín, 2006; Vavrus, 2002);
- (2) scholarship in which teacher educators measure the impact or effectiveness of a single multicultural education class or workshop, usually by analyzing data collected from their students (Ambe, 2006; Bruna, 2007; Gayle-Evans & Michael, 2006; Klug, Luckey, Wilkins, & Whitfield, 2006; Lesko & Bloom, 1998; Lucas, 2005; McNeal, 2005; Mueller & O'Connor, 2007; Wasonga & Piveral, 2004);
- (3) scholarship that describes challenges associated with raising multicultural consciousness in teacher education students, often focusing on those with racial and class privilege (Aveling, 2006; Case & Hemmings, 2005; Marx, 2004; Moss, 2008; Nieto, 1998; Pennington, 2007; Raible & Irizarry, 2007; Sleeter, 1996; Smith, 1998; Solomona, Portelli, Daniel, & Campbell, 2005); or
- (4) scholarship that critically analyzes the body of literature on some aspect of MTE (Cochran-Smith et al., 2004; McAllister & Irvine, 2000; Sleeter, 2001a, 2001b; Trent, Kea, & Oh, 2008; Weiner, 2000; Zeichner & Hoeft, 1996).

These are crucial lines of study, providing philosophical and theoretical bases for the field, models for action research within teacher education programs, and portraits MTE scholarship, among other things. But what is missing, with the exception of a few studies (such as Gollnick's [1995] analysis of state and federal policy initiatives informing multicultural teacher preparation) are structured inquiries into the overall national landscape of MTE as carried out in teacher education programs. My examination of the literature uncovered virtually no empirical studies of national patterns of ways in which MTE is framed and practiced in coursework. Nor did it uncover any empirical studies identifying best practices in MTE beyond the limited context of a single classroom or program.

In regards to the literature that does exist, two themes emerged as most informative to my study: (1) approaches to multicultural education in general, and (2) approaches to MTE. An examination of these areas of the literature provided a theoretical and philosophical baseline against which to situate my analysis.

Existing Typologies of Multicultural Education and MTE

Conceptualizations of multicultural education vary. But in a previous study (Author, 2006) in which I analyzed a history of definitions and conceptions of multicultural education from a broad range of the field's scholars (such as Nieto [2004], Sleeter [1996], Banks [2004a], and Grant and Sleeter [2006]), I found five points of agreement, which I called "defining principles" of multicultural education:

- (1) multicultural education is a political movement and process that attempts to secure social justice for historically and presently underserved and disenfranchised students;
- (2) multicultural education recognizes that, while some individual classroom practices are philosophically consistent with multicultural education, social justice is an institutional matter, and as such, can be secured only through comprehensive school reform;
- (3) multicultural education insists that comprehensive school reform can be achieved only through a critical analysis of systems of power and privilege;
- (4) multicultural education's underlying goal—the purpose of this critical analysis—is the elimination of educational inequities; and
- (5) multicultural education is good education for *all* students.

Unfortunately, the consensus among scholars of multicultural education practice—including MTE—holds that such practice usually fails to reflect these principles (Author, 2006). In fact, the MTE practice tends to reflect more of a human relations, color-blindness, or “celebrating diversity” approach than one committed to the chief concerns of multicultural education: educational equity and social justice (Cochran-Smith, 2004; Díaz-Rico, 1998; Hidalgo, Chávez-Chávez, & Ramage, 1996; Jackson, 2003; McKenzie & Scheurich, 2004; Vavrus, 2002).

In order to clarify this gap, many multicultural education scholars have developed typologies or stage-theories (Banks, 2004b; Grant & Sleeter, 2006; McLaren, 1995). These typologies summarize approaches to multicultural education practice. On one end of these spectrums are approaches that support dominant hegemony, such as Banks's (2004) “Contributions” approach to multicultural education or McLaren's (1995) “Conservative Multiculturalism.” On the other end are those that call for educators to participate in the establishment of socially just, equitable, liberatory, and democratic schools and societies, such as Banks's (2004) “Social Action” approach or McLaren's (1995) “Critical and Resistance Multiculturalism.”

I initially intended to group the MTE syllabi using a typology constructed by Grant and Sleeter (2006). But as I analyzed them, I found that an abbreviated version of McLaren's (1995) frameworks, as used by Jenks et al. (2001) to frame approaches to multicultural preservice teacher education, lent an additional layer of sociopolitical complexity to the discussion. I summarize these two typologies below.

Approaches to Multicultural Education

Among the available typologies, the one that appeared most prevalently in the MTE literature was Grant and Sleeter's (2006) typology of “teaching approaches for addressing human diversity” (p. 7). Their model includes five approaches.

The first of these—*teaching the exceptional and culturally different*—situates multicultural education within the dominant hegemony. According to Grant and Sleeter (2006), this approach is assimilationist, focusing on enabling “students to succeed in learning the traditional curriculum in traditional classrooms and to be successful in the existing society” (p. 12). Students who don't fit the dominant “norm” are understood in relation to supposed deficits. The job of the teacher is to help students of color, English

language learners, economically disadvantaged students, and students from other disenfranchised groups adjust and “achieve” to that dominant norm.

Teachers who adopt Grant and Sleeter’s (2006) second approach—*human relations*—believe that multicultural education’s chief concerns are interpersonal harmony and respect. The goal of this approach is to “improve feelings and communication in the classroom and in the school as a whole” (p. 57) through the development of stronger interpersonal relations and prejudice reduction. Like those who lean on the *teaching the exceptional and culturally different* approach to multicultural education, those who draw primarily on the *human relations* approach ignore structural inequities and avoid addressing the ways in which larger sociopolitical contexts inform interpersonal conflict and prejudice.

The basis of Grant and Sleeter’s (2006) third approach—*single-group studies*—is the examination of a single culture or identity group. It transcends the *teaching the exceptional and culturally different* approach in that it calls on teachers to examine an identity group beyond surface-level stereotypes in order to understand the group’s history of oppression. Those who take this approach often are concerned with improving social conditions for a particular group of people. One problem with this approach is that it too often ignores the intersectionalities of issues—race and class, class and gender, gender and sexual orientation.

According to Grant and Sleeter (2006), their fourth approach—*multicultural education*—“rests on two ideals: equal opportunity and cultural pluralism” (p. 163). This approach calls on teachers to address power and privilege in the classroom—to subvert dominant hegemony, purposefully educate about injustices, and ensure educational equity for all students. The overall goal of the *multicultural education* approach is to reform schools comprehensively based on principles of equality and pluralism.

Grant and Sleeter’s (2006) final approach—*education that is multicultural and social reconstructionist*—prepares students to be active citizens, constructing a world without oppression; a world of equity and justice; a world that meets the needs of the full diversity of humanity. This approach requires the practice of democratic schooling, the nurturance of critical consciousness through the examination of systemic inequities in relation to students’ own lives, and the development of social action skills in both teachers and students. And, unlike with the *single-group studies* approach, this approach attempts to build bridges connecting various marginalized groups in order to strengthen resistance to oppression.

These approaches refer specifically to multicultural education theory and practice in a P-12 context. In order to expand this context across the wider sociopolitical landscape of education, Jenks et al. (2001) overlaid Grant and Sleeter’s (2006) model with McLaren’s (1994) frameworks for multiculturalism. The resulting typology of three theoretical frameworks for preservice MTE became the initial basis for my analysis of MTE syllabi.

Theoretical Frameworks for Multiculturalism in Preservice Teacher Education

Jenks, Lee, and Kanpol (2001), informed by McLaren (1994) and others, identify three theoretical frameworks of preservice MTE: (1) *conservative multiculturalism*, (2) *liberal multiculturalism*, and (3) *critical multiculturalism*. The core value of *conservative*

multiculturalism, like Grant and Sleeter's (2006) *teaching the exceptional and culturally different* approach, is assimilation. Its central questions, according to Jenks et al. (2001), are, "How do we Americanize minorities? How do we prepare them for a competitive economy?" (p. 91). Conservative multiculturalists insist that they are committed to equality and inclusion, but apply that commitment only to those willing to adopt "mainstream culture and its attending values, mores, and norms" (p. 90). They are interested, not in discussing injustices, but in what "we" have in common. They justify this focus with a deficit ideology, suggesting that equality comes through social mobility, which is facilitated only when the "culturally different" acquire the knowledge and skills necessary for participating in mainstream, market-driven society. Such an ideology—as drawn upon, for example, in Ruby Payne's (2005) work on poverty—ignores systemic inequities, requiring marginalized groups to conform to the very systems that marginalize them.

Jenks et al. (2001) describe how *liberal multiculturalism*, like Grant and Sleeter's (2006) *human relations* approach, "accents the need for diversity and cultural pluralism and the acceptance and celebration of difference" (p. 92). *Liberal multiculturalism* transcends *conservative multiculturalism* in that, at the very least, it acknowledges and appreciates difference instead of demanding conformity. However, although liberal multiculturalists may intend to model progressive practice, they pay insufficient attention to power, privilege, and control. They support diversity programs which encourage an appreciation of difference, but only in ways that ignore the access *implications* of difference.

Critical multiculturalists, according to Jenks et al. (2001), insist that educational equity can be achieved only when we consider deeper questions:

Under what conditions and by whom are concepts of equity and excellence constructed? What do they look like for different groups and in different circumstances? ... How can equity and excellence be achieved in a society in which historically the dominant culture has determined their meaning? (p. 93)

These questions dig into power relationships, forcing educators to understand their work within a larger sociopolitical context that is dominated by free-market competition and controlled by and for the benefit of the powerful. It is the job of multicultural education, according to critical multiculturalists, to expose these relationships and reconstruct schooling in ways that dismantle, rather than reify, social stratification, as in Grant and Sleeter's (2006) social reconstructionist approach.

These approaches—conservative, liberal, and critical—differ from those described by Nieto (2004), Sleeter (1996), Banks (2004a), and Grant and Sleeter (2006) in that they do not describe one's orientation to multicultural practice so much as one's sociopolitical philosophy regarding the purpose of multicultural education—the values and orientations that *inform* one's practice. As a result, they, in addition to Grant and Sleeter's (2006) typology of approaches to multicultural education, provided an important philosophical and theoretical frame of reference for my initial analysis of multicultural education syllabi.

Methods

Using qualitative content analysis, I analyzed 45 syllabi from multicultural education classes, focusing on the ways in which multicultural education is conceptualized in course descriptions, course goals, course objectives, and other conceptual and descriptive text.

Data Collection

I collected these syllabi through a sort of snowball sampling. I posted electronic mail to several listservs to which many people interested in multicultural education subscribe, such as those hosted by the National Association for Multicultural Education, Rethinking Schools, and EdChange. I requested syllabi from anybody teaching multicultural education or related classes in teacher education programs. I requested, as well, that people forward my message to friends and colleagues who might be willing to share their syllabi.

I specified three eligibility conditions. I based these conditions on a desire to limit my analysis to courses focused explicitly on MTE, making cross-course comparison more relevant and meaningful than it might have been with a broader selection of syllabi. The conditions:

1. The course's *primary focus* is multicultural education or a directly related topic (cultural diversity in education, social justice education, intercultural education), so that, for example, a general foundations course with a partial focus on educational equity is not eligible.
2. The course is offered in an undergraduate or graduate *education* program, so that courses in communications (such as Multicultural Communications), social work, and other fields are not eligible.
3. The syllabus has been submitted by the course instructor—not by a student or colleague—with explicit permission for me to use it in the study.

Initially I received 51 syllabi, but disqualified six of them because they were not eligible under these conditions.

Two-thirds (30 out of 45) of the syllabi analyzed were from undergraduate courses, while the remaining 15 were from graduate-level courses. Sixteen of the 45 (36%) syllabi were from private 4-year colleges and universities, 27 (60%) were from public 4-year colleges and universities, and two (4%) were from community colleges.

The syllabi also represented a regional cross-section of the U.S. Based on the division of regions as adopted by the Equity Assistance Centers in the U.S., five syllabi (11%) came from Region I; three (7%) from Region II, six (13%) from Region III; six (13%) from Region IV; six (13%) from Region V, two (4%) from Region VI, seven (16%) from Region VII, three (7%) from Region VIII, six (13%) from Region IX, and one (2%) from Region X.

Data Analysis

I limited my analysis to course descriptions, goals, objectives, and other contextual or descriptive text. I chose to focus on these aspects of the syllabi for two

reasons: (1) they best captured the theoretical and philosophical frameworks and approaches informing the course development; and (2) these aspects tend to represent the official and consistent aspects of courses—the parts of a course design that remain consistent. For the purpose of this particular study, I was interested in the official curriculum—the ways in which approaches to MTE were codified in more or less permanent parts of course syllabi.

As I mentioned, my intention was to analyze syllabi using Grant and Sleeter's (2006) typology. But as I began my analysis I found that their typology failed to capture what emerged as the most popular theoretical and philosophical underpinnings of the courses. I turned, then, to the typology introduced by Jenks et al. (2001) and found that it more closely approximated these underpinnings, but did not do so with as much specificity as the analysis warranted. Ultimately I chose to use their typology—conservative, liberal, and critical multiculturalism—as a starting point for my analysis. However, I decided, as well, to allow a more detailed typology to emerge organically out of the analysis itself, adding a dimension of grounded theory to my study.

I began, then, by examining the data for key words or phrases that would suggest theoretical or philosophical orientations consistent with conservative, liberal, or critical multiculturalism. For example, syllabi in which non-dominant groups were often described using “othering” language, in which language and framing suggested a market-centered ideology, and in which I observed other characteristics consistent with conservative multiculturalism (as described above), were grouped together. Because most syllabi included at least some language and framing consistent with two or all three of these approaches to multiculturalism, I looked for patterns in overall language and framing. For example, in one syllabus I found a goal statement that could be seen as consistent with a liberal or even critical approach to multiculturalism: “recognize and deal with dehumanizing biases such as sexism, racism, prejudice and discrimination.” However, the overall pattern of language throughout the syllabus was reflective of a conservative approach, including text such as:

- “develop sensitivity to and understanding of the values, beliefs, lifestyles, and attitudes of individuals and groups”
- “be aware of and understand the various values, lifestyles, history and contributions of various *subgroups*” (my italics)
- “relate effectively to *other* individuals and various *subgroups other than one's own*” (my italics)

Once the syllabi were grouped using this typology, I began a deeper examination, trying to identify the more subtle theoretical and philosophical intricacies at play. During this phase of the analysis I relied heavily on Strauss's (1987) four basic guidelines for open coding: (1) ask the data a specific and consistent set of questions, (2) analyze the data minutely, (3) frequently interrupt the coding to write a theoretical note, and (4) never assume the analytic relevance of any traditional variable until the data show it to be relevant. The questions I asked the data were: (1) what theoretical or philosophical groundings are evident, implicitly or explicitly, in the text?; (2) what theoretical or philosophical groundings are suggested by what is absent from the text? (this is where the interruptions for theoretical notes proved particularly helpful); and (3) what does the text suggest, implicitly or explicitly, is the purpose of multicultural education? I proceeded to color-code with these questions in mind.

Although I was analyzing text, I held fast to Potter and Wetherell's (1994) notion of "texts as social practices" (p. 48) in which the researcher's relationship to the text is social, not linguistic, in nature. In other words, I was not looking for the linguistic patterns of symbols (text) on the page, but for patterns of thought and meaning. I was less interested in the words themselves than in what individual texts suggested about the ways in which multicultural education was being framed.

Findings

The primary purpose of this study was to analyze the ways in which multicultural education was being framed in multicultural education teacher preparation coursework. An unintended product of my analysis was a new typology of five approaches to MTE. I will summarize these findings then discuss their implications for MTE.

Distribution of Approaches

Close to 16 percent (seven out of 45) of the syllabi analyzed were found to be consistent with Jenks et al.'s (2001) notion of "conservative multiculturalism." These syllabi tended to frame multicultural education in assimilationist terminology and often included "othering" language when referring to non-dominant groups. They were marked, as well, by what they did not include—most notably, explicit attention to systemic inequities and how these inform individual practice.

A majority of the syllabi—58% (26 out of 45)—were dominated by elements of "liberal multiculturalism." These syllabi suggested courses in which difference was celebrated, in which students focused on learning about cultural values and self-awareness. So, although these courses transcended an assimilationist or conformist ideology, they still failed to consider power, privilege, and systemic inequities in education.

Approximately 29% (13 out of 45) fit Jenks et al.'s (2001) description of "critical multiculturalism." These syllabi suggested courses in which education was discussed in sociopolitical context. Participants explored power relationships, oppression in society and schools, and the ways in which educators helped reify or dismantle inequity.

This distribution alone uncovers important points for discussion—the fact, for example, that 71% of the syllabi describe "multicultural education" courses that appear inconsistent with basic theoretical principles of multicultural education. However, the introduction of a more layered typology presents opportunities for more detailed discussion.

A New Typology of Approaches to MTE

After several rounds of coding and analysis, five approaches, each more detailed and nuanced than those described by Jenks et al. (2001), emerged. I named them (1) Teaching the "Other," (2) Teaching with Tolerance and Cultural Sensitivity, (3) Teaching with Multicultural Competence, (4) Teaching in Sociopolitical Context, and (5) Teaching as Resistance and Counter-Hegemonic Practice.

Teaching the “Other”

Seven (15.6%) of the syllabi—those consistent with *conservative multiculturalism*—reflected what I called the “Teaching the ‘Other’” approach to MTE. These syllabi framed multicultural education in ways that supported hegemony and existing power relations. They did so by (1) using *othering* language, (2) presenting non-dominant groups as homogeneous, and (3) defining multicultural education through a market-centric or capitalistic lens.

Othering Language. *Othering* language implicitly or explicitly defines a person or group as being outside the realm of normalcy. Such language helps maintain hegemony, attaching negative value to identities or ideologies that differ from the hegemonic norm.

These six syllabi were replete with both implicit and explicit *othering* language. Several referred specifically to learning about “other cultures.” For example, one syllabus explained that students would

develop skills and knowledge necessary for communication with people from other cultures and co-cultures. Co-cultures include African American, Asian American, Native American, Latino/a, women, gays and lesbians, the disabled, and social class.¹

In fact, three of these syllabi referred to groups of color and other disenfranchised peoples as “co-cultures” or “subgroups”—explicit *othering* language. One noted that participants would “be aware of and understand the various values, lifestyles, histories, and contributions of various subgroups in our society.” Another referred to the “communication styles of various American subgroups.”

A somewhat less explicit way several of these syllabi *othered* was by suggesting lines of distinction between particular groups. Two of the syllabi, for example, distinguished between “white” and “multicultural” by using the latter to mean “people of color.” According to one syllabus,

By the year 2010, *multicultural groups* [my italics] in the United States will collectively out-number European Americans. The changes in these demographics will bring about new challenges and frustrations for institutions that serve a diverse population.

Similarly, the authors of many of these syllabi seemed to assume that all of their students would be white. One syllabus from a large urban university asked,

Can we effectively translate what we do as professionals to those who may need our assistance, or will we fail at bridging the gap? How will we understand acculturation stress and what can we do to help ourselves and others to adjust?

Such questions *othered* by suggesting a we/they or us/them dichotomy. But they also did so by assuming that the students in the class itself were part of the hegemonic “us.”

Homogenization of Non-Dominant Groups. Another common feature of these syllabi was a tendency to homogenize identity groups. Several of the syllabi suggested homogeneity within non-dominant groups—but none did so within dominant groups. For example, one syllabus explained that students would “study the socio-cultural worldviews of several racial/ethnic groups of American minorities.” The primary

¹ I have chosen not to cite specific syllabi as sources in order to protect the identities of those who allowed me to include their work in this study.

objective of another course was “to develop sensitivity to and understanding of the values, beliefs, lifestyles, and attitudes of individuals and groups.”

In one of the syllabi, students were charged with participating in the homogenization process. They were instructed to choose “one culture different from your own and explain how people from this culture communicate when they interact with people from the predominate culture of the U.S.” Earlier in the syllabus, “cultures” were described as non-dominant identity groups: African Americans, women, and so on, insinuating that African Americans, women, or people from other identity groups communicate homogeneously.

In addition, several of the syllabi focused on a “contributions” approach to multicultural education. These designs essentialized identity groups, referencing them primarily in terms of surface-level cultural traits and contributions. One course description explained that students would examine “the contributions of different ethnic groups to customs and traditions ... in the United States.” In a few instances, the language describing the organization of these courses was essentializing (as well as *othering*). One such syllabus began with a “brief outline of course content”:

- (1) African Americans (Blacks, People of Color), (2) Asians, (3) Hispanics (Latinos, Puerto Ricans, Cubans, North, South, Central Americans, Caribbeans, Jamaicans, etc.), (4) Native Americans, (5) European Whites (Anglos), (6) other National and ethnically represented groups in America... (9) Gender Issues, (10) Religious Differences (Muslim, Jewish, Christian, Baptist, Buddhist, etc.)

The language here was confounding—using “People of Color” as a synonym for “African Americans” and conflating identities such as nationality, race, and ethnicity. But of equal interest was the organization of the course, built upon an assumption of homogeneity within each of these groups. This sort of organization was another shared feature among these syllabi.

Market-Capitalist Lens. Market ideology—including the notion that the purpose of education is to prepare students for the global marketplace—was common among these syllabi, as well. Several included market-centric language. For example, one syllabus explained the importance of multiculturalism in distinctly market terms: “Consumers (clients) are demanding that we be knowledgeable about their worldview, similar in experience and/or characteristics, and able to translate our services to meet their needs.” According to another syllabus, students would “explore ways to use American social experiences and multicultural heritages as sources of corporate strength.”

These syllabi shared many of the characteristics of Jenks et al.’s (2001) *conservative multiculturalism* framework and Grant and Sleeter’s (2006) *teaching the exceptional and culturally different* approach. They focused largely on preparing teachers to manage diversity by gaining a simplified, surface-level understanding of the cultures of people from various identity groups. An analysis of these syllabi suggested little or no attention to power and privilege concerns, or even to a complex understanding of diversity.

Teaching with Cultural Sensitivity and Tolerance

A total of 26 syllabi, 57.8% of the sample, were consistent with Jenks et al.'s (2001) conceptualization of liberal multiculturalism. A closer examination of these syllabi revealed patterns that enabled me to divide them into two more specific groups. The first of these, "Teaching with Tolerance and Cultural Sensitivity," comprised 13 of the 45 syllabi, or 28.9% of the overall sample.

This approach to MTE was characterized by (1) a tendency to frame multicultural education as respecting and celebrating diversity; (2) a focus on sensitivity and self-reflection; and (3) a failure to connect either of these—respecting diversity or self-reflecting—to educational inequities.

Multicultural Education as Respecting Diversity. The course description of one syllabus read: "This course will focus on... understanding, accepting, appreciating, and celebrating the complexity of diversity." A majority of these 13 syllabi identified the preparation of educators to respect, accept, or celebrate diversity as a central goal—if not *the* central course goal.

References to respecting diversity often were couched in an assimilationist sort of pluralism, sometimes in ways that actually problematized diversity. For example, the following was the second of three key questions addressed in one course: "How can we respect and recognize diverse identities, and still maintain a common American identity?" The third question: "Can we have equal opportunity without cultural assimilation?" Other syllabi reflecting this approach referred to developing a "commitment to human diversity," "respecting human diversity," and "celebrating differences."

Cultural Sensitivity and Self-Reflection. Notably, none of these 13 syllabi connected a commitment to respecting or valuing diversity with eliminating educational inequities. Rather, the courses appeared designed to encourage sensitivity and self-reflection. For example, the ability to "tolerate" difference was an oft-cited competence to be addressed in these courses. According to one syllabus,

We begin the term by addressing questions such as... 'What responsibilities do educators and educational institutions have toward developing tolerance and what constraints do they face?'

Each of these 13 courses centered self-reflection—particularly regarding one's biases—in the MTE process. One course description summarized,

This course takes an in-depth critical reflection and discovery of self and of the ways in which personal values develop from the integration of ... multiple dimensions that shape adult identity. Students will confront their own assumptions, bias, and values (both positive and negative) and see how these factors influence interpersonal relationships. After self reflection, students will use this knowledge to begin a journey of cultural understanding...

Another syllabus explained, "The class will be a reflection and discussion class that will examine personal prejudices, biases, and beliefs." A third course in this group was designed to help teacher candidates "develop an awareness of their own stereotypes and biases."

Lack of Attention to Educational Inequities. A third shared feature of the syllabi that reflected the "Teaching with Tolerance and Cultural Sensitivity" approach to MTE was a lack of consideration of educational inequities. None of these syllabi named

systemic inequities explicitly. None of them drew connections between respecting diversity or identifying one's biases and larger contextual factors, such as race, gender, or class inequity.

Instead, these syllabi suggested a very interpersonal focus to MTE—an approach less interested in systemic change than in human relations. For example, one syllabus included among its course objectives, “to become aware of the impact ... biases have on interpersonal relationships.” Even when these syllabi named dimensions of identity around which educational inequities exist, they did so in the context of relationship-building rather than inequities. The course description on another syllabus detailed how students would examine how race, gender, and other identities “influence the interplay between self and others,” but did not suggest any attention to the ways in which these identities affect one's educational opportunities.

Teaching with Multicultural Competence

I called the other approach to MTE that emerged from my analysis of syllabi consistent with Jenks et al.'s (2001) liberal multiculturalism “Teaching with Multicultural Competence.” These courses differed from the “Teaching with Tolerance and Cultural Sensitivity” approach in that they focused less on self-reflection for personal awareness and more on skill development. They comprised 28.9% (13 out of 45) of the syllabi analyzed.

These syllabi shared three major characteristics: (1) the centering of multicultural competence, (2) a principal focus on pragmatic skills, and (3) a lack of attention to educational inequities, a characteristic shared with the “Teaching with Tolerance and Cultural Sensitivity” approach.

Centrality of Cultural Competence. A majority of these 13 syllabi named multicultural competence or cultural responsiveness as the central course goal. For example, the primary goal of one course was to “provide potential educators...with entry level knowledge about becoming culturally responsive teachers in culturally diverse inclusive, and inner city, urban classrooms.” Several included course objectives such as learning “culturally responsive teaching and learning strategies” or demonstrating “cultural competence.”

In each case, “competence” and “responsiveness” seemed to refer to enlarging cultural knowledge bases in order to, in the words of one syllabus, “meet the needs of all...future students.” The course description in another syllabus explained, “Multiple perspectives and more complete knowledge about our world and schools are necessary” in order to “see the world and the culture in which we live from multiple perspectives.” According to another syllabus in this group, students were to “examine relevant teaching strategies and curriculum materials to meet the needs of widely diverse student populations...”

Principal Focus on Pragmatic Curricular and Pedagogical Skills. An outstanding feature of these syllabi—one that differentiated them from the “Teaching with Tolerance and Cultural Sensitivity” approach—was their clear focus on pragmatic skill-building. Although these courses contained aspects of the previous approach, they tended to connect everything—self-reflection, interpersonal relations, and so on—to curricular and pedagogical practice.

Several of these syllabi referred explicitly to culturally appropriate teaching strategies. The central goals of one course were to prepare teachers to “implement effective teaching strategies in diverse classrooms,” to “prepare a variety of instructional strategies to meet the needs of diverse learners,” and to “develop a caring and nurturing classroom where all students can and will learn.” Another was designed to focus on “age and culturally appropriate strategies for creating effective teaching-learning environments.”

Similarly, many of the syllabi reflecting this approach emphasized the implications of diversity-related concerns for curriculum and instruction. This emphasis was captured particularly well in the primary course goal described in one syllabus:

It is my goal that by successfully completing this course, you will have a better understanding of how social, cultural, and economic factors influence the processes of education. Understanding these factors will help you to develop classroom practices which better meet the needs of all of your future students.

The course description in another syllabus stated, in similar fashion, that students would explore “responses to cultural diversity and their practical implications for education.” Another course was designed to present “a picture of the increasing diversity found within educational institutions and the implications it has for educators in developing both policy and practice.”

Lack of Attention to Educational Inequities. These courses transcended the interpersonal focus of those that reflected “Teaching with Tolerance and Cultural Sensitivity” by drawing direct connections between personal awareness and multicultural practice. However, they shared an inattention to educational inequities. Although several of these syllabi described the need to strengthen teaching skills in order to reach students from a diversity of identities, none of the 13 named the amelioration of educational inequities as an aspect of multicultural competence. This feature of these syllabi distinguished them from those reflecting the “Teaching in Sociopolitical Context” approach to MTE.

Teaching in Sociopolitical Context

Thirteen of the 45 syllabi analyzed (28.9%) fit Jenks et al.’s (2001) critical approach to MTE. As with those that fit their conception of liberal MTE, a deeper analysis of these syllabi revealed two more specific approaches. I called these approaches “Teaching in Sociopolitical Context” and “Teaching as Resistance and Counter-Hegemonic Practice.” The former, which comprised nine of these 13 syllabi, or 20% of the total, shared three characteristics: (1) a focus on critical analysis of educational policy and practice at an institutional level, (2) consideration of this analysis in a larger sociopolitical context, and (3) the engagement of critical theories. They comprised ten, or 22.2%, of the total sample of syllabi.

Critical Analysis at Systemic Level. The most outstanding way in which these syllabi differed from those reflecting previously discussed approaches was their transcendence of interpersonal or individual-level awareness-building. Instead, the courses described in these syllabi appeared to focus on a critical analysis of educational policy and practice at an institutional level. Many of these syllabi explicitly referred to the importance of moving from an interpersonal to a systemic level of analysis. For

example, according to a course objective in one syllabus, students would learn to “differentiate between personal and institutional discrimination, as well as the forces which either promote or inhibit equity and cultural pluralism.”

Unlike most of the syllabi reflecting previously discussed approaches, which referred to race, gender, sexual orientation, and so on, only in terms of individual or group identity, a majority of these syllabi connected them to systemic inequity and oppression. A learning outcome named on one syllabus declared that students would establish a knowledge base about the dynamics and selected manifestations of social and school-based inequities and forms of oppression such as racism, ethnocentrism, sexism, classism, ableism, linguisticism, heterosexism/homophobia/biphobia/transphobia, religious oppression, and others...

Another course, according to its course description, was designed to engage students “in the critical examination of the psychosocial and sociopolitical relationships between teaching, schooling, education, and educational policy and leadership in the U.S.” Several of the syllabi situated such examinations in a historical context, as well. For example, according to the primary course objective on one syllabus, “Learning colleagues will demonstrate an understanding of the multiple, often competing, goals of public schooling how these goals have evolved historically, and how they presently impact our democratic society.”

Most of the courses fitting into previously described approaches were designed to prepare teachers to understand student experience primarily through self-reflection and personal awareness. The courses fitting the “Teaching in Sociopolitical Context” approach focused, instead, on deepening teachers’ understandings of inequities pervading schools. A goal listed on one syllabus was,

To analyze the influences on learning of such sociocultural and sociopolitical variables as race, ethnicity, gender, social class background among others; and to gain an understanding of how structures, policies, and practices of schools tend to perpetuate discriminatory inequities by their effects on students and educators. According to another syllabus, students would “consider institutional changes needed in schools and society for all children to have equal educational opportunity.”

Consideration of Larger Sociopolitical Context. Another characteristic of these syllabi was their placement of schooling in a larger social and political context. For example, one course was described as a “study of cultural, historical, social, and psychological factors that either promote or diminish equal human worth and either empower or suppress linguistically and ethnically diverse groups of students...” Another course was designed to engage students in a “critical analysis of social, historical, and philosophical dimensions of multiculturalism.” According to a third syllabus, students would learn “to apply knowledge of cultural characteristics and cultural change to a culturally-marginalized group in social, economic, legal, and political contexts.”

Most of these syllabi included course goals or objectives focused explicitly on drawing connections between educational inequities and parallel inequities in larger society. Such a focus was captured by a question posted on one syllabus: “Are social inequalities within the larger U.S. society reproduced in schools, and if so, how are they reproduced?” An objective of another course was to

examine from different theoretical and ideological perspectives the nature of pluralism and intergroup relations in the U.S. society in order to elucidate the basic causes and complex dynamics of racism, sexism, and other forms of discrimination...

A third course was characterized as “an examination of the socio-historical, political, and philosophical forces which influence the institution of schooling in the United States.”

Engagement of Critical Theories. The third distinguishing characteristic of the “Teaching in Sociopolitical Context” syllabi was the incorporation of critical theories into the MTE process. Several of these syllabi named their use of critical theories explicitly. They referred to queer theory, feminist theory, and critical multiculturalism.

In addition, several of these courses appeared to be centrally concerned with engaging students in critical analysis, drawing implicitly on critical pedagogy and critical theories. Each of these syllabi referred in some way to applying critical thinking and analysis to social and educational inequities. For example, a learning outcome for one course was to “enhance critical thinking skills” as applied to “contemporary issues in the field of multicultural education.”

A majority of these courses appeared to draw upon critical pedagogy, not simply as a content area, but as a *process* for MTE. One course was described as the “study of diversity in educational settings and practices with emphasis on processes of inquiry, reflection, collaboration, and critical analysis.” Another syllabus detailed how students would “apply methods of critical analysis to an examination of the socialization process and to the systematic maintenance of oppression.” According to a third syllabus in this group, students would be engaged “in the critical examination of the psychosocial and sociopolitical relationships between teaching, schooling, education, and educational policy and leadership in the U.S.”

Teaching as Resistance and Counter-Hegemonic Practice

The final three syllabi (6.7% of those examined) shared many of the features of Jenks et al.'s (2001) conception of critical MTE. Like those that reflected the “Teaching in Sociopolitical Context” approach, these courses appeared to be built largely on critical theories, to frame education in a larger sociopolitical context, and to use a systemic rather than (or in addition to) an interpersonal level of analysis. But one characteristic shared by these syllabi distinguished them: a determination to prepare teachers to resist, and to prepare their students to resist, oppression.

Whereas the “Teaching in Sociopolitical Context” courses appeared to be designed to nurture critical consciousness, preparing teachers to understand the sociopolitical nature of their work, these courses appeared to be designed, at least in part, to *apply* critical consciousness to counter-hegemonic teaching. The “Course Overview” of one of these courses contained similar characteristics as the “Teaching in Sociopolitical Context” courses: “The premise that guides the course is that education is a set of political, economic, and cultural relationships that reflect the dominant social arrangements in society.” It continued, though, by connecting this sociopolitical context to teacher resistance: “Issues of power and powerlessness are central to the course as they illuminate how social arrangements are imagined, constructed, *and challenged*” (my italics). Another syllabus alluded to a sort of resistance pedagogy, explaining that

students would “demonstrate ways to teach critical multicultural content using transformative and constructivist techniques.”

Moreover, these courses were designed to help teachers or teacher candidates imagine themselves as change agents both within and outside schools—as well as to nurture this spirit in their students. For example, the conceptual framework for one of these courses named the importance of “critical consciousness on the part of both educators and students,” but connected this explicitly with the need for students and teachers to “engage in the liberatory process of social change.” Another referred specifically to the use of arts in counter-hegemonic practice, calling them “dialogic and agentive” means for education and social change. Unlike the syllabi categorized into the other approaches, these raised social reconstruction as a key project of multicultural education.

Discussion

These findings, particularly the distribution of the syllabi across the emerged typology of approaches to MTE, largely support existing scholarship on MTE. Consistent with this scholarship (Cochran-Smith, 2004; Author, 2006; Vavrus, 2002), most of the courses described within these syllabi appeared crafted to prepare teachers with cultural sensitivity, tolerance, and multicultural competence. Most of the courses were not designed to prepare teachers to identify or eliminate racial, socioeconomic, or other inequities, or to create equitable learning environments. In fact, only about a quarter of them—26.7%—appeared designed to prepare teachers in ways consistent with the defining principles of multicultural education (see Author, 2006). In other words, most of the syllabi analyzed for this study failed to frame multicultural education as a political movement concerned with social justice, as an approach for comprehensive reform, as a critical analysis of power and privilege, or as a process for eliminating educational inequities.

Considering this disparity, one might find hope in the fact that a fairly small percentage of the syllabi—15.6% or seven out of 45—were grouped into the “Teaching the ‘Other’” approach. However, although 27 of the 39 other course designs failed to reflect basic principles of multicultural education, they, at the very least and unlike the “Teaching the ‘Other’” syllabi, did not appear to be built upon values (such as the homogenization or other-ing of non-dominant groups) that directly contradicted these principles. Still, despite the relatively low number of syllabi constituting the “Teaching the ‘Other’” approach, we should be alarmed that any teacher might be educated to adopt oppressive philosophies or practices under the guise of multicultural education. We should be alarmed that any teacher might be prepared, in the name of multicultural education, to contribute to, rather than to counter, existing educational inequities.

On the other end of the spectrum, the syllabi reflecting the “Teaching as Resistance and Counter-Hegemonic Practice” approach—those that most fully encompassed the key principles of multicultural education—comprised the smallest number of the syllabi analyzed (three out of 45 or 6.7% of the total). Even if we grouped these with the “Teaching in Sociopolitical Context” syllabi, which drew on the key principles but did not position the teacher, as in Grant and Sleeter’s (2006) social reconstructionist approach, as a counter-hegemonic agent, we would be left with a total

of twelve syllabi (or 26.7% of the total) designed to prepare teachers to be what might be called *authentic* multicultural educators.

A majority of the syllabi, 57.8%, fell somewhere in-between, drawing on approaches— “Teaching with Cultural Sensitivity and Tolerance” and “Teaching with Multicultural Competence”—which were neither distinctly un-multicultural nor distinctly critical-multicultural in nature.

To be sure, the values (such as an appreciation for diversity) and skills (such as culturally competent teaching) promoted in each of these approaches (other than the first) are important to a holistic approach to MTE. Effective teachers need to be multiculturally competent (Constantine & Sue, 2005; Luiquis & Pérez, 2006; Milner & Ford, 2007). They need pragmatic curricular and pedagogical strategies (Sleeter, 2005). They need to reflect on their biases and how these inform their practice (Bannick & van Dam, 2007; Boyle-Baise, 2005). This is an important point of reflection in regards to typologies such as the one that emerged from this study: One might assume that the goal is to transcend the first four approaches described here in an attempt to achieve “Teaching for Resistance and Counter-Hegemonic Practice.” But a loftier goal might be to draw on the skills and competencies focused upon in each approach (excepting the “Teaching the ‘Other’” approach, perhaps), adding layers of complexity and proactiveness as we strive toward the latter approaches. For example, shifting from “Teaching with Cultural Sensitivity and Tolerance” to “Teaching with Multicultural Competence” need not require us to stop encouraging teachers to respect or celebrate diversity. Instead it requires us to help teachers understand that respecting diversity means little if this respect does not inform practice—if it does not help them become multiculturally competent practitioners. Similarly, one need not desert multiculturally competent instruction in order to shift to the “Teaching in Sociopolitical Context” approach. Instead, she or he must recognize that real multicultural competence can be achieved only when one understands her or his practice in a larger sociopolitical context. One cannot teach low-income students effectively without understanding how class and poverty inform the ways in which such students experience the world (and, as an extension, one’s own classroom). In fact, as I reported earlier, many of the syllabi that reflected what I called the “Teaching as Resistance and Counter-Hegemonic Practice” approach contained elements of the other approaches.

Unfortunately, most of these syllabi represented courses that did not appear to be created with this sort of scaffolding in mind. Or the scaffolding crashed before it reached the “Teaching in Sociopolitical Context” approach. Overall, this study suggests, like the body of literature preceding it, that most multicultural education type courses are not designed to prepare teachers to do the work of multicultural education.

Conclusion and Moving Forward

To be sure, education programs—and particularly licensure programs—face a myriad of challenges and pressures that affect decisions regarding course design. These include individual program and institution governance processes as well as the expectations of accreditation agencies (Honawar, 2008). They also include the limits of faculty expertise. These challenges and pressures highlight the multi-faceted approach—

changes in consciousness, in policy, in practice—that would be required for any systemic shift toward more authentic MTE.

One point of departure might be NCATE, the most popular and prestigious accrediting agency for U.S. teacher education programs. An analysis of the language embedded in its controversial Diversity standard (NCATE, 2008) reveals patterns consistent with the “Teaching with Multicultural Competence” approach described earlier:

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity.

Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P–12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P–12 schools. (par. 5)

Although most of the syllabi did not appear to be designed to prepare teachers to practice multicultural education as conceived theoretically, they did appear designed to meet this NCATE standard.

In addition, the introduction of models or guidelines that draw upon the five common principles of multicultural education (as discussed earlier) might mitigate the lack of faculty expertise in MTE at some institutions. Organizations such as the National Association for Multicultural Education or the Center for Multicultural Education at the University of Washington could take the lead on such an effort, translating the abundance of theory and philosophy in the field into clear suggestions—not proscriptions, but guidelines—for course development and delivery.

A concurrent push for more research on approaches to and practice in MTE is warranted—research that looks beyond this or that strategy within one’s own courses. This study uncovered several points along a line of inquiry related to MTE which are ripe for scholarly attention. These include the ways in which various approaches to MTE translate into teacher practice, multicultural teacher educators’ perceptions of their preparation for teaching multicultural education type courses, and actual MTE practice—what happens when the classroom door is closed? We might, as well, look to other forms of professional development for models and approaches that more closely approximate the principles of multicultural education in the teacher education process.

Meanwhile, the typology that emerged from this study might provide a lens through which teacher education programs can consider their multicultural education course offerings. What, exactly, are these courses teaching teachers to do and to be? And what are the implications of this as it pertains to educational equity and social justice—the roots of multicultural education?

References

- Almarza, D. (2005). Connecting multicultural education theories with practice: A case study of an intervention course using the realistic approach in teacher education. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 29(3), 527-539.
- Ambe, E. (2006). Fostering multicultural appreciation in pre-service teachers through multicultural curricular transformation. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, 22(6), 690-699.
- Amosa, W., & Gorski, P. (in press). Directions and mis-directions in multicultural education: An analysis of session offerings at the annual conference of the National Association for Multicultural Education. *Multicultural Perspectives*.
- Aveling, N. (2006). 'Hacking at our very roots': Rearticulating white racial identity within the context of teacher education. *Race, Ethnicity & Education*, 9(3), 261-274.
- Banks, J. (2004a). Multicultural education: Characteristics and goals. In J. Banks & C. Banks (Eds.), *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (pp. 3-30). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Banks, J. (2004b). Approaches to multicultural curriculum reform. In J. Banks & C. Banks (Eds.), *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (pp. 242-264). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bannick, A., & van Dam, J. (2007). Bootstrapping reflection on classroom interactions: Discourse contexts of novice teachers' thinking. *Evaluation & Research in Education*, 20(2), 81-99.
- Bert, B.L. (2001). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Boyle-Baise, M. (2005). Preparing community-oriented teachers: Reflections from a multicultural service-learning project. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 56(5), 446-458.
- Bruna, K. (2007). Finding new words: How I use critical literacy in my multicultural teacher education classroom. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 33(1), 115-118.
- Case, K., & Hemmings, A. (2005). Distancing strategies: White women preservice teachers and antiracist curriculum. *Urban Education*, 40(6), 606-626.
- Cho, G., & DeCastro-Ambrosetti, D. (2005). Is ignorance bliss?: Pre-service teachers' attitudes toward multicultural education. *The High School Journal*, 89(2), 24-28.

- Cochran-Smith, M. (2004). *Walking the road: Race, diversity, and social justice in teacher education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2003). Standing at the crossroads: Multicultural teacher education at the beginning of the 21st Century. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 5(3), 3-11.
- Cochran-Smith, M., Davis, D., & Fries, K. (2004). Multicultural teacher education: Research, practice, and policy. In J. Banks and C. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (2nd edition, pp. 931-975). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Constantine, M.G., & Sue, D.W. (2005). *Strategies for building multicultural competence in mental health and educational settings*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Díaz-Rico, L.T. (1998). Toward a just society: Recalibrating multicultural teachers. In R. Chávez Chávez & J. O'Donnell (Eds.), *Speaking the unpleasant: The politics of (non) engagement in the multicultural education terrain* (pp. 69-86). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Dressman, M. (1998). Confessions of a methods fetishist: Or, the cultural politics of reflective nonengagement. In R. Chávez Chávez & J. O'Donnell (Eds.), *Speaking the unpleasant: The politics of (non) engagement in the multicultural education terrain* (pp. 108-126). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Gay, G. (2005). Politics of multicultural teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 56(3), 221-228.
- Gayle-Evans, G., & Michael, D. (2006). A study of pre-service teachers' awareness of multicultural issues. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 8(1), 45-50.
- Gollnick, D. (1995). National and state initiatives for multicultural education. In J. Banks and C. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education*. Old Tappan, NJ: Macmillan.
- Gorski, P. (2006). Complicity with conservatism: The do-politicizing of multicultural and intercultural education. *Intercultural Education*, 17(2), 163-177.
- Grant, C. (1992). *Research in multicultural education: From the margins to the mainstream*. London: Routledge.
- Grant, C., & Sleeter, C. (2006). *Turning on learning: Five approaches to multicultural teaching plans for race, class, gender, and disability*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hidalgo, F., Chávez-Chávez, R., & Ramage, J. (1996) Multicultural education: Landscape for reform in the twenty-first century. In J. Sikula, T. Buttery, & E.

- Guyton (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (2nd ed; pp. 761-778). New York, NY: MacMillan.
- Honawar, V. (2008). Teacher ed community is striving to interpret candidate "dispositions." *Education Week*, 27(28), 1-13.
- Jackson, C.W. (2003) Crystallizing my multicultural education core. In G. Gay (Ed.), *Becoming multicultural educators: Personal journey toward professional agency* (pp. 42-66). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Jenks, C., Lee, J.O., & Kanpol, B. (2001). Approaches to multicultural education in preservice teacher education: Philosophical frameworks and models for teaching. *Urban Review* 33(2), 87-105.
- Jennings, T. (2008). Addressing diversity in U.S. teacher preparation programs: A survey of elementary and secondary programs' priorities and challenges from across the United States. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, 23(8), 1258-1271.
- Keiser, D.L. (2005). Learners not widgets: Teacher education for social justice during transformational times. In N.M. Michelli & D.L. Keiser (Eds.), *Teacher education for democracy and social justice* (pp. 31-55). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Klug, B.J., Luckey, A.S., Wilkins, S., & Whitfield, P.T. (2006). Stepping out of our own skins: Overcoming resistance of isolated preservice teacher populations to embracing diversity in educational settings. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 8(3), 30-37.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Multicultural teacher education: Research, practice, and policy. In J. Banks and C. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 747-761). Old Tappan, NJ: Macmillan.
- Lesko, N., & Bloom, L.R. (1998). Close encounters: Truth, experience and interpretation in multicultural teacher education. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 30(4), 375-395.
- Lucas, T. (2005). Fostering a commitment to social justice through service learning in a teacher education course. In N.M. Michelli & D.L. Keiser (Eds.), *Teacher education for democracy and social justice* (pp. 167-188). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Luiquis, R.R., & Pérez, M.A. (2006). Cultural competency among school health educators. *Journal of Cultural Diversity*, 13(4), 217-222.
- Marx, S. (2004). Regarding whiteness: Exploring and intervening in the effects of white racism in teacher education. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 37(1), 31-43.

- McAllister, G., & Irvine, J. (2000). Cultural competency and multicultural teacher education. *Review of Educational Research*, 70(1), 3-24.
- McKenzie, K.B., & Scheurich, J.J. (2004) Equity traps: A useful construct for preparing principals to lead schools that are successful with racially diverse students. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40(5), 601-632.
- McLaren, P.L. (1995). White terror and oppositional agency: Towards a critical multiculturalism. In C.E. Sleeter & P.L. McLaren (Eds.), *Multicultural education, critical pedagogy, and the politics of difference* (pp. 33-70). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- McLaren, P.L. (1994). *Revolutionary multiculturalism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- McNeal, K. (2005). The influence of a multicultural teacher education program on teachers' multicultural practices. *Intercultural Education*, 16(4), 405-419.
- Milner, R.H., & Ford, D.Y. (2007). Cultural considerations in the underrepresentation of culturally diverse elementary students in gifted education. *Roeper Review*, 29(3), 166-173.
- Moss, G. (2008). Diversity study circles in teacher education practice: An experiential learning process. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, 24(1), 216-224.
- Mueller, J., & O'Connor, C. (2007). Telling and retelling about self and "others": How pre-service teachers (re)interpret privilege and disadvantage in one college classroom. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, 23(6), 840-856.
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2008). NCATE unit standards. Retrieved April 27, 2008 from <http://ncate.org/public/unitStandardsRubrics.asp>
- Nieto, S. (2004). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education*. New York, NY: Longman.
- Nieto, S. (1998). From claiming hegemony to sharing space: Creating community in multicultural courses. In R. Chávez Chávez & J. O'Donnell (Eds.), *Speaking the unpleasant: The politics of (non) engagement in the multicultural education terrain* (pp. 16-31). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- O'Grady, C.R. (1998). Moving off center: Engaging white education students in multicultural field experiences. In R. Chávez Chávez & J. O'Donnell (Eds.), *Speaking the unpleasant: The politics of (non) engagement in the multicultural education terrain* (pp. 211-228). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

- Pennington, J. (2007). Silence in the classroom/whispers in the halls: Autoethnography as pedagogy in white pre-service teacher education. *Race, Ethnicity & Education*, 10(1), 93-113.
- Potter, J., & Wetherell, M. (1994). Analyzing discourse. In A. Bryman & R.G. Burgess (Eds.), *Analyzing qualitative data* (pp. 47-66). London: Routledge.
- Raible, J., & Irizarry, J. (2007). Transracialized selves and the emergence of post-white teacher identities. *Race, Ethnicity, & Education*, 10(2), 177-198.
- Rao, S. (2005). Effective multicultural teacher education programs: Methodological and conceptual issues. *Education*, 126(2), 279-291.
- Rubin, B.C., & Justice, B. Preparing social studies teachers to be just and democratic: Problems and possibilities. In N.M. Michelli & D.L. Keiser (Eds.), *Teacher education for democracy and social justice* (pp. 79-103). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Sleeter, C. (2005). *Un-standardizing curriculum: Multicultural teaching in the standards-based classroom*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Sleeter, C. (2001a). Epistemological diversity in research on pre-service teacher preparation for historically underserved children. In W. Secada (Ed.), *Review of research in education* (Vol. 25, pp. 209-250). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Sleeter, C. (2001b). Preparing teachers for culturally diverse schools: Research and the overwhelming presence of whiteness. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(2), 94-106.
- Sleeter, C. (1996) *Multicultural education as social activism*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Smith, R. (1998). Challenging privilege: White male middle-class opposition in the multicultural education terrain. In R. Chávez Chávez & J. O'Donnell (Eds.), *Speaking the unpleasant: The politics of (non) engagement in the multicultural education terrain* (pp. 197-210bh). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Solomona, R., Portelli, J., Daniel, B., & Campbell, A. (2005). The discourse of denial: How white teacher candidates construct race, racism, and 'white privilege.' *Race, Ethnicity & Education*, 8(2), 147-169.
- Strauss, A.L. (1987). *Qualitative analysis for social scientists*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

- Trent, S., Kea, C.D., & Oh, K. (2008). Preparing preservice teachers for Cultural Diversity: How Far Have We Come? *Exceptional Children*, 74(3), 328-350.
- Valentín, S. (2006). Addressing diversity in teacher education programs. *Education*, 127(2), 196-202.
- Vavrus, M. (2002). *Transforming the multicultural education of teachers: Theory, research, and practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Wasonga, T.A., & Piveral, J.A. (2004). Diversity and the modeling of multicultural principles of education in a teacher education program. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 6(3), 42-47.
- Weiner, L. (2000). Research in the 90s: Implications for urban teacher preparation. *Review of Educational Research*, 70(3), 369-406.
- Wilson, S., Floden, R., & Ferrini-Mundy, J. (2001). *Teacher preparation research: Current knowledge, gaps, and recommendations*. Washington, DC: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy.
- Zeichner, K., & Hoeft, K. (1996). Teacher socialization for cultural diversity. In J. Sikula, T. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 525-547). Old Tappan, NJ: Macmillan.